



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/>





ZM  
O'Sullivan











Preserve this Leaf.

To my dear friend

Richard Hayint

from her faithful

and affectionate friend

W. M. L. Key

Natick (Md)

May 24 1867

"Be thou faithful unto death  
& I will give thee a crown  
of life"



# ROMANISM AS IT RULES IN IRELAND:

BEING

## A FULL AND AUTHENTIC REPORT

OF THE MEETINGS HELD IN VARIOUS PARTS OF ENGLAND AND  
SCOTLAND,

IN WHICH

THE THEOLOGY SECRETLY TAUGHT,

THE

COMMENTARY ON THE BIBLE CLANDESTINELY CIRCULATED,

THE

LAW OF THE PAPAL STATES

SURREPTITIOUSLY SET UP TO GOVERN IRELAND, AND THE

*Secret Diocesan Statutes of the Province of Leinster,*

HAVE BEEN

SUCCESSIVELY DETECTED AND EXPOSED, TOGETHER WITH ALL THE IMPORTANT DOCUMENTS  
RELATING TO THE SUBJECT, SELECTED AND ARRANGED WITH A COPIOUS INDEX.

BY THE REV. MORTIMER O'SULLIVAN, D.D.

AND

THE REV. ROBERT J. M'GHEE, A.B.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

"Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils. Speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their consciences seared with a hot iron. Forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth."—I. Tim. iv. 1, 2, 3.

PUBLISHED BY R. B. SEELEY AND WM. BURNSIDE,  
HATCHARD AND SON, SIMPKIN AND MARSHALL,  
NISBET, LONDON.

MILLIKEN, GRANT AND BOLTON, CURRY, TIMS, BLEAKLEY, DUBLIN;  
AND TO BE HAD OF ALL THE BOOKSELLERS.

1840.

m. m. b.

25955A

GEORGE FOLDS, Printer, 1, Saint Andrew-street  
(Opposite Trinity-street, Dublin.)

TO HIS GRACE

THE

LORD JOHN GEORGE BERESFORD,

PRIMATE, &c. &c.

---

THE subject of the following compilation, most respectfully dedicated to your Grace, the Editors believe to be, under whatever aspect it is regarded, of the gravest possible interest. It is a faithful exposure of the system of social, moral, and religious instruction, adopted by the Church of Rome, for her Ecclesiastics and Laity, enforced in the authoritative standards of her theology, and painfully illustrated both in the past history and present condition of our distracted and unhappy country.

The Editors are not so happy as to know that your Grace will pronounce a favourable judgment on their publication. They feel that the most appropriate tribute to offer you, would be one on which public favor was undivided. They cannot lay claim to such a recommendation;—but, conscious that their labors have been conducted in a spirit

of which they trust your Grace would approve, and confidently appealing to the invectives of unscrupulous adversaries, (who, aspersing their motives, have uniformly left their arguments unassailed,) for a tacit but satisfactory acknowledgment, that the statements are not chargeable with error or exaggeration; they allow themselves to hope, that unmerited calumny has not disintitled them to the honor of thus publicly testifying their respect for the eminent station in which your Grace has been providentially placed, and for the high qualities by which, as men of all parties confess, you have been enabled to uphold and adorn it.

## P R E F A C E .

---

WHATEVER apology may be thought necessary by the consciousness of imbecility or the diffidence of genius, for obtruding their productions on the public, it is the high prerogative of truth to stand forth in the simplicity of her own inherent power, and instead of humbly soliciting the attention of mankind as a boon, to demand it with authority as a right. It is therefore that the Editors of the following pages, however they may feel their own deficiencies in advocating the sacred cause of truth, cannot so far wrong their judgment as to offer an apology to the British empire for sending forth this work from the press. They know that they publish truth, which, whether in reference to the political, the social, the moral or the everlasting interests of the nation, cannot be disregarded, much less contemned with impunity, by any individual from the cottage to the throne. These volumes rest their claim to attention on the evidence of facts, on the unanswered and unanswerable demonstration of irresistible documentary proof—proof which has exhibited the impotence of sophistry to evade it—of perjury to deny—of power to crush—of clamour to cry it down. They do not expose the principles or the deeds of men of other times, who have passed away from the busy scenes of life—whose conduct might be misrepresented—whose motives might be misconceived—whose books, whose words, whose oaths,

whose actions, might be placed, by malice and ingenuity, in such an unfavourable point of view as to mislead the public mind, but who, if they could arise from their graves and stand forth in the honest integrity of their own conscious innocence and virtue, could vindicate their honor and avenge their wrongs, and turn the tide of public indignation and contempt on their accusers. They do not tell a tale of men in humble life—they do not bring a charge against poor unlettered creatures—they do not fasten the crimes of the Ribbonman, the Whitefoot, or the Rockite, on weak and helpless individuals, who perhaps might never hear the story of their accusations, and even if they did, whose poverty and weakness would forbid them to cope with their accusers, to meet their charges with responsive energy and power on the platform or in the press, or even to seek redress for injured character from the tribunal of public justice; these are not the subjects of attack and exposure in these volumes. The principles, the words, the oaths, the books, the acts of living men are brought into the blaze of day—their secret conclaves are laid open—the subject of their secret discussions, their questions, their answers, are proclaimed aloud upon the public platform—those authoritative standards that are to guide the men who direct the consciences, and rule with despotic tyranny the temporal and eternal destinies of an unhappy population—those standards that make crimes the subject of instruction, and the interests of a Church the motive for their perpetration—those standards that reduce obscenity and perjury to rule, and confiscation, murder and sedition to law—these are plainly and palpably exhibited.

The authorised circulation of notes on God's Eternal Word, given as of infallible authority to a credulous confiding people—notes full of blasphemy, idolatry, intolerance, and persecution—notes which under the pretence of a commentary, borrow the semblance of authority from the sacred text, for every false doctrine it denounces, and for almost

every crime that it forbids, *these* are detected and exposed to public view.

The laws of a foreign tyrant set up within the limits of the British empire—the sceptre of an arbitrary foreign power wielded within the precincts of the boasted British Constitution, to invade the liberties, the laws, the religion, the properties, the lives, of British subjects—to denounce the Protestant Sovereign of the realm, and all powers, temporal and ecclesiastical, deriving their authority from that sovereign—to sever the allegiance of Irish Roman Catholic subjects from their monarch, and give the undivided fealty of those subjects to the Pope—to compel them to temporal subjection under the lash of spiritual despotism—these are the facts unanswerably demonstrated in these volumes. And who are the men against whom the charges are brought? who are they who are defied again and again before the open face of day to meet, or to confute a single one of them? who are they whose efforts of defence have but betrayed the consciousness of guilt, and afforded only fresh occasions of confirmation of their crimes, till they have been driven to prefer the confession of a coward and submissive silence, to the helpless and baffled impotence of any further effort to defend? They are the first, the ablest, the most learned, the most powerful, the most vaunted champions of the Papacy. Here, you may behold the leaders of a band of public truce breakers dragged by the grasp of truth from the degraded and dishonored benches of the British Senate, and the crimes of that guilty superstition, by which they have been nursed and trained to perjury, publicly branded on their brow. Here you may see the confederated band of ecclesiastical seditious tyrants, the authors and organisers of their country's crimes—prominent in exemplifying the pestilent principles they have inculcated—reversing the office and the order they profess to hold of sacred guides,

“ Who lure to brighter worlds, and lead the way,”

You may behold them the instructors and the exemplars that lure and lead to guilt, to darkness, and to death. Here you may see exhibited the smooth and open smile of bland, unruffled, serenity upon the countenance, while you hear the deep and dark denunciation that bursts in secret from the heart—Here you may see the loud and lofty letter breathing integrity and honor, and denying in the public press to the Prime Minister of England, the principles, the facts, the books which are demonstrated before your eyes, to be adopted in the secret conference by the very man who denies them. Here you may see the calm and christian tenderness of brotherly kindness, breathed in the address that is published to a people, as if they were all “beloved fellow Christians,” while anon you turn your eyes and look into the chamber of imagery, and there you see the mask of Christian charity flung off, and the dark inquisitor with his brethren in his secret Synod sealing up the sentence of curse and excommunication against the men that are openly addressed as his beloved brothers—Here you may see the dignified and apostolic sermon breathing all the charity and love of the Apostle John, and then the livid lip that has pronounced the base hypocrisy, breathing out threatenings and slaughters like the persecutor of Tarsus against the disciples of the Lord, in the secret conclave of inquisitorial persecution.—Here you may see the open, unanimous declaration, the confederated oath proclaiming, as it affects to do, their genuine principles, and signed and given before the face of the nation, to priests and people by their guides, their highest authorities, to beguile and to deceive the men who saw and heard these sentiments proclaimed on oath—and then when hypocrisy and treachery had gained their point, you may see the secret instructions pressed with all the power of authority upon these very priests, to guide that very people, in the secret orders and inculcation of the confessional, which demonstrate every syllable of that declaration to be one



unanimous and infamous imposture, and every sentence of that oath to be one black tissue of deep confederated perjury. Here you behold the canons and the laws of the dark and deadly days of Papal Massacre denounced, and openly denied before the nation, and those very laws pregnant with persecution, with confiscation, with treason, and with slaughter, revived and set up in the secret and authoritative conclave, as the laws to dismember the Empire, and to deluge our streets and fields with blood—Here you see facts that admit of no denial, acts that admit of no explanation, perjuries that cannot be palliated, crimes that cannot be extenuated, supported by proofs that cannot be met; you see mathematical demonstrations of moral turpitude, that leave all systems of human iniquity except the Papacy at a distance.

Popery had professed, Popery had sworn, Popery had been believed, Popery had succeeded. This is not the place to follow her in her fatal progress to that ominous position which she has attained, one cannot say in influencing, but in ruling the destinies of England. It is enough that she was proceeding in the full career of, yet undetected crimes, of yet successful perjuries, manifest indeed in her acts, but professing liberality and charity in her principles, when it pleased Providence, by a concurrence of unlooked for circumstances, a chain of unsought for, unsuspected proofs, to lay open the system of Theology in which her Hierarchy had been so long, so secretly, and so successfully training the wretched population of the country. A brief consultation with a few friends was all that was necessary to determine the course to be adopted, and that was, that the facts should at once be laid before the British public in London; a little time was occupied in the arrangements, and in about six weeks after the plan had been resolved on, the meeting was held in Exeter Hall. Fifty copies of Dens were previously secured and sent to London, and on the 20th of June, 1835, the facts of the case, the horrid principles of

secret cruelty and crime, the well concealed theories of Priestly instruction, the lessons of deep and dark atrocity, that had so long filled the country with treason and with blood, were then dragged forth to light.

Perhaps a greater and a more universal interest never was excited in England by a single public meeting, than by the first that was held in Exeter Hall, and that solely by the subject, as the persons who brought it forward were men without name or influence with the British public. A second meeting was immediately demanded, and held in three weeks after the first; the more the evidence of facts was investigated, the more clear and convincing did the proofs appear. The criminals, the Popish Hierarchy, feeling they were detected, were silent all but Dr. Murray; he, necessarily compelled to self defence, afforded by all his sophistries, his denials, his equivocations, and his solemn appeals to his oath, only fresh materials for his own conviction; his weak and silly apologist, the compiler of the Priests Directories, involved him only deeper and deeper by establishing the proofs of his crime; their complaints of not being heard in their own defence, while they refused every opportunity offered them to appear: their charge against their accusers of going to a distance, while they refused every invitation to meet them at home, only served the more to convince the public mind of their manifest consciousness of the truth of every charge against them, and such was the anxiety of the public to learn the full statement of the case, that if the Editors could have acceded to all the applications they received to hold public meetings, they might have proceeded through the length and breadth of the United Empire.

The first of these Volumes, closing with the year 1835, is occupied with accounts of Meetings held in various parts of England and Scotland, and the intense interest and anxiety of the Protestant public to hear, the deep and earnest attention of the crowded meetings, and the voice of

loud acclamation mingled with expressions of astonishment, disgust, and horror, with which the various statements were received, could never be conveyed in any printed form.—At the close of the year 1835, a letter appeared in a newspaper, in which it was stated that a certain Bible printed in Cork, in 1818, contained the doctrines of Dens in the shape of a commentary on the Scriptures, of which some specimens were given in the letter, and that the names of the Popish Bishops were among the list of subscribers to this publication. This caused an inquiry—the identity of the extracts in the paper, with the notes of a celebrated Bible published in Dublin, in 1816, was at once perceived. It was well known that this Bible had been publicly abjured by the Bishops, that Dr. Troy had denied having given it his patronage, and had been convicted of falsehood by his own bookseller, that Dr. Murray had declared in his evidence in 1825, that it was not circulated under the authority of any Bishop or Priest in Ireland, and that, till then, no counter proof had been adduced against him. After some delay a copy of the Cork edition was procured, a comparison was instituted between them, they were evidently different editions of the same book, and the names of Dr. Troy and Dr. Murray appeared not only as subscribers but as patrons of the publication. The second Volume of this work commences with a comparison between the doctrines of this infamous commentary and Dens, instituted at a public meeting held in Glasgow, in January, 1836, where both editions were produced, and the iniquity, the falsehood of the Romish Hierarchy stand out still more conspicuously than before. Again Dr. Murray attempts to redeem his character by a denial of any knowledge of the fact, and again affords an opportunity for fresh exposure and conviction.

The facts are still more fully developed at a subsequent meeting, held in July, at Exeter Hall, and this period of the controversy was distinguished by an incident that served to

give new interest and deeper importance to the case. One of the Editors, through a mistake, which the detail of facts will render perhaps less inexcusable than it might at first appear, brought forward, not in evidence of the facts, but in an incidental illustration of the Papal power, a Bull which had come into his hands as is related, and which he conceived to be a genuine document, but which turned out to be fictitious and certainly not written with intention to deceive. The production of this fictitious document was the signal for one simultaneous burst of Papal and Radical indignation against the individual who produced it; the Press of the United Empire, as far as it pleads the cause of Popery, echoed the charges of wilful falsehood and forgery against him, and the admitted spuriousness of this one document was pleaded as a demonstration of the falsehood of every other.

One circumstance, however, then little dreamt of in the midst of this loudly vociferated triumph, served to make it but of brief duration; that circumstance was this, that the fictitious document professed to be a Bull, and while the shout of Papal acclamation over this fictitious Bull was ringing loudest in the ear of England, they little knew that a fresh detection and exposure of the crimes of their Hierarchy was ready to meet them in the midst of all their triumph.—The accession of political power which they had gained by perjuries, without measure and without number—abjuring all the laws and canons of their church that had been in former times the signal and the authority for treason, for confiscation, and for slaughter, had emboldened the Romish Bishops to bring those laws into active operation, on the consciences of the people in the confessional, which is the mode the Church of Rome has ever most approved, of making her laws of force and power in any country, and they accordingly had set up these laws in connexion with the republished Theology of Dens.

Through all their tissue of complicated perjuries, the plea the popish bishops had relied on to prove the total renunciation of these laws, was the fact, that they could not be in force, for they had never been published by their authority in the country; therefore, by their own admission on their oaths, the publication of those laws in the country had put them into force.

Their book of canon law, and its important references, had been examined. These laws were brought out immediately in another public meeting in London; and as will be seen in the results of the meeting held on the subject, the shout of short-lived triumph was turned into the abashed confounded silence of conscious and convicted guilt; and while to this day they strive to raise the public cry of forgery and of imposture as to the fictitious bull, to this day they do not dare even to mention, much less to meet, the proof that they have set up the laws they had denied again and again upon their oath, and the laws which they bring to bear with despotic and irresistible power upon the consciences of the miserable Roman Catholic laity, to bring them into slavery, and to make them, when opportunity long sought and wished for may present itself, the instruments of treason, of insurrection, and of slaughter in unhappy Ireland.

There seemed no further development of Papal guilt to be expected, yet another discovery still more important than the last served to rend the veil for ever from the mystery of iniquity—the secret statutes of the Provincial Synod of the Bishops of Leinster, were discovered. By these, Dens, which had before been proved to be a guide for the priests, but only inferentially shown to carry its influence to the people, was now demonstrated to be the guide established by episcopal authority, for all the population of the Church of Rome; the priests were proved to be drilled in that standard by the bishops in the conference, to teach them to direct by it the consciences of the people in the confessional—the laws that had been added

to this atrocious system of theology, were placed beyond the reach of doubt, as to their tremendous use and destination; and treason, confiscation, perjury, and murder were brought home to the very heart of the episcopal authority of Rome. The monster was fully now exposed to public view, that so long had preyed upon the wretched population of the land, and contrived, like the desolator of Arcadia, so to drag its victims to their power, as he dragged the cattle backward to his den, that the traces might seem to point away from the place of destination, so that they could not be tracked to a religion that was the real author of their crimes and misery. The detection and exposure of these secret statutes, in meetings at Exeter Hall and Bristol, held by the Editors, closes their present publication.

They have not omitted a single document on behalf of the Church of Rome, that was written by a single individual whose name was known, or that could give a shadow of weight to any effort to defend them.

They have omitted some correspondence of merely local interest connected with the Hereford Association, on the part of Thomas A. Knight, Esq. of Downton Castle, and the Rev. Maurice James, of Pembridge. The former of these gentlemen has passed away from this earthly scene; and they would not preserve a correspondence which might inflict unnecessary pain on individuals, and could not throw much additional light upon the facts of the controversy. The correspondence with Mr. James they omit for various reasons—it would swell these volumes without adding a tittle to their interest, and could convey no instruction to the reader, except the melancholy lesson, that when either false political prejudices, or a still more lamentable error as to the religion he professes, leads a Minister of the Established Church to undertake the defence of Radicalism or of Popery, he exhibits a miserable illustration of the cause he has espoused, that it is destitute alike of principle and of truth. It is well

for him when, as in the case of Mr. James, his efforts to defend a cause are so insignificant, that they are not worth preserving, even for the cause he has attempted to defend, and that they are left to be forgotten in the ephemeral pages of a newspaper, instead of being consigned to dishonorable perpetuity in a book.

They have printed their speeches verbatim from the most correct reports of the meetings they could procure, though in several instances those reports are exceedingly deficient. In some they were printed in pamphlets, for which the documents were furnished at the time, and these are the best reported in the work. They have generally omitted all expressions of applause, except those with which they were received at the commencement and conclusion of their addresses, which seem right to retain as the reports expressed them, that the public feeling may not be unknown on the subject. In one or two speeches, which were printed from corrected reports, and which they had given with directions to the compositor to erase them, they have been accidentally retained. They have only to add, that should the advocates of Papal crime venture to dispute one single resolution passed at a single Protestant meeting, they now deliberately assert that they are true in every tittle, and that while it pleases God to spare them life and health they will neither retract nor qualify a single document they have produced, a single statement they have made, a single principle they have asserted, but will maintain them against any and all the Papal Hierarchy, or any man in their Church they can procure to plead their cause.

They conclude these prefatory remarks with an earnest hope and prayer that God will accompany their plain and faithful testimony with his blessing; that he will graciously vouchsafe to maintain the religion, the liberties, the laws, which His Providence has so graciously established in this

realm, and that He will lead their Roman Catholic fellow subjects to see that a religion, pregnant with crimes like the Papacy, cannot, *a priori*, be the religion of a Holy God; that the superstitions of this Apostate Church are alike abhorrent from the doctrines, as her principles are from the morals of the Bible, and that they may be led to hear the voice of inspiration when it cries, "*Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues: For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities.*" REV. xviii. 4-5.



# A FULL AND AUTHENTIC REPORT,

&c. &c.

---

THE statement made in the introduction to this Report only renders it necessary here to remark, that the following documents appeared as preliminaries to the first public meeting.

The first is an advertisement, bearing the signatures of twenty clergymen, three of whom are dignitaries of the Established Church, one a fellow of the College of Dublin, and one a member of the Synod of Ulster. This advertisement appeared in several papers, on the first and second week of June, 1835, and was as follows:—

## “ TO THE PROTESTANTS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

“The undersigned having recently discovered by authentic and unquestionable documents, which they have reason to believe have never met the public eye, *that the standards adopted and the principles inculcated by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy of Ireland are of the same intolerant and persecuting nature at this day that are well known to have characterised their Church in former times*, do feel it their painful but imperative duty to stand forward and produce, before Protestants of all denominations, unanswerable testimony on this subject.

“They make this public address to Protestants, for the purpose of giving to them an opportunity of judging on a question of vital importance to every one who values the rights of conscience, and the security of property, of liberty, and of life; and also for the purpose of affording to the Roman Catholic Bishops in general, and to Doctor Murray, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, in particular, as specially implicated in the charge, *an opportunity of meeting it in public, in their own persons, or by any of their clergy, or by any Roman Catholic layman, duly delegated and authorised by them.*

“They accordingly give notice, that three or more of their number purpose, with the gracious permission of Divine Providence, to attend at Exeter Hall, on Saturday, the 20th of June, instant, at twelve o'clock, and submit and illustrate the documents to which they have above referred.

(Signed)

H. R. Dawson, Dean of St. Patrick's,	Rev. Arthur Newcombe,
Robert Maude, Dean of Clogher,	Rev. C. H. Minchin,
Richard Murray, Dean of Ardagh,	Rev. Cæsar Otway,
J. H. Singer, D.D., F.T.C.D.,	Rev. John Hare,
Henry Cooke, D.D.,	Rev. Edward Marks,
Rev. Robert Daly,	Rev. William Hare,
Rev. Horatio T. Newman,	Rev. Gibson Black,
Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan,	Rev. Fielding Ould,
Rev. J. D. Hastings	Rev. R. J. M'Ghee.
Rev. Thomas Kingston,	

#### REGULATIONS OF THE MEETING.

“1. Admission to be by tickets, to be had at No. 9, Exeter Hall, Strand, and every person using a ticket of admission shall be considered as promising submission to the chair.

“2. Any Roman Catholic clergyman or layman, authorised by any one or more of the Irish Roman Catholic bishops, and who shall have left his name and authority at No. 9, Exeter Hall, at or before twelve o'clock on Friday, the 19th of June, will be permitted to speak.

“3. No Protestant but those who are delegated by the clergy who have signed the above document to be permitted to speak.

“4. Every speaker must confine himself, under the correction of the chair, strictly and exclusively to the subject in hand.”

---

The position which Mr. O'Connell occupies, as the professed champion of the religion of Popery, makes it necessary to preserve a memorial of the share which he took, or rather feared to take, in the proceedings recorded in this book. The following letter, addressed to that gentleman, appeared on the 17th of June, in the *Standard*, inviting him to come to Exeter Hall, to attend the public meeting on the 20th :—

“ TO DANIEL O'CONNELL, ESQ., M.P.

“ Sir,—I have now a newspaper before me, containing a letter of yours, dated April 28, 1835, addressed ‘to’ your ‘*constituents in particular, and to the people of Ireland in general*,’—as one of the latter class, I answer the following paragraph :—

“‘This is the ground on which I delight to grapple with the No-Popery hypocrites. How often do they exclaim against the benighted and ignorant Papists! How often do they declare that Catholicity is founded on ignorance, and that there would be no Catholics if there were no ignorant persons. Well, here we Catholics *meet them foot to foot*—here, we say, assist us to educate the people. If education promotes Protestantism, why, then, here come and educate the people. Do ye believe yourselves, or be ye hypocrites and liars? If you believe yourselves,—if you do not wish to be set down as the falsest of the human race—come forward now, and give this surplus money to educate the Irish people. But no, they falsify their own declaration and pretences; they basely *shrink* from the test of education, and unable to reason or argue with success, they raise a cry of bigotry congenial to those who are incapable of comprehending argument, or, appreciating political or moral justice.’

“Here, sir, you throw down the gauntlet to the Church of Ireland; wherefore, in the name of that Church, (though one of the weakest of her sons), I take it up, and let Ireland and the empire see if you are ready and able to *redeem your pledge*. You ‘*delight to grapple with the No-popery hypocrites.*’ You delight ‘*to meet foot to foot the men that refuse to assist you to educate the people.*’ Well, Sir, let us see whether there be any *truth* in this boast.’ And, now, not as a *hypocrite*—for God abhors the deceitful—but honestly as a Protestant, and as one who loves his Roman Catholic countrymen, as one who longs to see them delivered from a yoke that bows them down in darkness, and spiritual bondage, and misery, I say ‘NO-POPERY;’ as one who values the rights of conscience, who claims for them the same privileges I claim for myself, and who refuses to acknowledge the right of any man to shut out God’s truth from them and their children, and to sell them superstitions in its place; I say, for their sakes, ‘NO-POPERY.’ I refuse to *unite* with you or your priests to educate the people, because the *system* in which your priests would educate them, and in which they are trained and educated themselves, is a system that will not bear the light of day; it is a system that dares not stand the scrutiny even of human judgment, much less of the Word of God. If your bishops think it can, we shall, no doubt, see them, or some one, or more delegated by them, at Exeter Hall on the 20th inst.; but if not, if they shall find it convenient, as they have so often done before, to stand on their *dignity*, and refuse to notice the publication affording them an opportunity to appear in public, and defend their principles; then, Sir, that you may be indulged by meeting those whom you so long to encounter, ‘*foot to foot,*’ I thus *publicly, sincerely, and not hypocritically,* invite you to appear on the platform at *Exeter Hall*, in their and your own behalf, and apply the powers both of your legal inge-

nuity and your popular eloquence, to invalidate the plain simple statements of fact and document that shall there be laid before the public. What these may be it is unnecessary now to state. It is better not to prejudice the public mind beyond what the necessity of the case requires. Do not retire, Sir, into the House of Commons, where I and my friends cannot meet you—do not bluster there, and complain that the Irish Protestant clergy come over here to malign your pious bishops. Do not go over to Ireland, and tell the Roman Catholics that we malign their religion, and do not tell them what a *drubbing* we should have got, could you but have met us '*foot to foot.*' Come, Sir, we shall meet you with the courtesies and the courage of war—but, '*the weapons of our warfare are not carnal.*' I have longed to meet you on a fair field, and no favour. But, in common with all the Roman Catholics of Ireland who shall hear the case, as far as their priests cannot prevent them, you will find that your system will not bear the light of any human tribunal; and if not,—if you and your bishops must shrink in conscious apprehension from that ordeal—I warn you, not as an enemy, but as a friend, to reflect, before it be too late, how you and they shall appear when you come to stand in judgment at the bar of God.

"I write to you, Sir, with very little feeling of personal consideration. As far as I am concerned, I am physically unable to cope with any opponent; if I can speak a *little*, it is all I can hope to be enabled to do. I thank God the cause is in the hands of abler and better men, but if I could speak only a few words, and that they were the last I could speak even for my country, they should be to express a wish that my poor countrymen might be brought out of the deep darkness of Popery into the glorious light of the Gospel, and become in reality what they have been called in fable, 'an island of saints'—

Then Ireland shall be, 'great, glorious, and free,  
First flower of the earth, and first gem of the sea.'

"This is the true and only 'Emancipation,' for which I am your servant and faithful labourer,

"R. J. M'GHEE.

"London, June 13."

## FIRST DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

---

The first great meeting at Exeter Hall was held on Saturday, June 20, 1835.

It was expected that either the Roman Catholic clergy would have themselves attended the meeting, or have delegated some persons on their behalf to do so; and consequently the greatest excitement pervaded the public mind to witness a discussion in which the tenets of the Church of Rome were to be publicly impugned. Eleven o'clock was the hour appointed for the commencement of the proceedings, but long before that period every seat in the Hall was occupied. Among the noblemen and gentlemen who occupied the platform were the following :—

Earl of Roden, Earl of Galloway, Earl of Bandon.

Viscount Mandeville, M.P.; Lord Ashley, M.P.

Honourable Francis Bernard; Honourable Captain J. A. Maude, R.N.; Honourable Captain Francis Maude, R.N.; Honourable Randolph H. Plunkett; Honourable and Rev. Sir Francis Stapleton, Bart.; Honourable Colonel J. Wingfield Stratford; Honourable J. King.

Rev. Sir Harcourt Lees, Bart.; Sir Robert Shaw, Bart.; Right Hon. Sir George Rose, Bart.

Right Hon. Frederick Shaw, M.P.; William Verner, M.P.; Alexander Perceval, M.P.; Henry Maxwell, M.P.; Anthony Lefroy, M.P.; A. Chisholm, M.P.; Alexander Pringle, M.P.; C. L. Cuming Bruce, M.P.; — Lawson, M.P.; J. Hardy, M.P.; James A. Stewart Mackenzie, M.P.; J. D. Jackson, M.P.; Richard Longfield, M.P.; James B. Praed, M.P.; Ralph Sheldon, M.P.; George Finch, M.P.; J. H. Calcraft, M.P.; Sir Robert Bateson, Bart. M.P.; Sir Edmund S. Hayes, Bart. M.P.; W. E. Gladstone, M.P.; J. P. Plumptre, M.P.; M. Archdall, M.P.; — Balfour, M.P.

Rev. Mr. Benson, Master of the Temple; Rev. Dr. Holloway, Rev. Dr. Kenney, Rev. Samuel O'Sullivan, Rev. H. Beamish, Rev. Edw. Nangle, Rev. Dr. Jelf, Rev. J. Cator, Rev. Dr. Thorpe.

John Wynne, Esq., of Hazlewood; William Cunningham, Esq., of Lanesborough; John Poynder, Esq., J. E. Gordon, Esq., Somerset Richard Maxwell, Esq., Captain Saurin, R.N., Lieutenant-Colonel Le Blanc, Colonel Phipps, Thomas Verner, Esq., Thomas Stewart, Esq.

Among the ladies were the following :—

The Marchioness of Ormonde, Lady Caroline Calcrafft, Lady Barham, the Countess of Roden, Ladies Elizabeth and Maria Jocelyn Hon. Mrs. Lefroy, Hon. Mrs. Maxwell, Hon. Lady Stapleton, Hon. Mrs. James King, &c. &c.

At a few minutes past eleven o'clock Lord Kenyon appeared upon the platform, and was loudly cheered.

MR. HARDY, M. P., having moved that Lord Kenyon do take the chair, and the motion having been seconded, his Lordship took the chair accordingly.

HIS LORDSHIP addressed the meeting in the following terms:—  
On this most important and solemn occasion, I am not going to intrude any observations of my own upon the meeting. We are here summoned upon one of the most important and sacred occasions upon which Christians can be called together, and I am sure I only say that which will meet with a corresponding feeling from all present, when I suggest that the proceedings should be opened by a prayer to Almighty God; I therefore call upon the Rev. Dr. Holloway to open the business of the meeting by prayer.

DR. HOLLOWAY then came forward, and with due solemnity repeated the following prayer:—

“Almighty and everlasting God, who art the God of all the earth, and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, in whom and through whom we have at all times free access to thy divine Majesty, we bless and praise thee for the revelation of thy holy name, which thou hast given unto us in him, and we pray thee of thine infinite goodness to enable us to understand that name in spirit and in truth. We praise thee that we are permitted to ask counsel at thine hand; we bless thee that thou hast promised to preside at the head of thy church, and to be by thy wisdom an unerring guide, and to conduct us in all things that concern thine heavenly kingdom. Blessed Lord, we are here assembled to deliberate upon the truths of thy kingdom. We pray thee to preside over us, and grant that we may receive the revelation of thy word in spirit and in truth. May those who conduct thy service in the influence of thy Holy Spirit, and who have their hearts open to receive the truth as it is in Christ Jesus, enter into thy kingdom; and may the

day be fast approaching when all shall know thee, from the least to the highest. Remove out of us all mistakes, delusions, and heresy; engraft thy word upon our hearts in all simplicity and truth, and glorify the name of God, we humbly beseech thee, through the instrumentality of those who are assembled before thee. Pardon our sins, we pray thee, for thy dear Son's sake, and enable us to conclude our imperfect petitions in the words and in the spirit of our blessed Redeemer, who taught us, saying, "Our Father," &c. (The meeting joined the Rev. gentleman in repeating the Lord's Prayer.)

LORD KENYON then said—Before any of those who are appointed to address the meeting proceed to do so, I think it desirable, for the sake of making the business more distinct to the great assembly here present, to read the notice which was given for holding this meeting. (The noble lord here read the notice.) With respect to the rules to be observed, I am anxious that those rules should likewise be perfectly understood by all present. Having read the rules, his Lordship said—I now beg leave to notify to the meeting that the Rev. Mr. M'Ghee is about to address them.

The REV. ROBERT J. M'GHEE said—My Lord, before I enter upon the subject on which I have been appointed to address this meeting to-day, I am obliged very reluctantly to state, that after the meeting had been fixed beyond the power of revocation, the appointment of the visitation for the archdiocese of Dublin necessarily prevented the attendance here of the Dean of St. Patrick's and the Rev. Robert Daly. I mention this circumstance with peculiar reluctance, because if they had been enabled to come in time, my friend, Mr. Daly, would have taken the place which I feel comparatively so very unworthy, and, I regret to add, physically, unable to occupy. Labouring as I do under much pain and weakness in that organ which I am now obliged to exert—knowing that the statements which I have to make are necessarily prefatory to the observations of those who are to follow me—unable to throw any additional weight upon them—and being thus deprived of the assistance of my reverend friend, Mr. Daly, I really should have sunk under the apprehension of the important duty which has devolved upon me, and the consciousness of my own incapacity, if my reverend brother, Mr. Tottenham, had not come to me at a moment's notice. I have put him in possession of the statements which I have to make, and I trust to your kind indulgence to permit him to assist me in reading the documents which must necessarily be submitted to you,

and if I should be unable to conclude my address, to allow him to finish the statements which are to be made. Throwing myself, therefore, upon your kind indulgence, I shall proceed to the subject which has called us together.

We cannot but regret the necessity which has obliged us to publish any document that might be supposed to have even a tendency to lead this meeting to prejudge the case which is to be submitted to it, or to cast any imputation upon the Roman Catholic hierarchy or priesthood of Ireland: but if we had brought forward charges against men, regarding their doctrines or principles, without giving them an opportunity of knowing the nature of those charges, and of coming forward to meet and answer them in public if they pleased, then, indeed, we should have been accused, and justly accused, of misleading your judgment, as it were by stealth, and of attempting to excite a prejudice which the objects of it had not an opportunity to counteract. This, you feel, would be an injustice, and, therefore, we were obliged to publish the statement which many of you have read: but you will permit me, if any wrong has been done, to redeem it by reminding you, that it is the principle of British justice to presume every man innocent until he is proved to be guilty. Let me, then, in their behalf—since the Roman Catholic prelates have neither come here themselves, nor delegated any of their clergy, or any Roman Catholic layman, to appear amongst us—permit me, in their behalf, to remind you, that it is your duty not to receive any charge or imputation against their doctrines or principles except such as shall be fairly, positively, and conclusively established to your sober judgment and conviction; so that when any resolution of yours is brought forward upon those grounds, it will bear your own calm and deliberate reflection, and will go forth, I trust, with weight and power to the remotest corners of your country.

The statements which are to be submitted to you consist of two plain matters of fact. The first is, that a certain book—this book—*Dens's Complete Body of Theology*, has been adopted by the Roman Catholic prelates of Ireland as the standard guide of the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland for twenty-seven years past, namely, from the year 1808, to the present year.

The second point to which your attention will be called is a consideration of the nature of that book.

In the first statement which I shall have to make, I am happy to



feel that I shall not be obliged to introduce any question which can cast any reflection upon the doctrines or principles of the Roman Catholic prelates. It is a mere question of matter of fact. If you have been led to suppose that this book is a bad book, you are now called upon to dismiss that consideration from your minds, and to look simply to the evidence of the fact which shall be submitted to you. If I can show to you these several points—

*First*, that the Roman Catholic archbishops and bishops assembled on a certain day in the year 1808.

If I can show, *secondly*, that they being so assembled, selected this book from the whole body of their theology as the best book that could be republished.

If I succeed in showing, *thirdly*, that they so selected it for a particular purpose, namely, that they considered it the most secure guide for those ecclesiastics who might not have an opportunity of access to libraries, or of consulting their superiors where they wanted information.

*Fourthly*, If I can show that, in consequence of that resolution, they ordered 3,000 copies to be printed of the work, which then consisted of seven volumes, that is, according to calculation, a copy for every Roman Catholic priest in Ireland.

If I can show, *fifthly*, that this book, calculating the price as the same at which it sells now, allowing for an additional volume in the present edition, was then worth the enormous sum of 5,250 guineas.

If I can show, *sixthly*, that twenty-three years after, namely, in 1831, this book was set up as the conference book for the Roman Catholic priests of Ireland, or rather, I should say, of the province of Leinster, by Dr. Murray, Dr. Kinsella, Dr. Keating, and Dr. Doyle, (the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, and the three other bishops of the province of Leinster.)

And, *seventhly*, that, in consequence of the scarcity of the work, (the whole of the former edition of 3,000 copies being out of print and lost sight of in Ireland,) a new edition was ordered—I say ordered, as we have reason to think it was, (for an 8th volume, the previous edition having consisted of only seven, was added with the express sanction and approbation of Dr. Murray, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin)—if I can show this on the testimony of the publisher of both editions—that of 1808 and that of 1832.

If I can also show, *lastly*, that the questions proposed at the

private conferences of the Roman Catholic priests, printed in the most authoritative documents, appointed by the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Leinster for five years, namely, for the years 1831, 1832, 1833, 1834, and 1835, are taken consecutively from this book, and correspond with the consecutive chapters in *Dens*—if I can show these different points, then I think I shall have satisfactorily established the fact, that this book has been set up as the standard authority and guide of the Roman Catholic priests of Ireland, from the year 1808, down to the year 1835.

The first document to which I shall beg to call the attention of the meeting is this—It is a History of the Roman Catholic Association, by Mr. Wyse, M. P. I find in the appendix, No. 7, a number of resolutions adopted at a meeting of Roman Catholic prelates, assembled at Dublin, on the 25th of February, 1810. The following resolutions were on that occasion unanimously adopted:—

“ 1st, Resolved—That it is the undoubted and exclusive right of Roman Catholic Bishops to discuss all matters appertaining to the doctrines and discipline of the Roman Catholic Church.

“ 2d, Resolved—That we do hereby confirm and declare our unaltered adherence to the resolutions unanimously entered into at our last general meeting, on the 14th of September, 1808.”—*Wyse's History of the Catholic Association*, vol. ii. appendix, p. xx.

This is an independent document. It has nothing to say to the question, but it proves this fact—that at the meeting of February, 1810, the prelates adverted to the meeting of September, 1808, and confirmed all the resolutions of that meeting; that is merely an independent testimony, but here is a book which informs us what those resolutions were—at least what one of those resolutions was, which were adopted at the meeting of the 14th of September 1808. I beg to call your particular attention to this extract:—

“ At a meeting of the Roman Catholic prelates of Ireland, held on the 14th of September, 1808, it was unanimously agreed that *Dens's Complete Body of Theology* was the best book on the subject that could be republished.”

Here we have the fact, that the Roman Catholic prelates met on that day, and in the book it is proved that they selected *Dens's Theology*. It is added,

“ As containing the most secure guidance for such ecclesiastics as may, by reason of the peculiar circumstances of this country, be

deprived of the opportunity of referring to public libraries, or consulting those who may be placed in authority over them."

They set it up, you perceive, as the standard authority for all Roman Catholic priests when they could not refer to libraries, or could not consult their superiors. This book goes on to say, that,

"Inasmuch as his Grace Dr. Murray, Dr. Doyle, Dr. Keating, and Dr. Kinsella, have made it the conference book for the clergy of the province of Leinster, the publisher, as well to obviate the difficulty experienced by them in procuring the work, as also to advance the cause of religion and morality in the other parts of the Irish church, is induced to reprint a limited number of copies."

Now, this limited number of copies, the publisher told me and a brother clergyman, amounted to 3,000. So that we have here the testimony of the publisher of both editions, the one printed in 1808, and the other in 1832. It is then stated that another volume was added, with the express sanction and approbation of the Most Rev. Dr. Murray. I have now to mention what the book is upon the authority of which I make this statement. This is, I may say, the most authoritative book in the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland. The priests are obliged, under the penalty of what they call mortal sin, to repeat certain exercises every day, which they call offices. These are taken from the Breviary, from the Missal, and from parts of Scripture which I know not, but every year there is published a *Directory*, under the authority of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, in which these offices are prescribed for every day in the year. Therefore, before the first of January, every Roman Catholic priest in Ireland must have this book, and he must have it in his hands every day of the year to direct him. It is called the *Priest's Directory*. In this book it is stated, that the Roman Catholic priests are to hold, four times in every year, a conference, in each of which, questions are to be proposed by the prelates of each diocese, and the priesthood are obliged to be informed of the standard principles of their church in answer to those questions. Now, to show that the statements I have made are correct, the *Directory* from which I have read is that of 1835, this year. I shall now refer to the *Directory* for 1831, and we find the questions for the conference printed in each of the *Directories* in consecutive order to this day. In that for 1831, the heading of the questions for conference is as follows:—

"Obeying the commands," (I am translating from the Latin,)—

“obeying the commands of the most illustrious and most reverend the archbishop and bishops of the province of Leinster, we shall discuss the treatise from the author, Mr. Dens, of ‘human actions,’ in two conferences, of ‘sins,’ in one conference, and of ‘conscience,’ also, in one conference, for the year 1831.”

This was in 1831, twenty-three years after the first edition of the work was published, in 1808, and in consequence of this being set up by the command of “the most illustrious and most rev. the archbishop and bishops of the province of Leinster;” a new edition was printed in the next year, 1832.

I have here the *Directory* for 1832, and the same facts are exactly recorded of the meeting of the bishops, and the following notification, is given—“In the press, and will be published in March, 1832,” &c. We have here also the questions for the conference of this year printed and the heading is—

“There will be four conferences for the year 1832. In the province of Leinster, in which, following Mr. Dens as our author, we will discuss his treatise on the ‘virtues.’”

In the *Directory* for 1833, there are also the questions for the conference taken from Dens; in the *Directory* for 1834, also the questions are taken from Dens, in the same consecutive order; and in the *Directory* for 1835, the present year, the questions are also taken in regular succession from the same source. The questions of conference for 1831, will be found in the first volume of *Dens*, from page 144 to 182, each question of the printed conference corresponding with a chapter in *Dens*. The questions for the second conference will also be found from page 162 to 264. It is not necessary for me to trespass on the time of the meeting by referring to them in detail. It is sufficient for me to state that the consecutive questions of conference for the five years, from 1831 to 1835, are taken from the consecutive chapters in *Dens*, and those chapters are selected as furnishing authoritative standard answers to the questions. It will now, I believe, be universally admitted that this book has been set up as an authoritative standard for the Roman Catholic priests of Ireland, during the time I have specified.

The only objection which we could possibly have anticipated to this allegation is, that as the statement in the *Directory* is not actually signed by the Roman Catholic archbishops and bishops, but is only

the statement of the printer, we cannot fasten a charge upon them:— that the printer may put what he pleases in his book, and they are not answerable for what he may introduce for the purpose, perhaps, of puffing off the work.—But in answer to that, we must consider these questions—Is it possible that the authorised printer to the whole Roman Catholic Church in Ireland—to the College of Maynooth—and the Roman Catholic prelates, should print a matter of fact concerning the archbishops and bishops of every diocese in Ireland, in a book which was to be in the hands of every priest in Ireland, if the statement were not true? Is it possible he could print a statement that all the Roman Catholic prelates had set up as a standard of theology, which all priests were to have in their hands—a work which they had not so set up? Is it possible he should publicly state that he had been for this very reason ordered to print this book, if he had not been ordered? Is it possible he could persuade the Roman Catholic clergy that they were to discuss in their private conferences, which they held under the direction of their bishops, certain questions which he should print, and that those questions should correspond with the authoritative standard, if those questions had not been proposed, and that standard not set up? I believe even a child would at once see that this is not possible. I confidently submit that there never was a clearer case than that which I have submitted to this meeting, and it was with a view to give an opportunity of impeaching this statement, if it were possible to impeach it, that I took the liberty of writing to Mr. O'Connell, to request him to come here, and if he could, to refute the authenticity of my statement, by all the powers of his legal talents. We desire nothing but truth. It is a small matter for us to stand here before a number of our poor fellow-sinners, when we remember that we are standing in the presence of our God. I trust I may say with equal confidence for my dear brethren and for myself, that we come here influenced by no unworthy motives—impelled by no unkind or unchristian feeling, but simply to discharge an imperative duty to our church—our churches rather, (for we are of different denominations)—to our fellow-creatures of all persuasions—to our country and to our God. I therefore, before I proceed to the consideration of the second part of my statement, most confidently submit these facts to the judgment of the meeting, and I trust that there will not only be no dissentient voice, as I am sure there will not, but not even a single dissentient feeling. If I thought there could be any mistake, I would endeavour

to anticipate it; but I confess I see no possible link that can be added to the chain of evidence, and I therefore confidently submit, through the chair, to this meeting, the following resolution:—

“Resolved—That it appears to the satisfaction of this meeting, that *Dens's Complete Body of Theology* has been adopted by the Roman Catholic bishops of Ireland, as containing those principles which they approve for the guidance of the Roman Catholic priesthood, since the year 1808, and set up for the conferences of the priests in the province of Leinster, since the year 1831.”

The Rev. Dr. COOKE seconded the resolution.

Lord KENYON then said, the meeting have heard the resolution proposed by the Rev. Mr. M'Ghee, and seconded by Dr. Cooke, and it is for them to express their sentiments upon it. Before I put the resolution, I shall take this opportunity of calling publicly on Mr. O'Connell, and apprising him if he be present, that although he has given no notice of his intention to take any part in the discussion, it is open for him now to address the meeting on the subject under immediate consideration, as it will be during the future progress of these proceedings. The noble Chairman then read the resolution, and put it to the meeting.

Some interruption arose here from an individual endeavouring to address the assembly, without having qualified himself by a compliance with the rules laid down. In reply to Lord Kenyon, who asked him who and what he was, he stated that he was an Irishman and a Roman Catholic. His Lordship then read the rules aloud, and inquired whether the person was deputed by any of the Irish Roman Catholic bishops or clergy? to which he replied that he certainly was not.

Lord KENYON then said, that independent of the rules which had been laid down, an express communication had been made to Mr. O'Connell, as the Rev. Gentleman had just stated. It was no prejudice or imputation upon Mr. O'Connell that he had not presented himself there, in consequence of that communication; but that which was a special invitation to him could not be considered an invitation to any one else.

The resolution was then carried, it may be said unanimously, not more than half a dozen hands in the vast assembly being held up against it.

The same person who had caused the former interruption again endeavoured to address the meeting.

Lord KENYON again declared that he could not be heard. If an exception were made with respect to one individual, it might be expected that it should be made with respect to one thousand.

The Rev. Mr. M'GHEE again rose and said—I congratulate the meeting upon the resolution which they have unanimously adopted. You have this day decided upon a question which has baffled all the talents of all the statesmen and all the theologians of the empire from time immemorial. You have decided upon a question for which Mr. Pitt appealed in vain to the foreign universities. You have decided a point which your senators argued and re-argued during all the time that the Roman Catholic question was discussed in parliament. You have this day determined what is the nature of the principles really adopted by the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Ireland. The importance of that resolution cannot be calculated at this day. I firmly believe that the resolution you have adopted this day will be carried down in the page of your country's history; and of the nature of it you can only be aware now, by considering the character of the book which has been proved to be so unanimously and authoritatively adopted by the Roman Catholic prelacy of Ireland; and I am sorry that it is now my painful duty to state that the principles contained in that book are as bad—as full not only of error, but of intolerance and persecution—as ever the enemies, even the worst enemies of the Roman Catholic Church have ever charged its members with maintaining from their ancient councils. I will first state a few propositions which are to be deduced from it.

In the first place, it will appear from it that the Roman Catholic Church accounts Protestants of all denominations, whatever they may be, heretics.

Secondly, They assert that by baptism (for they allow heretical baptism to be valid) we are brought under the power—the domination of the Church of Rome.

Thirdly, So far from granting us toleration, they hold, that it is their duty to exterminate the rites of our worship.

Fourthly, That it is the duty of the Church of Rome, to compel heretics by corporal punishments to return to the faith of Popery. And,

Fifthly, That the punishments so denounced are confiscation of property, exile, imprisonment, and death.

I have made some extracts from the documents on this subject, and I have given in parallel columns the Latin and the English, in a small pamphlet of forty or fifty pages, which is published by Seeley, to satisfy the public curiosity at the present moment. As I am suffering much pain in the organ of voice, perhaps you will permit me to avail myself of your kind indulgence by requesting my Rev. friend Mr. Tottenham, to read some of those extracts, proving consecutively the points I have mentioned.

The Rev. Mr. TOTTENHAM then came forward and said—Mr. M'Ghee's first proposition is—

“That Protestants of all denominations are accounted heretics by the Church of Rome, and worse than Jews and Pagans.”

This is proved by the following extracts :—

“What is heresy?”

“Answer. It is the unbelief of those who profess indeed that Christ has come, but reject his doctrine as to any part as proposed by the Church, such as Lutherans, Calvinists,” &c.—*Dens*, vol. ii. p. 78.

In this it is established that the Church of Rome accounts all persons heretics who reject any part of the doctrine given by Christ, and of course they reckon their own doctrine as being identical with that of Christ. Again—

“What kind of infidelity is the greatest sin?”

“We answer with St. Thomas, quest. 10, art. 6, by distinguishing. If the infidelity is considered objectively, or in reference to the subject matter of it, then Paganism is worse than Judaism, and Judaism is worse than heresy—because the Pagan errs in more particulars than the Jew, and the Jew in more than the heretic. But if it is considered subjectively, or in reference to the pertinacity of the will and the resistance to the faith, then heresy is the worst, and Judaism generally worse than Paganism—because heretics are wont to have a greater knowledge of the truth of the faith than Jews, and Jews than Pagans; and so, generally, heresy is the greater crime.—*Dens*, vol. ii. p. 78.

Here we have two things established—first, that the Church of Rome accounts Protestants as heretics; and secondly, as such, reckons them worse than Jews or Pagans.

The second proposition of Mr. M'Ghee is—

“That all are by baptism placed under the power of the domination of the Church of Rome.”



I shall read the following extracts in confirmation of this statement

“Are all who have been baptised in the church?”

“We answer, No. And particularly heretics and apostates are evidently not of the church, because they do not profess the same faith and doctrine with those who are in the church, which, nevertheless, is expressed in the definition of the church.

“Objection. The church judges and punishes heretics, but she does not ‘judge those that are without,’ according to the Apostle, 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, chap. v.; therefore heretics are in the church.

“We answer, by denying the consequent; for although heretics are without the church, nevertheless they remain by reason of baptism subject to the church, whence she justly seizes them as deserters from the camp of the church, and so they are under the obligation of returning; but the apostle is treating of those who have never entered the church, or who have not been baptised.”—*Dens*, vol. ii. p. 114.

Again, in the chapter of “Infidels and Heretics being subject to the law,” we meet the following passage:—

“Heretics, schismatics, apostates, and all similar persons who have been baptised, are bound by the laws of the church which concern them, nor are they more released from her laws than subjects rebelling against their lawful prince are released from the laws of that prince.

“Objection. Heretics are not in the church; therefore they are not subject to the church.

“We answer by distinguishing the antecedent. If it means that heretics are not in the church, as far as relates to the union of charity and communion of the saints, we grant it; but if it means that they are not in the church as to subjection, we deny it; for they are made by baptism, subject to the church, and they remain personally subject to the church, wheresoever they may be.”—*Dens*, vol. ii. p. 289.

Thus, the second proposition is established, that the Church of Rome considers Protestants, as being by baptism, subject to its jurisdiction; and the only point remaining to be considered on this part of the subject is, whether that church considers the baptism of heretics valid. Now the Council of Trent utters an anathema against those who should doubt the validity of such baptism:

“It is not required that a minister should explicitly intend to do that which the Roman Church does, but it is sufficient that he should simply and generally intend to do that which Christ instituted, or that

which the true church does, whatsoever his opinion of that church may be, as the practice of the church declares, which holds the baptism of heretics to be valid.

“But what if he should have two conflicting intentions, as for example—the heretic baptises, intending to do that which Christ instituted, or what his own church does, but not what the Roman Church does?”

“We answer—Such a man, morally speaking, baptises in a valid manner.”—*Dens*, vol. v., p. 133.

I now pass to the third proposition, and in doing so we are ascending to the climax—that so far from granting toleration, “it is the duty of the Roman Catholic Church to exterminate the rites of our religion.” In *Dens' Theology* are the following questions:—

“Is it lawful to tolerate the rites of unbelievers?”

“This is answered, first,—The rites of the Jews, although they sin in exercising them, may be tolerated with a certain degree of moderation, because from thence great good accrues to the church, namely, that we have a testimony to our faith from our enemies, since by their rites those things which we believe are represented to us as in a figure.

“It is said, ‘with a certain degree of moderation,’ because if there be any danger that the Jews, by their rites, prove a scandal to Christians, the church can and ought to moderate, or even to prevent it, as may be expedient. Hence, it has been decreed, in the fifth *Book of Decretals*, 6th chap. 3 and 7, that it may not be lawful for the Jews to have many synagogues in one state, nor to build new ones in many places.

“We answer, secondly—The rites of the other unbelievers, namely, of Pagans and Heretics, are not in themselves to be tolerated, because they are so bad that no truth or utility can from thence be derived to the good of the church.

“Except, however, that some greater evils might accrue from some other source, or some greater good be prevented.

“Objection I. The apostle to the Romans, chap. xiv., v. 5, says, ‘Let every man abound in his own sense,’ (we translate the Greek, ‘Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.’) Therefore, liberty of religion is left to every man.

“This is answered by denying the consequence, (that is, by denying that liberty of conscience is to be left to every man,) for the apostle is not treating of the rites of religion, but of the observance or non-observance of the difference of days and meats, according to the law of Moses, either of which might well be done at that time.

“Objection II. The dilemma of Gamaliel, Acts, chap. v., verses 38 and 39. Where he is speaking of those things which the apostles were doing, ‘Refrain from these men, and let them alone, for if this counsel or this work be of man it will come to nought, but if it be of God ye cannot overthrow it.’

“We answer, first—This is a dilemma, not of the sacred Scripture, but of Gamaliel, who, by this apparent argument, wished to rescue the apostles, whom he favoured, from present danger.

“We answer, secondly—That, granting the argument of Gamaliel to be valid, there is this difference, that the cause of unbelievers is not doubtful to the judges of the church, as that of the apostles was to the Jews, but it is clear that it is certainly false and condemned; whence it is not to be tried or approved, but extirpated, unless there may be some prudential reasons which may induce us to tolerate it.”—*Dens*, vol. ii., pp. 82, 83.

The fourth proposition is stronger still, namely, “That it is the duty of the Roman Catholic Church to compel heretics, by corporal punishment, to submit to the faith.” The questions in *Dens* are these:—

“Are unbelievers to be compelled to join themselves to the bosom of the faithful?”

“We answer, first—Unbelievers who have never been baptised cannot be compelled to receive the faith; in the first place, not by the church, because she has no jurisdiction over the unbaptised, according to the 1st Corinthians, chap. v., verse 12, ‘What have I to do to judge them that are without?’ Nor even by secular princes, although their superiors, because they have only a political power over them, which merely respects the public peace and tranquillity.

“The same also is proved by the example of Christ, the doctrine and practice of the church, and the form prescribed to the apostles in preaching. (Matt. x.)

“Objection.—It is said, Luke, chap. xiv., verse 23, ‘Go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in:’ therefore all unbelievers can be compelled to receive the faith.

“This is answered by denying the consequent; for, according to St. Gregory, the words of the parable are to be understood of compulsion improperly so called, which is used by preaching, persuasion, showing of miracles, &c.

“But if, with St. Augustine, you understand the words of compulsion properly so called, then they are understood of heretics and schismatics, who have at some time made profession of faith, and who can, properly speaking, be compelled.

“ We answer, secondly, to the question—That unbelievers who have been baptised, as heretics and apostates generally, and also baptised schismatics, can be compelled by corporal punishments to return to the Catholic faith and the unity of the church.

“ The reason is, that they by baptism are made subjects of the church, and therefore the church has jurisdiction over them, and the power of compelling them, by the ordained means, to obedience, and to fulfil the obligations contracted in their baptism.

“ This also, obtains in the case of those who have been baptised in their infancy, or who, compelled by fear or any necessity, have received baptism ; as the Council of Trent teaches, session 7, canon 14 ; and the 4th Council of Toledo, canon 55.

“ You may object—‘ No one believes against his will, but the will cannot be compelled ; therefore no one can be compelled to the faith.’

“ We answer by denying the consequent ; for he is not compelled to believe against his will, but that from being unwilling he should be made willing.

“ You urge again—No one can be compelled to baptism, therefore, no one to the faith.

“ We answer with St. Thomas on this—‘ As to vow is the part of a willing mind, but to pay what is vowed is of necessity ; so, to receive the faith is the part of the will, but to hold it when received is of necessity ; and therefore heretics can be compelled to hold the faith.’

“ Meantime it is not always expedient that the church should use this right, as will appear from what shall be said hereafter.”—*Dens*, vol. ii., pp. 79—81.

Thus the Church of Rome professes the power not over the unbaptised, but over all who are baptised, in whatever class of heretics they may be found.

The fifth and last proposition is :—“ That the punishments which the Church of Rome decrees against heretics are confiscation of property, exile, imprisonment, and death.” This is the most important of all. I beg the attention of the meeting to it, and, if necessary, I will read the original Latin as well as the translation :—

“ What are the punishments decreed against those infected with that stain ?

“ Heretics that are known to be such, are infamous, *ipso jure*, and are deprived of Christian burial.

“ Their temporal goods are, *ipso jure*, confiscated ; but before the execution of the act, the sentence declaratory of their crime ought to proceed from the ecclesiastical judge, because the cognizance of heresy lies in the ecclesiastical tribunal.

“ Finally, they are also justly afflicted with other corporal punishments, as with exile, imprisonment, &c.

“ Are heretics justly punished with death ?

“ St. Thomas answers—2da. 2dæ. quest. 11. art. 3, in corp., ‘ Yes, because forgers of money or other disturbers of the state are justly punished with death, therefore, also, heretics, who are forgers of the faith, and, as experience testifies, grievously disturb the state.’\*

“ This is confirmed, because God, in the Old Testament, ordered the false prophets to be slain ; and in Deut. chap. xvii. v. 12, it is decreed, that if any one will act proudly, and will not obey the commands of the priest, let him be put to death.—See also the 18th chap.†

“ The same is proved from the condemnation of the 14th article of John Huss, in the Council of Constance.”—*Dens*, vol. ii. pp. 88, 89.

You will here observe, that not only the confiscation of property, exile, and imprisonment, but death, are decreed against heretics, and the author attempts to justify them by a reference to the authority of the Old Testament, and an appeal to the infallible authority and precedent of the Council of Constance. Now, the state of the case is this—from the extracts which I have read these five propositions are proved distinctly—that Protestants of all denominations are considered heretics by the Roman Catholic Church ; that that church holds, that we are, by baptism, placed under its domination ; that so far from granting toleration, it is its duty to exterminate the rights of our religion ; that it is its duty, fourthly, to compel us, by corporal punishments, to submit to the faith ; and fifthly, that the punishments which it decrees are, confiscation of property, exile, imprisonment and death. And mark, lastly, that the only restraint, the only exception in any one of these cases, is a mere question of expediency.

The Rev. Mr. M’Ghee resumed—Now, it may, perhaps, occur to some individuals here—it ought, perhaps, naturally to occur to us all—that although those principles are to be found in this book, so adopted by the Roman Catholic prelates and hierarchy of Ireland, still that those prelates did not, or would not, bring such principles as these under the discussion of their priests ; but they rather avoided it, taking what was good in the book, and putting out the bad. But what will be the sensation of this meeting when they learn, that the questions proposed for the private conferences of the Roman Catholic

\* 1st Appendix 1.

† Ibid 2.

priests of the province of Leinster, for the year 1832, by the archbishop and bishops of Leinster, nay rather, I believe, for those of the priests of Ireland, were questions embracing every single point which you have heard taken from the chapters in *Dens*. You will remember the heading of the conferences is—"There will be four conferences for the year 1832 in the province of Leinster;" and then it goes on to say, "in which, following Mr. Dens as our author, *Dominum Dens auctorem sequentes*, we shall discuss his treatise on the virtues." These principles are all to be found in a discussion upon the virtues—the theological virtues, faith, hope, and charity. Here, in the second conference is the question, "Are unbelievers to be compelled to unite themselves to the bosom of the church?" You have heard the answer—the authoritative answer. "Is it lawful to tolerate the rites of unbelievers?" You have heard the answer. "What punishments are decreed against those affected with the stain of heresy?" You have heard the answer. There is, perhaps, another objection. Perhaps, you will say, although these questions are given as proposed in the private conferences, and although the answers are made which are found in the book, perhaps the bishops and clergy deny the authority of *Dens*. I am sorry to be obliged to state, that such an interpretation is impossible. The proposition of the question itself, the very terms in which it is proposed, and the declarations made, preclude the possibility of such an interpretation. I must call the attention of the meeting to the principle of the punishments decreed by the Church of Rome, as stated in the treatise of *Dens* on laws. I am now translating from the book, of *Dens*, vol. ii. p. 307.

"Punishment is decreed in a two-fold manner by the laws, namely by the mode of the sentence already decreed (*sententiæ latae*), and of the sentence to be decreed (*sententiæ ferendæ*).

"The punishment is said to be of the *sententiæ latae*, which is incurred by the very thing in which the transgression of the law, or the sin, is committed, without any further sentence; such is the excommunication annexed to external heresy.

"The punishment of the *sententiæ ferendæ* is that which is not incurred by the very fact, but is decreed to be inflicted by the sentence of the judge to be afterwards pronounced."

It is then asked—

"How do you distinguish whether the punishment is of the *sententiæ latae* or *ferendæ*?"

The answer is—

"By the words of the law itself."

It is added—

“If these words be used in the law—*ipso jure*—*ipso facto*—then it is of the *sententia lata*—that is, it is of that nature that the decree has already passed against it.”

Now, when we turn to the chapter in *Dens*, on which this question of these private conferences is proposed, what do we find? We find these very words, which prove these punishments to have passed the infallible decree of Rome :

“Heretici notorii sunt infames *ipso jure*, &c.

“Bona eorum temporalia sunt *ipso jure* confiscata, &c.”—*Dens*, vol. ii. p. 88.

And how is the question proposed to the priests, on this subject, in the conference? it is—

“Quæ pœnæ contra ista labe infectos *LATÆ*?”

This is the very expression declared, in the treatise on laws, to be decreed by the Church, without any trial being necessary on the subject; so, without judge or jury, or any other sentence necessary to be pronounced, heretics fall under the denunciations which you have heard, as being decreed against them by the Church of Rome. There is another point which puts the question beyond all possibility of doubt, and to which I wish especially to call the attention of the meeting. There is a chapter in *Dens* on the consent of bishops—vol. ii. page 129, in which this question is asked:—

“Is the express consent of the bishops required for the infallible authority of a decision decreed (*lata decisionis*?)

“Answer.—No; but their tacit consent is enough, consisting in being silent, and not reclaiming against it, after the definition decreed, which has sufficiently come within the knowledge of the bishops; for to be silent in this case is to consent; for the error, saith Felix III., which is not resisted is approved; and truth when it is not defended is oppressed; and St. Aug. Epist. 109, saith, the church of God is that which neither approves nor keeps silence as to those things which are contrary to faith or a good life.”

Here it is declared, that if the bishops do not cry out against a decree they ratify it. What, then, have we here? The bishops not silent, but speaking; not crying out against, but adopting, printing, circulating, commanding, proposing the very questions, and setting up

this book as the authoritative standard of their answers for all the Roman Catholic priests of Ireland.

Another interruption occurred here, from some unauthorised persons attempting to address the meeting.

LORD KENYON said—No person can be allowed to interrupt the proceedings of the meeting. If any one does so, he will remember that he cannot stay in it.

MR. M'GHEE resumed—Let no man now, I say, pretend to be ignorant of the sources of those fitful flames of desolation and of death which are ever bursting up from the volcanic bosom of unhappy Ireland. You talk of bringing your legislation to allay them—you might as well legislate to arrest the eruptions of Vesuvius, or to extinguish the lava that boils in the burning bosom of Etna. There is a monster like him who was fabled to be buried beneath the Sicilian mountain, who spreads his giant length and breadth beneath all the deep foundations of that unhappy land, and manifests the struggling powers of his existence, only by his ceaseless efforts to convulse, to agitate, and to inflame. What peace can we expect in such a state of things as this, when confiscation, exile, imprisonment, and death—the very horrors of war—are incorporated in the very framework of man's social existence?—When men who ought to be the ministers of Christ, instead of taking the leaves from the tree of life, to sweeten the bitter waters of contention; evoke, as it were, the demons of discord to poison the streams which should flow pure and unsullied from the “fountain of living waters”—where religion, that blessing which God has given us to heal the wounds of human sorrow, to still the storms of human passion, and to renew and regenerate the apostate heart of man, is made in the hands of its ministers an instrument to rankle every wound, to exasperate every passion, to ulcerate, to fester, to gangrene into death the natural corruption of the guilty human heart? You all remember the time when it was stated, that the principles of the Church of Rome remaining the same, and man's natural heart remaining the same, it was to be expected that where the same opportunities offered, the same results would be produced; and history was appealed to in confirmation of this proposition; and you recollect that on that occasion a certain noble and learned lord stated, that “those who read history thus, read it like an old almanack.” I think that noble and learned lord for his apposite and prophetic



illustration. Little did he dream, when he made that remark, that the time was so soon to come when the fanciful conceit of illustration would be lost in the fatal reality of fact, and that the English language would be left without another word which would come with equal power, not to corroborate, but to pour a flood of refutation on his arguments. For, what is this book but an almanack?—the almanack of the Roman Catholic priests of Ireland. Here is the almanack of 1832. Is this an old almanack? Here is the almanac of 1833. Is that an old almanac? The almanac of 1834, of 1835. Is that an old almanac? Who can be surprised at—alas for my poor countrymen—I was going to ask who can blame the excesses of the deluded peasantry of Ireland, when the very crimes of the unhappy people are enumerated amongst “the virtues” of the authoritative standard of their spiritual guides. Recollect, “*tractatum de virtutibus discutimus*”—when the deeds of guilt and darkness which are reduced to horrid practice over the drunken debauch of the midnight assassin, are debated in principle in the sober mornings of religious conference among the priests? Oh, if my poor countrymen were here, and I could address them all, (and I can say for both priests and people, that “my heart’s desire and prayer to God for them is, that they may be saved,”) I would ask them one question, “Is this the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ? Is this the religion of Him who came into this world to save sinners? Can this bear the test of human judgment for a single moment?” And oh, as I see there are some Roman Catholics here, and I would address them, I hope, with fidelity, but I trust I can say, with Christian affection—I ask them, in the sight of Him who shall judge the heaven and the earth, if these things cannot for a moment bear the test of human scrutiny, how shall they stand before the bar of the eternal God? We cannot wonder if those dark and guilty purposes which are cherished in the ear at the confessional, are sometimes let out in the imprudent effusion of the intemperate public orator. We cannot be surprised at, and we cannot recollect without horror, the truculent threat, that if power were not given to the Church of Rome, the night should come, when the latches of our doors should be lifted, and we should be laid weltering in our blood before the faces of our wives and children. We cannot be surprised if, when a man chooses to exercise the privilege of a freeman, in voting against the power of the

Church of Rome, the threat of a death's-head and cross-bones should be —

(Here a violent interruption took place, and continued for some time, several persons in the room attempting to address the meeting. Order was at length restored, on an appeal from the Chairman.)

Mr. M'GHEE again proceeded.—I should not, he said, have adverted to this trite and hacknied charge, because it has been spoken of in other places—it has been spoken of on the hustings and in the House of Commons, but I have not seen it spoken of as I think it ought—for what is the fact? The fact is this—that this very emblem of a death's-head and cross-bones, or some such horrible shape or figure of death, was the portentous harbinger of murder which is fixed upon the doors of the victims destined for assassination in many of the southern counties in Ireland.—

(The disturbance was here renewed, by persons, again attempting to interrupt the speaker.)

LORD KENYON said, I must call upon the meeting to recollect the object for which it is convened, and the terms upon which persons are allowed to attend at it. The object of the meeting is to prove to Protestants of all religious denominations, by authentic documents, the real tenets of the Church of Rome, as now held by the Roman Catholic bishops and priests of Ireland. Any Roman Catholic who could obtain tickets are allowed to attend here, but they must not complain or interrupt the proceedings, if Protestants proceed to show what are the real tenets of the Roman Catholic Church, and the practices to be deduced from them; that being the purpose for which the meeting is called. I call upon the meeting to stand by the chair to prevent interruption. If any person does interrupt the proceedings he must leave the meeting—he must be turned out.

The Rev. Mr. M'GHEE, when order was restored, said, I suppose I have been interrupted, because it was considered that I had stated what was not the fact. Now, before I came to this meeting a document was sent to me by a clergyman, a friend of my own, in the south of Ireland, and he sent me the very paper which I now submit to the meeting. (The Rev. Gentleman here exhibited a figure of death and cross bones.) These are the actual figures which were placed over the door of the poor victims of assassination. They represent a figure of death stretched upon a coffin, with the assassin's hand above,

pointing to the figure, and these words printed—"THERE HE IS." This paper is an actual print, I know not by what ruthless hand, but these were circulated and pasted over the doors of destined victims, through several counties of Ireland. This one in my hand was actually fixed up as a notice of assassination and taken down by a policeman in the county of Kilkenny. A fac-simile of it was published in the *Kilkenny Moderator* of the 1st of September, 1832, and the fact was stated as one well known in all the southern counties of Ireland. I do not mean to charge the individual with the actual intention of issuing such a threat, but I will ask this question, did he know that it was used as the actual threat of murder, or did he not? If he says he did not, I can only answer that I believe there was not an attorney in the hall, not a lawyer on the circuits, not a judge on the bench, not a juryman in the box, not a witness on the table, or a culprit in the dock, who did not know that that was the actual emblem that was fixed on the doors of the victims of assassination. If he was the only one ignorant of it, how marvellous was the sympathy of his sentiment—and if he did know of it, how awful and how truculent was the threat of his intimidation. I pass now from the principles contained in the book to which I have referred, and proceed to call your attention to the solemnity of the forms by which those principles have been abjured, and to point out to your consideration how confidently those abjurations were referred to by the most zealous supporters and able advocates of Catholic emancipation, before that Bill was passed; for you recollect with what confidence they referred to the utter abjuration of those principles by the whole hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church. On one occasion a gentleman, a friend of mine, in the county of Louth, went to a meeting of Roman Catholics. His speech is not reported in this volume, containing speeches of Mr. O'Connell, and Mr. Sheil, which I hold in my hand, but he said the Roman Catholic prelates and priests should renounce and deny their ancient councils, before they asked for power over the Protestants.—Mr. Sheil replied to him in this language:—

"How much more wise it would be of Mr. M'Clintock, instead of referring us to the Council of Lateran, to refer his fellow-believers to the progress of events, to the universal diffusion of intelligence, and the material changes which the religion both of Catholics and of Protestants has undergone. The sphere of human knowledge has advanced, and the Catholic Church has been carried along in the universal progression.

Our faith is the same, but our system of ecclesiastical government is wholly changed. Persecution cannot be considered as an ingredient of a man's creed. It may, indeed, be the result of his principles, but cannot be considered as of the essence of his belief. It were wiser for M. M'Clintock to look at the declaration of the Catholic universities, denying the abominable doctrines imputed to us, to the recent protest of the Catholic bishops of Ireland, and to the oath which every Roman Catholic takes, rather than to the moth-eaten volumes with which he has been replenishing his mind."

Mr. O'Connell too, in his celebrated address to the Dissenters of England, uses these expressions:—

"We desire to bring into practical operation the great principle of individual duty and social right, 'that every human being should worship God according to the sincere dictates of his conscientious belief.'"

Again :

"The Catholics of Ireland are devoted with equal warmth, and, if possible, more persevering zeal to the cause of religious freedom. The Catholic prelates eagerly join the Catholic laity in the assertion of the principle of liberty of conscience.

"Protestant brethren, there are other charges made against our tenets which we do not stop to contradict. Those who know us best are well aware how false and unfounded all such charges are. However, we subjoin in the appendix accurate copies of the oaths taken indiscriminately by the Catholic laity and Catholic clergy of every rank in Ireland."

Here Mr. Sheil appeals to the renunciation of those principles by the universities ; and both he and Mr. O'Connell appeal to the oaths of the prelates. Mr. Sheil appeals to the universities. I go to the universities, and I ask of all the universities to which Mr. Pitt sent his questions, what was the one which protested most loudly against them? It was the university of Louvaine, and the protest was in these terms :—

"The Faculty of Divinity at Louvaine having been requested to give her opinion upon the questions above stated, does it with readiness ; but struck with astonishment that such questions should, at the end of this eighteenth century, be proposed to any learned body by the inhabitants of a kingdom that glories in the talents and discernment of

its natives ; the faculty being assembled for the above purpose, it is agreed with the unanimous consent of all voices, to answer the queries absolutely in the negative."

This comes from the college of Louvaine, and what is the fact? That fourteen years before, in the college of Louvaine, this very book was published. Mr. Dens's work was adopted and approved as an authorized standard of theology, as appears by the approbation from the proper authority prefixed to the fifth volume, and bearing date the 15th March, 1776. So much for the universities at the end of the 18th century. Both Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Sheil refer to the oaths of the bishops. Now let us examine that point—I will beg to call attention to three or four particulars connected with it, and one of them cannot but strike you as singular. Dr. Murray and Dr. Doyle were examined before a committee of the House of Commons, and they were asked questions as to the standard principles of the Church of Rome. Dr. Murray gave the Creed of Pius IV. the Catechism of the Council of Trent, *Bossuet's Exposition of the Catholic Faith*, *Verron's Rule of Faith*, *Holden's Analysis of Faith*, and several others; Dr. Doyle gave "*The Decrees of the Council of Trent*, *The Profession of Faith by Pius the Fourth*, and *The Roman Catechism, or Catechism of the Council of Trent.*" Now, is it not a singular fact, that although this book was set up as a standard for those gentlemen when they were priests, by their bishops; and afterwards set up by them when they became bishops for their priests; yet, that neither of them adverted to *Dens's Body of Theology*? Is it not also singular, that in all the controversies which we have had in Ireland on the subject, I never recollect—I may be wrong, but I do not recollect—Dens's book being once referred to? But I have to call your attention to another fact of importance. Here is a Bible; this is the Roman Catholic quarto Bible, published in 1816, by the authority of Dr. Troy. When the *British Critic* exposed some of the notes in this Bible—and, if you were to read them, you would see what an awful commentary they are upon the word of God; Dr. Troy denied that he had authorized the edition; but Mr. Coyne, the Roman Catholic bookseller, whom I believe, from all I have ever heard of him, to bear as excellent a character, and to be as proper and well conducted a man as any in the city, boldly asserted that he had received authority from Dr. Troy, and he published his letter to

that bishop. In this Bible there is this note on the 17th chapter of Deuteronomy, from the 8th to the 12th verse:—

“Here we see what authority God was pleased to give to the Church guides of the Old Testament, in deciding without appeal, all controversies relating to the law, promising that they should not err therein; and punishing with death such as proudly refused to obey their decisions; and surely he has not done less for the Church guides of the New Testament.”

Dr. Murray was examined on the subject of this note before the Committee of the House of Commons. He was asked his opinion of it, and how he explained it, because it arrogated to the Church guides of the New Testament the power of putting to death. After explaining his view of the meaning of the passage, he added—

“But on account of the wrong principle which, if misunderstood, it might tend to propagate, I ordered the objectionable part of the note to be expunged, and in the stereotype edition of the Bible already alluded to, there is no such note to be found.”

Now here is the stereotype edition, and the note is to be found exactly in the same place, with this distinction, that the words “punishing with death such as proudly refuse to obey their decisions,” are omitted, but the same principle is retained, and the same authority is claimed for the Church guides of the New Testament as that which was given to those of the Old. Dr. Murray was also examined with respect to the Council of Constance, and the murder of John Huss, which has always been considered one of the most marked specimens of perfidy and cruelty that history exhibits. John Huss came with the safe conduct of the Emperor Sigismund to the council; but, in spite of his safe conduct, he was taken and put to death. This is an awful proof of the practical effects of the principle of not keeping faith with heretics. Dr. Murray stated in his answer—

“That John Huss taught doctrines very pernicious to society, which the civil laws as well as the laws of religion condemned; that the safe conduct, on being examined, proved to be nothing more than a mere travelling passport.”

And added, that

“Unfortunately the same statute which then disgraced the law books of England, was in force in Constance, and according to that law he suffered death.”

He was also examined as to the doctrines of love and charity incul-

cated upon the Roman Catholics towards Protestants; and particularly as to a prayer in one of the liturgies that God would humble the enemies of the Church. His answer was—

“It is a prayer which has been in use for centuries, and it means nothing more than that the enemies of the Church may not triumph over it. It does not excite any hatred or unkindly feeling towards those not of the Church, for great pains are taken to instil a contrary feeling into the minds of the Catholic people. They are taught to love their own enemies, and the enemies of the church: that is carefully instilled into the minds of the youngest children, who are taught the elements of the Christian doctrine; they are taught that their neighbours, whom they are bound to love as they love themselves, comprise mankind of every description—even those who injure us, or differ from us in religion.”

Now, mark these things. Dr. Murray says that, on account of the objectionable meaning which might be attached to the note, he had caused it to be expunged. He states, that an offence against civil society, and a law similar to one which existed in England, were the causes of the death of John Huss; and he declares that the principles of kindness, charity and love, to the enemies of the Church, are inculcated upon the minds of Roman Catholic children. Now, what is the fact? In this very book, *Dens' Theology*—the authority which Dr. Murray has set up as a conference book for the priests of his diocese, the authority which is so daringly taken from God's Holy Word, as a ground for the murder of heretics, is taken from this very passage in Deuteronomy, with this identical objectionable interpretation of it, which he says, lest it might be misunderstood, he had blotted out from the stereotype edition of the Bible:—“*Confirmatur ex eo quod Deus in veteri lege jusserit occidi falsos prophetas. Et Deut. cap. 17. v. 12. statuatur, ut qui superbierit, nolens obedire sacerdotis imperio, moriatur.* This is confirmed, because God, in the Old Testament, ordered the false prophets to be slain; and in Deut. chap. xvii. verse 12, it is decreed, that if any one will act proudly, and will not obey the commands of the priest, let him be put to death.” While he mourns over the law of Constance, which at that time of darkness caused John Huss to be put to death, he sets up as the precedent and authority for the murder of heretics, this very murder of John Huss at the Council of Constance:—“*Idem probatur ex condemnatione articuli 14, Joannis Huss, in concilio Constantiensi.*” “The same

is proved from the condemnation of the 14th article of John Huss in the Council of Constance." And while he says that the principles of love and charity are so carefully instilled into the breasts of children, what does he do? We have here the 8th volume of the work to which I have before referred, and we find under the express sanction of Dr. Murray himself, this doctrine laid down—

"The bishop is bound, even in places where the office of the Holy Inquisition is in force, sedulously to take care that he may purge the diocese entrusted to him from heretics; and if he find any one, he ought to punish him with canonical punishments. He ought, however, to take care that he does not obstruct the inquisitors from discharging their duty."—*Dens*, vol. viii. p. 82.\*

Here it is laid as an express command upon the bishop to purge his diocese, not from heresy, but from heretics—"ab hereticis," even where the holy inquisition is in force, and the only restraint placed upon the persecuting power and duty of the bishop is, that he shall not interfere with the tender mercies of the inquisitor. I am sorry to dwell upon any individual—but it was not to these points that Mr. Sheil and Mr. O'Connell referred. They referred to the protest of all the Roman Catholic bishops against these pernicious doctrines. Now, here is a book, published by Dr. Doyle, "*An Essay upon the Catholic Claims*, addressed to the Right Hon. the Earl of Liverpool." To this is appended the pastoral address of the Roman Catholic archbishops and bishops of Ireland, to which these gentlemen so confidently refer us, and let us see the object with which they declare that they published it:—

"At a time when the spirit of calm inquiry is abroad, and men seem anxious to resign those prejudices through which they viewed the doctrines of others, the archbishops and bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland avail themselves with pleasure of the dispassionate tone of the public mind, to exhibit a simple and correct view of those tenets that are most frequently misrepresented.

"If it please the Almighty that the Catholics of Ireland should be doomed to continue in the humble and degraded condition in which they are now placed, they will submit with resignation to the divine will. The prelates, however, conceive it a duty which they owe to themselves, as well as to their Protestant fellow-subjects, whose good opinion they value, to endeavour once more to remove the false

---

\* 1st Appendix 3.



impressions that have been frequently cast upon the faith and discipline of that church which is entrusted to their care, that all may be enabled to know with accuracy the genuine principles of those men who are proscribed by law from any participation in the honour, dignities, and emoluments of the state."

Now, here we have the object in publishing this pastoral address and declaration. It is divided into fourteen heads, and the eleventh head contains the following words:—

"The Catholics of Ireland not only do not believe, but they declare upon oath, that they detest as unchristian and impious the belief that it is lawful to murder or destroy any person or persons whatsoever, for or under the pretence of their being heretics, and also the principle that no faith is to be kept with heretics."

Now, mark here, when it is their interest to lead Protestants to believe that these are their real principles, they publish their declaration on oath, not addressed to Protestants, but to the Roman Catholic priests themselves, as the most solemn manner of conveying their sentiments, and as if, when they impressed such principles upon their clergy, it were impossible that they should ever instil any other doctrines. They swear that they detest such principles as injurious and iniquitous, while you have decided upon evidence as clear as any that has ever been brought before a court of justice since the world began, that for eighteen years before, and six years after, these very principles were addressed to the priests, circulated amongst them, and held up as the true standard of doctrine, and the guide of their private conferences. We are referred to the bishops and we go to them. We find the bishops protesting on oath against these principles, and yet we find them, at the same time, circulating and maintaining these principles, on the perverted authority of the Bible, and the too true authority of the ancient councils of the Roman Catholic Church. Now, I say, give me the honest persecution of the Assyrian tyrant, who sets up his golden idol on the plains of the province of Dura, and makes a proclamation that he will cast down, bound into the midst of the burning fiery furnace, all who refuse to bow before his divinity—give me the unrelenting fury of the Pagan persecutor, who drags the Christians to his tribunal, and if they refuse to sacrifice to the idols, casts them into the arena to the lions—give me the candid cruelty of the false prophet, who propagates his religion with

his scymitar, and brandishes it in the face of open day ; but save me, O ! deliver me, from the cruel treachery of him who will take the Bible in his hand and kiss it, and hold it out to you as a pledge that he detests as impious and unchristian the principle that would put you to death on account of your religion, while he secretly distributes the dagger amongst his dark confederates, to whet it for the auspicious moment when it may be expedient to plunge it in your heart. I should remark, that this pastoral address is signed with the names and seals of every Roman Catholic archbishop and bishop in Ireland. It contains the names and seals of those men who have since set up this book as the authoritative standard for conferences of their priests of the province of Leinster. Now I take these two documents, one in each hand, and I ask this question—here I hold in one the published oath—the proclaimed oath of the Roman Catholic prelates of Ireland, addressed to their priests—and here I hold in the other, the principles which have been proved to you to have been circulated as the authoritative standard of doctrine among those priests. Now give me leave to ask, to which of these documents are we to turn ? If these principles in this document are not impious and anti-christian, why do they swear in this document that they are ? If they are, as they have sworn, and justly sworn they are, impious and anti-christian ; and if they detest them, why have they published two editions of this work, and printed and circulated them amongst their priests ? If we believe, and I am sure we ought to believe their oath, the truth of that oath implies their detestation of those principles. If we believe and we cannot refuse the evidence which is placed before us, that they have adopted those principles, then the adoption of those principles infers the falsehood of their oath. I defy all the powers of human talent and human ingenuity to reconcile these documents together. I say then, I care not upon which horn of the dilemma their consciences, if they have any, are to be impaled. I leave those consciences to God, but man must judge of fact ; and what is the fact here ? I call upon this assembly—I would call upon all the empire, if it could hear me—I call heaven and earth to witness the truth that these are their adopted principles : and I call the same powers to witness that this is their published, authenticated, confederated oath ; and I say that instead of manifesting themselves as the ministers of that blessed Redeemer, in whom “mercy and truth are met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other,” they

exhibit themselves as the ministers of that dark and anti-christian apostasy, in which murder and treachery have met each other, Popery and perjury have kissed each other. [Here the speaker struck the two books together in his hands, and the effect was loudly responded to by the meeting.] Now the Hon. and Learned Member for Dublin says, "here we Catholics meet you foot to foot—assist us to educate the people." Now let me ask, assist whom to educate the people? or assist to educate them in what? Whom are we to assist? Is it those gentlemen? [Here the speaker opened the two books, and held them out to the meeting.] Are we to assist these persons in educating the people of Ireland in the principles of religion and morality? or in what are we to educate them? Is Ireland to be educated in this [holding up the Bible?] or in this? [pointing significantly to Dens's work.] Are we to educate her in the words of the living God, or in the awful errors, and superstitions, and iniquities of the Church of Rome? or are we to make a compromise between both—to abandon the authority of the living and eternal God, and to acknowledge the principle that springs from the prince of darkness, that the authority of the living God over his creatures is to be abandoned, and that what he has written, as the Lawgiver and the Redeemer, is to be blotted out from man's inspection? Or are we to take out from this book whatever is inconsistent with this? I say, as a minister of the Church of Ireland—I say, I trust, as a minister, however unworthy, of the Lord Jesus Christ—first, before we are guilty of such apostasy from all principle, perish the temporalities of the Church of Ireland to their very foundations! (The enthusiasm with which this sentiment was received, it is impossible to describe. The body of Clergymen on the platform rose simultaneously, and signified, by cheers, their participation in the feeling expressed by the speaker; while it was re-echoed and applauded with the loudest and most enthusiastic acclamations by the meeting at large.) I say, annihilation to her parishes—confiscation to all her sees—martyrdom to her ministers, but fidelity to her God. And now let me say, that while it is the duty of the minister of God, it is, like God, his strange work to speak in judgment of his fellow-sinners. If all those of whom I have spoken were assembled here this day, however my duty commands me to lift up my voice as a trumpet, and to warn them of their transgressions, yet though I must bear the testimony of the minister before men, I dare not be the accuser of my fellow-sinners before God. I presume not, in the sight of the Judge of heaven and

earth, to throw a stone at any man, whether he be bishop or priest of the Roman Catholic Church. If I know the truth—and if they are, as I must say they are, in awful ignorance and error—I must remember that it is the mercy of God to me, and must ask myself the question, “Who maketh thee to differ from another?” While I acknowledge that it is the privilege and the duty of a minister of God to be a Barnabas—a son of consolation—it is also sometimes his duty to be a Boanerges, a son of thunder;—but for all the injuries which the Roman Catholics can hold in principle—for all the evils which they could reduce to practice—it is my duty as a minister of Christ, and I trust it is the feeling of my heart, to pray for them; I can say, with the apostle, “my heart’s desire and prayer to God for them is that they may be saved;” for I love my country and my poor countrymen—and the more I think them wrong, the more my heart mourns over them, and all I ask is, that they may be brought out of every error by the light of truth—that they may be led to feel the spirit of the blessed Jesus, and being found as I am, a poor sinner, that they may be washed in the blood of Him who came to seek and to save that which was lost.—(The Rev. Gentleman sat down amidst a renewal of those loud cheers which had been frequently called forth throughout his speech.)

The Rev. Dr. COOKE then rose and spoke to the following effect:— I am truly inadequate to the task which my friend has laid upon me, and I feel the inadequacy increased by every attempt at interruption. I have, in my progress through life, been frequently engaged in public meetings, and I have always made it a rule to learn manners from the Indians when I cannot learn it from Britons or my fellow-Irishmen. The manners of the Indians are these: no matter what you say, however much he disbelieves you, and however he may be determined to resist you, either by the severity of the tomahawk or the gentleness of the scalping-knife, he will patiently wait till you have done, and not interrupt you in your progress. I do trust that if there be any English Roman Catholic present, he will remember this principle and be taught by it, that if there be a fellow-countryman Roman Catholic here, that he will remember it also and be taught by it; and I, as an Irishman and a Presbyterian, will do the best I can to learn in the same school. I hope, though it be a vulgar one it may be as useful to us as many of the hedge schools and colleges which are to be found in Ireland. In attempting to address you upon the present subject, there are one or two points which I feel it necessary to bring

before this meeting. One reason why I feel it necessary is, because I have learned that we have been honoured with considerable notice in some of the public prints: and I have learned that some of them have even prophesied that no wise person and that no respectable person would come here. Perhaps this is the case. I have no scale whereby to measure the wisdom, the common-sense, or the respectability of the audience, but I take it as I find it, and I am contented; and I must say more than contented with it. We have been told, I understand, for I have not read the papers—I have a respect for the public press, though I am not a worshipper of it, and am not much afraid of it. We have been told that there has not been time enough given. From the time at which our advertisements were published in England, it may have been supposed that there was not time enough for the Irish hierarchy of the Church of Rome to prepare themselves; but they had a fortnight's notice in Ireland. We thought it due to them, and they had the first notice. I should think that a fortnight is ample time for any man to prove a fair matter of fact, for the whole question turns on one original principle, viz.: whether these eight volumes of *Dens's Theology* have or have not been admitted as a standard of reference by the Church of Rome. If such a charge were made against me, I could refute it in a moment. If it were false or if it be true, the honest way is for their references to come forward and acknowledge the fact. I do not hesitate to affirm, that before as fair a jury as, perhaps, any one ever had the honour of pleading before, and in the presence of as honest a jury, and as competent a jury, and as numerous a jury, as any advocate would wish to address himself to, the matter has been proved satisfactorily, and the verdict brought in, and while their hand was lifted up, their heart must have beat with their hand in acknowledging the sentence just. A full meeting of Britons with a number of Irish friends, have acknowledged the fact that we desire to prove, namely, that these eight volumes have been admitted as the standard books of reference both for private consultation and for the private reference of the Roman Catholic priesthood. That we have made some restrictions with regard to the meeting, I also feel it necessary to refer to. We have not flung our doors open to every one to come in and fling at us what missiles he pleases. There are those in all Churches who do not much care what they say to a man; there are those who do not much care what arguments are brought forward because no one

is accountable for them. There are those who have made their attacks, and when we have spoken to a respectable Catholic priest or laymen regarding them, he has said, "Who cares about that fellow? I would not give a farthing for what he says. There is no one who would shake hands with him: there is no one who would sit with him at the same table, or hob-nob with him over a glass of mountain dew." This is the way we have been repeatedly met, when such men have come to a public Protestant meeting; and to guard not against the respectability of the Roman Catholic laity, or the learning of the Roman Catholic priesthood, but to guard against these chance-meddling men, that like lights, rise from the bottom and float on the surface, we have been compelled to adopt these principles of self-preservation, to guard against unaccountable, unauthorised, unacknowledged persons. But we invited surely the most influential in point of learning when we invited the whole priesthood, and we invited surely the most influential in point of acuteness when we invited that man whose talents entitle him to the respect of the public. I should have felt great delight, having once or twice been honoured by the special favour of the Hon. and Learned Gentleman, in having an opportunity of bandying the compliment. I have no idea that I possess the powers of his head, the wisdom of his mind, or the legal tact of making the worse appear the better cause. In these things I could not compete with him; but I would compete with him in courtesy and in kindness—with our Irish property of fighting for love. But the weapons of my warfare should not be carnal—they should be a reference to his own Scriptures. It would be a reference to truth and to principle which I would employ as the weapons of the warfare in which I should delight to engage with him. Full well I know that the Hon. Gentleman may justly be considered a great legal tactician. He has made it his boast that he could drive a coach and six through all the acts of parliament which have ever passed. I should have been delighted to see him mount the box—not to take the legal whip and the legal reins, but to take the theological whip and the theological reins, and see whether he could drive a coach and six through Mr. Dens. I should rejoice to see a man whose legal character and powerful eloquence could drive a coach and six through an act of parliament trying what he could do with Mr. Dens. We know how the spider makes its web—how it stretches it out—and I would have been delighted to see how he would have been caught in

it ; as he shook his wings, and energized more and more, he would have been like the unfortunate fly—he would have been more and more entangled, and Mr. Dens would have come out of his hiding-place. I should have felt satisfaction in seeing him, and I hope I shall obtain it.

Some of the wisest men in every city—the editors of newspapers, always the wisest persons—the only persons entitled to the title-royal, we—have told us that we have not given time enough. Now we will give time enough, and we will give them an advantage. The worst thing for an advocate to do is to let out the ground of defence or accusation before the case comes on to be heard. I will let them have their own time ; I will let them prescribe time and place—and let it be here again. I merely ask them for time to be permitted to return to my country, and attend on particular and pressing duties for one week, and I will take the speediest steam-boat from Belfast to Liverpool, and the speediest coach from Liverpool to London, and I will leave the coach and appear upon the platform again, and let their priesthood and their hierarchy either come themselves or appoint a deputation, and let the Legal and Learned Gentleman come with them. We will meet them, and if they are able to refute us, we will acknowledge our error ; but if we should point out facts which they cannot gainsay, I call upon them as honest men and as professing Christians, to acknowledge they were mistaken, and to acknowledge it very much in the same way as a sage personage did in a work, which I read when a boy, called *Uncle Toby*. One of the parties expected to find only two things, whereas he found seven, and he pronounced it with an indescribable word that nobody yet had ever been permitted to tell. He expressed himself just in the way that you would do when you opened a drawer and found more than you looked for : so let them acknowledge that they have found more than they looked for. I know that there are many in Ireland who cannot read Latin, except under particular circumstances. I acknowledge that there are legal men who have not time to put the plumb-line into theological learning. I admit that there are men in England who have only opportunity to appear where the members of parliament are engaged all the time. I admit they may not have time to know these books, but they shall know them ; the books shall be exposed to the gaze of the public, and then let them acknowledge the sin of their Church and say, “ If you do not repent we will leave you.”

I have farther to notice an attack in the public press. We have been treated as persons who have come over here for the purpose, not of ministers of peace, but ministers of ill-will. I fling back the accusation upon those who bring it. I ask these gentlemen, is that a peaceful document? I ask them is it in the vocabulary of their peaceful object, that heretics should be confiscated as to property, that they should be incarcerated as to person, and that they should be consigned over to the tender mercies of the inquisitor? I tell you that to have peace so long as the doctrine of war is hugged to the bosom of the Church of Rome is utterly impossible. We will have peace with the men; but with this principle I do proclaim an unchanging war, and I think that every man must proclaim war against it. Be it remembered that the oath of the Roman Catholic prelates has proclaimed war against it, and if we come after them, and proclaim war against this principle, let them remember that the prelates threw the first stone, and pronounced it at once impious and unchristian. Upon these grounds I think the public prints will see that we are not men of war, but of peace. We are plenipotentiaries, although self-appointed, to endeavour to negotiate peace between the Church of Rome, and Protestants. We intend to say to our fellow-countrymen, and to others of the Church of Rome, your decrees are issued out against the truth of God; we pray you do as Buonaparte did with other decrees—withdraw those decrees, and the moment truth forces you to withdraw the decrees of confiscation and imprisonment, we will negotiate as firm a peace between you and us as ever was founded between England and America; and we will go on in harmony, only we do not admire Irish reciprocity, which is said to be all on one side. With this exception I would say to the editors of newspapers, that we are not men of war, but of peace, and our great object is to induce the hierarchy of the Church of Rome, and to induce the honorable and influential laity of the Church of Rome, to come forward and burn these pages of Dens by the hands of the common hangman, if you cannot find a more infamous functionary to consign them to the flames they deserve; and when they have burned them up, and thereby there has been an anathema stamped upon them, we are ready not only to embrace you as we do now in the arms of kindness as men, but we will embrace you in principle as professing the same Gospel.

There is another reason why, before I come to the business of the meeting, I desire to speak one word. I have joined with my brethren



belonging to the Church of which I am not a member, in order to bear a common testimony to a common cause. My brethren belong to a Church that receives prelacy as a form of government. I belong to the Church of the humble Presbyterians, and yet I feel that I can join with them heartily, and upon common grounds. There is no man who knows to what dignity he may attain, and therefore I am not at all surprised that I have attained to more dignity than I ever expected. I attained to the dignity, not long ago, of being alluded to in the British senate—at least so the public press says. I cannot suppose that the thing took place; I must not infringe upon the privileges of the House, for I remember I was once afraid of a white rod, and I am far more afraid of a black one. Some truth-telling newspaper, or the reverse—whichever way you choose to take it—said that I was mentioned there as a person who did not possess the confidence of the Presbyterians of Ulster. Who said I did? Not I. I tell you that the Presbyterians of Ulster are not the men to put confidence either in princes or in men's sons. David has taught them in the Bible not to put confidence in princes, and I, being a man's son, they will not put confidence in me, because they are told to put no confidence there. The Presbyterians are the men who neither pin their faith to the sleeves of men, nor put their consciences in their pocket. The greatest insult that could be offered them would be to suppose that I possessed their confidence. But if any honorable gentleman should say I do not possess the confidence of the Synod of Ulster, I say there are two of us. This fact I could not altogether overlook, lest it should be supposed that while I, as a Presbyterian, join with my brethren of the prelacy, I put myself forward as possessing the confidence of the Presbyterians of Ulster, and was not entitled to possess it. I say no man possesses their confidence, but I am one of them, and there will be nothing more easy than for any individual who chooses to try the matter in a clear field and fair play, by coming over with me, and meeting me with the ministers of the Synod of Ulster. I will put it upon the Baconian experiment. I cannot but refer to another fact. I always take it for granted that the newspapers know nothing about the matter, and I refer to it as nothing more than their report. It was said, that upon one occasion, I had celebrated a marriage between the Church Establishment in Ireland and the Presbyterian Church; that I had made all the effort in my power to obtain a marriage licence. So ephemeral were the expressions that I employed, that I could

not obtain a copy of them, and I could not depend upon my own memory; but I will endeavour to state the terms in which I did express myself; what I proclaimed was a three-fold marriage—first a marriage of charity and forbearance in things where we differed;—secondly, a marriage of hearty concurrence in things where we agreed; and thirdly, a marriage of mutual co-operation against imminent dangers, where we were threatened and surrounded with them. This was the three-fold marriage. I do not pledge myself for the words, but for the sentiments. And now, if I speak in the hearing of a Presbyterian of the Church of Scotland; if I speak in the hearing of any Presbyterian of England; if I speak in the hearing of any Dissenter of any form of Protestantism whatever, I ask him, can he forbid the banns? If there be a man, although his soul were as contracted as the neck of a vinegar-cruet, and although the contents of his mind were as acid as those of the cruet, (and we Presbyterians are said to be proverbially sour), yet were he in the condition of the cruet, and had he, instead of the milk of human kindness, the acidity of the juice of the apple, or any thing that can be converted into acid; had he this within him, could he forbid the banns? Is there any form of Dissenterism which will say, I forbid the union of the Protestant Church in charity and forbearance, in things where they differ? We are called to have charity to our Roman Catholic brethren, I hope we have it, and who can forbid the principle? If a Mahomedan came before me, I would have charity on points where we differ. I enjoin upon my own conscience a marriage of mutual forbearance. We must all exercise mutual forbearance, and where is the man so destitute of all the principles of true religion as to say, that he will not forbear towards a man who differs from him, but they will treat him in the way that the northern men, in the time of Henry the Fifth, treated Lord Cobham, when they told him of the heresies he had committed, and then said, “We entreat you, for Christ’s sake, to allow us to put Lord Cobham to death.” The second point of the marriage was a hearty concurrence in things where they agreed. Is there any man that forbids these banns? If we agree in points of doctrine and discipline, shall we disagree because we do not live on the same side of the Tweed? There are many points where I would shake hands with the Church of Rome. There are points of Divine truth where we agree, and, though I feel bound to protest against her errors, and worse than errors, in discipline, yet, where I do agree with her, I join in hearty concurrence. In the same way when

there are branches of Protestantism threatened with a sweeping volcano, and Master Dens is coming in the dark, it is surely high time that we fly from a common danger, and that we should unite heart to heart, and arm to arm, and prepare to fight the enemy. I trust these remarks will not be considered extraneous. These things were in reality in some degree essential to the meeting, and also essential to the vindication of the humble individual who has attained the honor of more notice than was agreeable to him. They were not foreign to the purposes of the meeting in uniting with one heart to examine what are the principles contained in these books in reference to ourselves.

The point that has been allotted to me is, to bring before this meeting a very remarkable thing. It is a pity that an Irishman should touch it, because I know what a punning disposition there is in all people. All are punsters if they have wit to be so; and therefore when an Irishman has to commence with a bull, you will naturally pronounce it a bull. Allow me to bring before you the famous bull that is called *Unigenitus*, referring to the only-begotten Son of God. It is said to have been pronounced by the favor of the Lord, as I understand it, and his celestial assistance. There were two great concurrences, you perceive; the favour of the Lord—the Lord's favour operating upon the Bishop, the Pope, and the Cardinals, and the celestial assistance as coming down to them, and with this assistance, as they were headed in conclave, the following dicta were issued, amounting to 101 principles, which I do not propose to bring before the meeting fully, but, only a very few of them. The first that I bring before the meeting is the second in point of number :—

“2. The grace of Jesus Christ, the efficacious principle of every kind of good, is necessary to every good work, and without it, not only nothing good is done, but nothing good can be done.”

I would say as a Protestant, that it is a fair principle. One would think the Pope had turned Protestant; but that is not the case, for the Pope has afterwards pronounced it false, schismatical, suspecting of heresy, blasphemous, and heretical. The second principle that I shall mention, is number 9 :—

“9. The grace of Christ is the supreme grace, without which we never can confess Christ, and with which we never can deny him.”—1 Cor. xii. 3.

The second principle is, that however remote from salvation the

obstinate sinner may be whenever Jesus exhibits himself to be the Son, it behoves him to surrender himself to Christ, to humble himself and adore his Saviour. The next point is no 15 :—

“ 15. Whenever God accompanies his command and his external word with the unction of his spirit, and the interior power of his grace it works in the heart that obedience which he seeks.—Luke, ix. 60.

“ 17. Grace is that voice of the Father which internally teaches men, and causes them to draw nigh to Jesus Christ; whosoever does not come to him after he has heard the outward voice of the Son, is by no means taught of the Father.—John, vi. 4. 5.

“ 18. The seed of the Word, which the hand of God waters, always produces its fruit.—Acts, xi. 21.

“ 23. God himself has delivered to us this picture of the Almighty operations of his grace, setting it forth by that act whereby he produces his creatures from nothing, and gives life to the dead.—Rom. iv. 17.

“ 38. The sinner is not free, unless to do evil, otherwise than by the grace of the Deliverer.—Luke, xiii. 29.

“ 39. The will which grace does not prevent, has no light unless to lead astray; nothing of devotion, unless to cast itself down; nothing of strength, unless to wound itself; it is capable of every evil, and incapable of all good.—Matt. xx. 3, 4.

“ 40. Without grace we can love nothing unless to our condemnation.—2 Thess. iii. 18.

“ 41. All knowledge of God, even the natural knowledge in heathen philosophers, cannot come except from God, and, without grace produces nothing but presumption, vanity, and opposition to God himself, in place of the affections of adoration, gratitude, and love.—Rom. i. 19.

“ 50. In vain we cry to God, ‘My Father,’ if the spirit of charity be not in him who cries.—Rom. viii. 15.

“ 51. Faith justifies when it works; but it does not work unless by love.—Acts, xiii. 43.

“ 54. It is love alone that speaks to God, and love alone that God hears.—1 Cor. xiii. 1.

“ 58. There is neither God nor religion where there is not love.—1 John, iv. 8.

“ 69. Faith, its exercise, increase, and reward, is entirely the gift of God’s free grace.—Mark, ix. 22.

“ 73. What is the church, unless the company of the sons of God, resting in his bosom, adopted in Christ, subsisting in his person, redeemed by his blood, living by his Spirit, acting by his grace, and looking for his grace to eternal life.—2 Thess. i. 1, 2.

"79. It is useful and necessary, at every time, in every place, and every kind of person, to study and understand the spirit, piety, and mysteries of sacred Scripture."—1 Cor. xiv. 5.

I pray every Protestant who hears me, whether he be a Churchman or a Dissenter, to listen to the sentiment contained in the last principle.

"80. The reading of the sacred Scripture is for all.—Acts, viii. 31.

"81. The obscurity of the Holy Word of God is not a reason for dispensing laymen from reading it.—Acts, viii. 31.

"82. The Lord's day ought to be sanctified by Christians, by reading works of piety, and, above all, of the sacred Scriptures. It is condemnable to wish to restrain a Christian from this reading.—Acts, xv. 21.

"83. It is an error to argue that the knowledge of the mysteries of religion ought not to be communicated to women by the reading of the sacred books.

"84. To take away the New Testament out of the hands of Christians, or to consider it to be shut up from them, by taking away from them the mode of understanding it, is to shut the mouth of Christ.—John, iv. 26.

"85. To interdict Christians from reading sacred Scripture, particularly the New Testament, is to interdict the light from the sons of light, and to condemn them to a species of excommunication.—Luke, xi. 33.

"86. To take the consolation (of reading Scripture) from the common people of joining their voice to that of the whole church, is a custom contrary to apostolical practice, and the purpose of God.—1 Cor. xvi. 16.

"98. The state of persecution and penalties which any one endures as a heretic, flagitious and impious, is generally the last trial, and highly meritorious, as what more conforms a man to Jesus Christ.—Luke, xxii. 37.

"100. It is a deplorable time in which it is believed that God is honoured by persecuting the truth and its disciples. In vain does any one flatter himself with the purity of his intentions in persecuting worthy men by fire and sword, if blinded by his own passions, or carried away by other men, because he will not examine. We often think we sacrifice an impious man to God, when we sacrifice God's servant to Satan."—John, xvi. 2.

I have now read you a long catalogue, which honest Protestants in all the Churches established in these lands hold, and all the Evangelical Dissenters of England—I think there is neither man, woman,

nor child among them who would not subscribe to the truth of every article I have read. You would surely imagine that when the conclave met and consulted the favour of God and the Divine assistance, and diligently and laboriously undertook this salutary work, as the importance of the work demanded, the Pope had turned Protestant: very far from it: for now he says, "Having heard all and singular"—how legal—a six-and-eight-penny business—"Having heard all and singular of these propositions," the Pope and Cardinals pronounce them—what? truth, think you?—prepare yourselves for hearing in how many ways they declare these principles to be heresy. This is the very measure—the thermometer of heat and cold of the Vatican; and you will perceive how beautifully it graduates between zero and the burning point. They are all declared to be false, captious, ill-sounding—the very *cacaphonia*. I can make no doubt, the Italian ears were mightily discomposed. I remember seeing a picture of some Italians listening to bad music, and of the horrible agonies into which the father, mother, and children were thrown by a hurdy-gurdy. I can imagine that the whole conclave were thrown into convulsion when these 101 principles were read in their ears. "All and singular of these propositions are pronounced false, captious, ill-sounding, offensive to pious ears, scandalous, pernicious, temerarious, injurious to the Church and her customs, contumelious to the secular power, seditious, infamous, blasphemous, suspected of heresy, savouring of heresy." They had a nice sense of scenting out heretics. It is said that the way whereby heretics used to be discovered was by the scent, and that appears to be one way whereby the conclave discovered heresy. "Suspected of heresy, savouring of heresy, favouring heretics, heresies, and even schism, errors next to heresy, often condemned, and finally heretical." There is a nice distinction made between idolatrous and idolatry, and so there is here between heresy and heretical. This is what grammarians call an abstract or concrete. But we have not got to the end yet. It is added "by this perpetual constitution they are denounced, condemned, and reprobated." And further—"this constitution commands the venerable patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops, and other ordinaries, and likewise the inquisitors of heretical pravity, that they coerce and compel its contradictors and rebels of every kind whatsoever, by the forenamed penalties, and other remedies of law and fact, invoking likewise, if need be, the aid of the secular arm." "Nor shall it be lawful for any man to impugn or

contradict it, under the indignation of Almighty God, and the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul." Thus various opinions which they choose to call heresies, and particularly the 101 opinions which are here recorded, and in the very words and sense in which they are recorded, are declared to be condemned and reprobated, and that for ever. I remember to have seen an edition of Bewick's *British Birds*, at the end of which there were some caricature-representations of various sports of youth. Among the rest, was one of some boys building a pyramid of snow, on the front of which some classic youth had inscribed the words, "*In perpetuum rei memoriam*," while at the same time the rays of the sun were shining fully upon it. Something like this I see in the labours of this august conclave. They issue their decree, and then they add, "By this everlasting constitution of ours, all these various principles are declared to be what we have here stated them to be." But their labour will prove somewhat like the snow figure raised by the classic youths. I am reminded also of another representation which I have seen—an engraving of Luther finding the Bible among the cobwebs of the library in which it had been for ages deposited, while the sun was shining fully in, and illuminating all the surrounding darkness. So the sun of righteousness and of truth shall shine upon the snow man which this reverend conclave have moulded together; and under the influence of its rays it shall disappear into thin vapour.

But the holy conclave gets on—and let me here observe, that this Bull *Unigenitus* is admitted by the Roman Catholics to be a rule of faith—it is commanded to both sexes not to think about these propositions; not to teach them! not to preach them; it also interdicts any from teaching them, consequently, from speaking of them, or from discoursing of them in public or in private, except for impugning or opposing them. And then, further, we are told that the venerable patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, and other ordinaries; likewise the inquisitors of heretical pravity, shall coerce and compel its contradictors, and rebels of every kind whatsoever, by the forenamed penalties and other remedies, invoking likewise, if need be, the aid of the secular arm, in order to carry into effect these most delightful, loving, agreeable commands of the church. Nor is this all—"it shall not be lawful for any man to impugn or contradict these prohibitions," either by commenting upon them, or observing upon them temerarily; and if any man presumes to do so, let him know that

he does it at his peril, and that he will incur "the indignation of Almighty God, and the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul." (Expressions of disapprobation from some gentlemen on the platform, and from some persons at the lower end of the room.) This document is then given and signed by the proper authorities. I told the audience at the beginning that they would do well to adopt the Indians' rule, and to hear us patiently to the end. I perceive now, as I often have done before, that the moment the bright sword of the Spirit is brought to bear upon them, there is this interruption and yelling. It was thus that the brethren were assailed in the city of Cork; and when the assailants had not (to use an Irish phrase) a word in their cheeks, they took their hats, and cried out, "Now, boys, another word for old Ireland!" and under cover of the noise so raised, the champions fled, and the field was left. They cannot throw in even a shred of an argument, and yet they succeed in disturbing the memory of the speaker, in confusing the harmony of the proceedings, and in preventing the public reporters for the press from doing their best to give a faithful report of what has taken place. The papers, some of them, have already stated that we were coming before a packed jury; but I will now give them another challenge. Let them, if they please, meet us in Dublin; half the tickets shall be given to Roman Catholics, and the other half to Protestants; and with a jury thus equal, we will pledge ourselves to make them ashamed or afraid of *Dominus Dens*. Though I know pretty well the character of the men by whom we shall be met; and though, from what I have met with before, I have but little stomach for the fight, yet I have no doubt we shall meet them shield to shield, and man to man, and, with numbers thus equally selected from both sides, that we shall win the day. Let them meet us by their clergy, with their learning and research, and by their respectable laity who have rank and character, and talent, to stand by, and not merely by any of those ephemeral lights, which occasionally float before the public; let them thus meet us, and we will plead the cause of liberty against domination, of charity against separation, of protection against incarceration, and of saving men, body and soul, instead of delivering them over to the power of the secular arm. But I will give you a few definitions.

I have already told you that the Bull *Unigenitus* is a rule of faith among the Roman Catholics; it is declared to be the dogmatical law of the universal church, and all who dissent from it are pronounced



heretics. Now, I happen to be a Dissenter, and I wish all my brother Dissenters to swallow this pill; I believe that it will be good for the promotion of our health. As to the titles given to the 101 opinions, they are stated to be false, erroneous, heretical, and so on; and all this is said to be proved. One of the proofs is, that all which is said by the church is a rule of faith, and that every one who denies it is a heretic; and also that it is heresy to utter or converse about "ill-sounding propositions." Definitions of the various terms and epithets which it employs are there laid down. A proposition is described as heretical, which contains errors contrary to the faith; as erroneous, which is opposed to the truth; as schismatical, which detracts in any measure from the obedience which is due to the Sovereign Pontiff and the ecclesiastical superiors; as blasphemous, which is in any way injurious to the honour of God and of his saints; as temerarious, which has the boldness to assert any thing contrary to the universal sense of the faithful, and the opinions expressed by learned theologians, and so on. Thus, if any man denies the divine assumption of the Virgin Mary, he offends. If any man declares that the supreme Pontiff is not entitled to be called "*Sanctissimum*," he offends. Now I have no objection to give the Pope a civil title, regarding him as a temporal prince; but after having read the holy doings of Leo X.—which, by the by, are written in Latin, because it would not do to have them in any language which is generally understood—after having read of those remarkable doings of the Pope, it would be rather difficult to speak of them except in what the conclave would call "ill-sounding propositions." Again, a proposition is called scandalous, which would affix any ridicule or scandal to any opinion or ceremony. Thus a man would offend, who should call auricular confession by any term which might bring it into contempt. Or if any should question the reality of certain relics, which the Roman Catholics call a peculiar state, or sense of religion, as if they were to be judged of from the evidence of the olfactory nerves. I have heard of a sailor who once said that he had seen as much wood exhibited purporting to be fragments of the cross of Christ, as would, if collected together, have built a seventy-four. Another, who was observed to kiss a head, said to be that of John the Baptist, with peculiar affection, observed that he had reason to do so, for it was the third head of John the Baptist he had seen. Now, to object to any thing of this kind is pronounced by this learned conclave to be scandalous, and

expose the man who is guilty of it to most serious punishment. There is another thing which I would mention as connected with the maintenance and influence of the Roman Catholic Church, especially in Ireland; I mean the oath taken by the Roman Catholic metropolitans and bishops, in which the "Royalties of Peter" are asserted and defended. By virtue of this the Popes establish their claim to particular countries as lords paramount. I will read the document which describes these "Royalties," together with the authorities from which the statements it contains are derived. In this day of municipal reform, I would beg leave to move in this house, for a reform in the corporation of Rome. I think we may profitably resolve ourselves into a committee of the whole house for this purpose. But I will read

"THE ROYALTIES OF PETER."

The oath taken by Roman Catholics, metropolitans, and bishops, binds these prelates to defend (*inter alia*) the Royalties of Peter against all men, and here are a few of them by way of specimen, and I question if in the British Museum, amidst all that has been fished from the sea, dug from Herculaneum, pulled from the Parthenon, or raised from the Catacombs, there be a wonder of nature or a relic of art to be once brought into comparison.

"1. To have a plenitude of power by which he can infringe any law, and act according to his sovereign will.—*Greg. Decret. lib. iii. tit. 8, cap. 4.*

"2. To be so much superior to all other men, that none shall presume to tax his faults, or to judge of his judgment.—*Grat. Dist. xl. c. 6. (si Papa, &c.) Con. G. iii. c. 10. Citante Baronio.*

"3. To be so exalted, that it is idolatry to disobey his commands.—*Greg. vii. Ep. iv. 2.—Greg. iv. Apud Grat. Dist. 19.*

"4. To possess the spiritual and temporal sword, to be superior to all sovereigns on earth; nay, so much superior, that it is 'held of necessity to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff.'—*Extrav. Com. lib. i. lit. 8. c. 1. Vide Decret. Bon. viii.*

"5. To have a right to dethrone heretical princes, absolve their subjects from their allegiance, and empower Roman Catholics to exterminate them, and seize upon their lands.—*Con. Lateran, iv. 3d Canon.*

"6. To be 'Christ's lieutenants, whom it is so necessary to obey that he who doth not obey them ought to die the death.'—*Leo. X. in Con. Lateran, Sess. 2.*

"7. To convoke general councils at his pleasure, all bishops being obliged to attend, upon summons from him.—*Eugen. P. in Con. Hor.*

"8. To preside in councils, so as to suggest matter, promote, obstruct, overrule the debates in them.

"9. To conform or invalidate their determinations, giving life to them by his assent, or subtracting it by his dissent.

"10. To define points of doctrine, or to decide controversies authoritatively; so that none may presume to contest or dissent from his dictates.

"11. To enact, establish, abrogate, suspend, dispense with ecclesiastical laws and canons.

"12. To relax or evacuate ecclesiastical censures, by indulgence, pardons, &c.

"13. To render void promises, vows, oaths, obligations to law, by his dispensation.—*Bellarmino, iv. 22, iv. 2.*

"14. To be the fountain of all pastoral jurisdiction and dignity.

"15. To constitute, confirm, judge, censure, suspend, depose, remove, restore, reconcile bishops.

"16. To confer ecclesiastical dignities and benefices by paramount authority, in the way of provision, reservation, &c.

"17. To exempt colleges, monasteries, &c. from jurisdiction of their bishops and ordinary superiors.

"18. To judge all persons in all spiritual cases, by calling them to his cognizance, or delegating judges for them, with a final and peremptory sentence.

"19. To receive appeals from all ecclesiastical judicatories, and to reverse their judgments if he findeth cause.

"20. To be himself unaccountable for all his doings, exempt from judgment, and liable to no reproof.

"21. To erect, transfer, abolish episcopal sees.

"22. To exact oaths of fealty and obedience from the clergy.

"23. To found religious orders, or to raise a spiritual militia for the propagation and defence of the church.

"24. To summon and commissionate soldiers by crusade, &c. to fight against infidels, or persecute infidels."

(See, generally, *Barrow on the Pope's Supremacy*, where the inquirer will find much more on the Royalties.)

The reading of this document produced a strong sensation. Some few gentlemen expressed their disapprobation, and a Mr. Leahy, of Trinity College, Dublin, exclaimed, in reference to one of the articles, "As a Roman Catholic I deny that!" But Dr. Cooke observed,

that the contradiction must be addressed not to him, but to the Popes and Cardinals by whom the various articles were decreed. It is of no use, continued he, to contradict me; any man may easily do that; the poorest wretch brought from the purlieus of St. Giles's may be able to do that; but who has the temerity to contradict Cardinal Bellarmine or Pope Gregory? Let any man contradict the Lateran Council if he dare! Now having disposed of these "Royalties of Peter," and proposed your going into a committee in order to reform the abuses of the corporation of the Vatican, let me next give you some extracts from the famous decree of Boniface VIII.

Extracts from the famous decree of Boniface VIII., translated from the original Latin, as extant in the Antwerp edition (*Juris Canonica*), edited by the command of Gregory XIII., A.D. 1648.—*Con. Gen.*, tom. i. p. 2, fol. 806-7:—

"There is only one Catholic and apostolic church. We are compelled by the urgency of the faith to believe and to hold, and we firmly believe, and with simplicity confess, that this is the church out of which there is no remission of sins. There are one body, one head of the one and sole church, (not two heads as a monstrous thing,) viz., Christ, and Christ's vicar, Peter, and the successor of Peter. The Lord himself, saying 'feed my sheep,' (John, xxi.) speaks generally, not concerning these or those, but in such manner as to be understood that *all* are committed to him. If, therefore, the Greeks or any other affirm that they are not committed to Peter and his successors, they necessarily confess that they do not belong to Christ's sheep, since the Lord says, (in John x.) 'one sheepfold and one shepherd.' We are instructed by Gospel expressions that there are two swords, viz. the spiritual and the temporal; for on the Apostle saying, 'Behold there are two swords here,' (in the church to wit where the Apostle spoke,) the Lord does not answer that it is too much, but that it is sufficient. Assuredly he who denies that the temporal sword was in the power of Peter attends badly to the Word of the Lord, saying, 'Return your sword into the sheath.' (Matt. xx.) Wherefore, each sword, viz. the spiritual and the material sword, is in the power of the Church, but the one is to be exercised *for* the Church, the other *by* the Church; the one is in the hands of the priest, the other in the hands of kings and armies (*millitum*,) but at the nod and sufferance of the priest. It is necessary, however, that sword should be under sword, and the temporal authority; be subject to the spiritual power, &c."

And again, "that the spiritual power is superior in dignity and nobility to any earthly power, we must the more clearly acknowledge,

inasmuch as spirituals exceed temporals. \* \* \* For the truth itself bears witness that the spiritual power hath the province of regulating the earthly power. There is verified concerning the Church and ecclesiastical power the prophecy of Jeremiah, (chap. i. ver. 10.) ' See, I have this day set thee over the nations, and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant.' Therefore, if the earthly power go astray, it shall be judged by the spiritual power; and if an inferior spiritual power go astray, it shall be judged by its proper superior; but if the supreme go astray, it can be judged by God only, not by man. So the apostle witnesses: ' The spiritual man judgeth all things, but he himself is judged of no man.' (1 Cor. ii. 15.) This authority, although granted to a man, and exercised by a man, is not human, but rather divine, given by the mouth of God to Peter himself, and on him and his successors."

" Moreover, we say, determine, and pronounce that every human creature is subject to the Roman Pontiff, as of absolute necessity to salvation.

" Given at the Palace of Saterah, in the eighth year of our Pontificate."

I will now, continued Dr. Croke, present you with a few documents to show what is the cognate form in which these truths are taught in Ireland; and taught not as obscure terms, in the Latin language, but in plain English, to children, and the junior members of the Romish Church. Dr. Cooke then read some extracts from various books of devotion in which the individual was instructed to regard good works as highly meritorious, and as having virtue to plead her cause with God, when no other eloquence would be regarded. I had learned, said Dr. Cooke, that there was an intercessor who had an unchangeable priesthood, whose merits was ineffable—who was gifted with all the powers of an endless life; but now I am told, on the authority of this book of instructions, that when the day of the Lord shall come, the various works which human beings have performed, will plead for them when no other eloquence will be regarded. He then proceeded to read some other portions in which the duties of penance, self-mortification, and chastisement, were urged as meritorious. Thus these blind guides lead the blind, and thus both are likely to fall into the ditch together! And this is the book which is to teach religion

to the Roman Catholic children of Ireland—the book which is recommended by the Board of Education—the book which is to be placed by the side of their renowned Extracts—the book which is to introduce the Christian religion to the minds of the uninstructed! I feel that I have taken up too much of the time of your Lordship and this meeting; but as a member of another denomination, I feel joyful that I have been permitted to come forward. I am conscious that I have not attempted to rankle the diseased wound, but have rather aimed, in imitation of the good Samaritan, to pluck the arrow out of the wound, and to pour in the oil and the healing balm. I am anxious to unbarb every arrow, to heal every wound. If the Roman Catholics will not become Protestants, I would at least have them do one thing; if they will not lay aside the Royalties of Peter, let them at least wash his face! A certain Roman Catholic once asked a Protestant, where was your religion before Luther? To which the Protestant rejoined, where was Peter before his face was washed? If the Roman Catholics will not abandon the Vatican, let them at least sweep away the cobwebs by which it is disfigured. If they will not fully and fairly receive the Bible, let them at least knock down Dominus Dens! Let them no longer allow his volumes to remain amongst their books. Let them clap it into the flint-mill of the Index Purgatorius; let them seek to have it fully purified from all its errors and absurdities. The Roman Catholics often say to us, “Why do you come amongst us from time to time, and throw your fire-brands upon our combustibles?” Our reply is, “Why do you keep gunpowder in your cellars. We shall strike our steel against the hard head of Dominus Dens, and if sparks are made to fall on the powder you have spread, the fault is yours, not ours.” Instead of desiring to be fire-brands, we rather wish to direct the waters of the Shannon to your cellars, and put out all that might prove destructive. We want to take all the combustibles which Dominus Dens has prepared out of the way; we want to remove every obstruction to peace and harmony, that we may shake hands across the table, and say, “Hail, good fellows! well met!”

Three or four gentlemen, in various parts of the room, again attempted to address the audience, but the Noble Chairman reminded them of the rules which had been laid down for the regulation of the meeting, and told them that if they persisted in breaking those rules, they could not be allowed to remain in the hall. His Lordship then announced—

The Rev. MORTIMER O'SULLIVAN, who rose amid loud cheers, and addressed the meeting in the following words:—The various interruptions which this distinguished assembly has endured with so much patience, have had for me a touch of comfort. They showed me that there were some individuals from my country here,—they showed me that these individuals had given their names to the Church of Rome,—and they satisfied me, of which, indeed, I have always been assured, with respect to multitudes of my countrymen, that they have not given more. I willingly persuade myself, that if the gentlemen who so frequently interrupted the progress of the meeting believed that their church maintained those most abominable doctrines which have been this day fastened upon it, they would not have lifted their faces in the light of England, in an assembly like this, and stood confessed as making common cause with a church thus justly set forth as the pestilent enemy of mankind.

There was pain, too, in my mind, in the feeling that these generous champions could not find a corresponding spirit of boldness in the prelates who, as their guides and directors, should have advised them on this occasion. It is now nearly three weeks since there was flung before the Irish people the knowledge that a discovery had been made which exposed the secret doctrines of the Church of Rome. It is nearly three weeks since the prelates of that church in Ireland were called upon to appear before the English nation, and deny their adoption of such monstrous principles, or defend their right still to uphold them. Further, my Lord, it was not required that these bishops should appear in person—the privilege of chivalry was afforded them, that they might stand here by their champions; and I do not hesitate to say, that abler champions,—more skilful—better acquainted with all the intricacies of the conflict, and more prepared for its emergencies, are not to be found in the world. And now, when we address ourselves to the English public, making manifest the enormities of the Church of Rome, we find that she has deserted her cause, and that, except in the tacit or expressed permission bestowed upon some individuals to stand forward and expose their want of courtesy, if they cannot exercise their skill in debate, she has left herself unrepresented and undefended.

It is not my purpose, my Lord, to detain this great assembly by adding to that mass of convincing evidence which my Reverend Friends have exhibited against the Church of Rome—evidence by which the

proofs of her iniquity and intolerance have been so unanswerably established. My task is different. It is to show that the doctrines which my friends have brought home to the Church of Rome, are mischievous in their effects as they are sinful in their origin—mischievous not only to the spiritual welfare of those whom they abuse, but to the civil society in which they are exemplified ; that they are not mere speculative errors—mere abstractions—but are, even at this hour, in active and deleterious operation. The resolution which I shall have the honour to propose is :—

“ That the present state of Ireland furnishes fearful evidence that the tenets of the Roman Catholic Church, such as they have been here exposed, are by no means a dead letter, but that their influence is dreadfully visible in the disorganization and sedition by which that unhappy country is afflicted, and in the means by which the Roman Catholics do not scruple to attempt the overthrow of the Established Church in Ireland.”

There are philosophical statesmen here as well as in Ireland, who have endeavoured, and will endeavour still, unless brought to shame by the disclosures which have been made, to fix in the minds of such as listen to them, a persuasion that there is no evil in allowing one person and one system to have spiritual influence over a man, while another system and other individuals claim to command him in temporal concerns. A more fatal error never was committed than in admitting the propriety of such a distinction. Further, my Lord, I would affirm, that never was error more signally made manifest than this has been, in the disorganization of my afflicted country. What is the consequence of it? Why this ; that the subject yields to the one system the fealty of his conscience—to the other, a merely prudential adhesion. The result, as regards Ireland, is this ; that the minds of a large class of her population are disencumbered of every conscientious scruple as far as regards the law—that it becomes a mere matter of prudence how they shall demean themselves towards constituted authorities—how they shall respect solemn engagements entered into with the state, and how they shall regard that which the law pronounces to be a crime. Upon all these matters a Roman Catholic may hold himself indifferent, provided, only, that he give all the energy which conscience can impart to that devoted obedience which should be yielded to his spiritual superior.

Facts sometimes abridge reasonings, and strengthen arguments, and



I will have recourse to them. I dare say it is well known to many here—it is certainly well known to all who have made themselves acquainted with the recent history of Ireland—that, until the Roman Catholics were admitted into the full enjoyment of all the privileges of the constitution—until every thing had been done which was likely to conciliate their gratitude—until the time had come when they themselves declared that all this had been done—and until, by a special obligation—a solemn, sworn obligation—they had laid themselves under additional engagements—the clergyman's right to tithe in Ireland never was directly assailed.\* There were assaults made on what were called its abuses, and complaints against what were called the inconveniencies arising from the collection of it—but as to the principle of tithe, the right of the clergyman was recognized—the obligation of the law was acknowledged. The wildest innovators, in the most troubled days of the angriest contentions, never went so far as not to admit that the tithe system, under certain modifications, should be supported. In the year 1829, however, the Roman Catholics in Ireland were set free from the necessity of further disguise, and you in England all expected that gratitude would have stronger influence with them—that justice and an oath would have greater weight in their minds—than the prudential restraints of those days when they had less to attach them to the state, and more to desire.

At the second of the Clerical conferences in the year 1830, the first question proposed for discussion was—“Who in Ireland are justly termed Beneficed persons,” *Quinam in Hibernia Beneficarii juste vocantur.* If any doubt as to the meaning of the question could be entertained, subsequent queries remove it, and show that it is proposed with reference to those who should be accounted “the beneficed clergy”—a question, in short to determine who are the persons justly entitled to the ecclesiastical benefices in Ireland. I need not

---

\* None of the insurrectionary movements of the last century, or of the present, until that of the year 1831, was avowedly directed against the principle of Tithe. The oath of the Threshers in 1807, not to contract with Proctors, or with any person but the proprietor, embodied the sentiments of almost all Tithe disturbers before 1830; before, we might affirm, the time when the Romish Prelacy, having sworn that “Emancipation” would remove all hostility to the Protestant Church establishment, changed their tone when they had obtained their ends, and, in the well-known words of Dr. Doyle, recommended the Roman Catholic people to have a hatred of Tithes as indelible as their love of justice.

prove to you that the Church of Rome does not recognise in the Protestant clergy a valid title to ecclesiastical jurisdiction or endowment. Directly or indirectly, the title, it is contended, must come from the Pope. The issue therefore of a discussion upon the question in conference, must have been a formal declaration of the Romish doctrine, and a denial of any right in the Protestant clergy to their ecclesiastical revenues. This, it may be said, was merely speculative. But it should also be said and remembered, that what was learned, and agreed upon, in conference, was to be taught in the confessional and from the pulpit; it should not be forgotten that resistance to the rights of the clergy commenced, in its most systematic and best organized form, in the summer of the year when those rights were questioned, and we may believe, decreed, in conference; and that since then, up to the present day, wherever Popery has power in Ireland, they are almost irrecoverable.

The year 1830 was rendered memorable before its close by a distinction of darker character than the system of what has been called "passive resistance." The massacre of Carrickshock forms a part of its history. There was a clergyman residing in the County of Kilkenny, distinguished by his benevolence, even in the body to which he belonged; possessed of an ample income both from the revenues of his benefice and from private fortune, all of which, having no children, he expended in his neighbourhood, in exercises of decent hospitality and in charities which might be termed munificent. His Protestant congregation was not numerous, but the multitudes whom he fed and clothed, for whom he provided or procured employment when they were strong to labour, and to whose weakness and necessities he ministered in times of sickness and affliction—the multitudes, who, in his prosperity, greeted him with reverence and blessings, might well encourage him to believe that he was surrounded by friends.

Well! this good man's sources of living were intercepted. He was not longer to be acknowledged as of right "a beneficed person." He must be taught to know that there was a law of mightier power, than that through which British subjects hope for protection. Against this he appealed, and sought redress from the laws of his country. In order to have certain notices served, a party of constables, eighteen in number, was ordered on duty. Let this be marked. They were not to molest any individual—to deprive any man of any

portion, however small, of property. Their duty was, simply, to protect the bearer of certain formal notices. As they proceeded on their way, the chapel bells, along their line of march, rung out. At the ominous summons, multitudes, in various directions, showed themselves, followed, and closed on, the devoted party. At first their purpose was not disclosed. The leader affected confidence and friendship, and, when he heard experienced constables expostulating with their officer, and suggesting the prudence of avoiding a dangerous defile, he solemnly gave an assurance that the party were safe; that not a hair of their heads should be touched. Thus he proceeded until he had allured his victims into a recess where discipline and valour were unavailing—then he gave his murderous followers the word for which they waited; and of these eighteen unoffending and confiding men, in open day, fourteen were brutally stoned to death.

The next year witnessed, if not so fearful a crime, a most instructive lesson. A number of individuals, accused of the murder, were arrested, and were to be put on their trial at the assizes of Kilkenny; and the Attorney-General—remember, an Attorney-General appointed by Earl Grey's government—was reduced to the humiliating necessity of adjourning the trials, on the acknowledged ground that justice could not be looked for in any case with which questions of tithes were connected. Why have I said that this was an instructive lesson? You shall judge.

At the concluding (the fourth) conference for the year 1830, the first three questions for discussion were these:—"What counsel should be given to persons engaged in military duties? What are the obligations of Judges? What of those who in our country are called Jurors?" The first of these I shall read in the original—"Quid militiæ deditis præcipiendum." It seems to contemplate not alone those who are more strictly termed soldiers, but all whose lives and duties partake of a military character—soldiers, constabulary, police. The three questions may be said to embrace all who are in any way engaged in the execution and the administration of the laws; the command, to consider them in conference, we may regard as a notification that the Roman Catholic Clergy were to enter upon the course of instruction suitable to the season in which they were proposed—to teach the soldiery and police their duties—to teach their own people in what light the magistrates and judges of the land were to be regarded—and to make them understand, in the event of their being appointed jurors, what was the

nature of their duties. We are in possession of some information from which we may gather what was the result of these questions, and of the discussions they occasioned. It had been found necessary, in consequence of the seditious discourses in the Chapels, to direct that an officer, I believe a commissioned officer, should accompany every military party which attended at a Roman Catholic place of worship; and we have, in the report of a Parliamentary Committee,\* the evidence of an officer, from which we understand plainly that the precaution was not unnecessary. The answers to the other two questions, at least so far as concerns the subject on which I am speaking, are obvious. It is a well known principle of Canon Law, that "the judgments of an excommunicated judge are invalid;" after the speech of my reverend friend and brother, it is needless to say to you that every Protestant judge has incurred the penalties of excommunication. Hence, an ingenious Roman Catholic witness, not ascribing authority to the tribunal of justice where a heretic presides, may feel conscience wholly at ease in availing himself, to the uttermost, of the permission which his Church accords to him in her doctrine of equivocation.

The duties of Jurors have been taught in a work of which some Roman Catholics have endeavoured, unsuccessfully, to disparage the authority; I mean the celebrated Rheimish Testament. I read a note on the 27th chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, 24th verse.

"Though Pilate was much more innocent than the Jews, and would have been free from the murder of our Saviour, seeking all the means that he could (without offending the people and the Emperor's laws,) to dismiss him, yet he is damned for being the minister of the people's wicked will against his own conscience. *Even as all officers are, and especially the judges and juries which execute laws for temporal princes against Catholic men: for all such are guilty of innocent blood, and are nothing excused by that they execute other men's will, according to the laws, which are unjust—for they should rather suffer death themselves than put an innocent man to death.*"

When morals of such a nature as this have spread through such a people as the Irish, is the massacre of Carrickshock or the assizes of Kilkenny matter of wonder? Is it to be wondered at, that, within the last year, there have been 187 dreadful murders perpe-

---

\* Committee on the state of Ireland, 1832—Evidence of Ensign Matson.

trated in one county of Ireland, and that for all these there has been but one criminal brought to justice?

Having put this case before you, I need not dwell on other documents. I did intend to lay before you the testimony of Mr. Inglis, a late English traveller—of Mr. O’Croly, a Roman Catholic priest—of Chief Justice Bushe—and of Sir Hussey Vivian, now Master of the Ordnance—for the purpose of showing that, in the mass of my countrymen, the followers of the Church of Rome, there is no remorse at the shedding of blood—no scruple of conscience at the commission of perjury—that there is a double process of demoralization carrying on—the one dependent on the fidelity with which the unhappy people observe oaths which they have pledged in support of a dark and formidable conspiracy—the other springing from the carelessness with which they break solemn engagements which they have sworn to keep, in every thing referring to the course of public justice. I will, however, pass over all these testimonies, and instead of speaking on matters of which there may be question and dispute, I will bring the case to a point at once, and say, that, according to the principles taught in that book from which we have heard extracts, the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church are such as to render the faith of a Roman Catholic pledged to the support of the State, not to be respected, because he is bound by anterior obligations to his church, and because the Pope or the Bishop can, by the exercise of an infallible power, or a power subordinate to infallible, deliver him from the engagements to which that faith has been pledged. You may ask me if I have any instances, any examples, to adduce? I then, without any hesitation, say, you have this spectacle before you, that thirty-five individuals, men of education, men selected to represent the spirit, and feelings, and character, of the Irish people—men selected to be the chosen champions of the Church of Rome, as existing in Ireland, have come here—have stood on the most conspicuous elevation of the whole moral world, and have, on that pre-eminent elevation, fastened on themselves the charge of a deed which, if it were perpetrated by individuals in this country, would, from every man in England, call down, in one simultaneous cry, the accusation of perjury. They say, “We have done nothing to weaken the Protestant religion and Protestant government in Ireland. They say that tithes have nothing to do with religion—that pounds, shillings and pence are not religion.” This is unredeemed iniquity.

I can charitably account for the violation of the oath on other grounds ; but the nature of the defence thus set up exposes it in all the nakedness of undisguised abomination.

And here, my Lord, I beg leave to indulge in a brief digression, which shall not be impertinent to the subject on which I am engaged. Protestants had said that the engagements of the Roman Catholics for the extermination of heretics were of an uncharitable kind, and in proof of the justice of their complaint, quoted from that solemn instrument, the oath by which Roman Catholic bishops pledged their fealty to the Pope, in which there was found the sworn and dreadful promise, that they would persecute and impugn all heretics. *Persequi et impugnare* were the words. These words Protestants interpreted as if they involved an engagement, not merely to confute their doctrines, but also, the more revolting one, to persecute them in their persons. A Roman Catholic bishop, however, made a defence to this effect: "We are not required," he intimated, "to persecute heretics in person, but we are bound by a solemn engagement to follow up and convince them by argument." (Some cries of hear.) I thank those gentlemen for their cheers. That was the explanation given by Dr. Doyle and Dr. Murray, and other Roman Catholic divines, in the years 1825 and 1826. Some years afterwards, in 1831, Dr. Doyle was again before a Parliamentary Committee. At that time principles had become more developed in the Church of Rome ; blood had been shed ; many ministers of the Established Church had fallen by the murderer's hand ; the law had become powerless to protect their properties or persons ; an appeal had been made in their behalf to the benevolence of England ; and many who had been eminent for charitable exertions, and who would still have continued these exertions, had they not, without a crime, or the imputation of offence, been virtually put out of the law's protection, or felt that law had no power to protect them, were made dependant for the means of existence on the charitable contributions of the humane and generous. The knowledge that the clergy of Ireland were in destitution, because a conspiracy had prevailed against the government, or against them, made it necessary to inquire into matters connected with such a conspiracy. Dr. Doyle had left Parliament under an impression produced by a solemn declaration, that he had nothing to do with the

punishment of heretics in their persons;\* but that it was his imperative duty, as a bishop, to attempt their conversion by argument. In 1831 he made a boast that he never had attempted to convince a heretic of his errors—that he had engaged in no controversy—but had left the Protestants to their opinions, without making the slightest effort to disabuse them. But there arrived a time when he awoke to a sense of duty. When the Protestants, provoked, I must confess, by the assaults of adversaries, came forth from their retirement, and began to shake Popery—when they stood out to discharge a duty which they had not done before—but which in later days they have sought to do, amid difficulties and perils—perils in which many have sealed the truth with their blood—when they opened the clasped book of God's word, and endeavoured to convey to the Irish people that knowledge which called out in the hearts of many an awakened man the question, "What shall I do to be saved?"—then the vener-

\* "The meaning which we attributed to it" (the word *persequi*) "was only to follow up by argument, and to commence, if we could, by proofs."—Dr. Doyle, *Lords' Com. 1825, Digest, vol. 2, p. 178.*

"I mentioned, in 1825, and I repeat it now, that till the period of the new Reformation, I never remember to have preached a single sermon about controversy, and what is more, since the new Reformation commenced, I have never done it directly. I do believe these sentiments of mine were the sentiments and feelings of the great majority of the Catholics, and that, if they had been left to follow their own opinions, they never would have troubled the Protestants about their opinions." "From what period do you date these efforts?" "They commenced, I think, about the year 1824," &c. &c.—Dr. Doyle, *Com. Com. on Tithes in Ireland, 1832, p. 336.* Hence, it appears that Roman Catholic Priests did not engage in controversy for the sake of instructing or reclaiming Protestants; that in short, their exertions were those of adversaries, not Apostles. It appears also, from the evidence, that the efforts of Dr. Doyle and his party were retaliation, provoked by the endeavours of Protestants to make proselytes; and that these endeavours commenced in 1824. Before that year, however, Friar Hayes had preached his controversial lectures, which the newspaper-organ of his party, the *Dublin Evening Post*, was forced to condemn as "incentives to blood." Before that year, in 1821, the existence of the Ribbon Society became notorious; in 1822, its object, the extermination of Protestants, was discovered, and Dr. Doyle himself addressed to the members of it his well-known Pastoral, in which he describes it as "a dark and bloody conspiracy;" while in 1823, he, without the sanction, or indeed rather in defiance of the judgment of the Pope, took a lead (and was conjoined by Dr. Murray) in that most alarming and mysterious movement of the Hohenloe miracles. All these menacing, and one would almost be tempted to say, blasphemous, manifestations, preceded the efforts to proselytise, which Dr. Doyle dates as having commenced in the year 1824.

able Doctor came forth from his fastness—then he buckled on the harness of battle, and excited that war *against the persons of the clergy* which attempted not to correct an error or to enforce a truth, but which has left many a family in Ireland acquainted with privation, and affliction, and the sorrow that is heaviest—and which has caused many a martyr's mangled remains (enthusiastic and continued cheering which interrupted the conclusion of the sentence. When the sensation had in some degree subsided, the Rev. Gentleman resumed.) Are we to receive the testimony of Dr. Doyle in his explanation of the words, "persecute and impugn," at the time when he was framing pastorals such as my friend has been reading to you—when he was making statements such as it was convenient to advance for the purpose of deluding England—or are we to receive his triumphant declarations at an after period, when he had set the war in motion which has led to such terrible consequences? I return to my subject:

The members of the Church of Rome, according to the declared opinions of their divines, are bound to combat heresy wherever it is to be found. Therefore, when they took the oath that they would not shake the Protestant religion or government in Ireland, it was to be understood with a reserve in favour of their antecedent obligations. (Interruption.) This I say in charity; if they prefer it, we may view it as naked perjury without an excuse. But when they say that tithes have nothing to do with religion, I ask on what principle can they defend the violation of another part of the oath, in which they have sworn to maintain the settlement of property as established by law? They acknowledge that property has nothing to do with religion. However strong, therefore, the injunction upon them to combat Protestant doctrine—however sincere their inclination to overthrow the Protestant religion—there appears to ~~be~~, if we may take their own defence as proof, no obligation on them to disturb Protestant property; and the violation of that part of the oath in which they swore to maintain it, appears destitute of any religious justification, and therefore exposing them to the charge of a wanton and gratuitous breach of their solemn, sworn engagements.

I now beg to offer one word on the subject of that church which has been the object of such unceasing and implacable hostility. It



might be urged by some, that if it were, what it has been calumniously styled, a monstrous nuisance, it would be unjust to accuse men for yielding to the angry instincts of their nature in attempting to put it down. I would simply say that every commission which has sat to inquire into the state of that church—every Parliamentary inquiry instituted concerning it, has ended in acknowledging its worth, and in commendation of the well-doing of its ministers. Indeed, we have this to say in thankfulness, that although there have been disabilities imposed on us, and injuries inflicted, there has been all through England an acknowledgment that we did not merit the inflictions. I know but one solitary exception, that of an individual who has attained ecclesiastical rank, the rank of archdeacon.\* Of the charge which he pronounces angrily against the Irish branch of the establishment, I need not say more than one word. I do assure him that the clergy in Ireland are not altogether such as he is. It is quite evident, from an incident which he relates, that he has formed his judgment of the clergy in Ireland from the remembrances of his own life. He gives an account of his having associated, in his younger days, with some individual more interested in the temporalities, than earnest in the duties, of his office; and having engaged, (it would appear from the promptitude with which he obeyed the signal,) in a kind of collusion with this individual, to furnish an excuse for closing the church doors, on the pretext that there was no congregation. From this instance of his own and his friend's conduct, although both were Englishmen, he seems to argue the character of the Irish clergy. I could assure the venerable archdeacon that if there were found, in Ireland, one ecclesiastic to whom, from courtesy, or years, or custom, the title of "venerable" could be applied—and he were to relate of himself such an incident as this archdeacon has communicated, without feelings and expressions of the most bitter mortification and abasement—there is not an individual in the Irish Church, at least not one accounted worthy to stand up among the people, who would not have declared that such an incident betokened profligacy and sacrilege in early life; and, related, as it was, without apparent humiliation, indicated that the vices of youth had only become fouler and more hardened,

---

\* We omit this dignitary's name. The necessities of our subject do not require it, and we therefore gladly indulge the feeling which pleads for silence.

when carried up into the inexcusable impenitence of old age. I trust that if these words reach the venerable archdeacon, he will rejoice to find that Sparta has twelve hundred other sons worthier than he. I fear I have trespassed unreasonably upon the attention of the meeting; that it is best I should hasten to a conclusion.

After some conversation between the Rev. Speaker and Lord Kenyon, his Lordship rose and said, that he was obliged reluctantly to leave the chair in consequence of an unavoidable engagement. He trusted, however, that his departure would cause no interruption to the eloquent speaker. He was sure that whatever gratification and profit he would lose himself, the meeting would suffer nothing by his departure, as his place would be filled by one much more competent to discharge the duties. He then bowed to the meeting, and retired amidst the most enthusiastic applause.

The chair was taken by G. FINCH, Esq. M.P. and Mr. O'SULLIVAN resumed.

This is not an Irish question, even as regards the Church in Ireland. I have heard individuals say that they accounted it very desirable that there should be restrictions imposed on members of the Church of Rome, denying them the right of voting in cases where the interests of the Church Establishment were concerned. I have never been able to see the wisdom of proposing such restrictions. If members of the Roman Catholic Church can be bound by oaths, the oath which is now required secures friends for the Established Church; it not merely neutralizes hostility, but it procures friends and champions, who should be only the more earnest to discharge the duty which they can conscientiously perform, in consequence of their hostility to certain doctrines which they cannot take within the sphere of their protection. But if it be impossible by an oath to engage their consciences and secure their neutrality, then it is well that there should be disclosed before the people of England the character of those who, by trading in oaths, have acquired privileges in our Constitution. It is not, as I said, a matter respecting merely the Church in Ireland—the Church has furnished the occasion on which certain principles of perfidy have become manifested; but it is to the operation of these principles here your attention should especially be directed.

I do not think I shall be accused of too lightly estimating dangers affecting the Church in which I am a minister, when I say that the magnitude of the considerations involved in the conduct of the Roman

Catholic people in Ireland is criminally diminished by any who would narrow attention to the perils to which it has exposed our Establishment. We certainly have strong ground for expostulation and complaint. When the Constitution was opened with all its privileges to the enemies of the Church, they purchased an entrance into its strong positions by renouncing and abjuring any design of active hostility. They offered an oath as an ample security, not only as imposing an obligation from which they could not be released, but also as exhibiting a criterion that, whatever their dispositions had previously been, their acts should thenceforth exhibit no proof that they were implacably hostile. The obligation, they have shown, could not bind them—the criterion was not fairly exhibited. As if the hatred with which they looked upon a Protestant Church was rendered fiercer by the obstacles against which it struggled, it would seem that the determination to root it out was strengthened by the solemn pledge to spare it, until, all power of equivocation ceasing, they boldly and openly attempted to overthrow what they had solemnly sworn to defend, and what, in consequence of having taken a solemn engagement, they had obtained, among their other privileges, ability to injure.

But let the case of the Church of Ireland pass. A mightier mischief than the destruction of its establishment is in process of being effected—a mischief in comparison with which even the overthrow of a venerable Christian establishment appears but an ordinary calamity. What is this mischief? It is the debasement of morals—here—among the people of England. The same efforts which are directed to the overthrow of the Irish Church are waged also against the steadfastness of British principle. They would, with one fatal success, silence the voice of the Gospel amongst us, and here would put out that sacred light of honour by which it is the boast of England that there she has ever been well directed. How is it that England's faithfulness and truth are sustained? Not surely, in every instance, by the sole power of Christian principle. You cannot expect that all hearts, in any nation, should be moved only by holy impulses. Men are subjected to the influence of mixed motives; all do not feel directly the power of true religion; but all nations where true religion is honoured, where a holy worship, a reasonable service, assembles many faithful servants of God, will experience good from their prayers and piety. Influences pass from religion which will permeate and pervade the elements of public opinion; virtue will, as it were, go

out from faith and prayer, by which the atmosphere of national feeling will be purified and kept wholesome. Truth and morals will become respected, not simply because they are divinely enjoined, but, also, because the usages and laws of society adopt them as principles to be had in reverence. Thus, through the influence of religion, extended beyond the exact limits within which true worshippers are found, a kind of secondary religion is imparted to the national feeling. Honour, honesty, the habit of truth, become invested with power; and it ought not to be believed that the practices by which these national virtues are impaired have not been designed to effect the object they seem calculated to accomplish. It ought not to be thought that nothing further is intended than to ruin the character of those who accustom the people of any country to witness fraud and faith-breaking. What have men, bold for the truth, been known to do in lands where they could offer no more effectual testimony against the prevailing idolatry? They have cast down the idols of the deluded people, in order that such an exhibition of their want of power might deprive them of all reverence. Is there not something similar in the outrage practised upon English feeling? England has her innocent idols—her social, household religion; and it is a fearful experiment to witness, whether the feeling in which her people have respected the virtues it prescribed, be not destroyed by familiarity with the insults offered to national faith and honour. They see promises broken—engagements solemnly entered into unscrupulously violated, and they see no rebuke causing shame where offence should have called down condemnation. Is it to be believed that the habit of witnessing unpunished trespasses shall not lessen the sensibility for which a moral people had been distinguished,—in which they had instinctively recoiled from whatsoever they accounted false and unbecoming? Who is there, who cannot, by remembering what has been, and reflecting on what is now, convince himself painfully that the process of debasement is in rapid operation? It is with nations as with individuals—vice must become familiar before its hatefulness ceases to be repulsive. At first it is detested—then it is endured—finally it is practised. The instincts of an honorable nature are quick to reject what is evil; but if the evil be not rejected, if it be committed to the sophistries of a fallen nature, there will always be found some plausible representation to abuse the nation, or the individual, who consents to hold parley with iniquity. Who will say, that, already, there is not something of that

confusion and indifference produced as to the hatred of violating truth, of which the result must be so fatal? Who cannot remember a time, when, to affix upon a gentleman of England the suspicion of an untruth, was to visit him with a plague, under which, as under the fabled influence of a wizard spell, he must droop and wither; when, so long as he remained uncleared of such suspicion, it seemed, as though wherever he went, wherever he was confronted by a human face, the terrible influence of an evil eye was upon him, against which he had no protection, from which he could have no relief, but to shrink from the companionship and sight of his fellows; and, as if the plague and the prohibition of leprosy were upon him, to betake him to places where he shall be no more shocked with the aspect of familiar faces; or, if his feelings were acute, to withdraw where happier footsteps never wandered, and waste and die in his degradation? Who will say that the curse would be upon him now? Is it not the humiliating truth, that to affix the stigma which was of old ineffaceable dishonour, inflicts no disqualification?—that it can be borne into places of trust and power, that it shall be displayed without shame, and looked upon without disgust, in assemblies once accounted the most select and the noblest in all the civilised world, and where now the epithet of especial dishonour, and the crime which calls forth its application, shall cause as little loathing and abhorrence as the *goitre* does in nations where that deformity is familiar? Is it to be believed that respect for truth or reprobation of falsehood, can long subsist under so flagrant and so often-repeated violations? Can it be thought good for the people of England to behold the assembly of their representatives frequently engaged in shameful contentions, and made the theatre of experiments upon credulity, by which, not many years since, the humblest meeting of the humblest artisans would have held itself disgraced? Can it be thought good for them to see that religion has lost its power to give sanctity to an oath, and that there is no magic in the Commons House of Parliament which can impart the honour of a gentleman? Upon what do you place a reliance that the contemplation of such opprobrious altercations as have disturbed high places—of such contemptuous epithets as the hazardous assertions of gentlemen, honourable by courtesy, have fastened to their names, shall not have its natural effect in weakening men's love for truth, and that, when they find that a lying spirit is abroad in the hearts of men, they will not lose that respect for constituted authority, and that

reverence for truth, which upheld the reign of justice and order throughout the realm of England ?

But what is the design of all this ?—The result may be the demoralization of a fine people. The design, if design can be inferred from apparent contrivance, is, that they may be brought so low in character as to become prostrate before Popery. Thus the foul spirit of that false church woos its victims. Rather than want subjects, it would contaminate to procure them. England—moral, rational, promise-keeping, oath-respecting—would be free—would reject the efforts to enthral her, and would not endure the abominations of Papal despotism for the sake of being delivered from any toil or apprehension ; but England, abased in morals, will be reduced in the scale of nations ; and the dreadful vengeance of Popery upon the people who have, with mightiest energy, shaken her power, will be, first, to strip her reputation of all its comeliness ; and when her children have become as conspicuous for disregarding all solemn obligations as they had been honoured for the observance of them—when mutual confidence has been destroyed—when honour has failed—when equivocation in the witness-box, and perjury in the jury-room, and partiality on the bench, are matters that have ceased to wake mens' special wonder,—then to insinuate, and procure friends who will promote the advice, that the dark genius of the confessional should be invoked for the purpose of establishing some correcting and sustaining authority in a land from which the light of truth has been excluded—from which respect for the laws of God has been effectually banished, and where all restraints of truth and morals have been forcibly snapped asunder.

But, it would be unjust to say, that all who nominally belong to the Church of Rome would consent to uphold her in her iniquitous claims and doctrines ; and I will not give up a hope that the exposures of this day may serve to detach from her some generous, though mistaken friends—friends who have given their adhesion to her because they know not her abominations. I was not surprised, as many here must have been, at witnessing the interruptions by which the peacefulness of this meeting was temporarily disturbed, because I know well, that it is the policy of the Church of Rome to keep her children in total ignorance of her most offensive doctrines. She holds that she has, externally, connected with her, many who belong to her, as, to use the illustration of Bellarmine, “ the hair and nails belong to the natural body, and serve it for ornament and protection.” Thus, are

many united to the body of the Church of Rome ; unacquainted with her character, but yet, giving to her the credit of their names and all other advantages of external adhesion. She retains them by disguising the characters of some doctrines, and by concealing some which she affects altogether to deny. Do not suppose that those who disclaimed these doctrines here to-day, did so with a knowledge that they were speaking falsehood ; I have no such painful impression. It is more gratifying to believe, that they thought they were speaking truth—they thought that their church was unjustly accused, and they came forward as gallant champions to speak in her defence. But when they remember that she has not, by her accredited ministers, appeared to defend herself, I trust that it will cause them to look more carefully into the documents now proposed for their examination, whether they be of authority, and what they teach. If they find this true revelation of Popery agreeable to their understanding, they will cling to it with increased devotedness ; but if they find her to be what we know her to be, and if they be what I would gladly believe they are, the day will come when we shall see a great shaking in that church ; and many, who in their ignorance defended, in their knowledge renouncing her.

The truth is, that for a length of time Popery concealed her foul visage and her foul doctrines from men's cognizance, and required from her followers no more than that they should give their adhesion to what her councils and her canons taught, most carefully hiding from their knowledge what these doctrines were which they were bound to hold. Individuals who gave their general assent did not know that the councils and canons which they respected were like those letters of death—those *σηματα λυγρα* among the ancients—which appeared to be missives of no gloomy character, but insidiously carried condemnation to those who bore them. Now the time is changed, and circumstances are altered ; the Church now brings out from the depths of her repositories the most noxious and abominable of her doctrines, and put it in the power of those who have been her friends to know what it is to which they have given their adhesion.—And what it is now shown to be ? Have we not seen that it had not been dead but sleeping—a sleep no doubt in which it became acquainted with the corruption of the tomb, but became acquainted with fouler corruptions, and possessed also with a spirit baser and worse than human ? It is no longer held in the sepulchre—it has come

abroad. Where its influence had been felt, its presence has now been rendered visible. Equivocation was the herald which announced its uprising—perjury and murder are the attendants which follow in its train. Has not its character been dreadfully revealed? Who was not shocked by the disclosures of my Rev. friend,—when you beheld him, in one hand, the engaging pastorals with which Popery would attract Protestant favour: in the other, the terrible volume from which her faithful ministers are instructed? What an exemplification of that wild German story, the man who walks in upper air, and his frightful associate, the double-guager—the fiend never to be disconnected with him, brought to confront each other—the one speaking in the tones he has learned in his intercourse with men, words of which men may approve; the other speaking the language he has learned in his own dreadful place, and in which the secret instructions, which change men's hearts into his likeness, are remorselessly inculcated. Shall this be a warning sent in vain? All ye that love truth, let your prayers ascend from fervent lips, out of faithful hearts, that the neglect of such a warning bring not down sore calamity on the land. Is this an unnecessary solicitation? Oh, when so foul a monster has come abroad into the ways of man—undisguised—intolerable—causing abhorrence or dismay to all who have not made a league with the iniquity, and acting with all the boldness produced by unconsciousness of the loathing with which it is deservedly regarded—a monster, where the spirit of a fiend appears to have animated the putrifying carcase of departed humanity: which proceeds on its dreadful mission, to slay the souls and bodies of men; callous and cruel; with the apathy of the dead and the malignity of the damned:—shall it be held premature, when thus vengeance has gone forth from the Lord, when the plague has begun, to cry aloud and spare not—to lift up most earnest supplications to God, that in his infinite mercy he will abstain from visiting calamity on the earth, that, without bloodshedding, without destruction of life, or violation of law, the aspect of the evil thing may be discovered in the true light of religion—that the prayers of the faithful may be blessed, and that they may be privileged to welcome with pious congratulations into a pure faith, many who have never given to Popery a higher sanction than of their names, and who will soon withdraw all countenance from its detected and intolerable abominations.

One word more, Sir, and I have done—a word to my brethren who



have appeared with me upon this platform to day, completing the proof that if we are of two Churches we are of one religion. Be assured that you have done good service to the cause of truth and of freedom. The effect of these discoveries will not pass away ephemeral as the plaudits with which your announcement of them has been hailed by this great meeting. The exposition of these fearful opinions thus brought into desolating and deadly operation on the minds of our population through the mysterious agency of the Roman Church, must awake all who love true religion, to a sense of the dangers with which Protestantism is threatened. And more especially to my brother, whose research and exertion has been the means of bringing these discoveries before the English people, I would speak a word of congratulation. Be of good cheer and hope. I know well that no terror or difficulty can turn you from the path of duty, or cause you to repent of your upright and most favoured exertions. You have done much for England and much for Protestantism in disinterring monstrous doctrines, and exposing them, in all their undisguised deformity, to the light of day. The result of your exertions will not speedily pass away. Truth endureth; and such truth as you have been privileged to make known, has never been unavailing. Then be of good cheer, brother; you have this day kindled up a light in England, which, I trust, by God's grace—

\*[Here the Rev. speaker was interrupted by a tumultuous burst of applause. The allusion to Ridley was evidently taken as it ought to be, and, after standing for some time, as if waiting to conclude the sentence, he sat down amidst the most deafening plaudits, and left to us the task of completing the sentence with a prayer and hope, that the light kindled on Saturday in the metropolis of England "shall never be extinguished."]

The following resolution, which Mr. O'Sullivan alluded to in the course of his speech, was then put from the chair, and carried unanimously:—

"Resolved—That the state of Ireland affords painful evidence that the doctrines here exposed are not a dead letter: and that their presence and power can be discerned in the distractions and disorganization of that afflicted country, and in the means which Roman Catholics do not scruple to employ in their endeavours to overthrow the Church Establishment."

---

\* Report of the meeting.

Mr. GORDON, at the close of the proceedings, gave notice of a meeting to be held on an early day, for the establishment of a Protestant Constitutional Association, and read a series of resolutions intended to form the basis of the society, which had been adopted by a number of noblemen and gentlemen on the preceding Wednesday.

The meeting separated.

---

Although the lucubrations of the Editors of the Romish press are, generally speaking, inadmissible into such a work as this ; yet those which tend to throw light on the subject, by exhibiting the mode of defence which the priests endeavoured to maintain through third persons when they were unable to appear openly themselves, either in the press or on the platform, are too useful to be thrown aside. The following evidently written by a priest, and professing to relate circumstances that occurred at a conference, and to cite the authority of Dr. Murray, as given there to his priests is of peculiar value, as it exhibits clearly that system of reckless duplicity and falsehood, which the subsequent discovery of their secret Provincial Statutes conclusively developed. It is taken from the *Weekly Freeman's Journal*, Saturday, June 27th :—

#### CHARLATANRIE.

“ Our first impression, on reading the report published by the Orange press of this city, of the antics of the prime mountebanks, Robert M'Ghee, Mortimer O'Sullivan, (the ex-Catholic,) and Cooke (the Presbyterian,) at the new menagerie of Exeter Hall, was to treat the affair with contempt. And this first feeling we would obey, were the calumnies, the gross and scandalous misrepresentations—the flagitious assertions, the infamous libels of the strolling venders of wholesale slander to circulate in Ireland alone, where the characters of the individuals are known, and where there are millions of living witnesses against them. But not only will the false statements spread over England, where ignorance and prejudice will probably procure them credence, but they have been made in England for the foul purpose of deception, and with the hope or assurance that the contradictions, should any be put forth, would either never be seen, or if seen, would not, such is the force of early impression, be credited, no matter how cogent, how precise, or how complete. Therefore it is that we condescend to notice the proceedings emblazoned with so much pomposity by the *Mail*.

“Our answer, then, to the spouters at Exeter Hall will be two-fold—

“First, admitting for argument sake, while we deny in point of fact, all the assertions of Mr. M’Ghee, who alone spoke with any semblance of pertinence—allowing for a moment that all his propositions are as true as they have been confidently announced and complacently adopted; conceding then for once that it is the doctrine of the Catholic church, adopted by the Catholics of Ireland, that Protestants, being formal heretics are punishable with excommunication, irregularity, incapacity to hold benefices or public offices, deprivation of benefice or dignity, deprivation of spiritual jurisdiction, denial of Christian burial, confiscation of goods, and corporal punishment, such as exile, incarceration, and death—granting all this to Mr. M’Ghee, Lord Kenyon, and the rest of the fanatics—let us ask are *they* in a condition to accuse Catholics of any offence in holding such doctrine? If Catholics believe, on the authority of their church that Protestants are heretics, and that heretics may rightly and lawfully be imprisoned, exiled, and hanged, because they are heretics—have not Protestants—these heroes of the reformation—these abettors of the right of private judgment, denounced Catholics as idolaters, and actually incarcerated, exiled, racked, tortured, hanged and burned them in hundreds of thousands in Great Britain and Ireland? If Catholics believe that Protestants as heretics may be deprived of property, liberty and life, should they refuse to conform to Catholic doctrine and discipline, have not Protestants actually enacted laws, and bloodily enforced them, confiscating Catholic property, imprisoning, exiling, and slaying Catholic persons, in order to compel these Catholics to profess a conformance to the new-fangled and piebald doctrines of Luther and Calvin, which make up the sum of Church-of-Englandism? If Catholics adopt—and they do not—the sanguinary and spurious canon of the 4th Council of Lateran, have not Protestants, while doggedly maintaining the principle of private judgment in matters spiritual, enacted the brutal penal code? Yet these individuals, who to this hour approve of that barbarous and bloody code, and who resisted with all their might its annulment or abrogation, are the very persons who come forward and attempt to raise a ‘No Popery’ cry in England, on the false plea that the Catholic church teaches, and that Catholics believe, the terrible doctrine that man has a right to put man to death on account of religious belief! Would it not be better for these people to look into their own hearts, and to purge themselves of the filth of intolerance, before they set about the reformation of their neighbours? Surely they who have preached and practised persecution in its most cruel form—who enacted laws for the purpose of setting father against son, brother against brother, and child against

parent—who set upon the head of the Catholic and of the savage brute the same price—who made the profession of the Catholic tenets high treason, and the education of Catholic youths a capital felony—and who strained every nerve to prevent the abolition of these cruel, unjust, impolitic, and pernicious laws—they surely have no right, no title to declaim against Catholics, even if the latter maintained as fully as they reprobate the atrocious doctrine attributed to them by the reverend and calumnious mountebank to whom we have referred.

“In the second place, we deny, on the part of the Catholics of Ireland, every assertion put forth by Mr. M’Ghee. The Catholic Church does not teach, nor do the Catholic people believe, the abominable doctrine that heretics—no matter of what class—Lutherans, Calvinists, &c. &c.—can or ought to be put to death because of their not professing their belief in the tenets of the church. On the contrary, the received doctrine of Catholics is, that the power of the church is limited to ecclesiastical censure; while the church denies to lay princes the right or interfering out of secular matters. This the ranters saw in Dens itself, vol. 2, page 79, although their candour and religious zeal did not urge them to reveal the fact. A further evidence of the tolerance of Catholics, and of the malignant misrepresentation of their revilers, is to be found in the same obscure work, which the fanatics have, in their malevolence, dug out of the grave of contempt, and galvanized into a momentary animation. In the second volume, page 86, we find the following passage. The article treats of heresy in particular; and the author, after putting the question ‘An dubius in fide est Hæreticus?’ and, after his peculiar fashion, answering by distinctions, goes on to say—‘But if the doubt arises from ignorance of a mystery, or from this circumstance, that the individual doubts whether it has been revealed and proposed for belief by the church, in that case the party will not be a heretic.’ Here is a generous distinction, of which St. Augustine avails himself when he says, as quoted by Dens, page 84, *de Hæresi in Particulari*, “without being pertinacious I can indeed err; but I cannot be a heretic.” And Steyaert adds—we give the original—‘Hac in re—(hæresi) generatim *satis certo* pronuntiari posse *multos* ta les etiam postquam ad usum rationis pervenerunt, *adhuc excusari*; quia vel de fide Catholica nil inaudiunt, vel non sic, ut ad discernenda illius fundamenta satis adhuc sint idonei. Speciatim vero aliquid *determinare*, valde est difficile.’ So far for the opinions propounded even in the work of Dens.

“We now come to the personal part of the case. The swaddlers gave a challenge to the Catholic hierarchy of Ireland to enter the lists with them at a time and place fixed by the Tartuffes.

“In the first place, then, we will say the challenge, under an affectation of fair dealing, was conceived in a spirit of dishonesty sufficient

to blast the cause it meant to serve, in the mind of any reasoning man, even before all inquiry. The Catholic hierarchy of Ireland, and Dr. Murray, Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, in particular, are cited, at the bidding of some twenty individuals, without authority, to appear in a distant city in the midst of Protestants, bigoted Protestants, to answer charges not specified, but only described as involving crimes of the very highest magnitude—crimes affecting the lives, liberty, and property of their fellow-subjects and fellow-Christians of the Protestant denomination. Could any man, or set of men, be so insensible to the sentiments of self-respect as to notice for a moment such charges, until they should be specified? Did the challengers really expect that Dr. Murray would actually go forward to prove that he was not a murderer or a robber, and that he did not abet these crimes, or that he could expect to be repaid for the loss of time and money to be spent in a journey to London, by coming back convicted, against his will and feeling, of being both the one and the other? Ah! the knaves! they knew well their challenge would not be accepted—that their gauntlet will lie undisturbed in the sand of the arena. If they really wished what they pretended—to give these dignitaries an opportunity of defence—why not mention the grounds of the charge, and afford ample time for preparing to meet it—and that charge the abetting of murder? No: truth was not their object, but conviction—to take the accused by surprise was their means, and they began with a prayer, the sanctified knaves! But why change the venue?—why drag the accused to England?—why try them before a jury composed of the alleged objects, the destined victims of Popish cruelty—of the men for whose blood they were said to thirst—of Protestants, inflamed, if they were but men, by the vile imputation—a packed jury, too, even of these? For, to whom were tickets given? To the friends of the accusers, to their active, avowed, and bitter partisans—the Kenyons, the Mandevilles, the Shaws, the Devonsher Jacksons, the Lefroys, the “saints” that “hate with a most perfect hate the enemies of the Lord.” And before such a jury and such an audience the fanatics pretended to fancy the Catholic Bishops would expect an unbiassed, impartial hearing, and an honest verdict! They are *not* honest men, and we tell them so without fear of doing wrong.

“But at length the 20th of June comes, and Exeter-hall is besieged. Oh! if Paddy were there what a hearty laugh he would give at the long sanctified visages, as they passed in ‘to bear false witness against their neighbour;’—unless, indeed the sight of them should remind him of a father or a brother, or a child, murdered at the bidding of a parson, in some tithing affray, for 1s. 8d.! Lord Kenyon gets pious, turns up the whites of his eyes, and calls aloud for a prayer. An

elaborate effusion of the spirit is accordingly poured forth, in which God is reminded that, '*he promised to preside at the head of his church, and to be by his wisdom an unerring guide.*' The Popish doctrine of the infallibility of the church, as we are a sinner! Well, here we have an infallible general council, consisting of ministers of *all churches* not Popish, of saintly lords and saintlier ladies; gentlemen commoners and their wives, all united in the spirit to pronounce on the Catholic Bishops of Ireland, and Dr. Murray, '*specially as interested in the charge,*' The fathers gravely sit—Lord Kenyon presiding—when up starts the Rev. Robert M'Ghee, notorious for his long-winded polemical letters against the Papists, which no one could bear to read, and for the insertion of which in the newspapers he had to submit to their exhibition as advertisements. No doubt the trunk-makers' and grocers' shops will be ransacked henceforth, and the discovery of the lost treasure be celebrated as more fortunate than that of the Pandects. The mountain heaves, the labours of parturition commence; when, lo! to the inexpressible joy and content of the holy matrons, then and there assembled, Master Robert M'Ghee, after severe travail, is delivered of his *ridiculus mus*. The first limb of the precious fœtus that appears is in the shape of a resolution, declaring that Dens' Theology is the '*authoritative standard* (these are the words of the aforesaid Robert) set up by the *Bishops of Ireland* as a guide to be consulted in all cases where access to libraries is not convenient, or the Bishops themselves cannot be consulted—and this for the last twenty-seven years.' On what authority is all this shown? On the authority of a publisher's *puff*, to get off his wares!! Just that, and no more. The publisher, no doubt, mentions an unanimous resolution that Dens' was the best work on the subject. We don't believe it. The publisher does not give the words of that resolution, but his own (honest, though it may be,) conception of its meaning. Had the words been as strong a recommendation of the work as he has described it, he would at once have seen the obvious advantage of giving the *ipsissima verba* of the prelates. This omission is a strong presumptive evidence that if the resolution existed ever, the Prelates did not resolve so unqualified an approval of the work as the publisher puts forth. And had they so resolved—had they said that it was the *best* work on the subject—they had resolved that which would have met with very general dissent among their clergy. But we challenge them to the proof that the Bishops of Ireland ever passed such a resolution. Let them name the chairman of the meeting, or mover or seconder of the resolution. According to their showing the Bishops passed the resolution unanimously. Now, the four Archbishops and seven of the suffragans were, and are, by act of Parliament, members of the Board of Maynooth College. If this book of Dens seemed to them to

deserve the unqualified eulogy bestowed upon it by the publisher, is it not strange that they, in 1808—the period of the alleged resolution—commissioned the late Dr. De la Hogue to publish his tract on religion, and five years later his other four tracts? And why, in 1815, did these four Archbishops and seven Bishops—Doctor Murray included, direct the republication of Bailly's Moral Theology for the use of the students at Maynooth, if Dens' were, in their opinion, that pre-eminent authority which Mr. M'Ghee would make it? The price of Bailly and De la Hogue is 3*l.* 10*s.* :—that of Dens only 2*l.* 2*s.* If the latter were deemed a 'standard authority,' why was it, the cheaper work, passed over, and the dearer books preferred? Fitzpatrick, not Coyne, was then the publisher to Maynooth College and to the Catholic Bishops, if they had any at the time; yet he, while publishing Dens on his own account, was also employed in publishing De la Hogue on the account of the Maynooth Board. How does this square with the flippant assertion of Mr. M'Ghee, and the impudent resolution of the saintly menagerie? Mr. M'Ghee says that 'this book was set in 1831 as the conference book for the Roman Catholic priests of Ireland.' He makes this assertion on his own authority, or on report. If on the former, then has he asserted a gross and a deliberate falsehood—for the book is *not* a conference book out of the province of Dublin, and is not heard of in the provinces of Armagh, Cashel and Tuam: and if Mr. M'Ghee speak on report, then we must charge him with an offence little less criminal than wilful untruth; namely, the reckless and careless propagation of false rumour, without taking pains to come at the truth, although the trouble of ascertaining the fact would be very trivial. He next says, that "a new edition (of Dens) was ordered" in 1832. This is another flat untruth.

"Further Mr. M'GHEE says—

"If I can also show that the questions proposed at the private conferences of the Roman Catholic priests, printed in *the most authoritative documents*, signed by the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Ireland for five years, namely, for the years 1831, 1832, 1833, 1834, 1835, are taken consecutively from this book, and correspond with the consecutive chapters in Dens—if I can show these different points, then I think I shall have satisfactorily established the fact, that this book has been set up as the standard authority and guide of the Roman Catholic priests of Ireland, from the year 1808, down to the year 1835. \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

'I have now to mention what the book is upon the authority of which I make this statement. This is, I may say, the *most authoritative* book in the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland. The priests are obliged, under the penalty of what they called mortal sin, to repeat

certain exercises every day, which they call offices. These are taken from the Breviary, from the Missal, and from parts of Scripture which I know not; but every year there is published a Directory, under the authority of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, in which these offices are prescribed for every day in the year. Therefore, before the first of January, *every Roman Catholic priest in Ireland* must have *this* book, and he must have it in his hands every day in the year, to direct him. It is called the 'Priests' Directory.'

"The reader will please to remark the passages in italics—for every one of these contains the assertion of a gross untruth. First, the Directory is called 'the most authoritative book in the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland.' It is not a book of any authority! It is a mere almanack, to guide the priest in the reading of his office and the saying of mass. Neither is it 'signed by the Catholic hierarchy of Ireland,' or by any prelate or priest save the compiler. Equally untrue is the other flippant assertion of Mr. M'Ghee, that 'before the first of January *every Roman Catholic priest in Ireland* must have *this* book.' No Catholic priest need have it, except a priest of the province of Leinster—the Catholic clergy of the other provinces having directories published by some of their own members. *For instance, the Rev. Mr. Bourke compiles the Directory for the clergy of Connaught—so that it is most likely that the priests of that province never before heard of Dens or of his Thomist and schoolmen pragmatisms.* But why is this Directory invested with so much authority by Mr. M'Ghee? For the purpose of giving an air of authenticity to the publisher's panegyric upon his wares. To that point, however, we will come shortly. At present we will follow the rev. mountebank through his assertions. He says:—

'It is sufficient for me to state that *the consecutive questions of conference for the five years, from 1830 to 1835, are taken from the consecutive chapters in Dens, and those chapters are selected as furnishing authoritative standard answers to the questions'* (hear, hear).

"The Charlatan makes a ludicrous tumble, and the oaves who looked on were filled with joy:—the fanatic uttered a flagitious falsehood and the pious saints cried 'hear, hear, hear.' 'The consecutive questions of conference (for the province of Leinster) for the five years, from 1830 to 1835, are taken from the consecutive chapters in Dens'—true, 'and those chapters are selected as furnishing authoritative standard answers to the questions'—untrue, palpably, viciously untrue.' We have the authority of our reverend and estimable friend, the author of the Directory for the province of Leinster, to state precisely how this matter stands. The Bishops of each diocese, and sometimes of a province, direct certain questions for the conferences of the clergy every



year. These questions are notified in the Directory for the province of Leinster. As in the discussion some order was necessary, and as the clergy are obliged to revise the whole body of theology in conferences, it was deemed more convenient to take up a complete system, such as Dens presented, than to be passing from one tract to another; for De la Hogue, the author of one of the Maynooth class-books, wrote no moral treatises except the one on penance; and Bailly's (the other Maynooth class-book) Dogmatic Theology is not to be had in this country. On the other hand Collet is too voluminous, and even rare; and Tournelli and other works, which have really pretensions to authority, are equally scarce. Hence the accident of the selection of Dens. The first year no mention was made of the author whose order was followed in the Directory. The clergy were thus put to inconvenience, being obliged to rummage through several volumes for the questions which followed consecutively in Dens—as it seldom or never occurs that any two theologians observe the same order in treating of their subjects. The next year the name was announced, but the cause assigned by Mr. M'Ghee for this selection of Dens is totally at variance with the truth. That Dens was not intended to be a standard authority is evidenced by the very wording of the notification in the Directory—*'tractatum discutiemus.'* If Dens were this infallible guide of which M'Ghee talks malevolently, there was an end of discussion—of the very thing for which the conferences are held. And that Dens was not intended to supply the answers will be at once understood from the following, to the accuracy of which we pledge ourselves on unquestionable authorities. *In the year 1831, at a public conference of all the secular clergy of this city, held at the Presbytery, Lower Exchange-street, a clergyman of great respectability asked the compiler of the Directory, 'why he had selected that obsolete and exploded theologian, Dens, for a conference book?' and added jocularly, that 'he supposed it was for the purpose of assisting Mr. Coyme in the sale of his newly-published book.' The Archbishop (Dr. Murray), who was present, forthwith interposed, and 'desired it to be distinctly understood, that Dens was by no means made a class-book for the conferences—that they were merely to follow his order in discussing the questions, and that the answers were to be taken from any books the clergy pleased to prefer. These facts will, we suppose, silence further calumny—extinguish the slanders already blazing through the country, and, we think, strip Mr. M'Ghee of his assumed infallibility, even to the conviction of the Tartuffes.*

“But, says Mr. M'GHEE, the book—mark the word—the book that asserts the authority of Dens, and the unanimous approbation of the Prelates—is itself the most *authoritative* book in the Church of

Ireland. Wilfully, grossly dishonest statement! It is not a book that states so: it is, once more Mr. Coyne's own advertisement, and has no more to do with the Directory than the booksellers advertisements appended to Moore's History of Ireland, or any volume of Lardner's Encyclopædia have to do with such volume. As well might the puffs of the silversmiths and vestment-makers, &c. found in the same 'book,' be held as binding the Catholic Prelates to an 'authoritative' approval of their several articles of merchandize! The thing is not only barefacedly dishonest, but it would be ridiculously so, were not the malice that dictated it more calculated to excite indignation than any other feeling. *The Bishops have never ordered their clergy to be provided with the work.* Some of the answers found in it could not be received, such as those that allege the Belgian laws. But if the work must be forced on the clergy of Ireland whether they will or no—if, in a word, the calumniators of the Catholic clergy will have that book to be the authoritative standard—why, be it so. Turn to page 6, vol. 1st. To the question "of what authority is the opinion of scholastics" (such as Dens himself)—what is the answer? 'That the unanimous opinion of scolastics makes said opinion'—what? an article of faith? No such thing—only the morally unanimous consent of the Bishops of the universal church can establish an article of faith—but makes it *morally* certain: and where the opinion is that of one or more such writers, it is precisely of that weight and *no more*, which the reasons on which it rests gives it; and in proof, the author quotes the 37th among the propositions *condemned* by Alexander VII. 'If a book be of a modern or young author, it makes at least a *probable* opinion, if not condemned by Rome.' That proposition was condemned by the pontiff, showing that the opinion of a theologian is of no greater value than his reasons or his character for talents and judgment make it. There is not a single work on theology, among the thousands that have been written, to *all* the propositions in which any Catholic, lay or ecclesiastical, would subscribe, or bind himself to subscribe—and, indeed, why should they, when even the *reasoning* of general councils, even on articles of faith, though entitled to respect, are not binding on the consciences of Catholics? What a farce, then, when, after the packed assembly of old ladies of either gender voted, in obedience to the Rev. Robert M'Ghee, that all the principles in Dens were, are, and ever shall be the principles of the Catholic Church of Ireland—how ridiculous, we say, to find the said Robert congratulating the old ladies on having decided upon a question which has baffled all the talents of all the statesmen and all the theologians of the empire, from time immemorial. Decided what Mr. Pitt could not get decided—decided a point which their senators argued and re-

argued during all the time that the Catholic question was discussed in Parliament! Verily a Daniel comes to judgment! Pope and general councils may hide their diminished heads, after the infallible decrees of Exeter Hall, under the guidance, be it remembered, of the spirit of Robert M'Ghee."

The character of this article being sufficiently exhibited in subsequent developments of this "mystery of iniquity," it is not necessary to enter into any lengthened exposure of it here. But the pretence of Dens, not being set up for a standard of Maynooth, where it could not have been concealed—of Bailly, the actual standard of Maynooth, not being to be had in Ireland—of Dens not being heard of in the provinces of Armagh, Cashel, or Tuam, while it has been since proved to have been for many years the conference book for all the Priests of Ireland—of Mr. Bourke compiling the Directory for Connaught—the pretended conversation at the conference—the jocular gentleman who asks, in 1831, if Dens was appointed to assist Mr. Coyne in the sale of his *newly-published book*? which was not published till 1832—the farce of Dr. Murray's interference, to inform the clergy that they might find answers to the questions in any book they chose, while his secret statutes since detected, prove that his conferences were to drill the priests in Dens, that he might be sure the priests were properly prepared in it to drill the people; these exhibit the admirable selection of the term which they have prefixed to the head of the article—"Charlatanrie," and prove that the writer of it, if not a good apologist, was at least an admirable disciple of his master—Dens.

Allusion having been made after the meeting of the 20th of June, in the House of Lords, to the Theology of Dens and Dr. Murray's patronage of it—in one of those powerful speeches of the Lord Bishop of Exeter, which command attention within and without the House. Dr. Murray addressed a letter to Lord Viscount Melbourne, the Prime Minister, bearing date July 2d, to the following effect, and extracted from the *Dublin Evening Post* of the same date:—

" TO THE RIGHT HON. VISCOUNT MELBOURNE, &c. &c.

" Mountjoy-square, Dublin, 2d July, 1835.

" MY LORD—I would hardly venture to claim one moment of that time which is so valuable to the public, if the subject on which I presume to address your Lordship, though in a great degree personal to myself, did not acquire some importance, by its reference to a measure of much public interest.

“ It appears, my Lord, that an attempt has been made to injure, through me, an institution of great value, I mean the Commission which his Majesty's Government has so wisely established, for the purpose of promoting in Ireland, a system of national education.

“ With this view, if I can credit the public journals, a statement has been made in your Lordship's House of Parliament, attributing to me certain doctrines contained in a theological work of Dens, on the ground that I directed the publication of that work, and appointed it as a text-book for the Conferences of the Catholic Clergy.

“ What was really said on that occasion I have no means of knowing, and, perhaps, have no right to inquire. *But I distinctly aver, that those imputations, from whatever quarter they may have found their way into the newspapers, are wholly devoid of any foundation in fact.*

“ *I do not entertain the doctrines thus attributed to me ; my solemn oath attests the contrary.*

“ *I did not direct the work of Dens to be published ; it was undertaken by a respectable bookseller, as a speculation in trade, entirely at his own risk, as a work which comprises a large mass of very valuable matter, though containing, too, some obsolete opinions, wholly unconnected with any article of Catholic faith, and which opinions it was known that hardly any one, at the present day, would think of defending.*

“ *Finally, I did not make it the text-book for our Theological Conferences ; for, on such occasions, we have no such book ; if by this expression we are to understand the work of any writer, whose opinions (WHEN NOT ALREADY DEFINED BY THE CHURCH AS ARTICLES OF FAITH,) the clergy are required, or, in any manner whatever expected, to maintain. In fact, our clergy are too well instructed to have the least notion of submitting to such a restriction. The questions proposed in Conference are brought forward for the very purpose of being freely discussed on their own merits ; and the decisions which, after due examination, are approved of, rest entirely, not on the individual opinions of this writer, or of that, but on those arguments that seem best calculated to carry conviction to the mind.*

“ The opinions of Dens, regarding *the right of temporal states to compel their subjects*, by confiscation and other punishments, to embrace religious doctrines of which their conscience could not approve, were unfortunately too prevalent throughout Europe at the time he lived ; and, I must add, no where more prevalent than where the Reformation was established. And why are the Catholics of Ireland now forced, by this unprovoked taunt, to remember that those desolating opinions were but too deeply imbibed, and too cruelly acted on by their Protestant rulers, during those centuries of religious per-

secution, from which they are but just recovering, and the horrors of which they are desirous to forget?

“Blessed be God! those doctrines are now little more than the record of by-gone intolerance. They are yielding every where to that better and more scriptural spirit of mutual forbearance, which has grown up and is spreading through all Christian communities; and they seem to have found almost their last resting place in the minds of those misguided, though otherwise (let me hope) respectable individuals, who lately exhibited such a miserable display of fanaticism in Exeter Hall, and a few, (let me again hope,) very few fiery zealots, who have allowed themselves to be so far blinded by passion as to participate in their anti-social opinions.

“As to the Irish Catholics, their doctrine on this subject is thus solemnly attested:—‘I, A. B. swear that I do abjure, condemn, and detest, as unchristian and impious, the principle that it is lawful to murder, destroy, or in anywise injure, any person whatsoever, for, or under the pretence, of being a heretic.’

“I have the honour to be, with the most profound respect, my Lord, your Lordship’s faithful humble servant,

† D. MURRAY.

In order that it may appear that every opportunity was given to the Roman Catholic Priests to meet the case, the following letter was addressed on the 3d of July to the Editor of the *Dublin Evening Mail*, and appeared in the paper of that date, in reply to a Mr. Walsh, a Roman Catholic Priest, who was reported in the *Freeman’s Journal* and *Morning Register*, to have denied the authority of Dens at a public meeting at Kingstown:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE DUBLIN EVENING MAIL.

“SIR—Having seen in the Weekly Freeman of Saturday last, that a Mr. Walsh, a Roman Catholic priest, denied, at a public meeting, the statement which I was called on to make at Exeter Hall, in London, as to Dens’ Theology, I think it right to state for that gentleman’s information, that there is another meeting to be held in London on the same subject, on Saturday, July 11, and that I have no doubt that gentleman will be heard with pleasure by that meeting, if he wishes to make any statement on the subject. The case is very simple—he has only to take over copies of his directory for the last five years when no doubt, he will be able to demonstrate his assertions, if the questions in the directories for those years do not find their correspondent answers in Dens.

“I have the honor to be, Sir,

“Your obedient servant,

“R. J. M’GHEE.”

July 3, 1835.

## SECOND DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

---

THE second great Protestant meeting was held on Saturday, July 11, at Exeter Hall.

Although great anxiety was evinced to gain admission to the first meeting, the anxiety to be present at that held to-day far exceeded any thing ever witnessed. As soon as it was known that the tickets of admission were ready, the applicants became so numerous that on Wednesday not a ticket remained undisposed of, and since that period many of the most respectable persons in the metropolis found it impossible to have their desire to be present, gratified.

It was known that many Roman Catholics had applied for and obtained tickets, and it was generally rumoured that the proceedings of the meeting were to be interrupted by clamour. In order to preserve the peace, a large body of police were in attendance, and throughout the day assisted in preserving order. Eleven o'clock was the hour appointed for taking the chair, but long before that period the large hall was filled to excess. The platform was crowded by Peers and Members of Parliament, and persons of the first distinction, amongst whom were—

Lord Barham, Lord Ashley, M.P. ; Earl of Lincoln, M.P. ; Viscount Grimstone, M.P. ; Viscount Cole, M.P. ; Sir Phillip Egerton, Bart. M.P. ; Capt. Alsager, M.P. ; Hon. A. H. Cole, M.P. ; Hon. Randall H. Plunkett, M.P. ; Henry Maxwell, M.P. ; Sir E. S. Hayes, Bart. M.P. ; Alexander Pringle, M.P. ; C. L. Cuming Bruce, M.P. ; The Chisholm, M.P. ; T. Balfour, M.P. ; Major Fancourt, M.P. ; J. H. Kearsley, M.P. ; Mervyn Archdall, M. P. ; J. D. Jackson, M.P. ; J. P. Plumptre, M.P. ; John Hardy, M.P. ; Sir Andrew Agnew, Bart. M.P. ; George Sinclair, M.P. ; E. J. Cooper, M.P. ; Alexander Perceval, M.P. ; George Finch, M.P. ; W. S. Blackstone, M.P. ; W. E. Gladstone, M.P. ; Right Honourable T. Lefroy, M.P., Sir George Clerk, M.P., Sir George H. Roese, Bart., and George Robert Dawson ; Honourables H. Bernard, Captain J. A. Maude, R.N., Captain Francis Maude, R.N., James King, and John Stuart Wortley ; Dean of St. Patrick's ; Archdeacons Stopford and Cambridge ; Rev. Doctors Kenny, Thorpe, Niblock, Bell, Holloway, J. H. Cunningham, H. Beamish ; N. Baxter, Esq. ; Richard Hart Davis, Esq. ; J. E. Gordon, Esq. ; Captain Saurin ; James Saurin, Esq. ; Robert Staples, Esq. ; Henry Pownall, Esq. ; John Poynder, Esq. ; John Cator, Esq. ; John Harford, Esq.

Among the ladies present we observed—

Marchionesses of Ormonde and Cholmondeley, Countess Dowager of Galloway, Lady Barham, Lady Caroline Stewart, Lady Olivia B. Sparrow, and Ladies Butler.

At eleven o'clock precisely, Lord Kenyon, accompanied by the Dean of St. Patrick's, Mr. M'Ghee, Mr. O'Sullivan, and Mr. Daly, appeared on the platform. Lord Kenyon was called to the chair amidst loud cheers.

Lord KENYON, on taking the chair addressed the meeting as follows:—On this occasion, as upon the last, when I had the honour of being placed in the chair to preside over a similar meeting, I have to request that so solemn an occasion shall be opened as the former was, by prayer—I therefore call upon Dr. Holloway to be so kind as to open the business by a prayer to Almighty God.

Dr. HOLLOWAY delivered the following prayer:—

“O! eternal and ever-blessed Lord God, who art the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in whom, and through whom we have access to the throne of mercy, we beseech thee of thine infinite goodness to look upon the face of thine anointed Son while we implore the outpouring of thy blessed Spirit, to lead us into thy gracious promise, even to all truth; for that end, thou knowest, O God, we are here assembling again together that we may know the truth as it is in Jesus Christ. O God, we pray thee preserve us from all errors, mistakes, heresies, and delusions, in the great concerns of immortal life. We pray thee to bless and preserve us in spirit and in mind from all discord and disposition to dispute the truth. May there be a readiness and a preparation in our hearts—which is from thee, O God—to receive the record which thou hast given unto us of thy dear Son; and where we are able to discover error, may we all, with one spirit and one mind, set our faces against it, and may we all be enabled manfully to contend for the faith which has been handed down to us from our forefathers. Be pleased to be present with us, O God. Pardon all that thou seest amiss in us, and enable us in mind, body, soul and spirit, to prove by public manifestation that we are the epistles of Jesus Christ thy Son, and true disciples of the Gospel read of all mankind for his name's sake.” The Rev. Gentleman concluded with the Lord's Prayer, in which he was joined by the assembly.

Lord KENYON then rose and said.—Before we proceed to the business of the day, I feel it my duty—having the honour to be placed in this chair—to state distinctly to the meeting the rules under which it is held, and by which all present must consider themselves bound

to abide. I am told—but I cannot believe it, for I feel certain that no such conduct would be pursued by persons belonging to the same persuasion with me—that some persons have come here to disturb the quiet course of the proceedings. I say I do not believe, that when persons are admitted on the understanding, and in the confidence that they will abide by the prescribed rules—they will violate those rules. It must be a calumny to say that any person will disturb the meeting—but if, unfortunately, I should be mistaken in that expectation, it will be my duty to call upon the meeting to stand by me, and enable me to do that which, as chairman, I am bound to do, namely—to maintain order. (Cheers.) Let it be recollected that this is, strictly speaking, a Protestant meeting—for the sake of giving information to the Protestants of England of the state of things to which their brethren are exposed, in consequence of the tenets adopted and acted upon by the Roman Catholics of the sister country—Ireland. If, instead of being a Protestant, I were a Roman Catholic, and gave permission to Protestants to attend at a Roman Catholic meeting, I am sure they would, one and all, hold themselves bound by the conditions upon which they were admitted; and I hope I have too just an opinion of my Roman Catholic brethren—as I may call them, belonging to the same nation—to think that they will suffer themselves to be actuated by other principles than would govern our conduct if we were placed in similar circumstances. The rules I will now read from the card.

A person of the name of Murphy took this opportunity of giving the first proof of a determination to violate the rules of the meeting. (These interruptions were repeatedly renewed by him and others, and rendered summary steps necessary to preserve order, as will be seen in the course of the report.) Mr. Murphy stood up and begged to be allowed to ask one question. (Cries of “Turn him out.”)

Lord KENYON said—No, Sir, I can allow no question. (The Noble Lord then read the rules of the meeting.)

Mr. MURPHY.—I wish to address the chair.

Lord KENYON.—If any person will interrupt the meeting he must take the consequences. I do hope and trust that no gentleman will be permitted to come here and disturb the meeting. I hope the orders of the day will not again be violated. If my expectation should be again defeated, it will be my duty, as chairman, to call



upon the meeting to assist me in maintaining order and preventing interruption. (Cheers.)

Mr. Murphy again attempted to speak, and the cries of "Turn him out" resounded from all parts of the hall.

Lord KENYON, having again called for order, said—I ought to have taken the opportunity of stating, that at the last meeting considerable expenses were incurred by those who called it, and therefore there will be a collection of money at the doors for the expenses that were incurred on the former, and those that may be incurred on this occasion. I now call upon the Rev. Mr. M'Ghee to address the meeting.

The Rev. Mr. M'GHEE, on presenting himself, was received with loud and general cheers, which, for some time, prevented him from commencing his address. When the applause had subsided, he said—My Lord, before I enter upon the subject which it is my duty to lay before this meeting, as there were some complaints expressed in the public papers, in reference to the proceedings of the last day—as it was stated that justice had not been done, that fair play had not been given to the accused, it becomes my duty to call the attention of those who think so, first, to the advertisement which was published, giving an ample opportunity to all those whose doctrines were particularly impugned, to come forward, either in their own persons or by any individuals whom they pleased to authorize, to meet the charges advanced, and, in addition to that, your Lordship will, perhaps, permit me to read a letter, which, after I went over to Ireland, and when, from the contradictions which were given to the statements made at the last meeting, it appeared to me to be my duty to return here again to maintain those statements, I wrote to Dr. Murray; so, with the permission of the chair, I will now read that letter, reminding the meeting that Dr. Murray is the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin.) The Rev. Gentleman here read the following letter:—)

" TO DR. MURRAY, ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

" Dublin, June 29, 1835.

" SIR—A sense of duty to you and the cause of truth impels me to lay before you the fact, and to submit to you the proposition contained in this letter. The fact is, that the interest excited in the public mind to learn more of the circumstances brought forward at the public meeting held at Exeter Hall, in London, on Saturday, the 20th ultimo,

respecting *Dens' Theology*, has induced a number of individuals in that metropolis to call for another public meeting, that the case may again be more fully brought under the consideration of the nation. This meeting is appointed for Saturday, the 11th of July. The statement already made is now, in all its parts, before the public. You have, no doubt, seen all the proofs, and the nature of those proofs, and you can impeach their authenticity or explain their meaning, if they admit of either impeachment or explanation. I saw it in one of the papers stated that Mr. O'Connell would not come when invited to the last meeting, because he knew that in such an assembly he would not be listened to. Now, Sir, I write to you to say, that if you choose to appoint any one, or any number of your clergy, or if you choose to appoint Mr. O'Connell, Mr. Sheil, or any other gentlemen who are there upon the spot, to come forward on that day to satisfy the public mind that the statement made is in any part untrue, that statement shall be made again before them, the case shall be re-heard, and any persons appointed by you shall be heard in reply with the most full and patient attention, under the regulations appointed by the meeting, and subject, like other speakers, to the correction of the chair. I feel called on to make this proposition, having been the person who made that statement.

“ I have the the honour to be, Sir,

“ Your most obedient humble servant,

“ R. J. M'GHEE.”

This letter was dated the 29th of June. I did not trust it to be delivered by the post, but sent it by a gentleman, a friend of mine, who wrote me this statement of the delivery of my letter:—

“ Dublin, June 29, 1835.

“ MY DEAR SIR—Having called on Dr. Murray with your letter, I was told he was engaged, on which I left the letter with his servant, directing him to give it to the Doctor himself, and that I should call in an hour for an answer. I accordingly did so, and when the servant went up to inquire, he returned shortly and said, that his master desired him to say there was *no answer*.

“ Believe me, my dear Sir, yours,

“ Rev. Robert J. M'Ghee.”

“ \*\*\*\*\*.”

Now I submit it to the candour, I submit it to the judgment, I submit it to the good sense of every intelligent gentleman, and of every Roman Catholic who may be in this meeting, whether I have not done my duty fairly and faithfully. The only answer given to this letter was that which appeared in a letter written by Dr. Murray to Lord Melbourne, in which he complained of the “miserable

display of fanaticism in Exeter Hall." These are his words. Now, whether it be the part of fanaticism to court a public, a patient, and a faithful investigation by men of the highest talent, of the most practised legal ability, and of the most consummate skill in debate, whom the Roman Catholic Church reckons amongst its best friends—whether it be the part, I say, of fanaticism to court such an investigation by such men, on a matter of clear, simple, legal documentary evidence, and whether it be the part of conscious integrity to decline such an invitation, it is not for me to determine; but I trust that before this meeting is dissolved, every individual in it will acknowledge that "we are not mad, but speak forth the words of truth and soberness." Permit me first to remark upon the different circumstances under which this meeting and the last have been convened. At the last you came together, perhaps, from motives of curiosity, to inquire into a subject of which you were at the time entirely ignorant; now you come with a deep anxiety to learn more of that upon which you have been painfully informed. Then, you came together at our request; we stand here this day at your command. Then, the statements which we made went forth unmet and uncontradicted; now they have been flatly and unequivocally denied in an authoritative letter from the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin to the Prime Minister of England. In consequence, therefore, of that contradiction of our statements, it becomes my duty to enter again into a plain and simple recapitulation of the evidence by which those statements are supported.

I have, first, to call the attention of the meeting to the documents from which that evidence is deduced. Secondly, to the nature of the evidence to be found in those documents. Thirdly, to the time during which those documents remained not only uncontradicted, but actually sanctioned by the highest authorities in the Roman Catholic Church. And, lastly, I have to consider those circumstances in connexion with Dr. Murray's letter to Lord Melbourne. I must first, then, beg your attention to the nature of the documents from which the evidence is deduced. Those documents are twofold—they are bound up together in this book, but although they are apparently only one, this little volume consists of two books, stitched together. One of them is the catalogue published by Mr. Coyne, printer to the College of Maynooth, and to the whole Roman Catholic hierarchy of Ireland. Mr. Coyne's catalogue is independent of the other book, and unconnected with it,

except that it is stitched up in the same volume. This other document is the Priest's Directory, which, as I explained at the last meeting, is a book published by the authority, and under the inspection, of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, and containing the *Ordo* of reciting the offices which the priests are obliged daily to recite under penalty of mortal sin. This, as I have said, is unconnected with the other. The one has no authority—it is merely Mr. Coyne's own catalogue; the other has a high authority—it is the Priest's Directory. It is most important that you should keep these two points distinctly in view, because if you see that the evidence in this (Coyne's catalogue) is confirmed and corroborated by the evidence in the Priest's *Ordo*, then we have two sources of evidence upon this important subject, and those two sources of evidence quite distinct from, and independent of each other. I come now to consider the nature of the evidence contained in the documents. I should first, however, remark that it was stated in one paper, the *Weekly Freeman*, in which there is an elaborate denial of the statements made at the last meeting, that I had misled the meeting, by saying that the Priest's *Ordo* was a book of universal authority in Ireland; for the writer says:—

“Equally untrue is the flippant assertion of Mr. M'Ghee, that, before the 1st of January, every Roman Catholic priest in Ireland must have this book. No Catholic priest need have it, except a priest of the province of Leinster, the Catholic clergy of the other provinces having directories published by some of their own members—for instance, the Rev. Mr. Bourke compiles the directory for the clergy of Connaught, so that it is most likely that the priests of that province never before heard of Dens, or of his Thomist and Schoolmen Pragmatism.”—*Weekly Freeman*, June 27.

In answer to this, I state that it is not the fact. I state that this is the *Ordo* for all the Roman Catholic priests of Ireland, and the only one; and I say that, both upon internal and external evidence. Here is the *Ordo* for 1834, and here is another for 1835. Both of these were purchased in the town of Galway, and sent up to Dublin. This other one, which was got in Cork, is the same exactly as the Dublin *Ordo*. How did these books get to Galway and to Cork, if they had *Ordos* of their own? But there is another point which makes the fact more clear. These *Ordos* contain the directions for every diocese in Ireland. This one contains directions for the

dioceses of Tuam, Galway, Dromore, Armagh, and Ossory, and so through all its pages directions are given for all the different dioceses in Ireland. I say, moreover, that until the year 1823, all the Roman Catholic priests in England derived their *Ordos* from Ireland. Here is the *Ordo* for 1823, and this is published "for the use of the venerable secular clergy of Ireland and England;" but after the year 1823, the Roman Catholic religion made such progress in England, that England could support and supply an *Ordo* of her own; so I assert that all the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland possess their *Ordo* and know what it contains.

I have now to call the attention of the meeting to the nature of the internal evidence contained in these documents. In Mr. Coyne's Catalogue there are two statements respecting the two different editions of *Dens' Theology*. He says that in the year 1808, on the 14th of September, all the Roman Catholic bishops of Ireland

"Unanimously agreed, that *Dens' Complete Body of Theology* was the best book on the subject that could be republished, as containing the most secure guidance for those ecclesiastics who could not have access to libraries, or an opportunity of consulting those who were placed in authority over them."

And that in consequence of that resolution a new edition was ordered, to the number of three thousand copies. Mr. Coyne states that this edition was published, by order of all the Roman Catholic bishops, in 1808. The second statement of his refers to the last edition—the edition of 1832—and the reason he gives for publishing it is this—

"Inasmuch as his Grace Dr. Murray, Dr. Doyle, Dr. Keating, and Dr. Kinsella, have made it the conference book for the clergy of the province of Leinster, the publisher, as well to obviate the difficulty experienced by them in procuring the work, as also to advance the cause of religion and morality in the other parts of the Irish church, is induced to reprint a limited number of copies."

Now, I say that that limited number of copies, on Mr. Coyne's authority, was also 3,000. With respect to the printing of the edition in 1808, I may have occasion to refer to that hereafter, but I shall now call your attention to that of 1832. Mr. Coyne says that he undertook that edition, not by order, but in consequence of his Grace Dr. Murray, Dr. Doyle, Dr. Keating, and Dr. Kinsella,

having made it the conference book for the clergy of the province of Leinster; and he adds, that an eighth volume is published under the express sanction and approbation of Dr. Murray. With respect to its having been made the conference book of the clergy of the province of Leinster, I have to call your attention to the evidence to be found in the Priest's *Ordo*, in confirmation of the fact. I make no apology for trespassing upon your time with what may appear to many of you dry details of documentary evidence. On the contrary, I should have occasion deeply to apologise to you, and still more to the Roman Catholic hierarchy, if I presumed to make any statement against them without a full, a clear, and a patient investigation of the documents upon which I proceed: and therefore, I trust you will kindly bear with the dry details which I must make, and I promise you that you will be amply rewarded by the eloquence of my friends who are to follow me. I shall now beg to call your attention to the evidence to be found in the Priest's *Ordo*. These *Ordos* contain not only regulations for reciting the offices, but also the questions to be discussed at the conferences for the different dioceses, which conferences are appointed by the special authority of the bishops. I must call your attention now to some documents which I did not bring forward at the last meeting, but which are of great importance to the subject. I go back, then, to the *Ordos* of 1825, and I entreat you to lend me your attention while I refer to those *Ordos* from 1825 down to the year 1835. I have been informed by some Roman Catholics, and I believe most truly, that the general practise is for the bishops of the different dioceses to appoint the questions for these conferences, which are held sometimes four times a-year, and sometimes oftener, by their priests. We find that Dr. Murray discharged this duty very carefully in his diocese, for here is an *Ordo* for the questions to be discussed at the conference in the rural districts of the diocese of Dublin, for the year 1825, at the close of which we find this sentence:—

“Prædictæ quæstiones et in eorum ordine in conferentiis cleri civitatis Dubliniensis alterno mense discutientur a mense Maii 1825, usque ad Martium 1826, inclusive.

“† D. MURRAY, A. D.,” &c.

“The aforesaid questions, and in their order, shall be discussed in the conferences of the clergy of the city of Dublin, every alternate month, from the month of May, 1825, to March, 1826, inclusive.”

In the *Ordo* for 1826, we find that the questions are to be discussed from May to October, and the same sentence closes it:—

“Prædictæ questiones,” &c. (Signed) † “D. MURRAY.”

I have next the *Ordo* for 1828, (there does not appear to have been any conference in 1827;) in it the same questions are prescribed and it has the signature of the archbishop, subscribed with the same sentence to it. In 1829, the signature of the archbishop does not appear, but directions are given for the order and form of the questions, and that they are to be discussed from March to September in other parts of the archdiocese, but in Dublin from September to March, 1830. This also issues from the authority of Dr. Murray; and in 1830 the heading to the conferences is translated as follows:

“There will be four conferences in the archdiocese of Dublin in this year, 1830: the archbishop himself will, in due time, appoint both the time and preacher in each district, either *viva voce*, if he cometh, or by his written instructions.”

Here we have, from 1825 to 1830, the questions appointed by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, signed with his signature for four years; and we have it declared in the last year, that he himself will, *viva voce*, on the spot, or by his written order, appoint the discussion. This clearly shows that the conference was strictly appointed, fixed, and directed by the archbishop himself. I now turn over to 1831, and there I find that the circumstances are entirely changed. The conferences are no longer appointed by the Archbishop of Dublin; they are no longer diocesan conferences, but become from that time to the present, provincial conferences. Here, in the heading of the conferences for 1831, the clergy say—

“In obedience to the command of the most illustrious and most reverend the archbishop and bishops of the province of Leinster, we shall discuss the treatise from the author, Mr. Dens, of ‘human actions,’ in two conferences; of ‘sins,’ in one conference, and of ‘conscience,’ also, in one conference, for the year 1831.”

Here we have the *Ordo* speaking in the name of the whole clergy and saying—

“In obedience to the commands,” not of the archbishop alone, of one, but “of the archbishop and bishops, we will discuss from Dens,” &c.

Here the four prelates are brought together, and we have the clergy

declaring, that in obedience to their commands, they will discuss the questions taken from Dens. In 1832, it is notified that—

“There will be four conferences for the year 1832, in the province of Leinster, in which, following Mr. Dens as our author, or the authority of Mr. Dens, we will discuss his treatise on the virtues.”

In 1833, the heading is—

“Questions to be discussed in the theological conferences through the province of Leinster.”

In 1824, it is—

“Questions for this year 1834, to be discussed in the theological conferences through the province of Dublin.”

And in 1835—

“Questions in the theological conferences to be discussed this year, 1835, through the province of Leinster.”

These are authoritative documents, published by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin. They do not come from Mr. Coyne's authority—they come from the authority of the Archbishop himself; and here we find in these documents, from this authoritative testimony, that up to the year 1830, the conferences were diocesan, and from 1830, down to the present time, they have not been diocesan, but provincial, the questions being discussed through the whole of the province of Leinster. Now, I assert, in vindication of Mr. Coyne's character, as he has been accused of publishing a falsehood, that these documents, independent as they are of his statements—coming as they do from the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin—corroborate and confirm beyond the power of refutation the statement that this book was set up by Dr. Murray, Dr. Doyle, Dr. Keating, and Dr. Kinsella, as the conference book for the priests of the province of Leinster; and so I say the internal evidence from the two-fold source of these documents, mutually confirm and establish the fact with irrefragable proof.

The next point to which I have to call your attention is this—the time during which this statement of Mr. Coyne's, which is now denied and vilified, remained uncontradicted; and not only uncontradicted but sanctioned and confirmed by these corroborating documents actually printed by the highest authorities of the Roman Catholic Church. Mr. Coyne's first advertisement—the first time we hear of Dens—is to be found in the catalogue sewed to the priest's *Ordo*, for 1832.



It states—"In the press, and will be published in March, 1832, by R. Coyne, *Dens's Complete Body of Theology*." Then he makes the statement which I have already noticed of the meeting of the Roman Catholic Bishops, in 1808, and of their command to print the book—of these four bishops subsequently setting it up as the conference book for the priests of the province of Leinster, and of his printing it in consequence the next year, when the *Ordo* was made, 1832. Now mark, for four long years this statement of Mr. Coyne respecting the meeting of the bishops, and their command to print the book—and respecting the setting up of that book by the four prelates as a conference book for the province of Leinster—for four long years this statement of Mr. Coyne's, that *Dens* was the best book that could be reprinted, as containing the most secure guidance to the ecclesiastics, has gone before all the bishops and priests in Ireland, and has remained uncontradicted and unnoticed; for four long years it has been stated in Dr. Murray's own Directory, from his own authority, that *Dens* has been set up as the conference book of the province of Leinster—for four long years the questions of conference, published in the *Directory*, have been taken in regular succession from *Dens*, and remained not only uncontradicted, but sanctioned, yea, prescribed, for they were not published by Mr. Coyne's authority, but under the authority and order of the Archbishop himself—for four long years these questions have been discussed; for mark, I have here the order of the conferences, and I have here the 1st, 2d, and 3d volumes of *Dens*; here are the conferences for 1831-32-33-34 and 35, and here are the pages in *Dens*, actually marked to correspond with the questions. Then I say that, for four, yea, for five years, these questions have been discussed in all the province of Leinster—page after page has been turned over of *Dens*, and not a word has ever been spoken against his work. And now what is the fact? We come here to Exeter-hall—we produce no books of our own—we make no unfounded statements against the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Ireland; but we take their own very books, and read these their own very statements—we read their own very questions, and their own very answers, to a public meeting, and then all the nation is in a flame—Mr. Coyne is a liar—*Dens* is excommunicated—peal after peal (the meeting took the hint, accidentally furnished by this phrase, and burst into renewed peals of applause)—peal after peal thunders from the press against us—we are fanatics—

we are fools—nobody knows any thing about Dens—not a soul seems ever to have heard the name—Dr. Murray never ordered it to be printed—he never made it the text-book for his conferences—he declares, in fact, that he has no such book—he writes to the Prime Minister of England, and disclaims altogether the facts as to the book on his word, and its doctrines on his oath! Now, let me ask what have we done? Have we fabricated the whole matter? Have we printed *Coyne's Catalogue*? Have we printed the *Priests' Directory*? Have we forged the questions and the answers in Dens? I submit—I do submit it to the calm consideration, to the sober judgment of all who hear me (for these things are to be considered soberly—the time is very near when all this gay assemblage, one after another, shall be dropping into eternity.) I submit, therefore, to the calm consideration of all who are here, and especially of my Roman Catholic friends and I call myself in the presence of the Judge of Heaven and earth—to the best of my intention I do call myself their sincere friend—I submit to their calm consideration whether these questions and these principles, which, when merely brought to the light of day, produce such a tremendous concussion, which force such a denial from those very men who have published them, whether they can be principles of solemn truth, and can stand the test of God's awful judgment in the day when he shall come to bring to light the secrets of men's hearts?

I must now pass from the consideration of this evidence to the denial which has been made by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin of the facts, or statements, as I shall call them, that were laid before the last meeting. Dr. Murray, in his letter to the Prime Minister of England, adverts to some mention which was made of *Dens's Theology* in the House of Lords, and he says—

“What was really said on that occasion I have no means of knowing, and, perhaps, have no right to inquire. But I distinctly aver that those imputations, from whatever quarter they may have found their way into the newspapers, are wholly devoid of any foundation in fact.

“I do not entertain the doctrines thus attributed to me—my solemn oath attests the contrary.

“I did not direct the work of Dens to be published; it was undertaken by a respectable bookseller as a speculation in trade, entirely at his own risk, as a work which comprises a large mass of very valuable

matter, though containing, too, some obsolete opinions, wholly unconnected with any article of Catholic faith, and which opinions it was known that hardly any one at the present day would think of defending.

“Finally, I did not make it the text-book for our theological conferences; for on such occasions we have no such book, if by this expression we are to understand the work of any writer, whose opinions (when not already defined by the Church as articles of faith,) the clergy are required, or in any manner whatever expected to maintain. In fact, our clergy are too well instructed to have the least notion of submitting to such a restriction.”

Thus Dr. Murray writes. Now here Dr. Murray says, First, that he did not direct Dens's work to be published. Secondly, that he did not make it the text-book for the theological conferences. Thirdly, that they have no such book. And, Fourthly, he disclaims the doctrines it contains. Before, however, I enter upon the consideration of Dr. Murray's statements respecting himself and this book, I must beg the attention of the meeting to the statement which he makes respecting Mr. Coyne. He says that this book

“Was undertaken by a respectable bookseller as a speculation in trade, and entirely at his own risk, as a work which comprises a large mass of very valuable matter, though containing too, some obsolete opinions, wholly unconnected with any article of Catholic faith, and which opinions it was known that hardly any one, at the present day would think of defending.”

Now, observe Mr. Coyne's statement. He says, respecting the edition of 1808, that he published it expressly by order of all the bishops; respecting the edition of 1832, he says, he did undertake it himself, but it was because it was set up as a conference book for the priests of the province of Leinster. Dr. Murray does not admit that the bishops gave the order for the publication in 1808. He says not a word about that; but he asserts that he did not set it up as a conference book in 1831, but that it was published by a “respectable bookseller.” He calls Mr. Coyne a “respectable bookseller,” and he calls him truly. Mr. Coyne is a respectable bookseller, a very respectable bookseller, and I believe he is a very honest man; but the important point is, that Dr. Murray calls him a respectable bookseller. What! here is a man who has published a statement respecting all his bishops in 1808; that they have commanded him to publish a book— who

publishes another statement in 1832, that this book had been set up as the conference book for the province of Leinster, by four other bishops; and yet that very book the Roman Catholic Archbishop is obliged to disclaim, in the face of the whole nation, in a letter addressed in the public journals, to the Prime Minister of England. Mr. Coyne has libelled all the bishops, and yet he is a "respectable bookseller." I say, if I were a Roman Catholic Bishop, I should call him a most audacious bookseller—I should call him a lying bookseller, for daring to publish a statement concerning his bishops, which statement was a libel on them for twenty-seven years. But the truth is, that Mr. Coyne is a respectable bookseller, and it was rather dangerous to provoke him on the subject. Mr. Coyne, in the year 1817, was charged with publishing a Bible with notes and comments with a false title-page. He said he had published it with the sanction of Dr. Troy. The notes upon that Bible were so atrocious, some of them you heard read at the last meeting, that when they were brought before the public notice in the *British Critic*, Mr. O'Connell came forward in the Roman Catholic Association, and disclaimed those notes upon that Bible. He said that not a moment was to be lost in repudiating such atrocities, and that "he would not remain a Catholic one hour longer if he thought it essential to the Catholic faith to believe that it was lawful to murder Protestants, or that faith could be innocently broken with heretics." A Committee was then appointed to draw up an address on the subject, and five successive meetings were held, but the notes on that Bible they have never disclaimed to this day. Dr. Troy, indeed, wrote a letter disclaiming the notes, and denying that he had given authority for the publication; but Mr. Coyne then came forward and wrote the letter which I have in my hand, and this letter, I say, is the letter of an honest man. The Rev. Gentleman then commenced the following letter:—

October 26, 1817.

"Most honoured Lord—It is with pain and difficulty that I am obliged to controvert for a moment, any statement coming from your Grace; but the character which I have earned and maintained these fifteen years, unsullied in the opinions of the Catholic clergy and hierarchy of Ireland, as the only publisher and bookseller in the kingdom of works exclusively Catholic, puts me under the indispensable necessity of addressing your Grace in public.

"The declaration which your Grace has published, leaves no alter-



native but that of either submitting to the imputations which it fastens upon me, or of giving, as I now do, a simple statement of facts, for the truth of which I appeal to your Grace's candour, and which shall, I trust, substantially remove the impression that your Grace's declaration is calculated to produce on the public mind with regard to me." \*

He then goes on to state the facts—(the letter is too long to read all through)—but he proves that he published the Bible under the express command and authority of Dr. Troy. Now, I say, this is the letter of an honest man; and I say to Mr. Coyne, and I say through Mr. Coyne to my Roman Catholic countrymen—I say to him, this is the second time that his statements have been declared untrue by two successive persons, having the title of Archbishop of Dublin, and I call upon Mr. Coyne to consider solemnly this fact, whether, when a man comes forward and publishes documents, and circulates documents by his authority, on religion, and when those documents are brought forward and discussed, retracts and denies them—whether such authority can come from God, or whether such authority is to be submitted to by man?

But Dr. Murray says, Mr. Coyne, this "respectable bookseller," as he really is, undertook the publication as a speculation in trade. Now, this is a question of trade. I dare say I have the pleasure of addressing some booksellers; but even if I have not, they will at least be anxious to read an account of a circumstance, in which their own trade is so deeply concerned. I believe all booksellers know that no man in the trade will venture his capital in publishing a work, unless he has tolerably good security for the sale of the work, and a return of his capital. But what does Mr. Coyne do? According to this statement, Mr. Coyne must be not only a respectable bookseller, but a very classical bookseller, and a very theological bookseller. Meeting with this book, which then consisted of seven volumes of Latin, he sits down and he studies the whole seven volumes of divinity—for, recollect, it was published entirely on his own responsibility. He finds that it "comprises a large quantity of very valuable matter though containing too some obsolete opinions, wholly unconnected with any article of Catholic faith, and which opinions, it was known that hardly any one at the present day would think of defending"—and what does he do? I believe it is a general principle in the trade,

---

\* These letters of Dr. Troy and Mr. Coyne, are found in full, vol. ii. pp. 36-39.

that half the selling price of a book covers the expense of its publication. Now, calculating the price of the work at its present rate, and making allowance for the eighth volume, which is now added, it must have amounted at that time to 5,250 guineas. Accordingly, Mr. Coyne meeting in this Latin book this "valuable matter," and notwithstanding, too, these "obsolete opinions," solely on the strength of his own theological and classical research, he sits down and ventures 2,625 guineas on a speculation in *Dens's Theology*. Not a hint from the hierarchy—not so much as a wink from the confessional! He undertakes the work boldly, venturing into the mighty depths of his own classical divinity. Now, I say, let Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Browne, hide their diminished heads. I challenge the annals of Paternoster-row, or Ave-Maria-lane, to produce me a bookseller who ever made such a hit in all the range of Romish theology as Mr. Coyne has done in Dens, for he ventures 2,625 guineas on a speculation in trade, solely on the strength of his own theological research. He sends this sum on a venture to the Vatican in 1809—he gets back his advance, doubles his capital, and is ready to set out upon another venture in 1832. This is the grave statement made by Dr. Murray to the Prime Minister of England respecting Mr. Coyne, and who shall dare to call it into question?

Having thus disposed of Dr. Murray's statements respecting Mr. Coyne, I come now to what he says of himself: He says, "I did not direct the work of Dens to be published." Mr. Coyne does not say he did, but he says that all the bishops directed it in 1808. Now, Dr. Murray was not a bishop in 1808. He was not a bishop till 1809, and therefore he certainly could not have directed it to be published in that year. But does he deny Mr. Coyne's statement that the bishops made an order for its publication in 1808? Has he the courage plainly to say that Mr. Coyne has stated a falsehood of the bishops? Not a word of the kind. He only says, "I did not direct Dens's work to be published." He then says, "I did not make it the text book for our theological conferences." That is another question. Now, mark; Dr. Murray's denial is a denial of a statement made here at the last meeting, that he and the three other bishops of the province of Leinster made *Dens's Body of Theology* a text book for the provincial conferences. When he says, "I did not do it," does he mean that because he joined with three others in

doing it he did not himself do it? So, because four men combine to do an act, one of them may say, "I did not do it," another may say "I did not do it," another may say, "I did not do it," and another may say, "I did not do it." I say, does Dr. Murray deny that this book was made the conference book for the province of Leinster? Who wrote the questions? Who referred to the answers? Here we have not Mr. Coyne's statement, but the statement, as it were, of the priests of the province of Leinster:—

"In obedience to the commands of the Most Illustrious and Most Reverend the Archbishop and Bishops of the province of Leinster, we shall discuss the treatise from the author, Mr. Dens, of human actions, in two conferences—of sins in one conference, and of conscience also in one conference, in the year 1831."

This is the statement of the priests of the province of Leinster. We have, then, the questions, and the answers to those questions taken from Dens. And does Dr. Murray mean to say that the book has not been set up by him, because he and three others joined in setting it up? If Dr. Murray did not set up this book as the conference book for the province of Leinster, let me again ask who did?

In connexion with this part of the subject, I must read a passage from the *Weekly Freeman*—a paper published in Ireland, in which the most elaborate answer that I have seen was given to the statements made here on the last day of meeting. This statement must have come, if not from the pen of a Roman Catholic priest, at least from his authority, for it says—

"In the year 1831, at a public conference of all the secular clergy of this city, held at the Presbety, Lower Exchange-street, a clergyman of great respectability asked the compiler of the Directory why he had selected that obsolete and exploded theologian, Dens, for a conference book, and added jocularly, that he supposed it was for the purpose of assisting Mr. Coyne in the sale of his newly published book."

So—they asked the compiler, Mr. Woods, why he selected this book, throwing it all off the shoulders of the bishops upon Mr. Woods. This is stated to have occurred in 1831, but this jocular gentleman, it seems, forgets that by Mr. Coyne's advertisement the book is not issued from the press until 1832. The idea of Mr. Woods making it the conference book, when we see and know that the confer-

ences are appointed by the bishops themselves!—when we have, for the years 1825-26-28 and 29, the signature of the archbishop to the conferences appointed by himself—the statement that Mr. Woods selected the book, not only for his diocese, but for the whole province of Leinster, is absurd to the last degree.

But I will now make a statement farther than I did at the last meeting. I meet the statement of Dr. Murray, that he did not make this book the text book for the theological conferences of his priests—I meet that statement with a direct, determinate, and explicit contradiction. (Here there were some hisses, and a person called upon the reverend gentleman to explain upon what authority he made this assertion.) I will say to my friend who hisses me, hiss if you please—revile me if you will—I say to you with the Athenian, “Strike me, but hear me.” On what authority do I make the statement that Dr. Murray did set up this as a conference book for his own clergy? I make it upon the authority of a document signed with his own name. Now, let me call you back to the conferences of 1825, and to the questions prescribed by Dr. Murray for his own diocese, before he joined the other bishops—let me also call your attention to the books which he gave in, in that year, on his oath, or at least his word, which was equivalent to an oath, before a committee of the House of Commons; when asked what books contained the most correct exposition of the Roman Catholic faith—in answer to that question, he says, it is to be found “in the *Creed of Pius the Fourth, The Catechism of the Council of Trent, Bossuet’s Exposition of the Catholic Faith, Verron’s Rule of Faith, Holden’s Analysis of Faith,*” and several others. Now, I say, that the questions for the conferences, signed by Dr. Murray’s own name, in the very year when he gave this answer, in 1825, were not taken from the *Decrees of Pius the Fourth,*—were not taken from the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*—were not taken from *Bossuet’s Exposition of the Catholic Faith*—were not taken from *Verron’s Rule of Faith*—were not taken from *Holden’s Analysis of Faith,* but were taken from *Dens’s Theology*—and if you ask me how I know the fact, here is the document itself, and here are the questions. I have traced the questions, up and down, through *Dens’s Theology.* Here is the sixth volume. The first question for the conference in May, is in page 1 and page 29—2d, p. 29, 22, and 35—3d, p. 31—4th, p. 1—5th, p. 3, 4, 15, 19—6th, p. 33—and so



I assert that every question for the whole conferences for that very year, signed by his own name, are taken from that very book, *Dens's Theology*. All through, the whole of the questions, not only for 1825, but also for 1826, 1828 and 1829, they are taken with exceptions of a local nature as to Ireland, from *Dens's Theology*.

The next statement that Dr. Murray makes is this— (Here a person in the crowd begged of the Rev. Gentleman to explain what was meant by a text book.)—Some one has asked me to explain what a text book is : we have Dr. Murray's own explanation of it, and I entreat your particular attention to this passage. He says—

“On such occasions we have no such book, if by this expression we are to understand the work of any writer whose opinions (when not already defined by the church as articles of faith,) the clergy are required or in any manner whatever expected to maintain.”

Now I have read some Jesuitical statements, but since I could understand what a Jesuitical statement was, unto this hour, I never read one that could surpass the statement contained in that sentence. Let us suppose my Lord Melbourne standing up in his place in the House of Lords, with that document in his hand. Some noble lord might think it his duty to refer to *Dens's Theology* : Lord Melbourne would then probably say, Oh, I have heard some statements of this kind, but they are all false. I have here a letter from the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, from which it appears that he does not make *Dens's Theology* a conference book, for in fact on such occasions the Catholic clergy have no such book.” Every man of common candour and integrity takes the plain broad statement as he finds it, and supposes, without entering on exceptions or details, that it presents the actual truth on the face of it, without reservation. Dr. Murray says they have no such work; there is the broad statement; but look at the Jesuitical limitation which comes behind it—

“If by this expression we are to understand the work of any writer whose opinions (when not already defined by the church as articles of faith,) the clergy are required, or in any manner whatever expected to maintain.”

Now, that is true, I say that statement is true; but mark what that truth is. It is perfectly true that the Roman Catholic clergy never

did take up *Dens's Theology*, or any other book written by any author as expressing opinions, or inculcating principles which (when not already defined by the church as articles of faith,) they were required or expected to maintain. But now mark the converse of the proposition: the converse of the proposition is this—that those principles which are defined by their church as articles of faith, whether they be found in *Dens's Theology*, or in any other work, the Roman Catholic clergy are expected, and it is their duty to maintain. Then comes the question—"What are those principles?" Are they those which were brought forward on the last day, as being defined by the church as articles of faith, or are they not? In the investigation of this point will come out the sophism of Dr. Murray's statement. I entreat your attention to this part of the subject. In the theological conferences for the year 1832, the question is proposed—"How many general councils are approved?" "*Quot concilia generalia approbata?*" "Are any councils, and what subject to error?" "*Anne et quæ concilia errori obnoxia?*" These questions refer to *Dens's Theology*. Now, in answer to the first question, we find in *Dens*, vol. ii. pp. 142 to 145, that eighteen general councils are approved, and when we come to the next question, as to what councils are subject to error, we read as follows—*Dens*, vol. ii. p. 146—

"General councils without the confirmation and approbation of the Roman Pontiff, are fallible, and have often erred, as appears in the council of Arminum, 2d of Ephesus, &c. because thus they do not represent the church, but the body without the head, to which the Lord has not promised infallibility.

"But if the assent and confirmation of the Pope be given only to any decrees of council, then those decrees only have full authority, as was done about the decrees of the council of Constance.

"That general councils approved by the Pope cannot err in defining matters of faith and morals is a certain matter of faith, whence those are to be accounted manifest heretics who presume to call again into question, things defined by such councils."

Now I assert that no Roman Catholic can deny that doctrine without denying every principle of his church; for it is a matter of fact, that those councils which are approved by the Pope are called infallible. This approbation is limited to the latter decrees of the council of Constance, and what do we find confirmed by the infallibility of the Pope?—

“The Gallican Church reckons this council among the œcumenical or general, but others only admit that, as to the last sessions, and as to those things which Martin V. approved, which were done against the errors of Wickliffe and others.”—*Dens*, vol. ii. p. 144.

Now, having this definition of the infallibility of councils, and having Dr. Murray's direct admission that the clergy are bound to maintain the things which are decreed by the church, I go back to the questions we discussed the other day, and I ask what is the authority for those questions? What authority is cited by Dens for compelling men to return into the bosom of the church? He says,

“Unbelievers who have been baptized, as heretics and apostates generally are, and also baptized schismatics, can be compelled by corporal punishments to return to the Catholic faith, and the unity of the church. The reason is, that they, by baptism are made subjects of the church, and therefore, the church has jurisdiction over them, and the power of compelling them, by the ordained means, to obedience, to fulfil the obligations contracted in their baptism. This also obtains in the case of those who have been baptized in their infancy, or who, compelled by fear or any necessity, have received baptism, as “the council of Trent teaches, session 7, canon 14.”—*Dens*, vol. ii. p. 80.

Now I open the 14th canon of the 7th session, to the rejection of which an anathema is attached, and I find as follows:—

“If any man shall say that infants, being baptized, when they grow up, are to be asked whether they choose to ratify what their godfathers and godmothers promised in their name when they were baptized, and when they shall answer that they do not choose to do so, are to be left to their own choice, nor to be compelled meantime by any other punishment to a christian life, except that they should be debarred from the eucharist and the other sacraments till they repent—let him be damned.”

This is the canon of the Council of Trent—this is the canon referred to by Dens, as the authority for compelling men by corporal punishments to return to the faith; and I say, on Dr. Murray's own sophism, that the Roman Catholic clergy are bound to receive this canon and this doctrine, as defined by the church. Again, in the chapter on the punishments of heresy, in which it is declared that heretics are infamous *ipso facto*—that they are to be deprived of Christian burial, their temporal goods to be confiscated, and also that they

are justly punishable with imprisonment, exile, and death (here some persons vociferated no, no). I am reading from the book (the interruption was still continued).

Lord KENYON said, "these purposed and wilful interruptions must not be allowed." The disturbance not being yet subdued, his Lordship called upon the policemen to turn out the persons who caused it. This threat did not produce any effect, until it was put into actual execution, and some persons were removed from the room by force, and even then the commotion did not immediately subside.

Captain GORDON, addressing the Chairman said, "My Lord, it has been said by some of the disturbers of the meeting, that if they are interfered with, you shall be marked."

Lord KENYON called upon all friends to sit down. It was his duty, filling the distinguished situation in which he was placed, to endeavour that the order of the day should be preserved, and the object of the meeting carried into effect. He must call upon every one to assist him in that effort. The manner in which they could best do so, was by themselves preserving silence; and, in the next place, if they saw any wilful disturbers of the meeting, to point them out to the police, who would do their duty in that, as in all places, by removing the nuisance, and discharge, in a peaceable manner, the duty which they had to perform.

Mr. M'GHEE then resumed—For one reason, on account of the loss of time and the pain which may have been inflicted upon the feelings of any individual—I regret the interruption that has taken place, but in another sense I rejoice at it—I rejoice to see the feelings of my Roman Catholic friends so excited against the principles which have been developed that they feel impelled by a sort of instinctive impulse to stand up and protest against them. I rejoice at this, and although these principles are ratified by the infallible authority of the canon of the Council of Trent, I rejoice to find them lift up their voices against it—and I do trust, that one of the most immediate results of these meetings will be, that a large body of Roman Catholics, who feel disgusted at such principles as these, will stand forward before the nation, and denounce the principles of *Dens's Theology*. This is the way to answer our arguments—this is the way to prove that they really do—as I hope they do—abhor such principles as these, but no feelings of any man or men can alter matters of fact. Here then, I say, in this infamous chapter in which such judgments are

announced against heretics, what authority is assumed for them? Is it the opinion of Dens, or of any other writer whose opinions (not defined by the church as articles of faith,) the clergy are not bound to follow? Are there not two authorities produced in this book for them? Is not one that very passage in the Scriptures, the 17th chapter of Deuteronomy, on which is the very note in the quarto edition of the Bible, published in 1816, which note, Dr. Murray said, he had blotted out from the stereotype edition of the Bible of 1825, but which he has not blotted out? That is one authority; and the other authority is that of the Council of Constance, in these very articles which were approved by Pope Martin the Fifth, and which very articles are declared in this book to be among those of this council that the church pronounces infallible.

But another point of importance to be observed is this—the title in *Dens's Theology* of the chapter on the punishments of heresy is, “De pœnis criminis hæresis”—“Of the punishments of the crime of heresy.” Now, does Dr. Murray, or do the bishops of the province of Leinster, in the questions which they put to their clergy at their conference, put the question in this way—“Quid censet dominus Dens—What is the opinion of Mr. Dens on the punishments of heresy.” Do they ask—“What are those ‘obsolete opinions which nobody thinks worth defending,’ concerning the punishments of the crimes of heresy?” No; the question is put—“What are the punishments *decreed* against those infected with that stain?”—“Quæ pœnæ contra istos eâ labe infectos latæ?”—What then becomes of Dr. Murray’s letter to Lord Melbourne? “We have no such book, if by this expression we are to understand the work of any writer, whose opinions (when not already defined by the church as articles of faith,) the clergy are required, or in any manner whatever expected, to maintain.” What is the meaning of the term punishments not only defined but decreed—“Quæ pœnæ latæ?” By what authority are those punishments decreed? Is the nation to be blinded by such sophistry? Does he mean to bring the authority of the decree into the question in his conferences, and does he pretend to exclude the authority of that decree from his answer?

But he says again—“I do not entertain the doctrines thus attributed to me; my solemn oath attests the contrary.” The Apostle says—“an oath for confirmation is to men an end of all strife;” and so it ought

to be ; but we sometimes see that it is only the beginning of strife. But before I remark upon this point, let me state to the meeting some of the principles laid down in this book on the doctrine of oaths. In the 4th vol. of *Dens*, page 214, we find these questions : "In what manner does the obligation of an oath cease ?" Chiefly by these means—"1st. By disannulling it. 2d. By dispensation and relaxation. 3d. By commutation. 4th. By change and subtraction of the matter. 5th. By the total end of the oath completely ceasing. 6th. By reason of the condition not being fulfilled. 7th. By the principal obligation ceasing—an oath purely accessory ceases. 8th. By non-acceptation of it, and forgiving or remitting it. 9th. If the oath begins to verge to an injurious issue, or to the prejudice of the public good," &c. It is asked in the next chapter—"To whom belongs the power of dispensation as to an oath ?" Answer—"It chiefly appertains to the Pope ; not, however, unless for some reasonable cause, because he dispenses in the right of another ; it also belongs of ordinary right to bishops."—vol. 4. p. 116. Now, in the 2d vol. p. 272, we find the mode of this dispensation, and the extent of this power defined. A question is asked, and an objection made as to the dispensation of the law of nature : it is said, "The obligation of an oath or a vow is of the law of nature ; nevertheless, a dispensation is granted in them, therefore," &c. Answer—"We deny the consequent ; because a dispensation is not made in the obligation of a vow or oath, the vow or oath remaining ; but the vow or oath itself is taken away or relaxed by the superiors of the Church IN THE PLACE OF GOD, and so the obligation thence arising, spontaneously, ceases by the remotion of the matter." I give to any man on earth all the talents of which man can be possessed, and all the power of language with which it is possible he could be endowed, and I defy him to frame an oath that an individual who holds these principles will not despise and trample on, if interest or any motive prompts him to its violation.

But I can meet Dr. Murray's disclaimer of these principles by his own oath and his own letter. I can bring one overwhelming evidence against him, and that one evidence is himself. In the year 1825, when he was examined before a committee of the House of Commons, this question was put to him—"Is the Bull Unigenitus received in Ireland?" Answer—"It is." He declares the Bull Unigenitus is in force in Ireland. In the question of the conference for the year 1832, one

question was, "Is the Bull *Unigenitus* a rule of faith?" and the answer in *Dens* must corroborate Dr. Murray's evidence, that it is in force in Ireland. He says—

"That the Constitution or Bull of Clement 11th, the beginning of which is *Unigenitus*, is the dogmatical law of the universal church, and so is justly called a rule of faith, that those who depart from it are heretics." He adds that—"as many bishops as have received that Bull have agreed among themselves as to the substance of their reception of it, for they unanimously declare that they recognise in that Bull the doctrine and the tradition of the church—that they receive it with reverence, and condemn the propositions it condemns with the same qualifications with which they have been condemned by the Pope."

Now what are these qualifications? In the 8th volume of *Dens's Theology*, which Mr. Coyne asserts was published with the sanction and approbation of Dr. Murray, this Bull *Unigenitus* is to be found. One hundred and one propositions which are condemned by the Bull, are enumerated in it. Some of those propositions so condemned are propositions constituting the very foundation of the hope of salvation for a sinner's soul—constituting the very foundation of all the most sacred rights of conscience—the right of man to read the Word of God, before whose awful tribunal he is one day to stand, and whose mercy that Word proclaims to him. The Bull *Unigenitus* denounces these principles, and upon what sanction? you shall hear.

"We recommend to the venerable brothers, fathers, patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops, and other ordinaries of places—also to the inquisitors of heretical pravity, that they should by all means coerce and compel all contradictors and rebels whatsoever by the censures and punishments aforesaid, and other remedies of the law and the fact, invoking also to this if need be, the aid of the secular arm."—*Dens*, vol. 8, p. 210.

Here are the qualifications by which these principles are condemned by the Pope; here is the law of the Bull *Unigenitus*, published, as Mr. Coyne says, under Dr. Murray's sanction, and admitted on Dr. Murray's own oath, in evidence, to be the rule of faith in Ireland; and now Dr. Murray declares, in his letter to Lord Melbourne, that he disclaims the principles which that bull contains! If the Bull *Unigenitus* be not in force in Ireland, why did Dr. Murray say, in his evidence before the committee of the House of Commons, that it is?

and if it be in force, why does he declare, on his oath, to Lord Melbourne, that he rejects its principles ?

When he says "I did not direct the work of Dens to be published ; I did not make it the text-book for our theological conferences ;" when he says "we have no such book," and when he disclaims its doctrines upon oath—I say, are these the principles, is this the effort of a lofty and ingenuous mind, flinging off with dignity and disdain the fetters which were attempted to be wound around it, and standing forth, like Samson bursting his green withs, in all the giant confidence of conscious innocence and conscious integrity before the nation ? No ; it is the plunging of the helpless captive in his toils, tangling, as he struggles, the meshes of his net around him—and gasping, in the hopeless weakness of his impotent efforts, to escape. Where can he turn that he is not more deeply implicated in the proofs of his iniquity ?

If he turns from the evidence of this "respectable bookseller," he is met by the documents under his own authority, by which *Dens's Theology* has been set up as a conference book by the four bishops of the province of Leinster.

If he attempts to evade this by saying "I did not do it," he is seized in the fact of his own diocesan conferences, taken from Dens in 1825, 1826, and 1828.

If he endeavours to escape from the meaning of Dens as a conference book, on the ground that the clergy are not bound to maintain anything that is not already defined by the church as an article of faith, he is trapped in the infallibility of the councils.

If he turns again and endeavours to escape from them, he is caught by his own evidence and tossed upon the horns of the Bull Unigenitus.

If he flies from all these—from bulls, and councils, and evidences, and facts, and testimonies, and all, to that last tremendous refuge, the abjuration of his principles upon oath, I will not pursue him into that fearful last asylum ; but I hope and trust the God of Grace will pursue him, not in judgment, but in mercy, before it be too late. I trust that God will show him that all refuges of sin for sinners are false and lying, but one, and that one is God, the Saviour of the guilty ; but the very fact that God is the only refuge for sinners, makes it the most tremendous act that man can be guilty of—not to fly to God as a refuge from his sin, but to endeavour by a false appeal to him to make that God an accomplice in his guilt.



I have now gone through the whole of this detail of proofs, and I assert that there never was a clearer case. There never was a plainer tissue of evidence laid before the human mind than these documents present. If they are not perfectly clear and conclusive, the defect does not arise from any deficiency in the documents, but from the feebleness and incompetence of the man who attempts to lay them before the nation. And now I say—all these questions, and all the principles which are found here—what are they for? Is my object to excite or stir up a spirit of animosity or ill will or hatred, towards the Roman Catholics? If it be, then I tell my Roman Catholic friends if such be my motive, I stand guilty before them as well as before God. If such be my motive, then I say I fall myself under the censures which I would lay upon others; but I can place my hand upon my heart, and say in the presence of the Judge of heaven and earth, that my heart's desire and prayer to God for them is, that God will be pleased to deliver them—not from these principles alone, for these principles are not the evil—they are but the fruits of the evil. The evil arises from ignorance of the deep foundations for the hope of man, which are laid in the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. If a man indulges in his heart—if he writes in his book—or if he puts in execution by his hand principles such as these, it is because he is ignorant of himself and ignorant of his God. And how should Christians meet this evil? Should we meet anger with anger, or should we requite evil with evil? The command of God is, "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." I say this ought to be our effort, and I trust it will be so; and that we shall not engage in a conflict of evil passions, but combat evil with the honest fidelity of faithful Christian love. I say that if we had been heretofore faithful and honest, and anxious for the salvation of our Roman Catholic countrymen, boldly testifying against the tremendous iniquities in which they are plunged—boldly lifting up our voices against their guilt and idolatry and superstition, and trying to correct the evil, not with penal laws, or with anger or malice, but with the Gospel of Jesus Christ—and the diffusion of the faithful testimony of the Word of God, they and we should not now stand in the awful situation in which we do before our God and before each other.

And I say it is most important that these facts should be laid before the English nation, that they may be made aware that the very evils of this tremendous superstition—for so I call it, not in anger, but in

love to my Roman Catholic fellow-subjects—I assert that those evils are making rapid progress over the whole country of England itself. Look at that map, [pointing to a large map which was hung up in the hall]; it is published by the Reformation Society, and exhibits the localities of the Roman Catholic chapels and colleges which are growing up in England. If you have not ears, have you eyes? Look at Northumberland; look at Durham; look at Yorkshire; look at Lancashire; look at Staffordshire; look at Middlesex. I call upon his Grace the Lord Archbishop of York; I call upon the Lord Bishop of Durham; I call upon the Lord Bishop of Chester; I call upon the Bishop of Litchfield and Coventry; I call upon the Bishop of London, to look at that map, and weigh well the fact, that this awful evil—this dereliction of the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ—this anti-christian apostasy—this substitution of the principles of books like this for the holy and eternal Word of God;—I call upon them, I say, to know and to consider that these evils are not stealing, but striding through their dioceses. I call upon my brethren, the clergy, and I warn them that the evil is spreading like a leprosy through all their parishes, and I say that the salvation of the country depends upon the ministers of the Gospel. I do not speak of temporal concerns, for I consider them as the small dust in the balance. Put all the temporal concerns of this great nation together; the King upon his throne, and all the state and power by which its temporal grandeur is supported, and weigh them in the balance against the soul of the poorest Roman Catholic in Ireland, and I say they are but as the small dust in the balance. I tell my lords the bishops, and I tell my brethren the clergy, that it is not in the laws of statesmen, but in the power of God's eternal Word, and in the determinate exertions of his faithful witnesses alone, to bring about by his blessing the salvation of the empire; and I am glad to say so, because if I were called upon to point out the worst evil in England, I should say it is a deadness and a disregard to this most tremendous fact, and a sort of criminal conventional compact amongst statesmen, that the principles of religion are to be banished from the legislation of the country. Statesmen! I speak in the presence of statesmen, and I say that statesmen who ought to be informed upon every subject which can come before them, are most uninformed upon that subject in which they are most concerned to be instructed. It is the common language to say, "Oh! theological questions are not to be discussed by statesmen—we cannot enter into

these things." If they cannot enter into an examination of the principles of religion, I say, in the name of God—in the name of common sense—in the name of justice—let them not venture to legislate for religion. If they enter into any question upon which they are called on to legislate—if, for example, they go to consider of the levying taxes upon their malt or upon their tobacco, what should we think of a statesman who should say, "I cannot enter into the details of all these questions?" If they presumed to legislate upon a matter where temporal interests were concerned, without an examination of the details, we should say it was a mockery of the interests of those for whom they legislated. Then, I say, if they must understand the details respecting the beer that is drank in their shops, or the smoke that is puffed in their streets, are the questions of religion, in which the temporal and eternal happiness of mankind and of millions yet unborn are interested: are they alone to be excluded from their consideration? How then are they to stand, when they come to give an account of their trust before the bar of the living God? I have now trespassed too long, and my last words in speaking to my Roman Catholic fellow-subjects and countrymen are, that while I bear my faithful testimony, and hope I shall continue to do so while God spares me life, against what I see of evil in them—I do it not for my own sake, but for theirs. It is far better to be the persecuted than the persecutor; it is far better to be the martyr than the murderer. The flames of Smithfield are extinguished long ago, and the martyrs have taken their harps, and joined the noble army of their fellow-saints, but the flame which seizes upon the guilty murderer "is the worm that never dieth, and the fire that never shall be quenched." I pray for my Roman Catholic countrymen, and my prayer to God for them, and my heart's desire is, that they may be found where I desire to be found myself, a poor guilty sinner, washed in the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. (The Rev. Gentleman's speech made a deep impression upon the auditory, and he resumed his seat amidst loud cheers.)

Lord KENYON here came forward and said, in pursuance of the resolution adopted for the regulation of this meeting, I wish to state that before I call upon the Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan, I am desirous to give an opportunity to those who may wish to address this meeting, that is to "any clergyman or layman of the Church of Rome, authorised by any of the Irish bishops of that Church, whose signature either of the London vicars apostolic shall attest, and who shall have

left his name and authority at No. 9, Exeter Hall, at or before twelve o'clock, on Thursday last, the 9th of July." Any such person can now address this meeting, and if he does not choose to do so now, whenever the Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan shall have concluded his speech. If any such person is now here, he can present himself, if he thinks fit so to do.

A person here stood up and said—I wish, my Lord, to address the meeting. (Great noise and confusion followed this interruption.)

Lord KENYON—Order, order. You cannot, Sir, be allowed to speak.

A gentleman on the platform said—I wish, my Lord, to answer the last speaker. (Noise and tumult for several minutes.)

Lord KENYON—There cannot, Sir, be one rule for those on the platform, and another for those in a different part of the room. Unless you have conformed to the rules laid down for this meeting, you cannot be attended to.

Another person said—But I wish to address you, as you have called upon me. (Confusion.)

Lord KENYON—I now call upon the Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan. (Hear, and cheers.)

The Rev. MORTIMER O'SULLIVAN presented himself amid enthusiastic cheering. He commenced by saying—My Lord, I come forward—

A person in the body of the meeting here started up, and exclaimed—I am a Roman Catholic, and I am ready to answer every thing that has been said. (Cries of order, order.)

Lord KENYON—If you are authorised, Sir, to address this meeting, you will have the opportunity ; but otherwise you cannot be attended to.

Great clamour followed this decision of his Lordship, and one or two persons were so violent in their conduct that it was found necessary to remove them. Order was at length restored, a person in the crowd said, "Let Mr. O'Sullivan produce his authority."

The Rev. Mr. O'SULLIVAN again presented himself amidst renewed cheers, and said, I have, my Lord, been asked to produce my authority, and in reply beg to state that I am here in obedience to the call which has been made upon me. We are not, as my Rev. Friend has stated to you, here, to request your attention to details such as, upon a former occasion, were laid before you ; but we have come in obedience to your request, to offer you further information. That I conceive to be my suffi-

cient authority for addressing this enlightened assembly. I do regret—(here there was a tumult excited which lasted for a considerable time, and a person on the platform was removed by the police.) Now, my Lord, continued Mr. O'Sullivan, that your authority has been vindicated and peace restored to the meeting, I venture to express my regret that there was a necessity for any interposition of your authority upon an occasion like this ; and I have also to express the deeper regret that there was not such a compliance with the regulations of the meeting as should have enabled us to have the benefit of the arguments and the answers of those, if any, who felt themselves or their church aggrieved. The gentlemen who have offered themselves to address your Lordship and the meeting, either solicited authority from their bishops, or they, notwithstanding sufficient notice of the necessity, neglected to do so. If they made the proper application to their bishops and were unsuccessful, can they complain that we should deny them a privilege which those most interested in the matter, and those also, who knew them best, did not think it proper to grant them ? And if, not having made any such application, and with a full knowledge of the rules, on the faith of observing which they gained admission here, they injuriously persevered in disturbing the meeting, under pretence of wishing to address it, it is difficult to give them credit, either for sound judgment or for sincerity.

I can affirm on the part of my Rev. brethren, as on my own, that our desire was to have been met on this platform by authorised respondents, and I can also affirm that to the best of my abilities, I mean to place before you what I imagine would constitute the strength of their defence. I do not presume to say that I shall offer the best arguments their ingenuity could contrive, but I think I shall be enabled to state those with which their case naturally supplies them. I shall refer to those documents to which they should themselves have recourse, and I make no doubt that the best arguments these authentic documents can supply, so far from impugning, will be found to corroborate the statement of my Rev. friend and brother.

It is necessary to be borne in mind, that the testimony adduced against the Church of Rome in Ireland, because of the republication and adoption of the recently discovered system of Theology, is not testimony by which it is sought to convict of intolerance a church until now unsuspected or unassailed. If of any sect, strongly discrimina-

ted by its religious opinions, it were for the first time affirmed that its tenets were corrupt and uncharitable, and it were offered in proof of the allegation, that a book, containing impure and anti-social maxims had been published as an accredited manual of doctrine or discipline for its ministers, there are few who would not admit as a valid, or, at least, a plausible objection, to the justice of the conclusion, evidence to show that the doctrines of the sect had been always abhorrent from what was now charged upon it, and that the conduct of its professors was such as to discredit the novel imputations. While its champions could affirm with authority—"We never have believed these doctrines imputed to us—our religion has never been defiled by them—they have never been exemplified in our conduct;" although none could deny that it was an unhappy incident to have false and pernicious doctrines insinuated into the system in any form or by any device, yet all would be ready and glad to declare that the character of a system previously unreprouched, was not irretrievably forfeited. The case on which we have to pronounce is not of this nature—judge whether it is not essentially different. If there were a system—call it a church—against which the testimonies of history were clear and cogent—against which its own recorded declarations were set in judgment—a church, in whose defence against grievous charges no voice was lifted up, except that which uttered the brave and uncorroborated denials of advocates—suspicious, because they had sworn to maintain what they without authority disavowed, or ineffectual because they were uttered by those who knew not what they said—and if, while the only argument advanced in defence of such a church, were derived from an appeal addressed to the charity of her accusers or her judges, beseeching them to believe that the spirit of a tolerant age had imparted its benefits to her, and silently changed the character of her opinions, it were discovered that the worst and foulest tenets of the most intolerant days had been revived, and were inculcated upon her ministers—then might unprejudiced men affirm that such a discovery was decisive, not as, for the first time, establishing an accusation against the exposed system, but as effectual to deprive it of the benefit of that plausible and ingenious remonstrance, which it would interpose between the judgment of a charitable or an indifferent age, and those unalterable principles on which, commonly, the abhorrence of mankind is visited. This is the case as affecting the Church of Rome, upon which we call for your decision.

It has been recently discovered that the bishops and priests of that church have chosen as their best and safest system of theology, a work affirming without disguise the most uncharitable principles. It is not because of this discovery that such principles are imputed to the Church of Rome; but it is contended that the discovery of such a work, and of the circumstances attendant on its adoption, afford abundant proof that the Church of Rome is unchanged in spirit as in creed—a proof unnecessary, perhaps, in the opinion of those who judged of that church by the standard of her own authenticated doctrine, but which ought to be admitted as conclusive by the many who were unwilling to believe that any doctrine of which a disclaimer had been uttered, could, nevertheless, be still retained and made a subject of secret and solemn meditation and conference.

This is our proposition—the subject of the charge we now allege against the Church of Rome in Ireland. Against it, and in defence of the accused church, much and gross invective has been wasted on my friends and me; and Dr. Murray has addressed a letter of expostulation or apology to his Majesty's prime minister. As to the former portion of the defence, neither would your tastes afford an enlarged examination of it, nor do I think it presumption to add, on behalf of my Rev. Friends and myself, that the reputation of the humblest amongst us, myself, is not altogether of so sickly a character that it is likely to suffer by allowing the imputations upon us to pass unheeded. To the letter of the Archbishop it is necessary to give some additional consideration, though very little is requisite after the exposé of my Rev. Friend.

Before, however, I offer any remark on that very important letter, it is, I consider, absolutely necessary to notice the statements which have been made, with an air of secondary authority, by some organs of the public press in Ireland. Indeed I am, it is probable, undervaluing these statements by so guarded a description of them. The *Freeman's Journal*, in its weekly number of Saturday last, directly affirms, "We have done all this on authority;" marking by the selection of its type that the declaration is emphatic. It proceeds—"And we know that what we wrote in reply to Mr. M'Ghee has had the good fortune to meet the views," no doubt it has, "and to obtain the approval of the Catholic prelates." It seems therefore worthy to be examined, in connection with the more direct declaration of one of those prelates, who favoured it with his approval.

The argument, abstracting it from personal invective, while acknowledging the selection of *Dens* as a book of conference, affects to establish three things. 1st. That the purpose to be served by appointing *Dens* as a conference book, was such as should protect the clergy of the Church of Rome in Ireland against the suspicion of holding his opinions. 2dly. That these opinions, or tenets, are not of the intolerant nature which we described them to be; and 3dly, that, even if they were, Protestants, by their enactment of penal and disabling statutes, have disintitiled themselves to visit uncharitable doctrines with censure. Each of these three matters is worthy of a little attention. The *Theology of Dens* was adopted with views, which protect the clergy who select or use it against the charge of approving of its doctrines. It was adopted, we are told, merely that it might serve as an index—reference was to be made to its pages for questions to be discussed, not for the authority by which they were to be decided. In this statement which the *Freeman's Journal* pronounces to be authorized, the adoption of *Dens* is admitted, and thus accounted for:—"We have the authority of our Rev. and estimable Friend, the author of the *Directory for the Province of Leinster*, to state precisely how this matter stands:—"The bishops of each diocese, and sometimes of a province, direct certain questions for the conferences of the clergy every year. These questions are notified in the *Directory for the Province of Leinster*. As in the discussion some order was necessary, and as the clergy are obliged to revise the whole body of theology in conferences, it was deemed more convenient to take up a complete system such as *Dens* presented, than to be passing from one tract to another, for De la Hogue, the author of one of the Maynooth class-books, wrote no moral treatise except the one on Penance; and Bailly's (the other Maynooth class-book) *Dogmatic Theology*, is not to be had in this country. On the other hand, Collet is too voluminous, and even rare; and Tournelli and other works, which have really pretensions to authority, are equally scarce. Hence the accident of the selection of *Dens*."

Here, then, it is acknowledged, distinctly and with authority, that *Dens* was selected as a book of conference; and that, however his authority was to be admitted or denied, his questions were, in the order he had proposed them, to furnish the topics of discussion. The ground on which his work was selected, while the works of writers who, unlike him, had some pretensions to authority, were overlooked, are some-



what curious. Collet is too voluminous—Tournelli is scarce—and *Bailly's Dogmatic Theology*, although it serves as a class-book in Maynooth, is not to be had in Ireland. By what contrivance this singular result has been produced, the authorised statement has not informed us. I will not make use of any irreverent comparisons, but it certainly does suggest matter of not the gravest character for reflection, that bulky tomes which serve as a class-book in Maynooth—the College of Maynooth—are contrived to have no visible or real existence in Ireland. The question of the French King, "In what part of Kerry is Ireland?" must henceforth have reference to Maynooth. But how this invisible, non-existent, class-book is studied by the substantial students, baffles all conjecture. The ingenuity of school-boys is, no doubt, capable of accomplishing extraordinary things. I remember a boy's account of his book, which I venture to say, was not inferior in genius and originality of invention to this which the authorised defender of Dr. Murray has set forth respecting Bailly's invisible class-book. "Why do you not look out for your words?" was the master's question;—"My dictionary, sir, is such a bad one." "Is it not the same with the dictionaries in general use in your class?" "It has no cover, sir." "Is it on the cover, boy, you would look for words?"—"It has no leaves either," said the persevering school-boy. This dictionary furnishes, I believe, the solitary precedent for the case of *Bailly's Theology*, which is not to be had in Ireland, but yet constitutes a class-book at the College of Maynooth.

But, to proceed:—The adoption of Dens was a matter of poverty, not of will. The prelates of the Church of Rome found it in existence, and made use of it. They had solemnly abjured its intolerant doctrines. It is said in their behalf, that they thoroughly abhor them still; but yet, that there was a convenience in adopting some book of conference, and, therefore, Dens was chosen. How did this convenience arise? The *Theology of Dens* was found in Ireland—the more unexceptionable theology was not. How is this to be explained? Did Mr. Coyne, of his own mere motion, at his proper cost and charge, at his own risk, print the volumes which the Roman Catholic clergy in Ireland disapproved—resolved not to indulge them with the works which they accounted so very decidedly preferable? Was Mr. Coyne the autocrat of all sacerdotal literature, so that bishops and priests must succumb to his will, and descending from their post and place, turn to feed upon the beastly viands he

chose to have provided for them? Is that the dignity, the purity of the Church of Rome? Is it at the dictation of Mr. Richard Coyne these ecclesiastics are to receive the knowledge of their faith; and because it pleases him to print a work containing doctrines which they detest, must they accommodate their conferences to his bad book, and follow, as he guides, through the foul and crooked ways of impurity and intolerance? How wonderfully bishops and priests have changed places since the days when councils were held. Once no book could be published without episcopal or inquisitorial permission. Now no bishop shall study, except at the discretion of a domineering bookseller.

But, my Lord, this tone is not suitable to the subject. The defence set up with authority for the adoption of a bad book is in character with that criminal adoption. So far from justifying the Roman Catholic bishops it aggravates their guilt. If any bookseller, however respectable, took upon himself the task of printing and publishing sentiments and opinions of which the heads of his church strongly disapproved—if he treacherously availed himself of the confidential office in which he was placed, to give his pestilent publication a spurious authority, it immediately became the imperative duty of his superiors to disown and censure him. He should not longer be permitted to proclaim himself bookseller to Maynooth. He should no longer be the publisher for the bishops and clergy of his church; he should not be permitted to profit by his daring and almost sacrilegious speculation; the three thousand copies of a bad book which he dared to print, if the law of an heretical government protected them from their proper fate, should be left to perish on his shelves; and, instead of opening a religious market in which they could be profitably sold, in order to inflict merited chastisement on so treacherous an offender, as well as to protect his church from the foul imputation he had brought upon it; Tournelli's or Collet's, or Bailly's, or some one of those systems having authority, should be at any sacrifice procured and printed, to show the nation that the Church of Rome was not altogether dependent on the intolerant creed of an exploded dogmatist, or the caprice of an insolent printer.

My Lord, it was the duty of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin not to let this rash offence pass unpunished. It was ordained by Leo X. that no man should presume to print, or cause to be printed, any book which had not previously been subjected to a bishop or

inquisitor having authority in the district, and, after examination, approved of. The printer who should transgress this law, he ordained, should be punished by the loss of the entire impression of his book, and by such other censure as his presumption merited. In the Rules for the Congregation of the Index established and authorised by Clement VIII., this ordinance of Leo X. is adopted, and it is further confirmed by the constitution of Benedict XIV., beginning "*Solicita et provida.*" But Dr. Murray, in that strictest and most precise of engagements, his bishop's oath, swore that he would observe with all his might, the apostolic decrees, ordinances, or disposals, reservations, provisions, and mandates of the holy see, and cause them to be observed by others. He swore also "that, by himself in person, unless deterred by a lawful impediment, he would visit the threshold of the apostles every ten years, and give an account to his lord (meaning the Pope), and his aforesaid successors, of all his pastoral office, and of all things anywise belonging to the state of his church—to the discipline of his clergy and people, and lastly, to the salvation of souls committed to his trust." Is it unreasonable to infer that arguments like those addressed to the people of England, are not such as it would be well pleasing to offer in hearing of the Pope? To say, "there is a bookseller in my diocese, one Mr. Richard Coyne, who has a predilection for a very bad book, written by a Mr. Peter Dens—I cannot prevail on this bookseller to provide a better work for our use, and, in anguish of spirit, I am constrained to impose on my clergy, and to adopt, myself, a work which brings disgrace on all who are supposed to favour it, and which must make that religion odious which I have sworn to protect from all dishonour." Would that be an excuse to the Bishop of Rome? Would Dr. Murray offer to him such an apology for his culpable remissness? Would he dare to affront the Pope with so manifest, so careless an affectation of apology or defence, as that in which he shows his knowledge of to the Prime Minister of England?

But this is not Dr. Murray's defence. It is, however, the authorised statement in his favoured journals—nor is his defence, as expressed in his own words, very different:—"I did not," he says, "direct the work of Dens to be published; it was undertaken by a respectable bookseller, as a speculation in trade, entirely at his own risk, as a work which comprises a large mass of very valuable matter, though containing, too, some obsolete opinions, wholly unconnected

with any article of Catholic faith, and which opinions it was known that hardly any one at the present day would think of defending." Is the meaning of this disclaimer that, in the work of Dens, there is good and evil? If it be, why was not the Archbishop vigilant to do his duty? Why did he not exercise his power, and require of the printer that that which was evil should be omitted? Why was it not demanded of the publisher that the same caution should be observed in the publication of Dens as had been exercised in the reprint of the Rheimish Testament? Why was not, at least, some mark of reprobation set upon passages of which the learned prelate disapproved? The authority of the bishop, as that of the congregation of the index, extends not alone to the power of general condemnation, but applies also to the affixing a censure on particular propositions in works otherwise irreprehensible. Bishops, according to the instruction given by Clement VIII., have authority not only to prohibit, but to expurgate and correct; and when they have noted such passages as should be changed, the requisite alterations having been made, the work may be permitted. Thus you may find, "in copies of the Index" the names of various works under a species of temporary interdict or suspension, prohibited until they are corrected, "*donec corrigantur.*" In some books the compendious process has been adopted of extracting leaves in which objectionable matter is contained. Thus *Burgh's Hibernia Dominicana*, by a species of domestic censure, has ten pages in most of the copies taken away—those narrating the attempt of James II. to establish his power in Ireland. But Mr. Coyne, at his own risk, published the entire of the *Theology of Dens*—his most revolting impurities—his intolerance; and no mark of reprobation is set upon the foul disclosures, nor any protection afforded by which men might know to refuse the evil and to choose the good. I do not know whether the rules of the index have been adopted in Ireland. If they have, Mr. Coyne should have been bound to observe them; but whether they have or have not been directly adopted, the bishop was bound to see their enactments enforced, and not to suffer such confusion to take place as has been rendered visible in this motley system of theology.

My Rev. Friend has already read for you the report of a conversation in which Dr. Murray disclaimed the adoption of Dens, and showed you the inaccuracy of dates which had not been observed by the authorised apologist. A very brief examination will set his

seeming denial in a light in which it can be understood. It is expressed thus :—

“ Finally, I did not make it the text-book for our theological conferences ; for, on such occasions, we have no such book, if by this expression we are to understand the work of any writer, whose opinions (when not already defined by the church as articles of faith,) the clergy are required, or in any manner whatever expected, to maintain. In fact, our clergy are too well instructed to have the least notion of submitting to such a restriction. The questions proposed in conference are brought forward for the very purpose of being freely discussed on their own merits ; and the decisions which, after due examination, are approved of, rest entirely, not on the individual opinions of this writer or of that, but on those arguments which seem best calculated to carry conviction to the mind.”

Does it appear that this contains a denial of Dr. Murray's having made *Dens* a text-book for conference ? It does not. If a “text-book” be an expression to be understood in a certain sense, he has not appointed *Dens* to such an office ; but if it be understood in a different signification, his language does not even insinuate a denial of the charge against him. In truth, the denial of Dr. Murray in his own letter and in the authorised statements, are the same. “ In the year 1831,” the statement informs us, “ at a public conference of all the secular clergy of this city (Dublin), held at the Presbytery, Lower Exchange-street, a clergyman of great respectability asked the compiler of the *Directory*, why he had selected that obsolete and exploded Theologian *Dens* for a conference book, and added jocularly that he supposed it was for the purpose of assisting Mr. Coyne in the sale of his newly-published work. The archbishop, Dr. Murray, who was present, forthwith interposed, and desired it to be distinctly understood, that *Dens* was by no means made a class-book for the conferences ; that ‘ they were merely to follow his order in discussing the questions ; and that the answers were to be taken from any books the clergy pleased to prefer.’ ” It is evident that the reference here is not to the publication in 1808, but to what the respectable clergyman terms the newly-published work. The anecdote has the more authority, because it is re-affirmed in a subsequent publication of the journal, the same which contains a notice of the approval given to it by the prelates of the Church of Rome, and which contains also Dr. Murray's letter. The date is certainly a little indiscreet ; but as my

Reverend brother has observed, that could have been easily rectified, had the narrator looked to the title-page of the *Theology*. By this it appears that the work was published in the year 1832, just one year after it had been selected for the conference, and therefore so late as to render somewhat premature the jocular remark, that its recent publication had suggested the idea of making it a conference-book in order to promote its sale. Such little *contre temps* as this must happen. The authorized statement, as if to make amends for its want of accuracy, moralizes very judiciously on the story—it would be wrong to say fable. “These facts,” it says, “will, we suppose, silence further calumny, extinguish the slanders already blazing through the country, and, we think, strip Mr. M’Ghee of his assumed infallibility even to the conviction of the Tartuffes.” No doubt they ought. Wherever there is a disposition to affirm that a work, which, from the title-page we learn was not printed until 1832, was called a newly-published work by a priest in the year 1831—and that a notice in the *Directory* of the same year was described as a device to promote the sale of the non-existent volumes; and where there is a disposition to receive or represent such affirmations as statements of fact; Mr. M’Ghee will be wise to keep silence; but it is not so certain that calumny will be silenced, or the Tartuffe’s rebuked.

But in all these statements there is this important coincidence—all describe the work of Dens as the adopted class-book of conference; such a book being understood to serve no other purpose than that of furnishing questions for theological discussion. Why, then, was more of this adulterated theology published, than these necessary questions? The answers were to be sought elsewhere. Why was the expense and the disgrace of these publications affixed wantonly on the Roman Catholic bishops and clergy? The questions recited in this vicious production would not have occupied more than the half of a single volume, the sixteenth part of the work. Why were they not extracted from the mass of intolerance and profligacy—profligacy the more flagitious, because of the pretext under which it would disguise itself, and in their separate form presented to the world? Nay, why was any part of Dens formally reprinted? His authority was nothing—his questions are set forth in the *Calendar*; why then send to him? He did not furnish the answers.

But, it may be said, there are questions to be found in Dens, which are not recited in the notices of conference. The *Calendar* proposes

the general questions which contain the subject of discussion in each section of the *Theology*; but, in the consideration of this subject, new questions are evolved, and for these it is necessary to have recourse to Dens. No such thing—these—they are not numerous, could be inserted in the *Calendar*, and if they enlarged a little the prospectus of each conference, the trivial inconvenience would be more than compensated by the advantage of having Dens retained in seclusion from the general eye.

But, is it altogether rash to argue, that the adoption of the questions which Dens proposes in the order in which he arranges them, involves the acceptance of his authority? It is not out of questions, but out of answers, that new questions arise—the answer is the intermediate term between the original and the suggested question. The order of questions has no grace or propriety, if it be disturbed by a rejection of the intervening answers. Call to your remembrance the most interesting examination or cross-examination of which any record has been preserved—let the questions be all carefully retained—let all the answers be obliterated, and will you say that there can be discovered any thing like order in the succession? No, surely. Orderly dependence in succession implies relation; and in consecutive interrogatories, relation or connexion is to be found only in the answers which one set of questions produces, and which furnish occasion for another. When, therefore, the order of questions in Dens is proposed, as that which the conferences must adopt, the adoption of the order of answers is understood; it may not be that they are adopted as necessarily to be believed, but that assuredly they are to be learned—that, in short, the conferences of which Dens was to be the class-book, were conferences in which the clergy were to become disciplined in the principles of his *Theology*.

Perhaps, my Lord, an example will set this argument in a clearer point of view than much discourse upon it. In order to economise time, I shall select one which may serve a double purpose, giving an opportunity to exhibit this question of order, and at the same time placing before the meeting the portion of the *Theology of Dens* to which his defenders have been best pleased to refer, in order to show the mildness or the mitigation of his doctrine. In the conferences for the year 1832, I find three consecutive questions—What is heresy? How is it divided? What are the punishments decreed against persons infected with that taint? Each of these questions is

the subject of discussion in a separate section of the *Theology*, and each of them is proposed in a form which seems to recognise, or at least direct the mind to, an answer such as that which the conference book contains. The question, *How* is heresy divided, presumes evidently the fact that there is a division, and we find in *Dens* the division of heresy into *material* and *formal*. The question, *What* are the punishments decreed against heretics, implies that some *have been decreed*, and we have the dreadful catalogue recited in the *Theology*. But to enter more minutely into the subject, we will take, my Lord, the section to which the apologists of Dr. Murray refer, and examine the order of some questions propounded in it. To save time, I shall quote only the questions formally proposed as such, not those which are plainly suggested. I select the section numbered 54, *De Hæresi in Particulari*, and quote the following consecutive questions:—

“ 1. What is heresy?—*Quid est hæresis.*

“ 2. When is obstinacy ascribed such as constitutes formal heresy? *Quando censetur adesse pertinacia constitutiva hæresis formalis.*

“ 3. Is he a heretic who from ignorance (*mortaliter mala, vel etiam affectata*) denies an article of faith?

“ 4. How, if obstinacy be essential to the guilt of formal heresy, can heretics, for example, those in Holland, be accounted formal heretics, since, from ignorance, they may persuade themselves that theirs is the true religion?—*Quomodo, si ad hæresim formalem requiritur pertinacia, hæretici, e. g. in Hollandia reputari possunt hæretici formales, cum illi ex ignorantia sibi persuadeant, sectam suam esse veram religionem?*”

These questions are arranged in consecutive order, and I would ask whether links of connexion are not necessary to render the order intelligible? For example. In the second question, an epithet is applied to heresy, which appears to discriminate one species from another,—a quality of mind is noticed upon which the distinction is assumed to depend. Whence arises the propriety of this second question respecting criminal obstinacy of attachment to any heresy which is distinguished by the appellation “formal.” It is to be found in the answer to the question which had preceded? The answer to the question, what is heresy, is this, “It is an obstinate error in the faith of one who professes the Christian religion.” *Est hominis Christianismum profitentis error in fide pertinax.* In this answer we can discern the reason for making “obstinacy” the subject of the question which



follows: we do not yet see how the term "formal" was suggested. We find it in the explanation of the answer, in which it is said that "without obstinacy" there is not *formal* heresy, as St. Augustine says, I may err without obstinacy, but without it I shall not be a heretic. "Thence," Dens continues, "the distinction is understood between formal and material heresy." The notice of this distinction is followed directly by the second question, which implies that the distinction and the alleged reason for it are admitted; in short that the answer and commentary upon it, which give the reply to the first question, are taken as granted in proposing the second. In the third question the subject of ignorance is introduced. Why? The answer to the preceding charged formal heresy on those who were supposed to have opportunities of correcting ignorance—"dum quis veritati fidei *sufficienter proposita, sciens, et volens* renititur"—a resistance with knowledge and will to truth sufficiently promulgated. Out of such an answer, the question respecting ignorance naturally grew. I need not trouble your Lordship or the meeting with lengthened remarks on the fourth question, because it contains embodied the question and the answer by which it was suggested. It is proposed only on the supposition that obstinacy is essential to the guilt of formal heresy, and it contains an indirect acceptance of the answer immediately preceding, in which a case is related wherein ignorance palliates heresy. I would observe, however, that as the question respecting heretics in Holland implies the adoption of the preceding answers, it also implies that a judgment unfavourable to the heretics has been pronounced, the question demanding not what that judgment is, but how it is to be reconciled with a certain admitted exemption, a demand with which the answer complies, affirming that the marks of credibility in the Church of Rome are so fully exhibited that ignorance could not be admitted as an excuse.

And this is the book, it should be remembered, which the bishops of the Church of Rome declare to be the surest guide for the studies of their clergy; the best substitute for libraries and sound advisers. Surely, when thus referred to the questions it proposes, it seems almost folly to attempt proving that they have not been required to purchase the expensive answers only for the purpose of disregarding them. What a book for such an office! I will not weary you with an examination of the ineffectual attempts to relieve it from the odium which its intolerance provokes against it. A single example shall

suffice. I take it from comments on a passage towards the end of the section to which I have been endeavouring to direct your attention. I think the one sample will be sufficient.

Dens, we are informed, "was infinitely more liberal than many of our reformed churchmen." "He pleads the exalted liberality of St. Austin's golden maxim in palliation of all who are not obstinately in error, in his solution to this important question: "What are we to think of the multitude who are born and educated amongst heretics and schismatics—are they to be excused from formal heresy?" Steyaert answers, that many such, *multos tales*, even after they arrive at the use of reason, are excusable, and that to pronounce a specific opinion on any is most difficult; for St. Austin says, I may be in error, but I cannot be a heretic without culpable obstinacy—*sine pertinacia*." This is the quotation as given by a Dublin journal: and, assuming its correctness, the editor is vehement in his invectives against any who dare to impugn the church he is defending, assuring his readers that the throat of such defamers "is an open sepulchre, and there is no faithfulness in their mouths." But what should the quotation have been if it were fairly stated? The amiable expression of St. Augustin *should be blotted out*. It is not found in the passage which the editor professed to quote, but in its place these menacing words, "nor is it proper to be too indulgent (or liberal) in this matter, attending carefully to the opinions of the fathers *upon the certain destruction of those who have not the true faith and church*." This is the passage. Such defences as these are instructive; they show the conscious weakness of our adversary's cause, and the unscrupulous measures resorted to in order to uphold it. I do not accuse the instruments of this despicable equivocation of knowing the vile uses to which they are made subject. I can believe that they are abused—that, unconsciously, they have lent themselves to the utterance of the untruth; and, unless I find them persevering in the maintenance of the fraud, I cannot consent to resign a hope that even the intemperance of politics will not render men of education and ability insensible to the wrong done them, in the insulting advantage which has been taken of their credulity.

It seems, indeed, a very bootless labour, to exhibit proofs that the *Theology of Dens* contains a mass of matter calculated to awaken at once abhorrence, and alarm, and disgust, in any minds, not subdued by temper or training, to an acquiescence in dogmas of the most revolting

intolerance, or descriptions of the foulest impurity. You have already heard proofs of the malignant and cruel principles which this bad book recommends. I will not dwell upon them. But there is a portion of the book which, although it may not be examined, should not be suffered to pass altogether unnoticed. I can remember well the surprise with which I first learned, from an individual highly distinguished and highly respected in this metropolis, that of all the books in his extensive and general library, he did not feel it necessary to keep any excluded from use—any imprisoned—except pages by which the clergy of the Church of Rome were made acquainted with the casuistry of which their office seemed to exact of them a sufficient understanding. These are pages, he said, of too frightful impurity to be left accessible to any inexperienced visitor, and I hold them in concealment. I thought of his words when I beheld the abominations of Dens, and I remembered them when I read of Roman Catholics decrying the propriety of committing the Book of God's Word, under his holy guidance, to all for whose learning it was written. It is not for the taught of Dens, and of the no less offensive writers whose names I will not recite, to offer such objection. They may, indeed, say, we do not allow these books to be generally read; but they do allow pages to be in general circulation which are of a very gross and disgusting character, and which they call examinations of conscience; and worse, they require that the young and inexperienced shall resort for guidance and instruction in secret conferences, in the most hidden and obscure thoughts and emotions—to whom? To men prepared for their office by studies which shall have transferred to their imaginations, pictures, of all the least suitable to their condition and duties. Give not the Bible to the young, that they may study it under the influence of faith and prayer; but require of a young, inexperienced, unsuspecting female, that she shall submit herself to the interrogatories of one whose thoughts are not tempered by the sanctity of home, or solemnized by the deep vigilance of parental solicitude—one whose studies in preparing for the confessional have conducted him through abominations, in comparison with whose foulness ordinary profligacy is grave and decorous—and she must open up her whole heart to such a companion, and in return be exposed to the hazard of becoming instructed in the wisdom of his speculative, but most debasing, experience.

Passing away from this distressing topic, and omitting the denun-

ciations in which the spirit of the Church of Rome expresses rather her hatred of those who exercise their right of private judgment, and adopt what she accounts incorrect opinions, than her maternal anxiety for their reformation, I shall solicit your attention to another class of doctrines, not, perhaps, so odious in their aspect, but certainly very formidable in their tendency and nature—I speak of those doctrines according to which the priesthood in the Church of Rome, in Ireland, are taught their freedom from all conscientious obligations to obey the laws of their country. In the questions proposed for conference in the year 1833, we find this—“Are the clergy subjected to human laws?” and in *Deus*, vol. ii. pages 290 and 292, we have the instructive answer. In the former page it is said, that men owe a twofold subjection to the law, by accepting it as a rule of action, in which case the law is said to have a directive force, and in submitting to punishment for disobedience, when the force of the law is said to be “coercive.” Keep this distinction in your remembrance, that laws have a twofold power, and that entire authority is that given to such as are accounted to have both a directive and coercive efficacy. Accordingly, in page 292, we are informed that “ecclesiastics are subject to the laws of the church concerning themselves, as well in their coercive as in their directive force.” This truth is pronounced to be “beyond controversy.” “To civil laws,” provided they do not infringe ecclesiastical immunity, they are bound, so far as their directive efficacy. The laws of the land, if they be in accordance, or not opposed to their ecclesiastical ordinances and exemptions, they will acknowledge to be precepts, which it is proper to observe, although they will not recognise any right of compulsion. But, “if the civil laws infringe their immunities, *“si vero leges civiles adversantur immunitati clericorum ;”* or if they be on a matter in which ecclesiastics are exempt from secular power, in such they are not bound either by a directive or coercive influence. Thus, then, if the laws of England do not harmonize, and most assuredly they do not, with the laws of the Church of Rome, the ecclesiastics of that church are bound not to acknowledge that they could justly be punished for disobedience; and further, that they do no more than their direct duty when they make it manifest that they have no respect for them as a rule of conduct.

This may, perhaps, explain the repeated refusals of clergy of the the Church of Rome to give evidence in a court of justice—refusals

not so frequent as to alarm the authorities of the State, but sufficiently so to disparage the public tribunals. Thus, then, the municipal law, in order to be respected, must be in accordance with the law of the church; and if it invade or infringe ecclesiastical immunity, it is not to be feared as a just restraint, nor respected as a rule of action. But those immunities—what are they? What are the rights which the Church of Rome asserts, and which the law must reverence? Do they reverence the rights of humanity, freedom to think, righteous exercise of conscience? Let the dreadful declaration of Dens—let Lateran and Constance, which he echoes, furnish the reply. I have a different reply; it will save time to produce it. It is contained in an address from the Belgian bishops, in the year 1815—an address in which the right they claim, which they demand to have preserved to them, is not the possession of their own immunities in peace, but the privilege to deny their fellow-subjects freedom of conscience—to deny the toleration of Protestant worship. In 1815, the Roman Catholic bishops, understanding that liberty of conscience was to be generally allowed through the State, took the liberty of addressing the Sovereign in this remarkable manner. I take the address, from which I give only some prominent extracts, as it is cited in the *History of the Jesuits*, published in 1816, and as it is also to be found in the *Annual Register*. Beginning with the King's assurance, in his proclamation, of confirming to the Catholic Church its establishment and privileges, they affirm that these are inconsistent with an article in the plan of the new Constitution, by which equal favour and protection are promised to all religious. They say:—

“ Already the proclamation of your Majesty, which announced that the new Constitution should ensure the liberty of religions, and give all equal favour and protection, has filled every heart—”

With what? with gratitude? with content? with kind and brotherly feelings? No: these would be feelings which, upon fit occasions, the Church of Rome could counterfeit—they are not those she inculcates. The Belgian bishops did not feign or dissemble. They spoke the language of their creeds and councils; they declared that the benevolent purpose of a liberal monarch, who would ensure to his subjects freedom to worship God, had filled the heart of every

member of their church—"with consternation." They said to their Sovereign—

"Sire, we do not hesitate to declare to your Majesty, that the canonical laws, which are sanctioned by the ancient Constitution of the country, are incompatible with the projected Constitution, which would give in Belgium equal force and protection to all religions."

They went further, and declared that if the Monarch enacted liberal laws, they would be placed in opposition to him. They say—

"We are bound, Sire, incessantly to preserve the people entrusted to our care from the doctrines which are in opposition to the doctrines of the Catholic Church. We could not release ourselves from this obligation without violating our most sacred duties, and if your Majesty, by virtue of a fundamental law, protected in these provinces the public profession and spreading of these doctrines, the progress of which we are bound to oppose with all the care and energy which the Catholic Church expects from our office, *we should be in formal opposition to the laws of the State*, to the measures which your Majesty might adopt to maintain them amongst us, and in spite of all our endeavours to maintain union and peace, the *public tranquillity might still be disturbed*."

Whether this was an idle menace, the events of late years have amply instructed us. These bishops were educated in the school of *Den's Theology*. Is it irrational to look with alarm on the policy which provides for the clergy of the Church of Rome in Ireland, instruction of the same character, and to look for the manifestations of its presence upon the aspect of Irish society? Is it irrational to conclude that a similar estrangement from the duties of citizens in Ireland may be ascribed to the same principle, and to dread that, whenever a convenient season arises, manifestations not less equivocal may make it but too clear that the spirit it awakened only waited the time when it could be prudently exhibited. Who does not remember the menace of the Irish bishop, addressed to a member of the Legislature of Great Britain, that if a rebellion were raging in Ireland from Carrickfergus to Cape Clear—from one extremity of the island to the other—no bishop would fulminate an excommunication against it; and that if any were to do so, his effort would be ineffectual—his denunciation would fall like a spent thunderbolt, an object of contempt to the people against whom it was issued. Here there was knowledge professed of the ecclesiastics and the laity of the Romish

persuasion—the bishops would not inflict censure for treason to the State; if any did, the people would despise his effort. How is this intelligible, except on the understanding that the bishops, trained up in intolerance, felt that they owed no duty to a Protestant Government, and that their people had been, under their instructions, wrought into a disposition which taught them at once to discern what censures of their church were intended to take effect, and what were to be regarded as demonstrations convenient to exhibit before Protestants, but having no design of coercing the judgment of those to whom there was a profession of especially addressing them?

But, perhaps, it will be said that the intolerance and disaffection manifested by the Church of Rome in Belgium—the lessons of late years, equally rancorous and alarming, provided for the instruction of the ministers of the church in Ireland, do not immediately concern you. Look upon that map to which your attention has been already directed, and see whether the evil is not drawing near to your doors?

But Popery in England may not resemble the Popery of Belgium or Ireland. Here it may not be intolerant. Judge by its acts. I have read for you expressions which bishops in Belgium addressed to their king. I shall now read passages from a communication which bishops of the Church of Rome here among you, do not scruple to convey to their people, even in England. The book I hold in my hand is the official notification, I believe, annually made to members of the Church of Rome in England, of matters connected with the discipline and services of their religion. This one is called the *Laity's Directory*, for the year 1833, and is thus certified, “*The Directory for the Church Service*, printed by Messrs. Keating and Brown, is the only one which is published with the authority of the Vicars Apostolic in England; signed James, Bishop of Ursula, Vic. Ap. London, November 12, 1829.” In the *Directory* thus certified, the encyclical letter of the reigning Pope is published, for the edification of the English people. I shall read an extract, from which you can judge the character of the communication.

“From this polluted fountain of indifference flows that absurd and erroneous doctrine, or rather raving, in favour and in defence of *liberty of conscience*; for which *most pestilential error*, the course is opened by that entire and wild liberty of opinion which is every where attempting the overthrow of civil and religious institutions, and which the unblushing impudence of some has held forth as an advantage to religion.”

Judge whether the character of Roman Catholics in England is not becoming more conformable to the principles of their church, than to the free genius of this country, when bishops shall venture to make such sentiments known to them. Consider the passage I have read for you, and observe how, in the judgment of a Pope, and of those, we may presume, who published his instructions, in England, the attempts to overthrow civil and religious institutions are looked upon with severity, chiefly because they open a way for that principle which would make freedom of conscience every man's right, and which is here declared a "pestilential error!" Again it is said, "Hitherto tends that worst and never sufficiently to be execrated and detested '*liberty of the press,*' for the diffusion of all manner of writings, which some so actively contend for, and so actively promote." Such are the principles which Rome, now in her feebleness, does not scruple to assert, and upon which, if ever she obtain power in England, she will act with authority. "Liberty of conscience a pestilential error—liberty of the press an evil never to be sufficiently execrated and detested!" And, notwithstanding this earnestness on the part of the Pope, the Roman Catholic Archbishop in Dublin gives such encouragement to the licentiousness of the press, that he constrains his clergy to follow in the track marked out for them by an insolent printer; and so encourages the detested liberty of conscience, that, notwithstanding the oath by which every priest is bound, an oath which requires that he receive without any doubt every dogma delivered in a sacred canon or general council, he will permit him to answer the dangerous questions of Dens from any book to which it may please him to give a preference.

Am I not justified in affirming that the declaration of the bishops in Belgium, the encyclical letters which vicars apostolic are bold enough to publish in England, and the book which has been appointed to direct the conferences of Romish clergy in Ireland, afford painfully convincing proof that the laws of Protestant states cannot be in accordance with the principles of Papal legislation, and that, in guarding the sacred liberties of mankind, they infringe on that despotism which priests and bishops of the Church of Rome denominate "ecclesiastical immunity."

The laws, therefore, of Protestant States cannot bind the consciences of those priests and bishops. How is their freedom likely to act on those dependent on their instruction? This question is best answered



by what has been done in Ireland, and what Ireland has been enabled to do here. It was one of the questions proposed for the conferences of Roman Catholic clergy in Ireland in the year 1832—"Is it lawful to tolerate the rites of heretics?" The questions for that year are headed by a profession that the authority of Dens is to be followed—*Dominum Dens auctorem sequentes, de virtutibus tractatum discutimus*. It is not necessary to prove that, properly translated, this passage recognises Dens as an authority, and that the argument derived from the expression to "discuss," is altogether invalid. It is not only practicable, but very common for students in any department of study to discuss the treatises of a great authority, not with the idea of adopting conclusions different from his, but in order to become more accurately acquainted with his course of instruction. But our proofs are too many and too clear to require of us, or even permit us, to dispute on points of language. The question, is it lawful to tolerate the rites of heretics, is proposed in a conference, which is directed to follow in its discussions the author, or the authority, Dominus Dens—and Dens gives his answer to the question—*An ritus infidelium sunt tolerandi?* Are the rites of those who have not the faith to be tolerated? "The rites of the Jews, although they sin in exercising them, may, with some moderation, be tolerated. The rites of others, not having the faith, to wit, Pagans and heretics, are not to be tolerated (*per se*), because they are so evil that nothing of truth or utility to the good of the church can thence be derived—"except, nevertheless, unless greater evils might elsewhere follow, or greater good be impeded."—Dens, vol. ii. p. 83. The author proceeds to establish that it is the *principle* of the Church of Rome not to allow a toleration of other religions, and to refute such arguments as might be derived from freedom of thought, and from testimonies derivable from Scripture. The result is, that wherever there is indulgence of another religion, it is because of some expediency; and that in any state in which the principle of toleration is maintained, what the Church of Rome terms its ecclesiastical immunity is invaded, and accordingly its priests owe no submission to laws which are thus objectionable. Wherever the Church of Rome can wield the secular arm, she will, of course, assert her principles of intolerance, so far as expediency advises. In other systems, the principle is, to leave conscience and opinion free—stern necessity alone calls for the required limitations. The Church of Rome inverts this order—avows it as her principle,

that the mind shall be enslaved, and is influenced only by the compulsion of necessity, or the suggestions of expediency, to grant, in some instances, a precarious toleration. It is, then, the principle of those who make Dens their authority, (and in his intolerant maxim of denying freedom of worship, Dens speaks only the language of canons and councils,) that the rites of heretics are not to be tolerated—a principle which must be asserted in all cases in which it shall be found convenient so to do. I ask, is not the conduct of the Irish Roman Catholics a commentary upon the principle which affirms the same stern truth as the answer given by Dens? Have they not, so far as they had the power, availed themselves of the secular arm? And have you not seen one set of ministers driven from place, and another intruded into the government of the country, because the one class consented to be the instruments of Popery in asserting her grand principle, by abolishing the rites of Protestant worship, and because the other repudiated, and disclaimed, and accounted as a sacrilege, the sacrifice demanded of them.

In every particular, the principle of Rome is asserted—so far as it is now expedient, it is carried into execution. How stands the question which affects the Protestant Established Church in Ireland? It was a church subsisting on its own revenues, requiring nothing of any body of men or any individual, except what was its right—its own property—granted and secured to it by the same laws which secure all other possessions. And the principle is affirmed now, that in certain instances the means for maintaining worship in that Church are to be withdrawn from it, because a majority in the House of Commons constituted by the enemies of the Church, demands the sacrifice. Is not this to affirm and carry into execution the principle, that they will not tolerate the rites of heretics? They have no hope that as yet they can prevail to close the doors of Protestant Churches where congregations are numerous; they have hope that they can succeed in other cases; where they have the hope they make the effort; and where, it may be, the continuance of divine worship would be of the most vital interest to the faithful few, surrounded with dangers and persecutions, they say their worship shall no longer be tolerated; they shall be punished by confiscation of the revenues which defrayed its charges. This is, to the utmost of their power, to affirm the principle of intolerance. The maxim in Dens demands no more. They should advance their claims and assert their principles in such a

manner as not to obstruct the greater good, and therefore, they for the present content themselves with the measure in which they hope to prove successful.

Will any man say that the church in Ireland is impoverished because Roman Catholics have been unjustly compelled to maintain it? The insinuation would be altogether groundless. Is this a reason for plundering the landlord of his rent? Of that rent the tithe was a portion. What would be the outcry here, if Protestant landlords had combined together in time past and declared that they would allow no Roman Catholic to become a tenant on their lands! What would be said if they now made it a condition that none should remain who presumed to contribute to the support of the pastors of their church? Would not the general voice be loud against the cruelty of the condition? And shall it, or can it, be denied, that reprobation should be with equal justice visited on the tenantry who would combine against the laws, and threaten to burst out into fierce insurrection, because landlords felt it right to pay their debts to Protestant ministers, and because the legislature of England wished not to abandon to their enemies, or to join with enemies in persecuting, as meritorious and as much aggrieved a body of men as are to be found on the face of the earth?

Remember, too, that this persecution is goaded on by those who swore that they would protect property, and would not disturb the church; whose seeming candour, when power was to be gained, was conspicuous in the admission that they dissented from Protestant doctrines, but that, as to the revenues of an Establishment, with those they were unconcerned: (they might, as other subjects, complain of inconvenience in the system of tithe, but as to the purposes to which it was appropriated, they could not occasion among them, as Roman Catholics, any discontent whatever;) and who, when power was won, and all the inconveniences of the tithe system obviated, find out the new and real grievance, and sum up all their complaints into the one word from which they, beyond all other men, should refrain—the word “appropriation.” And where is the warfare carried on against the church? In the House where no minister of that church can appear to defend his cause. First, by positive enactment it is provided that he shall be excluded: then the opportunity of his absence furnishes facilities for depriving him of his possessions. I enter not into a question like this. I do not dwell

upon the wisdom or the want of wisdom in an enactment which excludes, perhaps, half of the educated men in the country from all participation in the duties and toils in the legislature—which excludes those who must be supposed to be most studious of principle from sharing in a work by which the moral and religious feeling of the country must naturally be seriously affected. I can understand how inconvenient it might be that they should canvass the suffrages of the people. I cannot understand why general exclusion should not be compensated by a partial representation of their own order, why provinces should not send their own ecclesiastical representatives.\* I can hear it said that they are represented in the House of Lords, and cannot forget that it is now urged as an offence in that House if it refuse to register any decree which the Commons House of Parliament go through the ceremony of offering for its approval. I can understand, too, how the representatives of the people should protect the Church to which their constituencies are friendly, and can remember that the time is passed when such a hope could be accounted reasonable. I remember to have read of a sergeant of grenadiers, at the time of the French Revolution, whose poverty bore so hard upon him and his house, that he, in order to obtain relief, adopted the cruel expedient of disposing of his son's teeth to a dentist. He had, of course, some little difficulty in persuading the boy to submit, and obviated his last objection. How shall I eat my food? by the not altogether comforting assurance of masticating for him. However, for a time he remembered the duty, and kept the promise in the spirit of the obligation; but times changed—the boy—

“ Was left half desolate;

His mother chose another mate,”

and the new proprietor of the mansion had not the same tenderness of feeling, which, in the days gone by, mitigated to the child the evils of his condition. Is it not in some sort thus the church has been disabled and disregarded?—while the feelings prevailed which have procured such favour to the name of “English gentleman,” the necessary absence of the ministers of the church (from the house where their temporal interests were to be decided on, and where what

---

\* The principle of exclusion would be intelligible if it were applied only to clergymen having cure of souls. That an individual who has not a cure becomes incapacitated to legislate for the interests of religion, by the mere fact of being a minister in the Church of Christ, seems rather anomalous.

was of far more importance—their character, might be brought into question, and their sphere of usefulness restricted or enlarged,) was remembered, and was a restraint upon the speech of some, and a call upon the faithful advocacy of others. But times changed—a different disposition was manifested—and the consciousness of affording to the ministers of the church no opportunity to defend themselves, or their cause, which had once served as a protection to that cause, or, at least, had imposed a decorous restraint upon those who assailed it, was made to serve a different purpose; it emboldened assailants—and many stood up, and came forward to fling their discreditable aspersions upon us where we are not, who would not dare a second time to utter the calumnies if we were present to expose and stigmatise them.

I fear I am too long trespassing on your attention. (Loud cries of “No, no,” “Go on, go on,” and cheering for several minutes.) I take advantage of your indulgence and continue:—I beg to remind you that the principle by which the Church Establishment is assailed is a principle which would not, had it power, tolerate, in any form, the exercise of the Protestant religion—which would exclude Protestants from their churches, as well as their ministers from opportunity of defence, and in their place intrude and maintain the representatives and the advocates of such a theology as that of Dens. (Hear, hear, and loud cheering, followed by considerable clamour.) There were occasions on which I rejoiced at a manifestation of feeling like that, because it appeared to me to indicate dissent from the foul principles which were exposed to you; but I do not think it creditable to continue them, when it is to assail the cause of a persecuted body, like that of the clergymen of the church of Ireland. There is a defence set up for the intolerance of the existing church of Rome, of which these clamours have reminded me. It is asked—granting that Dens teaches persecuting tenets, and that Romish priests in Ireland adopt them, what right have Protestants to complain—did not they persecute when they had power—have they not forfeited, by their own conduct, the right to expostulate against the intolerance of others? It is not creditable to the age that men will venture on openly advancing excuses such as this. What is our complaint? What is the ground of our alarm? Not that there is evil in the human heart—not that man is subject to the influence of evil passions. No, surely—we know that he is a fallen creature, and is by nature sinful. We do

not, therefore, make it our complaint against the *Church of Rome*, that its members have been influenced by rancorous feelings, and have persecuted those who came within their power, and would not bend to their will—but we complain against the *Church of Rome*, that she shall elevate those base and rancorous passions into principles of holiness. We complain that while the religion we profess inculcates the necessity of combating and putting down malignant principles—Popery, as it were, sanctifies them, and places them in her calendar to be worshipped. We complain, that priests shall have set forth as motives to animate them, praises of piety such as that of the sainted Ferdinand of Castile, in whom, as I read from the Breviary, which, remember, priests in the Church of Rome must study diligently and daily, “the royal virtues were conspicuous—magnanimity, clemency, justice, but above all, zeal for the Catholic faith and an ardent desire to protect and propagate its holy worship.” How was this laudable zeal displayed? In preaching? in convincing men of their errors, and leading them to the truth? Hear the answer which the Breviary gives, “This he manifested principally by his persecution,” the word is “insectando,” if its meaning be obscure, the context explains it, “By his persecution of heretics, whom he did not suffer to abide in any part of his dominions, and for whose punishment when they were condemned to the stake, he with his own hands carried the billets of wood by which they were to be burned.” We complain that such manifestations of zeal shall be set down in the calendar as royal virtues, as merits of saints, and that priests shall study them as the graces of their religion. We complain that some, whose names modern Roman Catholics are not very willing to pronounce with honour, whose doctrines they say are exploded, shall be found in the rolls of the saints to whom they must address their prayers, and that supplications are offered for instruction in their exploded theology. We complain, in short, not that Ferdinand, or Pius, or Hildebrand, were cruel and intolerant, but that their vices shall be considered holy, and that religion, from which we would hope a correction might be derived for the evils of man’s nature, is found to exalt them, thus constituting a principle of permanence for the most malignant passions which have disgraced man’s fallen nature. Of this we complain; that the intolerance which professors of other creeds declare to be criminal and disgraceful, the clergy of the Church of Rome are bound to regard as holiness, and that they must fashion

their hearts, and when opportunity serves, their conduct, according to its flagitious directions.

And what is the defence—the reply to our charges? This—that Protestants had enacted severe laws—that Protestants, who, as soon as the times permitted, relaxed the severity of the penal code—who of late days removed every restriction—are not to complain now, because there was a time when some who professed the Protestant religion, in their political difficulties, or because of political prejudices, had enacted severe penal statutes. We ask, does our religion justify persecution? And if it abhor all tyrannical assertion of power to restrain the rights of conscience, if, as Mr. Wyse, a distinguished Roman Catholic—one of the most distinguished of the present day—admits, when Protestants persecute, they violate their principles of religion, while Roman Catholics persecute without any such inconsistency,\* have we not a right to expect a calm answer when we ask, whether it may not naturally excite our alarm to see principles from which so dreadful consequences proceeded in time past, and which are rejected by all other societies of men, reinstating themselves among the codes of instruction in the Church of Rome, recommended by the example of saints, and set forth in the words of those who are accounted to teach wisdom.

But the charges against Protestant intolerance, what are they? Severe laws were enacted. When it is remembered that Dr. Doyle, although he condemned the severity of the penal statutes, felt himself called upon to admit that laws of exclusion from offices of trust, and even from the sovereign's councils, were just and necessary, (and this he declared before a Parliamentary Committee in the year 1825,) can we admit it for a moment as a matter of complaint, that the necessary restrictions were applied, or wonder that at a time when all

---

\* "Do you mean to say that Protestantism persecuted like Catholicism?"

"This is a confusion of terms. I say Protestants persecuted like Catholics, and not with half so good an excuse. The Catholic who persecuted, alleged that his religion was infallible—that there could not be two infallible religions—that all others were, therefore, false—that the first act of charity was to save the immortal soul—that this ought to be done at the expense of the mortal body; consequently he thought himself at liberty, reasoning from these erroneous premises, in employing the secular in aid of the spiritual arm, to bring about this desirable end. This was not the case with the Protestant."—*Political Catechism, &c.*, by Thomas Wyse, Esq. London: Ridgeway, 1829. Page 65.

the world was in amaze at the frightful persecutions which, with a perfidy unexampled, except in the Church of Rome, were exterminating Protestants in France, the exiled natives of that country who had obtained shelter in Ireland and here—and who anticipated (if the endeavours of James II. aided by France, were successful to effect his restoration,) an infliction of the calamities which had driven them forth as houseless wanderers upon the country where they had found an asylum; can it be wondered at—above all can it be imputed to Protestant principle, that they learned the wisdom which Popery in France had taught them, and suggested laws which bore a very mitigated resemblance of those to which they owed their afflictions?\*

I shall endeavour now speedily to bring my observations to a conclusion. But, long as I have trespassed upon you, a circumstance yet remains of interest sufficient to justify me in entreating a continuance of your attention. We are challenged to produce, in corroboration of the testimony of Mr. Coyne, the resolution which commanded him first to publish *Dens's* pestilent *Theology*. We cannot do this; we know not whether the resolution was ever published; we are confident it has been carefully concealed; and we believe that the call upon us to produce it, is indicative of weakness, and shows that the authoritative statement of Mr. Coyne is one which cannot be contradicted. We admit that we cannot produce the resolution; we offer, instead, the evidence of the official printer, and the silence of the authorised apologist.

But there was a resolution passed upon the day when *Dens* was adopted which throws a light upon its entire proceedings. That was the day when the Roman Catholic bishops adopted the resolution, *that they would not yield a veto to the Crown*; when, having consented to grant this privilege by their resolution in 1799—having offered it repeatedly by their advocates, and having, by these offers, conciliated much favour to their cause—disregarding all former pledges, careless of the injury done to the reputation of their friends—although Lords Grenville and Donoughmore had pledged themselves for them in the House of Lords, Mr. Grattan and Mr. Ponsonby in

---

\* See *Facts and Documents, &c.* a work in which original statements of great moment, illustrative of the political and religious history of the times immediately preceding the accession of William III. are carefully selected and arranged, with his accustomed ability, by the author, the Rev. Dr. Kenny, of St. Olave's.



the House of Commons—they resolved upon a course the direct opposite of that which they had previously declared to be just, and which they had found to be very expedient.

My Lord, there was much wisdom in the contrivance of these resolutions, one of which denied to the Crown the power of becoming satisfied that Roman Catholic bishops deserved advancement—the other provided a course of instruction for the priests, which was likely to render it a convenience that their opinions should be subjected to no such government supervision. I read for you the resolutions—that which was passed in 1808—that which had been passed in 1799—and I do not hesitate to affirm, that, considered in themselves, they indicate much wisdom, and that when the circumstances of the country are taken into account at the one period and at the other, the praise bestowed upon wise contrivance will not be less liberally awarded.

I read for you the resolutions as I find them in *Charles Butler's History of the Roman Catholics*.

Resolutions of the Irish prelates in 1799, in favour of the veto :—

“That in the appointment of the prelates of the Roman Catholic religion to vacant sees, within the kingdom, such interference of government as may enable it to be satisfied of the loyalty of the person appointed is just, and ought to be agreed to.

“That to give this principle its operation without infringing the discipline of the Roman Catholic Church, or diminishing the religious influence which prelates of that church ought justly to possess over their respective flocks, the following regulations seem necessary :”—

“Rule the 4th—‘The candidates so selected to be presented by the president of the election to government, which, within one month after such presentation, will transmit the name of the said candidate, if no objection be made against him, for appointment, to the holy see, or return the said name to the president of the election, for such transmission as may be agreed on.’”

The declaration of the Irish prelates that the veto was inexpedient :

On the 14th September, 1808, a convention of the Irish prelates met at Dublin, and came to the following resolution :—

“It is the decided opinion of the Roman Catholic prelates of Ireland, that it is *inexpedient* to introduce any alteration in the canonical mode hitherto observed in the nomination of the Irish Roman Catholic bishops, which mode long experience has proved to be unexceptionable, wise, and salutary.”

Is it not worthy of remark, that the resolution to withhold from the Crown what had previously been declared a just and necessary security—and the resolution to provide for the clergy such an instructor as Dens, should have passed at the same meeting? By the one, the sovereign was denied the power to satisfy himself that the bishops of the Church of Rome in Ireland were, or should be, loyal men—by the other, provision was made for ecclesiastics learning that they owed no respect or obedience to the laws of the country which protected them. Wisely the resolutions were introduced—both at a birth. Dens could not produce its full effect if the inconvenience of making proficiency in his doctrines were not remedied by removing all danger of government supervision; and, on the other hand, freedom from such influence as this, would be of only imperfect worth, if the vacancy and disengagement of mind it induced were not occupied and turned to good account by an instructive theologian. The priest who apprehended that loyalty to the sovereign was likely to be among the elements conducive to his promotion, might not be perhaps in the most candid mood to judge of the loyalty of his accredited director; and he who was freed from such fears might have his mind turned to other pursuits than those which it was desirable he should follow, if Dens had not been provided for his instruction. Thus rejection of the principle of veto, and adoption of the principles of Dens, appear to have very conveniently signalled the proceedings of a memorable day. By the one, it was declared that the Crown should not have the power to exclude from episcopal rank and influence an individual disaffected to the State—by the other, it was provided that the surest guide in theological studies was one which taught that an obstinate heretic should be put to death, and that ecclesiastics in the Church of Rome owed no obedience to the laws of Protestants.

We cannot deny to the contriver of this well-assorted pair of resolutions the praise of no ordinary wisdom. Were there nothing more to be regarded than the resolutions themselves, this praise should be awarded; but, considered in connexion with the state of England, and of Europe, at the time when they were passed, they evince at once a degree of sagacity, and caution, and enterprise, to which it is difficult for the language of encomium to do adequate justice. You have read and remember, perhaps, that memorable instance of forbearance and regard for his own people, which, at the request of Parsons and his associates, Gregory the XIII. yielded in favour of the

Roman Catholics of England. Pius the Vth had excommunicated Queen Elizabeth, released her subjects from their allegiance, and commanded her deposition. The subjects of the Church of Rome who were condemned to remain in England were embarrassed by the ordinance, and the reasonable apprehensions of the Government and the Protestant people were aroused. Parsons solicited a mitigation or explanation of the inconvenient decree, and it was granted by Gregory XIII., to the effect, that his predecessor's bull was always in force against the Queen, and obligatory on Protestants, but that members of the Church of Rome were to regard it as lying in abeyance, and were not required to execute its provisions until an opportune season. The spirit of this explanation appears to be embodied in the rule of distinction adopted in Maynooth as to what the church "commands, indulges, and tolerates"—external circumstances constituting the reasons for her abstinence or enforcement of law, for her imperfect or her more ample revelation of principle or doctrine. This reasonable accommodation to circumstances demands much skill in order to its being safely managed. Many a gallant nature would spurn at the necessary restraint, and display with the more boldness the inconvenient doctrine, because prudence and personal considerations required that it should be concealed. Again, many of tender conscience would regard the necessity of disguise as a reason to doubt, and, perhaps, arrive at the conclusion, that what it was not discreet to avow, may have been of the class which it was not honest to entertain in secret. According as men belonged to either of the great divisions into which the brave may be divided—the class which assumes as its legend, "what I dare do, I dare justify"—the class which adopts a reversed legend, "what I dare justify, I dare do"—so might the influence of prudential considerations operate; causing some to proclaim, some to renounce, opinions which it was not considered favourable to the interests of the Church of Rome to have made generally known. What was the resource of that church, so wise in its generation? To leave its children undisturbed with respect to those tenets with which it was dangerous to make them thoroughly acquainted. They knew that the doctrines of their church had been established by canons and councils. To these depositaries, they might, in a convenient season, be directed; out of these, at the proper time, the doctrines which suited the emergency might be summoned; but, in the meantime, intolerance, disloyalty, and su-

perdition, could be seen only through the softening influence of distance. When any hateful principle was too distinctly visible, it was said to be no longer in operation—it was no more than the monumental statue of the principle it represented—such a principle could not live in the light of modern times; it had seen itself reflected in the ægis by which the genius of an improved age is protected, and had experienced at the sight of its own hideousness the fate of its prototype in classical story. It was now an object of speculative interest to the antiquarian, of instruction to all, but no longer could awaken or justify alarm in any. Thus were the doctrines which could create alarm represented. They were objects in a kind of *tableau vivant*—their outlines distinctly marked, but all their members in repose, until the moment when it served the ends of the performance that they should move, and give proof that they had life as well as being. In the meantime, fair ostents of respect for law and morals were skilfully exhibited. To the Pope, the members of his church were to be obedient in spiritual things—to the monarch and the civil law, they were to yield a temporal obedience. What more ought a monarch desire? He might desire that the boundaries of temporal and spiritual obedience should be accurately defined—that the one region should not be under the dominion of conscience, and the other subjected to no higher control than that which prudence should impose: he might desire that temporal should not mean transitory.

The distinction served the purpose for which it seemed intended. All real obedience was given to the church—a show of outward honour was exhibited towards the state; and the show was so contrived that at any convenient season it could be discontinued. You remember the fabric which Lucian describes in his art of writing history—the name of the reigning prince was exhibited on a conspicuous tablet over its entrance; the architect's name was not so ostentatiously, but far more securely, graven beneath it. The superficial observer knew no more than his eye communicated to him; but he who was more thoroughly instructed, well knew that a day was to be looked for when the pageant of the royal name was to disappear, and give proof that it had been placed there for no other end than to protect the more venerated inscription beneath from the shock of all unruly contingencies. Was due discretion shown in the preparations for dislodging the more humbling inscription from the tablet of papal power of Ireland? You

shall judge whether the operations were well-timed:—In 1799, the bishops of the Church of Rome in Ireland resolved that the Crown should possess a veto on episcopal appointments. In 1808, they came to a resolution annulling their former act, exposing their advocates to shame, and denying to the Sovereign the privilege of knowing whether the bishop to be appointed by the Pope was one not disaffected to the law. How was England and how was Europe circumstanced at these respective periods? In the former, England had proved herself successful over domestic treason and against a foreign invader. A mutiny at sea had been attempted in vain, and a sanguinary rebellion had been put down under circumstances which combined the Protestants of Ireland into one body, and taught them that whatever were the professions or the principles of individual Roman Catholics, the principle of their church was hostility to Protestants and their religion. England had triumphed upon the waters, and was, it may be said, the moving and guiding power by which the civilized world was arraying itself in arms against revolutionary France. Germany, Russia, Turkey, Prussia, all were in the field, or arming their battalions to oppose what was considered the common enemy of all. In that day, the bishops of the Church of Rome in Ireland resolved, that England, the head of this mighty confederation should satisfy itself as to their loyalty—they resolved, in short, that a relation of amity should subsist between their Church and the Crown. In 1808, circumstances were changed; France was at the head of the confederated world, and confederated against England. Russia, Austria, Prussia, the whole continent of Europe, it may be said, with the exception, and scarcely the exception, of feeble and distracted Spain, acknowledged one head; that was one which threatened proud things against England—clouds and portents were thickening around her—trade threatened—her coasts threatened—the valour and might of her armies yet unknown; in all respects her condition was the reverse of what it had been when the bishops of the Church of Rome had favoured her; therefore, with characteristic and consistent discretion, they resolved to favour her no longer. They proclaim *Dens* the sure guide of theological studies; they remove the restraints which might have rendered his contraband importations unacceptable. They intimate that there is no longer an expediency in temporising with a menaced and struggling empire, and uncover the doctrines of their church, by which such tergiversation is rendered intelligible.

But in looking upon the aspects of the year 1799 and 1808, there is one circumstance, which, being unaltered, renders the contrasted appearances the more remarkable and instructive. Upon each occasion the Pope was in disfavour with the court of France. Upon each occasion, it might be said, the papal power was prostrate—but in 1799, the power of England was formidable, and it was wise to conciliate. In 1808, she was in difficulties, and though the Bishop of Rome would not declare war against her, the bishops of his church in Ireland adopted measures calculated to weaken and render less comfortable the relations of peace. They adopted a theology calculated to inspire intolerance and sedition. They removed the restraint by which its pestilent efficacy might be counteracted, and while in the tremendous conflict between anarchy and order, England stood to her perilous trust, unshrinking; forsaken, warred against by her once friends and confederates;—while she stood the champion of order and truth and liberty, undaunted, alone, and yet she was not alone, for God was with her; while she was earning for herself that deathless name by which history will hail her as the restorer of oppressed and insulted man—even then pernicious influences were busy within her own land; and when the victory was won, and the altars and homes of England secured against alien profanation, among her own subjects atrocities unparalleled in war challenged her to a more difficult duty than she had yet performed, and principles worse than those against which she had contended—more execrable than those of the hireling assassin—were found, among the perpetrators of these barbarous crimes, to be dignified with the name of religion.\*

---

\* The above observations apply to the circumstances of the time at which the *Complete Theology of Dens* was recommended as the best guide to the Roman Catholic Clergy. The season at which it was appointed a conference-book was not less memorable. It was animadverted on by the speaker, in letters which appeared first in the *Standard*, and which were subsequently collected and published in the form of a pamphlet, by Mortimer, Wigmore-street, London. The following passage is extracted from letter 3, p. 65, &c. of the pamphlet:—

“It would be unjust to argue, that in making the “*Complete Theology of Dens*” their conference-book, the Roman hierarchy and priesthood ascribed to that writer authority to decide in matters of faith. Such prerogative abides, they say, with infallibility. It is recognised in the visible head of their church, acting in accordance with those canons and councils which they have sworn to receive. And the announcement that *Dens* should guide the sacerdotal conferences, denotes an epoch in the history of the Church of Rome in Ireland, not distinguished by the adoption of a new rule of faith, or the setting-up a strange authority, but memorable for the marked and threatening character of the doctrines and principles, which, in the

Shall it be said that circumstances like these, and proofs such as we have offered, can leave a doubt on the mind of any rational man

year 1831, the most illustrious and most reverend rulers of that church *thought it seasonable to have drawn forth from a sheltering oblivion, and recommended to the especial attention of their clergy.* The political aspect of the period on which Dens was invoked to shed his influence, demands a moment's consideration, and will recompense the delay.

"Towards the close of the year 1830, certain Roman Catholic bishops in Ireland came to the resolution of making the Theology of Dens the conference-book for their clergy. The Rev. P. Woods, compiler of the Priests' Directory, informs us that, before that year, the questions discussed in the Dublin conferences had not been, as matter of course, adopted elsewhere, that 'by a subsequent arrangement, the bishops of the province of Leinster, four in number, agreed to have the same matter discussed at their respective conferences,' &c., and that "they judged it expedient to have a fixed order, and gave the preference to that of Dens." Mr. Woods continues, 'when the time for the publication of the Directory next following this arrangement was at hand, Dr. Murray announced to me that we were to discuss *the three treatises* on Human Acts, Sins, and Conscience, in the successive conferences of the following year, and that *the questions were to be taken in the order of 'Dens.'*" I resist the temptation to comment at any length on the confusion or the chicanery of this unintelligible statement. Does the rev. compiler wish his readers to understand that '*the three treatises*' proposed for discussion were not those of the professor from whose treatises on the same subjects the questions for conference were taken? If this be the meaning he intended to convey—if we are taught that in that lowest depth of iniquity disclosed by Dens, a lower gulph still opens, what are we to think of the instructions which can accept his dogmas as a convenient and desirable cover? How shall we judge that system which can parade the adoption of questions taken from the pestilent theology of Dens, and, notwithstanding repeated challenges, dare not name the more execrable work in which its ministers are directed to seek the answers? If, on the other hand—but I will not waste your time and abuse your patience—the subject does not admit of supposition and conjecture.

"In the year 1830 Ireland became agitated, and prudent men disturbed by exertions to effect a repeal of the legislative union. The following year opened with strong demonstrations of power and will to further this perilous project, Mr. O'Connell calling out the Volunteers and the national prejudices and feelings on the one side; government on the other, confronting him with such powers as parliament and law could supply; and men of all parties earnestly observing or ardently sharing in the fortunes of a struggle, which has ended in securing the point of honour for the government, and surrendering the positions of strength to the repealers.

"Of the condition of Ireland at the period when the struggle commenced, it is scarcely necessary to remind you. The apprehensions openly avowed by the organs of the press which have been regarded as the ablest and most intrepid advocates of liberal opinion, denote the extent of the difficulties and dangers to be encountered. 'It has been said that we,' the *Times*, 'raise a No Popery cry against O'Connell and the ambitious priests, his allies. Not so. But when a cry bursts forth that has 'no Protestant,' for its object, we answer it by an appeal to the hearts and arms of all who bear the name of Protestant. They have heard

that the theology of Dens is adopted by the Roman Catholic clergy in Ireland, because it is conformable with their opinions.

---

us—they are aroused,—we know it, and we shall soon dismiss our apprehensions.' The *Atlas*, too, of Jan. 23, 1831, from which the above is quoted, anticipates that 'one consequence of O'Connell's frantic exhibitions will be the revival, in greater strength than ever, of the *Orange Societies*.' 'We cannot,' it says, 'in the present peculiar condition of Ireland, raise an objection against the re-organization and active interference of the Orangemen.' 'Into this predicament O'Connell has plunged the people, that, were it not for insuperable religious obstacles, the Orange lodges would now boast of members drafted into their body from the higher order of the Catholics.' How would the writers have expressed themselves had they known that this period of disaffection and alarm, and religious intolerance, when the signs of the times influenced them to warn the Protestants of Ireland that they ought to be prepared and *armed*, was memorable for a revival, amongst 'O'Connell's ambitious allies,' of Dens's 'Complete' and most execrable 'Theology.'

"I shall add but one further testimony—that of the most distinguished of the four bishops who decided on making Dens the director of their conferences, I mean Dr. Doyle. While the advocates of repeal of the Union laboured, the friends of British connexion were not idle. Strenuous efforts were made on their part to check and discountenance the agitation by which the country was harassed; and, among other contrivances adopted for this purpose, declarations were put forth expressive of the opinion that the excitement created by discussions of the repeal question was injurious. It was, naturally, an object of desire that the Roman Catholic bishops and clergy should co-operate with those who laboured for the public peace; and, from their declarations previously to the removal of the penal disabilities, and expressions of gratitude when their claims had been granted, confident hopes were entertained that they would gladly avail themselves of the opportunity to prove the sincerity of their professions and acknowledgments. The confidence of the party who sought these proofs was the more assured, because they consisted almost exclusively of those who had been favourable to the principles of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill, and because the name of the Duke of Leinster, which stood at the head of the list of those who signed the declaration, was supposed to have a weight and authority which must give a prevailing power to the request it recommended. The Roman Catholic bishops and priests, almost, to a man, refused. They would not sign the instructive, and I may add, because of their refusal, abortive, Leinster Declaration. Dr. Murray, Dr. Kinsela, and Dr. Doyle, three of the bishops who, about that period, agreed on the introduction of Dens into their conferences, were applied to on behalf of the noble Duke, and returned answers to the application. Two sentences from Dr. Doyle's reply, will sufficiently indicate the spirit in which they were written:—'Being unable at present to judge whether the *repeal of the act of Union be practicable*, I think it better as yet to abstain from making any declaration on the subject.' In another passage, he warns the noble Duke, that, 'division at home may have the effect of leaving the remnant of our aristocracy naked and defenceless before a hostile population, or oblige them to look to the power of England (*a power less secure than heretofore*) for protection.' Dr. Doyle's letter bears date October, 1830. In the November of the same year, Sir Robert Peel, in the House of Commons, in a reply to a speech of Mr. O'Connell's, asked—'Would the hon. member stand up in th&



What could be counted sufficient proof if that which we have adduced be pronounced unavailing? If Dens supply the questions, where are the answers which should be appended to them? Is it in the Bible his followers are to seek them? No, for every Roman Catholic priest has sworn that he will not receive the Bible except in that sense in which the fathers have unanimously accepted it. And upon what Scriptures, applied to any peculiar doctrine of the Church of Rome, are these fathers unanimous? Where then shall the answers be sought? They must be gathered from canons and councils; from those documents which teach that oaths prejudicial to the church are perjuries; that individuals who dissent from its doctrines are worthy of tortures and death. They must be sought where the dogmas of Dens are revealed, in only more hateful, because more enlarged, dimensions. There is no escaping from the dreadful conclusion that every question proposed in these mysterious conferences must be answered in a spirit no less abominable than that in which the selected guide and guardian has thought his religion required him to reply. But there is another trial. Can they ask us to try them in their effects? Can they call upon us to look over the face of their country, and upon their people, and pronounce whether the doctrines taught by Dens have acquired influence and authority. Oh, my Lord, blood and perjury, and midnight conflagrations, and the shrieks of perishing victims, ingratitude and treachery, and violated engagements, and the wasting destruction of families upon whose holy lives and works God did seem almost to set the seal of his visible approbation, give back the terrible reply. What evasion can avail against these complicated proofs? I know not any. We cannot find it in the engagements of priests and bishops. They have sworn that they receive without a doubt the decrees of persecuting councils. We cannot find it in the conduct of the people whom they have instructed. You may know how the chosen of their gentry comport themselves here. You

---

house and say that his object was to procure a sober and temperate appeal from the Irish people to that house. The answer was on record: the hon. gentleman had told them that Ireland was *not yet ready to repel force by force.* At such a time Dr. Doyle writes that, on the 'vexata questio,' he is *not yet ready* to make a declaration; and, while he pronounces England less secure than heretofore, he is recommending to his clergy a book eminently calculated still further to diminish her security, sowing political disaffection in the hearts of such as should accept its instructions, and a most rancorous intolerance of all who differed from them in religion."

cannot be ignorant how those who are more submissive to obey, have conducted themselves in Ireland. And if you see in their religion, in old times, intolerance, and see its worst principles re-appearing at this day in the habits of its people—if you see that a means of communication has been provided, a channel cut to convey what was worst in ancient days, so that it mingles with what is most fearful now, will you believe that the continuance is an accident? (Cheers and clamour, with hisses.) It is not clamour like this which can be admitted as a reply. We show the doctrines which the Church of Rome has by her councils and canons proclaimed—we show the manifestation of her principles in the distraction and outrage of Ireland. We show the channel of communication (between the intolerance of ancient councils, and the foul crimes in which it now makes itself manifest,) provided in the appropriate volumes of Dens, and it is not the spirit which betrays itself in the absence of an authorised defender, and in the sallies of uncourteous disturbers, which can at all impair the strength of the proofs we have submitted to you. (Cheers and mingled hisses.) I rejoiced at these interruptions when I thought they expressed dissent from foul principles; I do not feel gratified at finding them the miserable substitute for argument; they possess me with a notion that I have rashly and too obstinately resisted the suggestions of an able and intelligent friend upon this bench, who unsuccessfully laboured to convince me that the principles of Popery were admitted by many, who, I thought, had rejected them. I have to express my sense of the courtesy with which some Roman Catholic gentlemen have signified their dissent from our statements, but I must make a broad distinction between their conduct and that which others have thought not unbecoming in them to adopt. It is mortifying to think that individuals, respectable in condition or education, shall stoop to act a part usually allotted to the basest hirelings—that, willing to offer themselves as champions for an accused church, and rejected by those who could give them authority—seeing that these superiors would rather have their cause abandoned than allow advocates to appear in their behalf, the individuals whose assistance they repudiate shall do themselves the dishonour of making the despicable attempt to disturb the meeting to which, under the professions of respecting the decisions of the chair, they obtained admission. It is a manifestation of the evil effects of a church which can train up such champions. It teaches how the heart may become so changed

that the natural instincts shall no longer govern it—that it may become so abased as to endure familiarity with what it would once have esteemed vile and hateful—that hearts shall become ruined by the destructive principles of a bad church, and become infested, as ruins are, by foul and detestable inhabitants. It is the characteristic affliction of the ruined works of man that they are thus infested : in their solitude—in the broken and fallen memorials of former grandeur, they are grand still ; but their recesses are the haunts of loathsome and venomous things, which come out and change the feeling in which they are viewed—the dragon and the satyr inhabit them. The human heart is not incapable of harbouring what is most revolting, and as we contemplate the aspect of the Church of Rome, and think of natures over which the desolating influence of its false creed has passed, we are not to marvel that hearts, and consciences, and judgments of right and wrong have been corrupted and confused, and that where this state of moral ruin has been induced, noxious and venomous things shall crawl out into the light and hiss. Mr. O'Sullivan concluded amidst long-protracted cheering, by moving the following resolution :—

“That the concurrent testimonies of approved standards of faith in the Church of Rome, and of the conduct and character of Roman Catholics, confirm our conviction that *Dens's Complete Body of Theology* was adopted as a conference-book by bishops in Ireland, because it was in conformity with their opinions.”

The Rev. Mr. DALY then rose, at a quarter to four o'clock, and was loudly cheered on his appearance, he spoke as follows—At this late hour I shall not trespass for any lengthened period upon the attention of the meeting. I have brought with me a large mass of documents and evidence of various kinds, to which, had I risen at an earlier hour, I intended to have called your attention ; but at present I feel not only that it is unnecessary, but that it would be unsuitable to do so. I shall, therefore, simply advert to one or two features of the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, which, in my opinion, it is important to place before an English auditory. I am sorry to say that this is a time when there exists an indifference as to discrimination between truth and error. I would give the most unqualified toleration to every man's opinions ; but at the same time, I would, in the spirit of free discussion, ever desire to maintain God's truth against the errors and superstitions of men ; and the same liberty which I ask for myself to discuss with God's Word in my hand, God's truth, that same I ever

would desire to be freely given to others—yet, I also desire to raise my loudest protest against infidel and absurd principles, the consequences of which are present injury and everlasting destruction to those who maintain them. My reason for desiring to be allowed to enter my protest against the doctrines of the Church of Rome is, that in my conscience I do believe them to be destructive to the souls of men, and adverse to the present peace and present comfort of society. As I said, that although I have a mass of materials, it is my intention to be very brief; I will at once proceed to the first point which I mean to notice. There have been allusions made to the “immorality” of the Church of Rome; and I am happy that we have left such a foul subject; but I will give you the “morality” of the Church of Rome, and I hope that if, during the few moments for which I design to trespass upon you, you will give me your attention, you will be led to feel that the Church of Rome is a bad guardian in whose hands to place the education of the population of a country, with any expectation that under such tutelage they will be led to “the rest that remaineth the people of God,” and the “righteousness that exalteth a nation.” I will now proceed to read you a few sentences on the morality of the Church of Rome, as we have it exhibited in *Dens's Theology*; and while I take the extracts from that book which seems to have been placed in a position of peculiar prominence on the present occasion, I beg to say that I firmly believe that in them there is nothing but the genuine, though abominable, doctrines of the Church of Rome. I turn to that portion of the work which treats of “mortal and venial sin;” and I am prepared to prove that if ever there was a system framed with the deliberate intention of training up men in the way they should not go, such an one is to be found in the doctrine of the Church of Rome of “mortal and venial sin.” Let me observe, however, before I proceed, that it is sometimes difficult to convey exactly the meaning of the original by a simple translation into English; and that I shall, therefore, occasionally use the terms of art which are employed in the Latin, explaining, of course, the sense which I attach to them. In the following extract the terms *vitium* and *peccatum* are used to signify two kinds of sin—the former expressing not what we call vice, but an habitual inclination to sin; and the latter expressing the individual act of sin:—

Vol. I. Page 264. “What is *Vitium*?” “*Vitium* properly and theologically is defined, ‘a habit inclining *ad peccatum*;’ whence *ritium* is distin-

guished from *peccatum*, as the habit from the act. *Vitium*, however, and *peccatum* are often taken for the same."

"Which is worse, *peccatum* or *vitium*?" (the act or the habit.) Now, if I were to put this question to the present meeting nine-tenths of them would answer—"the habit"—the evil fount within—the source from which all evil comes. Not so, says the morality of the Church of Rome. (A person here cried out, "those are not the doctrines of the Church of Rome.")—The Rev. Gentleman continued—I have heard a good deal of "Protestantism" from my Roman Catholic brethren this day. I heard some of them protesting lustily against the canons of the Council of Trent, and now I hear some one protesting against *Dens's Theology*, and, like a true Irishman, before he hears what it is. To resume, however. The question which I last heard was, "which is worse—*peccatum* or *vitium*?" and the answer is given upon the authority of St. Thomas, who is the Pope that never dies; I believe they call him the "Seraphic Doctor"—I beg his pardon the "Angelical Doctor," as my friend reminds me. It is this—

"With St. Thomas, quest. 71, art. 3, *peccatum* is worse than *vitium*, because it is worse to act badly than to have a propension, or habitual inclination to acting badly. In a certain respect, however, *vitium* is worse than *peccatum*; because the habit lasts longer than the act, and may be the cause *plurium peccatorium*," (of many sins.)

Now, I say, that *vitium* is worse than *peccatum*—that it is worse to have an habitual inclination to act badly, than to be betrayed by circumstances into acting badly.

"How is *vitium* opposed to *virtus*?"

"*Vitium*, as it is a bad habit, is opposed to *virtus*, which is a good habit.

362. "What is mortal sin?"

"It is that which of itself brings spiritual death to the soul, inasmuch as, of itself, it deprives the soul of sanctifying grace and charity, in which the spiritual life of the soul consists."

That is the definition which I should give of all sin.

"The aforesaid definition of mortal sin is a *posteriori*, or from the effect; it may be defined a *priori*—a sin grievously repugnant to the order of right reason, and eternal law.—Likewise, a sin turning away from its ultimate end, or from God."

363. "What is venial sin?"

"That which does not bring spiritual death to the soul; or that which does not turn away from its ultimate end, or which is only slightly repugnant to the order of right reason.

363. "It is moreover certain, not only from divine compassion, but from the nature of the thing, that there are venial sins, or so slight ones, as in just men may consist with a state of grace and friendship with God."

That is to say, there is a certain kind of sin of which a man may be guilty without offending God. (Loud cheers, in the midst of which a person in the body of the meeting began addressing a question to the speaker, saying, "I would ask ——," but his voice was drowned in a renewal of the cheers.) The Rev. Gentleman observed, that as he had only a very short time to address the assembly he could not wait to be catechised. The individual in question persisted, however, in attempting to make himself heard until, on the order of the Noble Chairman, and in accordance with the general cry of the meeting, a policeman was proceeding to turn him out of the room; he then ceased, and was allowed to remain on his promise not again to disturb the proceedings.

Mr. DALY continued reading—

"It is proved from Sacred Scripture—Proverbs, xxiv. 16—it is said, 'the righteous man falls seven times'—James, iii. 2. 'in many things we offend all;' which sentences are understood of just men. Again, Matthew, chapter vii. some sins are compared to a mote; and, 1 Cor. iii. 10, to wood, hay, and stubble; therefore, they are of their own nature slight or venial." See other places of Scripture, and of the holy fathers on this matter in *Estius, in secund, dist. 42, sec. 4.*

"It is proved also from reason.—In every society some slight offences occur, which do not dissolve friendship:—therefore, such exist in the society and friendship which man has with God. Again, every sin does not take away order to the ultimate end; therefore, every sin is not mortal."

Then again, in page 365, to show further the evil of this system, it is said—

"Although mortal sin differs much from venial—yet by the testimony of *St. Augustine, book 21, 'De Civitate Dei,'* chapter 37, it is very difficult to discover, and most dangerous to define, what is mortal sin, and what venial; so that '*Encheiridii,*' chapter 78, he says—'They are to be weighed not by human, but by divine judgment.'"

I really do think, that an "infallible guide," who cannot point out to man how to exercise that which is offered to him as his best privilege, of incurring a certain extent of guilt, without sinning, is rather strange; it is the blind leading the blind, and both will fall into the ditch.

"And these remarks are especially true, when we would determine particularly what is mortal or what is venial sin.

"However, some rules are every where assigned by theologians, by which it can generally be discovered what sins are in their own nature mortal or venial. Steyaert assigns these four:—

"The first is taken from Sacred Scripture.

"When Scripture speaks of any sin in severe terms—that is to be considered mortal. For example: if it calls it *scelus nequitia, iniquitas, abominatio*, or says that it is worthy of death; hated by God; that it excludes from the kingdom of God; that it cries to heaven; if there be prefixed '*væ,*' &c.

"On the contrary, that sin is considered to be venial, when Scripture uses milder expressions, as if it uses the word '*mote,*' '*stubble,*' '*hay,*' &c.; or but slightly blames it, as Proverbs, x. 19.—'in the multitude of words there wanteth not sin;' and Matthew, xii. 36—'Every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give an account thereof in the day of judgment.'"

368. "What sin is said to be venial in its own nature?"

"That, which in its own account cannot be mortal, unless the malice of some other account be added. Thus, an idle word is of its own nature a venial sin; also a jocose or officious lie, excess in laughter, in joy, or sorrow, vain curiosity, &c., are of their own nature venial sins, because, unless the circumstances of some other account be added, they cannot be mortal.

"What sin is called venial on account of imperfect deliberation, or imperfection of the will, or as St. Thomas says, on account of imperfection of act?"

369. "1st. That which of its own nature is mortal, but in this act here and now is only venial, through defect of sufficient free will. Those that are venial in this way are the first motions of luxury, hatred, &c.; also, distraction in reading the *Hore Canonice* through slight negligence, a violation of fasting through ignorance or inadvertence, which might have been overcome, thoughts concerning an object morally bad without full consent, &c.; such also are motions of hatred, affections of homicide, &c., in those half asleep.

"In every matter, or in every kind of sin, can sin be venial from the imperfect deliberation of the act?"

"2d. In this state of fallen nature it seems to be affirmed so; however, some except hatred of God; but although that cannot be excused from mortal sin by ignorance, which must be very great, yet it may be so from other causes, for example, by vehement passion imperfectly considered, by inadvertence, &c.

"From what causes can any mortal sin happen to become venial on account of imperfection of act?

3d. "From those which can diminish free will, as inadvertence, ignorance, passions, fear, or any other defect of conduct. The rules given, No. 116, in *dubiis consensus*, may be applied here.

"What sin is called venial from the smallness of the matter?

"That which of its own nature is mortal sin, but in this act here and now is venial on account of the smallness or lightness of the matter about which it is concerned—thus, the theft of one penny is venial from the smallness of the matter: also detraction in relating a defect not much to be blamed—a trifling excess in drinking—a voluntary distraction in a small part of divine office, &c.

"Is not an idle word venial from the smallness of the matter?

"No—for though its matter be small, yet it is not called venial from the smallness of the matter, but of its own nature, that the division of the three kinds of venial sins may be observed.

"From whence can it be collected that many *matters* of sin coalesce?

370. "The thing is explained by examples—many small matters of theft being taken coalesce, in order to constitute a great sin of unjust detention, or injury of a neighbour. Likewise, on the same fast day often to eat some small thing; on the same fast-day often to perform light servile works; often, in divine office of the same day, to be a little distracted voluntarily, or to omit some small part—all coalesce respectively into one great matter.

371. "Are the single acts, by which it is thus come to a great matter, so many mortal sins?

"To distinguish—If any one from the beginning by many small or minute things means to come to a great matter, he sins in each act mortally from the beginning, according to the greatness of the intended matter, because every small thing proceeds from the will or affection towards a great matter, as the act commanded from the act commanding. Meanwhile, it may be remembered that, although he who, for example, from the beginning intends by small thefts to arrive at a notable sum, in each act of theft, sins mortally; yet, there does not lie upon him the obligation of restitution under mortal sin, until he arrives at a notable quantity.

"But if any one does not intend to arrive at a great matter, he then only shall sin mortally when he perceives, or can and ought to perceive,



that he has arrived at a great matter, whence his former acts shall be venial sins from the smallness of the matter; but the act, by which the great matter is filled up, is a mortal sin, because that last act is thought to be about a great matter, inasmuch as the former matters coalesce with the last, and so, by willing the last, he interpretatively at the same time wills the former matters. Hence, also, all following acts will be mortally bad.

“Do, therefore, the matters of small thefts, or injuries committed during the time of a whole life, coalesce?”

“More probably so, except, meanwhile, some injuries be repaired, pardoned, or made amends for, according to the intention of the owners, by alms; for men are not accustomed to require so exact a restitution of small injuries, but are considered to pardon in turn those very small things after the fact, or, at least, to agree that after their intention they may be given to the poor; and, therefore, pious men often give to the poor some alms even from this intention that they may make satisfaction, if by chance they owe any thing to any one. Observe, then, that injuries repaired, pardoned, or made amends for, do not coalesce, because they no longer in any way exist.

“Others say, that in order that small injuries or thefts may coalesce, it is required that they be morally continued, so that if they be separated by a long interval of time, they cannot constitute one whole.

372. “When do small matters not coalesce?”

“When they do not pertain to the same numerical precept, or the transgression of a precept morally one. Thus, if any one every day in Lent takes some small additional refreshment—if any one on different fast days performs a small quantity of servile labour, or, on different days neglect some small part in the canonical hours, in these or like cases, small matters do not coalesce, because they do not pertain to the same numerical precept, but to one virtually multiplied; similar precepts affect singular days in particular, and expire together with the day.

“Much less do matters coalesce when the precepts are altogether different; as if, when a fast-day coincides with a feast-day, one may perform some small servile work—may take some small quantity of food beyond what refreshment required, and may omit a small part from the mass and canonical hours; because those precepts, though they concur together, are not, however, more connected with one another than if they successively obliged, and so such a one only sins venially,

“If any one often slightly exceeds in drinking, those slight excesses do not coalesce in reason of the sin of drunkenness, because, although they oppose the same precept of temperance, they have not respect, however, to a transgression morally one; the reason of which seems to be, because they do consist in a permanent thing, and so cannot coalesce into one matter.

“Those slight excesses can, however, coalesce in reason of loss of health or family; because in reason of loss they are something permanent.

“The lives and characters of distinct men do not coalesce, according to No. 96; and hence, slight injuries or detraction of different men do not constitute mortal sin, but many venial sins.

“But yet, many slight injuries of the character of the same man, community, or family, seem to coalesce; and so if those small injuries, taken together, constitute a very heavy loss, a mortal sin has been committed. The same may be said of many slight blows, by which any one at length much injures the body of another.

“A case of error, making a venial sin mortal. A boy of ten years of age confesses with fear and anxiety, that he is a thief, and that he once stole one piece without the intention of stealing another.

“Let the confessor ask, Do you think that you did a great evil, and that you sinned mortally?

“Boy: Yes: I think I did a great evil, but I do not know what is mortal and what is venial sin, for I never heard.

“Confessor: Do you think that on account of this alone you would go to hell?—and did you form that judgment before you stole, that all who steal one piece of money ought, therefore, to go to hell?

“Boy: Yes; because all thieves go to hell.

“Confessor: Then you have sinned mortally against your conscience but now say, that stealing one piece is not of itself a mortal sin.”

He might also ask that boy if he thought this theft to be the greatest sin that he had committed in his whole life; if he says it is, it is a sign that he labours under an erroneous conscience.

“This erroneous conscience is sometimes found in boys about the theft of one penny.”

I vow very deliberately that if ever it were the intention of Satan to frame a system by which he should train up a youth in the way to lying and thieving, he could not possibly invent a better system than this. I declare it with grief, but I am convinced, sorrowfully convinced, and many in this room will agree with me when I make the assertion, that it is the character of the Irish people to be given to lying, and to be given to theft—(a faint attempt at hissing, which was answered by cheers)—and I ask you where does the sin lie?—at whose door is the guilt? I say it is with that church which would tell a boy of ten years of age that he was labouring under “an erroneous conscience” if he thought that he had been guilty of a great sin in stealing a single piece of money. I

remember once passing in my own neighbourhood, and meeting two children with whom I was acquainted—wishing to take notice of them and to say something, I asked where they were going? They said that they were going to a neighbouring village to buy candles. I was passing on, when I saw them whispering and talking together. I began immediately to suspect something wrong, and again asking them where they were going, I enjoined them to tell the truth. Their answer was, that they were going to a garden to buy cabbage. Those children were unconscious of the crime they had committed in uttering falsehoods—they had been trained up in the belief inculcated by the doctrine of Dens, that there is no sin in telling an officious lie which hurts nobody. If it were desired to invent a system for training the young in dishonesty and falsehood, surely it would not be necessary to do more than say that little sins at the beginning were venial in the sight of God. Why, the heathen poet had a better morality than the Church of Rome, when he said, *principiis obsta!*—stand at the very beginning! I am very sorry indeed that we should have to send this Christian Church to heathen Rome to learn morality. When, therefore, I hear the principle laid down that the Roman Catholic priests are the fittest and best instructors of the Roman Catholic people, I feel assured that, of those who venture to assert it—who would give up the population of Ireland, bound, to the hands of the priests, to be taught nothing but what the priest would teach them—the majority are not aware of the viciousness of the morality taught in the Roman Catholic Church. I say not one word about its immorality; but here I raise my voice in solemn protest against its morality, and the imparting of it by way of instruction to the people. This is, let me say, a most important subject at the present time, when it seems to be conceded, on all hands, that the Protestants are to enter into a combination with the Catholics of Ireland to keep the Scriptures, which would teach better things out of the hands of the Catholic population of Ireland. That, I must take the opportunity of saying, is the real principle of the present system of national education in Ireland; for, according to that system, it is the rule to give them no Scripture for six days of the week, and on the seventh to give them as much as the priest chooses to afford, which (if I may be permitted to use an Irish bull) will be less than none. I have in my hand an account of some of the schools under the existing society: I will just read the statements

relating to a few of them, and it will be seen that, bad as are its principles, there is a sort of Roman Catholic faith (if I may use the expression) exhibited in the carrying them into execution. (The Rev. Gentleman then proceeded to read the following accounts, concerning different schools in Ireland, under the Board of Education :]

“FERMOY SCHOOL.—A well-built school-house—teachers, Roman Catholics—salaries £50, grant £35.—Roman Catholics, 515, Protestants, 2; board-books in use, also *Butler's Catechism*, and a small book entitled ‘*Think well on it.*’

“MACROOM SCHOOL, BUILT IN CHAPEL-YARD.—On entering this school I found the master (Roman Catholic) explaining and repeating some of the prayers, collects, and acts of faith, hope, &c., of his prayer-book to all the children, collectively, although it was not his day of religious instruction. In the female school I found several copies of *Gahan's Bible*. They never received the Scripture lessons—Roman Catholics 501, Protestants 30.

“LOTA SCHOOL.—A neat but very small school-house, teacher, Roman Catholic—salary £12, grant £8—Roman Catholics 46, Protestants 0. One copy of Scripture lessons of Old Testament; Roman Catholic Catechisms of various sorts, *Doyle, Butler, &c.*

“TULLOW FEMALE SCHOOL.—In entering this the children must pass through the chapel-yard; in fact it is in it, but divided by a door, &c. Board allow £25 per annum. Roman Catholics, 300, Protestants, 0. No Scriptural lessons. *Dr. Doyle's Catechism* in hands. This is entirely in the possession and under the direction of Nuns.

“TULLOW MALE SCHOOL.—This is entirely in the hands of Monks. Board give £13 for fixtures, and allow £20 per annum. The Monk attending when I made my visit was an extremely ignorant poor man. They have not a single copy of Scriptural lessons. *Dr. Doyle's Catechism* in hands. Roman Catholics, 185, Protestants 0.

“RATHOR SCHOOL.—This school is built on a plot of ground allotted for the erection of the Popish chapel, but cannot be said to be in the chapel yard. Master, Roman Catholic; seems a steady man, but in knowledge not very extensive. Roman Catholics, 98, Protestants, 0. No Scriptural lessons.—*Doyle* is in hand.”

In conclusion, I would submit that it is of the utmost importance that the Christian Protestants of England should consider whether they will be in any degree connected with the giving over of the population of Ireland, and shortly the giving over of much of the population of England, to such instruction as is to be afforded them by

priests, who have been exercised in *Dens' Theology*? It signifies nothing whether or not that book was printed as a private speculation—it was printed in Latin, and must therefore have been intended for the priests. Three thousand copies were sold at once, and then another edition of the same number. It is clear that the Romish bishops sanctioned and patronized its publication, the poison is in circulation; and as surely as it reaches the priests it will get to the people; and the principles which it contains are those in which the people of the country are to be educated. The Rev. Gentleman then seconded the resolution, and sat down amid loud cheering.)

The resolution was then carried, and the meeting broke up.

---

A day or two preceding the second meeting at Exeter Hall, viz., on the 9th of July, a letter was published in the *Dublin Evening Post* and other papers, from Mr. Maguire, Roman Catholic priest of Ennis-magrath. It is worth preserving for three reasons—

First, as a specimen of the style of a Priest, who has been considered as the foremost controversial champion of Popery. It shows the tact by which they endeavour to get rid of specific charges by trying to cause a diversion.

Secondly, as the letter is alluded to hereafter, it is right that the reader should see it.

Lastly, it is an important relic when taken in connection with the fact, that the writer when subsequently taken at his word, and met in controversy by the Rev. T. D. Gregg, fled from the determined and resolute exposure of the horrible and disgusting abominations of the very book *Dens's Theology*.

It is taken from the *Morning Register*, July 11th, and is introduced as follows :—

“A CHALLENGE—FATHER TOM MAGUIRE.

“We have already announced the meeting to be held on the 11th, at Exeter Hall, on the subject of Doctor Peter Dens. We find by the following letter, that it is the intention of the Rev. T. Maguire to meet the disputants, provided they can screw their courage to the sticking-place either at Manchester or in London :—

“Leprosi ergo non absurde intelligi possunt, qui scientiam veræ fidei non habentes, varias doctrinas profitentur erroris. Non enim abscondunt imperitiam suam

sed pro summa peritia proferunt in lucem, et jactantia sermonis ostentant.—  
*St. Augustini, lib. 2. quest. Evang. cap. 40.\**

“LORDS, REVERENDS AND WOULD-BE REVERENDS—I owe you no apology for the publication of this letter—your late “fantastic tricks, before high Heaven,” your crusading proclamations, scandalous calumnies, reckless falsifications, time-killing speeches, and hypocritical challenges, at Exeter Hall, will account for it sufficiently to yourselves, and more than justify it to the British public. Had you confined your holy horror, your whining, but not very shining, denunciation to the carotid-artery-cutting principles of Peter Dens, as you affect to believe them, your clipping and pruning of that luckless author, your distortion of his meaning and suppression of his subsequent explication, had probably passed away without censure by escaping public exposure. But since your political detestation of Popery—religious you entertain none—has stultified you into a clumsy attempt to identify the religion of Catholics with the syllogistic lucubrations of ‘Mr. Peter,’ I shall inflict upon you that salutary castigation which your theological knavery, and logical quackery, have so long and so richly deserved.

Firstly, then, I challenge your leaden-headed chairman, ‘A noble fool, the noble tool of knaves,’

to meet me either in London or Manchester, with the choice of his Exeter-Hall champions, on his most convenient day of the last week in this month, and make good the charge against Dens, of justifying the murder of Protestants, or of any Sectarians whatsoever, and the charge against Catholics of holding intolerant principles. Now, although my religion, as a Catholic, rests as much on the authority of Peter Dens as on the authority of Joannes Scotus, or Joannah Southcote, but not a whit more, I pledge myself to the British community then and there to meet your boldest advocate, and to convict him of designing calumny against Dens and the Catholic world. I further bind myself to prove, perhaps to the surprise of my hearers, but assuredly to the confusion of my adversary, that the doctrine of Transubstantiation is a direct revelation of Jesus Christ—and if your hero will shrink from the controversy, Englishmen can appreciate his motives. I have volunteered a defence of this dogma in particular, because of all our articles of Catholic faith, it is the most vulgarly abused, the most commonly assailed, and the most grossly misrepresented by your ablest writers. Now, here are two separate actions in which your best of warriors have every possible opportunity of *attack*, whilst to me is only granted the partial privilege of *self-defence*. Secondly—As the Divine right of private judgment is the keystone that binds the grand arch of Protestantism, I must be permitted in my turn, to try the enemy’s resources in *defence* of this, his only entrance to the last “City of Refuge.” These are the

points to be discussed. The following are the terms :—Six English, or Irish, Catholic gentlemen, to be chosen by you, and six English Protestant gentlemen of the Church of England to be chosen by me. The foreman to take the chair. The audience to be admitted as at the Dublin discussion. When the discussion shall have terminated, the twelve jurors declare individually, upon their honour, who had the best of the disputation. The verdict of the majority to be final and decisive. There will be no difficulty in arranging minor preliminaries with me. Requesting a reply at your earliest convenience,

“ I remain your most obedient servant,

“ T. MAGUIRE, P.P. Ennismag Rath.

“ Dublin, 4, Capel-street, July 7, 1835.

“ P.S.—I shall meet none but a Church of England Parson, except the Noble Arcadians—the intellectual Kenyon, and the immaculate Roden. The Parson must not be an apostate.—The spiritual lofty Lord of Exeter is specially invited.

“ Lest—a thing not unlikely—our reverend and profane friends, noble and plebeian, at Exeter Hall, may not be conversant with the Latinity of St. Augustine, we subjoin a translation for their special benefit.—

“ These, therefore, are not absurdly called lepers, who, not having a knowledge of the true faith, make profession of various doctrinal errors. For, instead of concealing their ignorance, they seek to palm it on the public for consummate knowledge, and make an ostentatious display of their oratory.”

---

The day of the second meeting in Exeter Hall was remarkable for being the date of a letter from the Rev. Patrick Woods, the compiler of the *Priests' Directories*, in which that gentleman professes to give a simple candid detail of facts, and his evidence tends not a little as will be seen in the details of these volumes, to throw light upon the subject—it was addressed to the Editor of the *Dublin Evening Post*, as follows :—

“ 79 Marlborough-street, Dublin, July 11, 1835.

“ SIR—Although I have hitherto preserved silence on a subject in which I was personally concerned, I have not been altogether inattentive to passing events. I judged that I was much more suitably engaged in discharging the duties of my station, than in grappling with calumnies so often refuted ; and my first impression, on reading a report of the proceedings at Exeter Hall, was, that no notice should

be taken of them—and that, though, ‘unjust witnesses had risen up’ against the church of which I am a minister, ‘iniquity would’ finally ‘lie to itself.’

“The *Evening Mail* has, however, transferred into its columns some editorial observations of the *Standard* London newspaper of last Monday evening’s date, in which frequent allusion is made to a ‘Directory’ which I annually publish for the use of the clergy, and through which an attempt is made to fasten certain opinions and principles upon my ecclesiastical superior, and the respect I feel towards his exalted person and character induces me to place before the public a plain and simple statement of *facts*.

“I shall not stoop to notice the unworthy observations of the *Standard* on Catholic oaths. I shall not distort facts, nor indulge in coarse invective—neither shall I attempt to stir up the passions and prejudices of the people against my Protestant brethren and their doctrines. Before I received the imposition of hands, the directors of my collegiate course carefully informed me, that I was about to become the minister of *Him* who was ‘meek and humble of heart,’ and that I was not only to preach, but also to practise ‘*before all things, mutual charity*.’

“In the course of the year 1828, the Most Rev. Dr. Murray laid his commands on me to compile the *Priests’ Directory* for the following year; a request which has since been annually repeated. Now, this *Priests’ Directory* is neither more nor less than a clerical almanac, distinguishing Sundays and festivals from ordinary and week days, and announcing the mass and office for each day throughout the year; it also contains the names of the Catholic bishops throughout the British dominions, and some other information interesting to the clergy. But the calendar only is compiled *by order* of the archbishop; and to prevent collision between charitable institutions, and for the greater convenience of the clergy, it is his Grace’s *wish* that the arrangement of the charity sermons and the questions for discussion at the conferences should also find a place in the *Directory*. These are the only authorised portions of that publication, and the printer or myself, or both, may prefix or append any matter we think convenient or useful. Mr. Coyne is not empowered or employed in any way by Dr. Murray to print or publish the *Directory*—that respectable and worthy individual has hitherto printed and published it in consequence of a private agreement between him and myself. When I was named to compile the *Directory*, the questions for discussion for Dublin *only* were prepared by me, every other diocese had its own matter for conference. By a subsequent arrangement the bishops of the province of Leinster, four in number, agreed to have the same matter discussed, and the same order observed in discussion at their respective conferences. The person who furnished the questions before me was understood to have



followed the order of Antoine; my education at Maynooth gave me a bias in favour of the treatises most familiar to me, and I adopted that of Bailly. The provincial bishops, however judged it expedient to have a fixed order, and gave the preference to that of Dens. When the time for the publication of the Directory next following this arrangement was at hand, Dr. Murray announced to me that we were to discuss the three treatises on *Human Acts, Sins, and Conscience*, in the successive conferences of the following year, and that the questions were to be taken in the order of Dens. Some of the clergy had been previously complaining that they did not know whence the questions were taken, and to obviate this difficulty as well as to avoid being taunted with having set down for discussion, matter which the priests might consider useless, light or trifling, I honestly gave in crotchets at the head of the questions, the name of the author from whose work I had taken them by command. Of this Dr. Murray knew nothing until the Directory was printed and put into his hand. Nay, further, he never desired me to publish the name of Dens, nor to announce it to the clergy. He proposed that author to me for my guidance in preparing questions; he did not name any book whence the clergy were to gather their solutions, and he publicly declared so at a full and numerous attended conference of the metropolitan clergy. Dr. Murray has nothing to do with Mr. Coyne's catalogue, which is bound up with the Directory for the purpose of circulation. It derives no authority from this circumstance; it is neither more nor less than what it professes to be—'a catalogue.' Perchance his Grace never cast his eyes over it. But what is the whole upshot of this monstrous discovery? First, The Catholic prelacy of Ireland approved of *Dens's Theology* in the year 1808. More than a fortnight ago the editor of the *Freeman's Journal* was authorised to state that no such resolution was ever passed at a general meeting of the Irish bishops. He did so, and called for the proof of this alleged approbation. It is not yet forthcoming. Secondly, 'Dr. Murray confirmed the acts of the bishops of 1808 by a new approbation in 1832.' This his Grace has emphatically denied; 'but he approved of an eighth volume, and thereby sanctioned the foregoing seven.' When the new edition of Dens was nearly ready to issue from the press, it was suggested to Mr. Coyne by a friend that a volume, *not at all by Dens*, (as the advertisement in the Directory clearly shows,) would prove a useful supplement to the forthcoming work. Dr. Murray was already aware of the value of the information contained in this proposed supplemental volume, and he gave his sanction to its publication, without reference to Dens, or any other work. What more? 'Dr. Murray made Dens a conference book.' So says the printer's advertisement, and very fairly too (it has served the sale of the work *within the last few weeks.*) But Dr. Murray

says *not*, and he said so before his assembled clergy in 1831. Which is the better authority on the subject? If the opinions of any one private theologian were to form the standard of our belief and practice, what necessity for 'discussion?' If we had a *conference book*, then why publish questions? The same prescribed book which would furnish the answers, would also give the questions, and the bishops of Leinster had but simply to state that the clergy would be interrogated from page 1 to page 10, in vol. — of *Dens's Theology*. We have merely adopted the order followed by Dens, and we shall, God willing, continue to do so. It is true that he maintains some obsolete opinions, which nobody holds at the present day; but are we, therefore, to reject the useful matter with which his work in many places abounds? While I write, I have a book before me which professes to record the doctrine of Coke, the celebrated jurist, on *heresy*—I have not his works in my possession, but I am referred by my author to 'Inst. iii. 5.' If he be truly reported, I never read any thing more intolerant in Dens; and this Sir Edward Coke was Attorney General to Queen Elizabeth, and a great luminary of the British bar in the reign of that princess; and will any one pretend to say that the lawyers of the present day hold his opinions on this subject, because they read his works, and that he is to be exiled from their studies because he maintains an opinion now exploded, but too commonly held and acted upon in the age in which he lived. Perhaps the *Standard* would do me the favour to reply, at its leisure, to the following questions:—Why was *London* selected as a theatre for a late exhibition? If the Rev. gentlemen who spoke on that occasion felt all the anxiety they expressed for the spiritual regeneration of the Irish priests and people, why did they not bring the words of salvation *home to our doors*? The Rotundo in Dublin is just as commodious as Exeter Hall, in the sister capital. Was the constitution or character of that meeting such as to induce Catholics to suppose they should obtain an *impartial* hearing? Was it *fair* not to have previously announced the charges to be brought forward against our religion? Was it *kind* to invite us over to London, and not to name the *pious fund* on which we were to draw for our travelling expenses?

"When the *Standard* shall have condescended *satisfactory* replies to these interrogatories, I shall be more convinced than I now am of the purity of the motives which dictated this recent *ruse de guerre*.

"I have the honour to remain,

"Your very obedient, humble servant,

"P. WOODS."

The notices of this letter will appear in their proper place

On the 16th of July the subject was canvassed in the House of Lords, and from the character and station of the Peers spiritual and temporal who spoke on the occasion, most especially from the luminous speech of the Lord Bishop of Exeter, the Editors gladly refer to the *Mirror of Parliament* of that date.

On the 17th of July, the following letter was addressed in the *Times* to Mr. O'Connell:—

“ TO DANIEL O'CONNELL, ESQ. M.P.

“ SIR—There are many questions of theory in which confident assertions may delude a multitude, and bitter violent invective may weaken or deter an opponent. A man in political power may despise reasoning, may bluster through opposition, may scoff at truth, and triumph in falsehood, and he may be permitted to continue in such a course as long as the weakness and folly of a nation shall allow its interests and its institutions to be at the mercy of profligate and speculative ambition. But when great questions arise as to facts in which, unless a nation is actually abandoned by Divine Providence to judicial blindness, it must see that it can no longer remain passive; when facts are brought to light which prove that liberty, and property, and religion, and life are at stake, it is a dangerous experiment for a politician who is involved in the disclosure to substitute assertion and vapouring abuse for at least some decent attempt at reasoning and investigation.

“ If false accusations be alleged against him or any of those with whom he is connected, it must strengthen his hands exceedingly to examine and expose them. If, on the contrary, truths be brought forward which, if substantiated, entail on him and his associates a deep complication of treachery and perjury in fact, and of still deeper crimes in principle, he can hardly expect to put it aside by a pretended scoff or a vituperative affectation or disdain; he will only provoke where he expects to deceive. Men will more easily forgive even an attack on their liberties, than they will pardon a deliberate insult to their understandings.

“ You may call men ‘mountebanks,’ and even Mr. Henry Grattan may inflict on them the heavy censure of his denunciations, and call statements ‘false as hell,’ but you are aware that every coal porter on the wharf could use epithets as severe, and arguments as convincing; and respect for the House of Commons obliges me to add, that from such an individual they would at least be more in character.

“ But now, sir, what is the fact? Permit me to request your patient attention to it. I can assure you the attention of thousands, and tens

of thousands, is fixed on it, and will now be directed to you, to see what course you will pursue.

“ A number of Irish clergymen, of whom the only insignificant individual is the person who subscribes this letter, published an address to the Protestants of the United Empire, in which they state that they will come forward on a certain day and prove before the nation, in a public assembly, by authentic documents, that the standards adopted and the principles inculcated by the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Ireland are of the same intolerant and persecuting nature that formerly characterized their church. They invite the Roman Catholic hierarchy to stand forward and meet this charge, either by themselves or their delegates. You, as their foremost champion, are specially invited by a letter in the *Standard* to come forward and meet it on their behalf. The case was very simple. It was only to prove that the documents produced were not genuine, or to prove that they did not contain the principles alleged, or that they had not been in use among your hierarchy and priests; the day arrives,—the clergymen appear at their appointed post,—they produce the documents, the documents exclusively of your own priests,—they read the questions appointed for their private conferences by their bishops,—they read the answers in the books appointed by those bishops for those conferences. It appears on the face of the documents, that those bishops appointed and those priests discussed the right and duty of compelling all of us whom they please to call heretics to return to the faith of Rome, even by corporal punishments,—the assumption of a despotic authority over the conscience, property, and person of every man who had ever been baptized as a Christian in any church—the right and duty of extirpating the worship of our religion, and of persecuting us whenever a convenient occasion should present itself, by confiscation of property, exile, imprisonment, and death. These facts were laid before a meeting of nearly 5,000 persons; no one was authorised to contradict them.

“ The statements were published, the documents referred to were all laid before the public, and perhaps no report of any meeting ever obtained a greater degree of publicity or excited a greater share of attention. A number of noblemen and gentlemen in London, feeling anxious that these important facts should be brought out more clearly before the nation, appoint another day for another public meeting; it is fixed at an interval of three weeks; the meeting is announced in the public papers; a letter is written to Dr. Murray, your archbishop, who was particularly implicated in the charge, referring him to the documents, calling on him to disprove them if he could or to depute any person; you were particularly named to him as being on the spot to come forward and do so in his place; he writes, mean time, a letter to Lord Melbourne denying the charge, but totally unable to meet the

examination of the documents that prove it. The day of meeting arrives—5,000 people assemble—no person is authorised to meet the documentary evidence, and no unauthorised person, you must be aware, could be admitted. Dr. Murray's letter is examined—fresh documents are produced to prove that it is totally impossible the statements contained in it can be true—questions of his own diocesan conferences, signed with his own name, are produced, taken from that book in many parts verbatim, in several, in regular successive order, in all, directly by expression or implication, which in his letter to Lord Melbourne he declares he never used as a conference book. He denies on his oath to Lord Melbourne the principles of a particular bull, which he proved on his oath, or at least in his evidence before a Committee of the House of Commons, was in force in Ireland, and which, on the testimony of his own bookseller, is now published under his express sanction and authority. The absurdity of the hierarchy of an infallible church being dependent on the caprice of a bookseller for their conferences was clearly shown—the evidence of their own authoritative directory being proved to corroborate that of the bookseller, and, in short, the very existence of the questions of conference corresponding with the answers of the conference-book from which they were taken, set the matter totally beyond contradiction in the estimation of every honest man who has ears to hear the facts, or sense to comprehend plain common statements.

“Now, all this you meet with affected contempt; you call four clergymen mountebanks, and imagine you can blind the public by a pretended sneer at the text-book of your faith—Dens's Theology.

“Now, sir, you shall be put to the test, and we shall see whether this arises from a real fear to encounter facts, or an effort to get rid of that which you dare not meet. You have an objection to exhibitions in Exeter-hall, perhaps with some degree of justice. Let us see now if you will meet the case before another and a more responsible tribunal.

“I challenge you now, sir, in the face of all England, to meet these charges, if you are able, under the following circumstances;—Choose any one or two men, priests or laymen, to stand beside you, and you shall be met by either two or three of those whom (where you know they cannot meet you) you call mountebanks; select on your side two English lawyers, and we will select two more; let those lawyers on each side choose respectively six members of the House of Lords and six of the House of Commons, that will give us fourteen persons on each side, and let them choose a chairman. Now, I challenge you to debate before this select body of noblemen and gentlemen of talent and professional skill this question, which is not a question of theology, in which we might be supposed to have an advantage, but of plain legal documentary evidence, in the consideration of which you are thoroughly practised.

“ You know our line of argument, you have yourself all the documents that we have brought forward, for your priests’ directories have been sent over to you, providentially, for some other purpose, and are lodged in evidence before the Orange committee. I sent over the questions of printed conferences which we have, and they have been compared with the directories in the possession of your committee, and authenticated as being exactly the same by Mr. Maxwell and Mr. Finch ; therefore you have all the documents in your own hands,—directories, questions of conference, Coyne’s advertisements, and Dens’s Theology. Now I challenge you, if you are able, with all your practised skill and legal knowledge, and powerful eloquence, to debate this question of fact on documentary evidence before this tribunal,—whether Dens’s Theology was ordered to be printed, as Coyne states, by all your bishops, in 1808, and set up as a conference book for the province of Leinster, from the year 1831 to the present year ? Reporters shall attend to preserve the debate for the public, and the tribunal shall pronounce their opinion on the facts laid before them and the arguments advanced. Now, sir, recollect—“ he that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved ; but he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God.”

“ I am, sir, a faithful friend to truth and to liberty of conscience of all classes of men,

“ London, July 15.

“ ROBERT J. M’GHEE.

“ P. S.—Being obliged to leave town, you can make any communication through the public journals. Permit me to remind you that I have done my duty—the nation shall see how you are prepared to discharge yours. We shall no doubt, be ready to accommodate each other as to the minor arrangements of time and place.”

---

As it will tend hereafter to place the facts in clearer light, it is useful to show the steps that were taken by certain Roman Catholics of respectability in consequence of these meetings. The following letter was addressed to the Editor of the *Morning Chronicle*, to show the effect which the first meeting had produced. It is from a very respectable Roman Catholic Barrister in London :—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MORNING CHRONICLE.

SIR—I shall feel particularly obliged by your having the goodness to give insertion to the following letters :—

7, New Palace-yard, Westminster, Thursday.

“ SIR—As chairman of a meeting of Irish Roman Catholic gentlemen, who assembled yesterday, at No. 7, New Palace-yard, I beg leave

to transmit to you a copy of the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted :—

“ Resolved—That the chairman be requested to write to the chairman of the committee appointed to arrange the second Protestant meeting at Exeter Hall, claiming for Irish Roman Catholics the privilege of defending themselves against any imputations which may be cast upon their principles and conduct.’

“ Amongst the regulations which have been drawn up for the management of the meeting at Exeter Hall, I find it stated that no member of the Church of Rome shall, upon that occasion, be permitted to speak unless authorised by some one of the Irish bishops of that church, whose signature either of the London Vicars Apostolic shall attest !

“ In reference to this conditional prohibition, I beg leave to submit, for the consideration of the committee over which you preside.

“ That truth, justice, and reason, have no necessary or natural dependence upon commissioners or authorizations of any sort.

“ That if it should be holden that *any* authority is necessary to entitle the Roman Catholics of Ireland to defend themselves against the horrible imputations which have been cast upon their principles and conduct, it must be admitted *a fortiori*, in all justice and reason, that some authority is necessary for the justification of those persons who have made, and are about to repeat, those horrible imputations.

“ That those persons have not hitherto shown, specifically or distinctly, under what authority they have acted, or whether they have acted under any authority at all.

“ But that as no Irish or English bishop of the established religion was present at the first meeting, it is fairly to be presumed that in no part of the empire had the prelates of the establishment given any authority or sanction whatever to the proceedings of that meeting.

“ That no person illuminated by even the faintest glimmerings of common sense could for one instant have seriously entertained the expectation, that the Roman Catholic Bishops of Ireland would abandon their homes and their duties, upon the mere suggestion of a very few of their most inveterate enemies, and present themselves before a numerous assembly in the city of London, where they would have been subjected to personal insults of the most unwarrantable description.

“ That the same considerations which would prevent the Irish Roman Catholic Bishops from falling into the extravagant absurdity of conferring their personal attendance upon such an occasion, must also prevent them from delegating *any* clerical representative in their room, and that the notion of their authorising *any* layman to vindicate the truth of their theological tenets would be the most unimaginable absurdity of all.

“That the ‘Condition Precedent,’ upon the performance of which *alone* the Roman Catholics of Ireland are to be admitted to enter upon their own defence, is a self-evident impossibility: and that if the persons under whose controul the proceedings are to be conducted, shall persevere in requiring the performance of a condition which is incapable of performance, they will afford to the world the most unmistakable evidence that the object of originally imposing the condition was to prevent the possibility of any discussion at all, and to secure to the persons who are to address the meeting on Saturday next an unrestricted opportunity of disseminating the most horrible calumnies through the medium of the grossest delusion.

“I have the honour to remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

“DAVID LEAHY.

“To the Chairman of the Committee appointed to arrange the Second Protestant Meeting at Exeter Hall.”

“Exeter Hall, July 10, 1835.

“SIR—Having laid the letter which you addressed to the chairman of the committee for the arrangement, before that body, I have the honour to state in answer by their direction.

“‘That no charge has been made against the Roman Catholic laity of Ireland.’ The advertisement shows that the statements to be made to the meeting go merely to affect the tenets of the Roman Catholic Bishops and priests, as set forth in certain authentic documents. These statements being made by clergymen, and abundant opportunities having been given to the Roman Catholic hierarchy to meet them, either in person or by any individuals authorised by them, the committee cannot see any reason to depart from the rules of the advertisement, by permitting any persons unauthorised by them to address the meeting.

“I am, Sir, yours obediently,

“David Leahy, Esq.”

“NADIR BAXTER.

“Although I may rely upon common rumour and unquestionable notoriety for the most abundant illustrations of the cool veracity of the passage in the letter of the committee, which is requested, yet I hope I shall be excused for troubling you with a few short extracts from the report of the proceedings of the former meeting, which report has been published at No. 9, Exeter Hall, and at the houses of those booksellers who have issued the tickets of admission to the meeting.

“The Rev. Mortimer O’Sullivan is represented in that publication (page 39); as stating that according to the doctrines of the Church of Rome as inculcated by the Irish Roman Catholic clergy, ‘all the obligations of religion—all the impulses of honour—all solemn engagements—all private interests—all respect for the laws, and all fear of dis-



grace were to be set aside and trampled under foot at the command of the Pope. That the state of Ireland proved that the endeavours to disseminate these doctrines had been ruinously successful" (page 39.) That the resistance to the payment of tithes in 1830 had risen out of Dens's Theology, and that that robbery of the Established Church had been produced by communicating the doctrines of Dens "through the convenient secrecy of the confessional" (page 40.) That in the same year, "just before its shortest day had come, there was an active manifestation how these speculative doctrines produce an influence over practice" (page 41); that this "active manifestation," so produced, "through the convenient secrecy of the confessional," was the dreadful massacre of Carrickshock (same page.) "That when such morals have spread through such a people as the Irish, it was not to be wondered at that so many dreadful murders should have been committed" (page 42); that "the mass of his (Mr. O'Sullivan's) countrymen of the Roman Catholic persuasion entertained no remorse at the shedding of blood, no scruple of conscience at the commission of perjury" (page 42). "That perjury of the most naked and deliberate character had been specifically committed by the five-and-thirty Irish Roman Catholic members of Parliament" (pages 43 and 44). "That equivocation was the herald which announced the uprising of the Church of Rome, and that perjury and murder were the attendants that followed in her train" (page 52). Whether these be or be not "imputations upon the Roman Catholic laity of Ireland," is a question which I submit for the consideration of the candid, charitable, and enlightened audiences of Exeter Hall. The clergymen who figured upon the former occasion, have taken much credit to themselves for the wonderful discoveries which have resulted from the "disinterment" of *Dominus Dens* out of the corruptions of the tomb in which he had been so long deposited. For my part, I am humbly of opinion that the greatest discoveries which have been made upon the present occasion are the two very notable ones which have been made by the committee of management; namely, in the first place, that the most admirable method of discussion is to prevent the possibility of hearing more than one side of the case; and, secondly, that to charge the Roman Catholic laity of Ireland with the actual and habitual commission of robbery, perjury, and murder, is to "make no sort of personal imputation upon the Roman Catholic laity of Ireland."

I have the honour to remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

DAVID LEAHY.

Nothing could have been more absurd, than to permit Mr. Leahy or any person unauthorized by those directly implicated, to have entered into a debate on the case. It would merely have afforded an opportunity to the Popish and Radical press, to have diverted the public attention from the great facts laid before them, to have pretended that

certain excuses and apologies had been made, which were conclusive evidence in favour of the Popish Bishops, and to have quoted the speeches of Mr. Leahy and such gentlemen, without ever giving publicity to the answers, as they subsequently did in the case of Mr. Carew O'Dwyer, printing his speech at Brighton, and suppressing that of Dr. O'Sullivan.

On the first of August, the following letter was published in the *Standard*, dated 28th July:—

“ MORE PROOFS OF PETER DENS.

‘ Vires acquirit eundo.’

“ TO THE PROTESTANTS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

„ DEAR FRIENDS AND BRETHREN—It is of the utmost importance to the protection of all that is dear to freemen and to Christians, to the preservation of your civil and religious liberties, that your attention be firmly fastened on those facts which have been recently brought to light by Divine Providence respecting the Church of Rome. Remember Dens's Theology is not a novel, which is to figure in your newspapers for a few days, and then to be forgotten. Recollect, you have laid in this book before you the principles, the secret principles, which actuate those men who are now the virtual rulers of your country, who turn the scale in the balance of that legislative body which is now almost the sole arbiter of your freedom, and the freedom of your children. Recollect, that the worst and most abominable principles of perjury, treachery, intolerance, and persecution—of keeping no faith with you as heretics, of violating all oaths when it may conduce to the good of the church, of exterminating, whenever opportunity shall serve, the rites of your worship, of compelling you by corporal punishments to embrace the superstitions of Popery, and that those punishments are exile, imprisonment, confiscation of property, and death—Recollect, I say, that these principles have been brought before you as actually constituting the secret conferences of the Popish bishops and priests, at least of one province in Ireland, at no later period than the year 1832, and of having been the standard adopted by all the bishops for 27 years past. Remember that this has been established on clear, unanswerable, documentary evidence. Recollect that the bishops and priests of the Church of Rome, though invited to come forward to impeach that evidence, or disprove it, have not dared to make the attempt. Recollect that O'Connell, trembling, as he is, lest you should be stirred up to raise the cry of ‘No Popery’ to crush that domination that he is exercising over the men that call themselves the represen-

tatives of British freemen—recollect, that though challenged to meet the charge in the public assembly, he dared not attempt to encounter it. Recollect, that though challenged now to debate the case before a select body of lawyers and members of parliament, and that the debate should be printed for your information, he skulks in apprehension from the trial, and does not dare even to notice it. Recollect these facts, brethren, and learn to prize every document that serves to accumulate evidence on the subject. You know very little as yet of the atrocious principles contained in *Dens*; these will appear in proper time; the point for you now to dwell on is the fact of its adoption as the secret standard of the Popish hierarchy of Ireland. Let nothing divert your attention from this simple fact; and when this is once thoroughly made known to all Protestants of all denominations, and most especially to those whose religion these very Popish bishops and priests are now attempting to subvert, you will then be prepared to consider whether your liberties and your religion are to be bowed down beneath the despotism of papal tyranny and superstition, or maintained with the principle and resolution of British subjects, and of Christian freemen.

“Mark, brethren; there are now six documents before you to establish this fact as to this book.

“The first document is the catalogue of Mr. Coyne, the Roman Catholic printer and bookseller, in which is the fact stated, that he reprinted this book by an express order from the whole body of the Roman Catholic bishops in 1808, and that he printed another edition in 1832, because Doctor Murray and the three bishops of the province of Leinster had made it the conference-book for that province; and that he added an eighth volume under the express sanction and approbation of Dr. Murray.

“The second document is the *Priests' Directory*, printed under the immediate authority of Dr. Murray, containing the actual questions of conferences for the priests, and having the questions of conference since the year 1831, when Coyne states it was set up, down to this very year, exactly corresponding in regular successive order with the chapters in *Dens's Theology*, and proving to the most perfect demonstration the truth of Mr. Coyne's statement.

“The third document is the book itself, not only corresponding on the questions of conference, but actually bearing the dedication to Dr. Murray, and containing the words in that dedication, ‘*Hanc secundam editionem Theologiæ Petri Dens, ejus cum approbatione susceptam,*’ &c.

“The fourth document is an article in the *Weekly Freeman*, published June 27th, in Dublin, and which article Mr. Woods, the compiler of the *Directory*, informs us was published under authority, and is therefore worthy of notice.

observe, that whether considered in reference to the individuals whom he addresses, or the mode of his address, his challenge is such as to entail on it deserved neglect, not to say contempt, from gentlemen, much less from ministers of the Gospel, who never can meet any one on the ground of vulgar abuse; but even if his challenge were couched in decent language, it could not be accepted. First, because it was on a subject totally different from that on which the charge was brought against the Roman Catholic bishops and clergy; he never hinted a wish to meet the facts that Dens's Theology was adopted as a standard by all the bishops in 1808, and adopted as a conference book for the province of Leinster in 1832.

"Secondly—Because, as the specific charge was brought against certain individuals, who were invited to meet it by any persons whom they chose to appoint, Mr. Maguire had no sort of title to be heard without such authority, even had he attempted to meet the point in question, instead of trying, as he did, to divert public attention from the fact by a stupid bravado on subjects not connected with it.

"Lastly—Any challenge from Mr. Maguire to the clergy of the Established Church is a gross piece of impertinence, under any circumstances. He had the presumption to attack the Bishop of Exeter for a speech, in his official capacity, delivered in the House of Lords in the year 1833, in which his Lordship made some remarks on the idolatry and superstition of the Church of Rome. Mr. Maguire challenged the Bishop to meet him in Manchester or Liverpool, which he well knew the Bishop could not possibly do. His challenge was published with great parade in the papers, and placarded and cried about the streets. It was met: the charges of idolatry and superstition were most distinctly reiterated against the Church of Rome; her falsehood and incompetence to maintain her pretence of being an interpreter of the Scriptures was set forth; and he was challenged to find any one or more priests to stand forward with him to expound the Epistle to the Romans, and prove how his church interpreted that portion of the sacred volume; or, if he could not do this, to give an interpretation of his own, and to reconcile her superstitions and idolatries with the Word of God. This challenge, as well as Mr. Maguire's, was published in the Roman Catholic papers, cried about the streets, and sold in the shops; yet Mr. Maguire never ventured to notice, much less accept it; and now, at the end of two years, when a specific charge is made against the bishops of the Roman Catholic Church on another subject, and they are invited to send their priests to meet the charge, Mr. Maguire steps forward, unauthorised by the persons concerned, and, in an insolent, blustering tirade, endeavours to blind the eyes of the public, and to turn their attention from the

fact, by a mock challenge about something totally different from the point at issue. Had Mr. Maguire been chosen by the bishops to meet the facts of the case, it were certainly due to them to meet any person whom they had appointed; and, in this case, even Mr. Maguire had been privileged to appear. But I would remind that gentleman, that the questions at issue are of some higher importance than he seems to consider them—that there is another tribunal besides that of Manchester or Birmingham, or Exeter-hall, where these things are to be brought into judgment—where the unconverted sinner shall shrink appalled—and where sophistry and assurance shall perish in the light of eternal truth. I would warn him, before it be too late, to prepare to meet that Judge before whom he may be summoned—he knows not the hour; and I would tell him, that as surely as the Bible is the record of the living God, it were better for a man ‘that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he cast into the depths of the sea,’ than be found a minister of that ‘Mother of harlots and abominations of the earth,’ whose principles are well exhibited in the depths of their iniquity in the moral and dogmatic theology of Peter Dens. Trusting that Mr. Maguire may be delivered from that corruption, and from that death which must be the end of all who trust in vain superstitions, instead of in the Saviour of sinners, I shall take no further notice of that gentleman.

“ I now proceed to Mr. Woods. He has a most ample right to be heard and answered on the subject. Some parts of his letter, referring generally to the facts that have been established at Exeter-hall, require notice in the English papers, and must receive it there. There are some of more immediate reference to other matters, which are more properly to be treated of in the Irish papers—I allude to the five questions which that gentleman proposes to the *Standard*, and which it is our province to answer. He asks—

“ First—‘ *Why was London selected as a theatre for the late exhibition?*’

“ I answer, first—Because London is the theatre where Popery, with the hollow professions of liberality and toleration on its lips, perjury branded on its brow, and persecution raging in its heart, is blinding the mind of England, and aiming its blows at the religion and liberties of the Protestants of Ireland; and not only of the Protestants, but of the Roman Catholics, who value the rights of conscience, and desire free access to the Scriptures for themselves and their children.

“ Secondly—Because the best champions of Popery, in the persons of Mr. O’Connell and the gentlemen commonly called his tail, were in London on the spot; and it was most important to prove both to Protestants and Roman Catholics, that while he insults the Protestant clergy in the House of Commons, he dare not stand before a public

assembly when challenged to meet them, and to meet those facts that prove the real character of the Church of Rome—that Protestants should see the falsehood of the professions of Popish liberalism, and that all honest Roman Catholics should see, that while Mr. O'Connell brags and begs from them, under the pretence of being always ready to defend them, he really shrinks back like a coward, when brought boldly to the test, before the nation.

“ Mr. Woods's next question is—

“ ‘If the Rev. Gentlemen who spoke on that occasion felt all the anxiety they expressed, for the spiritual regeneration of the Irish priests and people, why did they not bring the word of salvation *home to our doors*? The Rotundo, in Dublin, is just as commodious as Exeter-hall in the sister capital.’

“ I answer—

“ ‘First—That the point in question, as to the adoption of Dens' Theology, by the Roman Catholic bishops, as their standard, was not brought forward on the doctrines of the salvation of Roman Catholics, but on points mainly affecting our liberties, properties, and lives. But I grant, and I trust sincerely feel, that the salvation of Roman Catholics is deeply involved in the principles held by their priests, as exhibited in Dens's Theology, and I think there is much justice in Mr. Woods's appeal, and I shall give it, please God, that consideration in the press, for my Roman Catholic countrymen, which its vast importance deserves.

“ Secondly—With respect to the Rotundo, I grant it is very convenient, and if Mr. Woods, who enjoys the confidence of Dr. Murray, and who has proved himself so competent to throw light on this question, will prevail with the Doctor to appoint himself, and any other one, two or three priests in the province of Leinster, or any where he pleases, to meet the facts, I am ready, and so are my brethren who have spoken with me at Exeter Hall, to stand forward, and meet those priests so authorised, in the Rotundo, whenever they please; and the documents we shall produce are those precisely which we have produced in London and which are now known to Mr. Woods and Dr. Murray. The only one I shall ask the favour to add to the list is, the letter from the pen of this Reverend gentleman himself, as strikingly confirming all the facts of the case.

“ His next question is—

“ ‘Was the constitution or character of that meeting such as to induce Catholics to suppose they should obtain an impartial hearing?’”

“ If the Reverend gentleman refers the term ‘*impartial*’ to the feelings of the meeting, it is natural to suppose that the feelings of a Protestant meeting would be partial to Protestant ministers; but if he

refers it to the propriety and the attentive consideration with which that meeting would have listened to Roman Catholic advocates, I confidently affirm that they would have been heard as fairly and impartially as any Protestant who spoke; and if not, the report of the fact in the press would have only told against the persons who had refused them a hearing. The meeting certainly would not hear men who came to brawl, to interrupt the speaker, and to violate all decency, and the very rules printed on the tickets, by which they had been admitted; but the same rules that ought to have prevented such indecent interruptions, had secured an attentive hearing to any who came authorised to speak on the Roman Catholic as well as on the Protestant side. But if Mr. Woods was apprehensive that he could not obtain an impartial hearing at Exeter Hall, and prefers the Rotundo, we shall be happy to divide the tickets for a meeting there with that gentleman, that he may give them to our Roman Catholic friends. We have no fear that when they see us ready to do ample justice to the case, and to give Doctor Murray and his brother bishops every fair opportunity here, as we gave them, if they had chosen to avail themselves of it, in Exeter Hall, they will not grant us an impartial hearing. Irishmen like to see fair play; and it is not for those who desire, as we do, openly and honestly to tell them the truth, and to serve them and do them justice, to be afraid of them; but it is for those who beguile them and deceive them, and then shrink back from the honest light of day, and who fear to vindicate in public the principles they inculcate secretly—it is for such men as these to fear all honest men among the Roman Catholics of Ireland.

“ Mr. Woods next asks—

“ Was it fair not to have previously announced the charges to be brought forward against our religion ?

“ I answer, that they were announced; the very first document that appeared in the press, bearing the signatures of twenty clergymen, announced that the charges to be proved were, ‘ that the standards adopted and the principles inculcated by the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Ireland, are of the same intolerant and persecuting nature at this day, that are well known to have characterized their church in former times’—these were the words. Was not this a fair annunciation of the charges? and if not, if Mr. Woods complains that they were not sufficiently announced before the meeting of the 20th of June, were they not stated with sufficient clearness before the meeting of the 11th of July? Was not Mr. Woods aware of them? Was not Doctor Murray aware of them? Was not Mr. O’Connell aware of them?

And if they were not informed of them then, I believe they are at least informed of them now ; and why do they not refute them if they are able ?

“The last question Mr. Woods asks is—

“‘ Was it kind to invite us over to London, and not to name the *pious fund* on which we were to draw for our travelling expenses ?’

“This has a two-fold edge ; it is a cut at us for taking care to procure from some ‘*pious fund*,’ the payment of our own expenses, and for not evincing the same consideration for the Roman Catholic priests. Now, to this I answer, First, I say, as a minister of truth, that one shilling of the expense of any one of us was never defrayed by any individual, or from any fund, except from our own pockets. Doctor Cooke was in London at the time of the first meeting—Mr. O’Sullivan was there at both ; they had, therefore, no expense to be defrayed. Mr. Daly’s purse is often open to others, instead of drawing from others for himself ; and I most solemnly say I never received a shilling for the purpose from any quarter. And now I say to Mr. Woods, that it was suggested to me to offer to pay the expenses of the priests, and I was restrained, not from a feeling of unkindness, but rather of delicacy, towards them. I thought they might consider it an affront, to offer to defray their expenses to defend their religion, from charges which disprove its title to the name of Christianity ; but since I see I was in error, I now offer to Mr. Woods, that since these charges have been brought, in London, at Exeter Hall, he and his bishops shall have another opportunity, if they choose, to meet them there. They shall appoint a day, and if Doctor Murray chooses to delegate Mr. Woods and any other two priests, they shall have fifty guineas each to bear their expenses there and back again, and the only fund on which I have to draw is, that I shall inform my Protestant brethren of their acceptance of the offer, if they choose to accept it, and request of them to supply me with the means of fulfilling my engagement. Hoping, Sir, that I have satisfactorily replied to the *questions* of Mr. Woods, and that his *arguments* shall be sufficiently answered in another channel,

“I have the honour to be,

“Your obedient servant,

“R. J. M’GHEE.”

The interest which had been excited in London by the plain demonstrative evidence of the adoption of such a standard of theology



for the Romish priests of Ireland, rapidly extended throughout most of the cities and towns of England; and if the Editors could have given their time to accept of the numerous invitations they received from every quarter, to hold public meetings, they might have proceeded through the length and breadth of England. This, however, was impossible—they could only attend to a few of their most pressing applications, and the next public meeting was held by Doctor O'Sullivan, at Worcester.

# GREAT PROTESTANT MEETING

AT

## WORCESTER.

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 10<sup>TH</sup>, 1835.

---

\* Monday saw one of the most imposing meetings of the inhabitants of this city and its neighbourhood that ever assembled within its walls. The meeting was held in the Town-hall, and long before the time fixed for the opening of the proceedings, every avenue to the room was blocked up by persons of the most respectable station in life, in endeavouring to procure seats. No meeting can be remembered in the city at which so numerous and highly respectable an assemblage was known to attend.

At one o'clock, the gentlemen conducting the business of the meeting entered the room, and upon the motion of the Rev. G. Benson, Richard Spooner, Esq. was called to the chair.

MR. SPOONER, having taken the chair, said that when he considered the solemnity of the subject upon which the meeting had assembled, and the motives which had brought them together, he was sure they would agree with him in thinking it most fitting that they should follow the example of other similar meetings, and open their proceedings by prayer.

The Rev. G. BENSON then read an appropriate and impressive prayer, after which the business commenced.

The CHAIRMAN, in rising to explain the object for which the meeting had been convened, begged to be distinctly understood that they were assembled for no party purpose whatever. The meeting was convened with the single view of strengthening the cause of Protestantism, and exciting among Protestants greater zeal and activity in maintaining the great principles of the Reformation. Into an exposition of those principles he should not enter, nor should he attempt to explain the urgent necessity of such meetings as the present,

---

\* Report in *Worcester Guardian*.

because both those tasks would be ably performed by the Reverend gentlemen about him. One point, however, he must allude to. He felt it only right to state, that upon this occasion he should not have consented to preside had he conceived that the meeting pointed at any individuals of a peculiar religious persuasion. To encroach upon privileges of any kind was not their wish. All that was asked by him, and those who acted with him, was the right of private judgment, — a right which to others they had never been reluctant to concede. Such was the true principle of Protestantism. Such they had always been willing to concede to the Catholics, though how far that principle was admitted by the Catholic Church, he would not pretend to say. Unprejudiced by any narrow motives, and influenced in no small degree by the recent events in parliament, he had at once consented to take an active part on this important occasion. He had alluded to parliamentary proceedings, and he felt necessary to do so considering their connexion with the important interests at stake. When he found that the House of Commons had passed a measure declaring that the surplus revenues of the Irish Protestant Church should be appropriated to other than Protestant ecclesiastical purposes, he had no hesitation in affirming that the time had arrived when it was incumbent upon those who respected the religion so nobly obtained for them by their forefathers, who respected that establishment under which toleration had been so liberally extended, who venerated that church which had been the means of successfully conveying religious instruction to themselves and their countrymen, to withstand with their utmost energy so dangerous and pernicious a principle. If the members of the Protestant Church had for it any feelings of gratitude, it was, at a crisis like the present, impossible for them to be silent. It was their duty to stand forward, and to exhibit their determination that no further measures of spoliation should be directed against the Protestant Church. It behoved them not to pass over the party by whom such measures of spoliation had been pressed forward. They should recollect that the majority which agreed to the affirmation of the principle in question was not a majority composed of English representatives, but of men who, he was compelled to say, had violated the solemn engagement of an oath, and ventured upon interference with subjects from which, by their own agreement, they had been absolutely and unconditionally excluded. It might indeed be suggested that these individuals explained away

this charge, and that they conceived the oath to be framed with such latitude as to justify them in the steps they had adopted. But that position he denied. To refute it he need appeal only to the evidence of their authorised agent, to a Roman Catholic gentleman, who was a party to the bargain which was made with the great body of the Roman Catholics in 1829. By him it had been honestly acknowledged that the oath did not afford the latitude which was claimed, and that in so convenient a light it had never till lately been regarded by any Catholic. These assertions Mr. M'Donnell defied his former coadjutors to contravert; but it was sufficient to look at the conduct of the Irish Catholics. Did they, or did they not, when the oath was framed, consider it to restrict them from an interference with the Established Church in Ireland? If they did not, they should have manfully informed the Protestants that they dissented from the terms of the oath, or the construction put upon them. The oath was discussed repeatedly in the House of Commons. The sense in which it was understood by the Protestants was notorious, and yet not one objection to that construction ever proceeded from a Catholic. Such being the case, was it common honesty in these gentlemen now to come forward and urge the latent ambiguity, as the lawyers called it, in the language of the oath? Was it not too gross to say "It is true you put that construction upon this oath. It is true, that we acquiesced in it, that we were silent, and suffered you to form your opinion; but, nevertheless, the oath is now worth nothing. We have taken it indeed, that we do not deny; but then it must now be construed according to our view of it, and to suit our purposes, and not according to the plain and common meaning of the words, and in conformity with your intentions in passing it." They could, from these men, expect nothing but perpetual and virulent hostility to the cause of Protestantism. From the energy of the Protestants he anticipated some check to their sacrilegious measures, and from their public meetings and associations, he was sure that some very considerable advantages must result. It would be a matter of no small importance if these meetings should lead the many enlightened men who were to be found among the English Roman Catholics to a consideration of those doctrines of the promulgation of which by their brethren in Ireland they must surely be in ignorance. He was certain that those worthy individuals, whom he was daily in the habit of meeting—whom he had known from childhood, and whom he respected as excellent neighbours, faithful

friends, and exemplary dischargers of all the duties of private life—if they could bring their minds to a calm and unbiassed inquiry of the facts collected upon this subject, and could satisfy themselves as to their accuracy, would be the first to disown the doctrines of the Irish hierarchy, and eagerly to proclaim “these are not our principles.” The maintenance of the grossly objectionable tenets had certainly been denied, and those who, speaking from the uniform testimony of history, had declared that the doctrines of the Romish Church were the same as they were formerly, and that “a Roman Catholic once a Roman Catholic always,” had doubtless received a very striking rebuke from a noble and learned lord, who told them that they read history like on old almanac, and were unable to discriminate the signs of the times. But facts would speak for themselves, and facts would be unfolded to the meeting that day. They would hear [the facts, and then judge for themselves. Of their conclusion he had no doubt. They would feel themselves called upon by every sense of duty to their country, themselves, and their God, to uphold the principles of the Reformation, and to maintain the Protestant Church in all its integrity. Any Roman Catholic who appeared duly authorised by his church, and responsible for all he said, would be allowed to reply to the statements made; but unauthorised individuals could not possibly expect to have the same permission. No purpose could be served by it. He himself had known Catholics, on the statements of members of their own body being objected to them, say, “Never mind what individuals say. We have certain tenets and certain authorised persons to support them. The former we will maintain, and the responsibility of the latter we will share.” Therefore he was warranted in saying that by suffering unauthorised persons to speak no good purpose would be served, and the good order of the meeting would be needlessly interrupted. He should conclude by calling on the Reverend Mortimer O’Sullivan to explain at length the objects of the meeting. From him who had an intimate acquaintance with the state of Ireland and the causes which disabled a country rich in the gifts of nature from blessing its inhabitants in proportion, they would hear a statement which he doubted not would make a lasting and practical impression on the minds of all present.

Rev. M. O’SULLIVAN—You have called upon me in a manner which renders apology for my appearance here, unnecessary. It may not be amiss, however, appearing as a witness, where I am, I may

almost say, personally unknown and unacquainted, to offer some undeniable vouchers for the general credibility of my statements. You have received with much favour and indulgence what may be considered as the recommendation of me by a friend—allow me to corroborate his good report by the testimony of adversaries and accusers.

It is known to some amongst you that the perils and sufferings of the Protestants of Ireland had become, towards the close of the last year, of so great notoriety, as to awaken alarm and sympathy in the breasts of their more prosperous brethren here. In Liverpool and other leading towns, a desire was expressed to hear a correct statement of evils of which vague rumours had been previously received; and in compliance with this desire a deputation was commissioned by the great body of the Protestants of Ireland to declare their grievances and dangers. Of this deputation I had the honour to form a part, and I was associated with an individual of extensive acquirements and great ability, who by his determination and untiring industry had called together the scattered fragments of Protestantism in Ireland, and united them into a power. I speak of the Rev. Charles Boyton. In company with this gentleman I attended two meetings, one in Liverpool, one in Bristol. When circumstances required his return into Ireland, I proceeded alone to Bath, Leicester, and Stamford. Reports, full and precise, of these five meetings were published. I was under the necessity of making statements at each of them, which showed that we had suffered much and long. The importance of these statements was made manifest by the vituperation of our adversaries. Their truth was attested by our adversaries' silence. In process of time they underwent a severer scrutiny than that of ordinary criticism. I was summoned before a Committee of the House of Commons, on which there were five Roman Catholic Members of Parliament—Mr. O'Connell, Mr. Wyse, Mr. Shiel, Mr. O'Loughlin, and Mr. Finn. It was shown to be a matter of some consequence to discredit or disparage my testimony. I was for six days under examination. For these six days I was the only witness examined. The meetings held at the close of the preceding year in England were adverted to, and, during the close and searching cross-examination of those six days, no one statement that I had made was even for a moment brought into question. May I not, then, annex to the recommendation of our respected chairman, the testimony borne

to the fidelity of my statements, by the silence of the press which has so vehemently inveighed against me—and by the abstinence or forbearance of my Roman Catholic cross-examiners.

I gladly turn to more important matter. Sir, you have correctly described the character and purpose of this great meeting. We have not assembled to advance the objects of any political party. You believe that the establishment, and in it the great principles of the Protestant religion in these countries, is assailed—and therefore you meet together, resolved to maintain them. You desire to see the great right of private judgment secured, and its accompanying responsibility understood and acknowledged—and it is because Ireland has become the arena in which the shock of adverse principles is felt, and not with a view to any political or party purpose, that your attention is directed to that highly favoured but most afflicted country. You turn your thoughts thither, not to learn how you may employ the evils you witness to the embarrassment or annoyance of any party, but that you may assist in maintaining Protestant institutions, where they are sorely assaulted, and that you may be instrumental in bringing down good upon a land and a race which seems hitherto to have succeeded in converting into evil every natural blessing.

It is, indeed, a wonderful spectacle—a combination of circumstances which might well be held incongruous and incompatible—that of unhappy Ireland. It is a spectacle too, which could not fail to prove instructive, if looked upon with seriousness, attention, and in a teachable spirit. You look upon a land rich in advantages of climate and soil, and situation, and you see it disfigured with squalid poverty. You look upon a people graced with high natural endowments, dishonouring these gifts by the meanest and most malignant vices—of a quick sense of honour and yet practised in base frauds—brave, and yet addicted to practices of cold-blooded cruelty—generous and grateful, so as to sacrifice their dearest interests for those who have done them service or even kindness, and yet, for some undiscoverable cause, ready to imbrue their hands in their best benefactors' blood. How shall these contradictions be reconciled or explained? Further, you look upon a people proverbially lovers of strict and equal justice, and you see them recommending and practising on principle the grossest wrong, cherishing the assassin, hunting down to death the just or the daring who would prosecute him for his crime. You hear of a murderer who has smitten down his best benefactor, smitten him, it may

be, for a price, a price less than the hire of one day's labour—you hear of evil men who have wrapt the abode of a slumbering family in midnight flames, who have gloated on the shrieks which proclaimed to them that infancy and old age were perishing—who have beleaguered with arms in their hands the burning house, until the flame has done its office, and silence has certified to them that not one has escaped—and you learn that the name of having perpetrated a crime like this, shall do its authors no injury—may, that it shall open an asylum to them in every dwelling, and ensure to them and to their families' protection and support. And where is it you learn that vengeance alights? If there was one who witnessed the frightful crime, and under the impulse of an affrighted conscience, denounced the murderers to justice—he it is whom the fury of the people will be sure to overtake—he it is upon whom the stroke of vengeance will inevitably descend in the midst of that people who have so earnest a love of justice—his portion will be to die a cruel, and a violent death, and to leave to his children the burden and brand of a hated and a dishonoured memory. How shall these things be reconciled!

But, I may be asked, how can they be believed—I must trespass upon your patience to hear my testimonies. I need not produce testimonies to the natural good qualities of the Irish people. The praise of their justice has been recorded by writers of your own country, and has been so frequently cited in these our days, that I may spare you the repetition of it—their valour has had so many and so unambiguous attestations in the history of land and sea, that I would not suppose you unacquainted with them—and, for the social qualities, the kindness, the hospitable virtues, the natural courtesy with which they are esteemed and graced—I thank God, the increasing intercourse between the countries, justifies me in affirming, that you need no remembrancer, and no new testimony. These are not the features in the national portrait which will be disputed: it is for the fidelity of the likeness in the less engaging features I feel bound to produce authority. Here I must rely on testimony, and that it may be available to my purpose, I shall produce only such as is placed beyond suspicion, by being that of parties competent to be witnesses of what they declare, and having no bias or interest to serve, which should cause them in the representations they have made to falsify or exaggerate.

My first extract shall be from the recent and popular work of a



very agreeable tourist, Mr. Inglis. I need not say that it is the work of one whose political predilections are of the kind which is termed liberal. Mr. Inglis seems to have made his Irish tour altogether under whig auspices and direction, insomuch so that we frequently find him passing in the immediate neighbourhood of clergymen, whose praise is in all the churches, and whose benevolent charities have secured to them an interest in all hearts, without attending at their public ministrations, without seeking a private interview, without, apparently, ever hearing of their names. Ignorance or unconsciousness of this description so frequent as almost to be uniform, could not have been accidental. It betrays the nature of the associations which Mr. Inglis had been led to form, and while his work bears testimony that such companionship could not influence him to misrepresent what he had seen, it proves, also, that he was safe from all danger of that species of Tory contagion, which might be supposed to infect him with the vice of intolerance.\*

“It will be easily seen from what I have said, that I found ample confirmation for what I have often heard. The small regard for veracity among the Irish peasantry, and their general disregard for an oath. To save a relation from punishment, or to punish any one who has injured a relation, an Irish witness will swear any thing. This would be called by some, hatred of the law; but although by swearing falsely the Irish peasant wishes to defeat justice, he does not do so merely because he hates justice and the law, but because he thinks he is bound to save his relation or any one of his faction.

“The same ferocity which has been exhibited at fights, is brought into court—false oaths are the substitutes for weapons; and by these witnesses seek to avenge the death of a relative who has been more unfortunate, but probably not less criminal than the accused.”

---

\* The following passage will show that no political bias could influence Mr. Inglis to withhold from the clergy in Ireland an acknowledgment, which he saw was due to them, and of which their peculiar circumstances at the time when it was paid increased the value.

“Now it is a curious fact, and a fact that consists with my knowledge, that Catholic emigrants send their remittances to the care, not of the Catholic priest, but of the Protestant clergyman, to be distributed by him among those pointed out. The same respect for, and reliance on the Protestant clergyman, is evinced in other ways. It is not at all unusual, for Catholics possessed of a little money to leave the Protestant clergyman their executor, in preference to their own priest, or to any other individual.”

## CHIEF JUSTICE BUSHE.\*

"It is a melancholy truth, that two species of demoralization seem to be going hand in hand together in this country; one manifesting itself in the fidelity with which unlawful oaths are observed; and the other in the violation and contempt of those oaths that are lawful, and taken in the administration of justice. *Illegal oaths are administered by them, often by compulsion to unhappy wretches, who attribute to them an obligation which they deny to more legitimate engagements. Vengeance is denounced against all who refuse to join their associations, or resist their mandates, or give information of their crimes, by those means they become numerous, and the incessant and indefatigable plunder of arms from all descriptions of loyal and peaceable subjects, soon renders them formidable. The destruction of property follows, houses and farms, and granaries, are levelled, crops are laid waste, pasture lands are ploughed, plantations are torn up, meadows are thrown open to cattle,—cattle are maimed, tortured, killed. Those persons who incur their displeasure, are visited by parties of banditti, who inflict cruel torture upon their persons, mutilate their limbs, or beat them almost to death. Men are deliberately assassinated in the open day, who have in any way become obnoxious to the insurgents, or opposed their system, or refused to participate in their outrages, and sometimes the unoffending members of a family are indiscriminately murdered by burning the habitation of our devoted victim. Entire classes are proscribed by them, especially those who in any way, from the highest to the lowest department, contribute to the administration of justice. The humble being who earns his bread by serving the process of a Court of Law is held up to public hatred, and persecuted like a noxious animal. The witness who gives evidence in a Court of Justice is stigmatised as an informer, and devoted to general execration, and the juryman is ordered on pain of death not to discharge his duty.*" [Charge delivered at Maryborough, May 23, 1832.]

---

\* CHIEF JUSTICE BUSHE IS THE JUDGE THUS EULOGISED BY MR. MOORE.

"The Chief Judge, on all solemn and interesting occasions, had a kind of collar placed round his neck, which possessed the wonderful power of contracting or relaxing, according to the impartiality of the sentence pronounced by him, and which pinched most inconveniently when an unjust decision was uttered. The use of this collar has been since discontinued, on account of the risk of strangulation to which it exposed many honourable judges, and the collar itself was supposed to be lost; but to the inexpressible joy of all lovers of Irish curiosities, it was again discovered a short time since, and is at present, I understood, worn on all occasions by the Chief Justice of Ireland, with the greatest possible ease and comfort to himself.—*Memoirs of Captain Rock, book 1st, chap. 1st.*"

SIR HUSSEY VIVIAN, MASTER OF THE ORDNANCE, &c. &c.

"In offering an opinion on the state of Ireland, there is one thing I should wish to notice, and that is the extraordinary carelessness of life amongst the lower classes. I have endeavoured, as far as possible to find out whence it arises that men who appear as kind in their dispositions, so grateful for any little kindness bestowed upon them, as the lower class of Irish generally are, should exhibit such little apparent reluctance to destroy their fellow-creatures. I have asked the Catholic Clergy; I have expressed my astonishment that they, who have such power and influence over the minds of the lower classes, do not prevent it; but neither they nor others I have spoken to on the subject pretend to account for it. It is a very striking circumstance in Ireland, that a disturbance scarcely ever arises but you hear of the loss of life; and during the whole of the disturbances in England (I mean no invidious comparison) there was but one instance in which a hand was raised against an individual. It is a matter well worthy of the consideration of those who would civilize and tranquillize Ireland, to ascertain whence arises this extraordinary difference.

"1476. Have you ever heard it attributed to the practice of waking the dead, and accustoming children to look upon dead bodies. I do not know what it arises from; but in legislating for Ireland it is a thing that must be looked at, in order to ascertain the cause of it, and to remove it if possible.

"1477. Do you not think that it may be owing to the abject state in which they exist, which makes their lives of little value? Yes, I can understand that as applying to themselves, but not as applying to the lives of other persons; it is a most remarkable thing. *If you go into their houses, and you are kind to them, they appear grateful beyond measure, and I believe really are so; and yet those very persons would have no sort of hesitation in taking up a stone and committing murder.* The cause of this readiness to sacrifice life is one of those things that

It may not be inexpedient to adduce the testimony of a witness thus unexceptionable on another subject, namely, the cause of insurrectionary crimes in Ireland. Poverty has been alleged as the cause. Chief Justice Bushe says,

*"I cannot recollect one instance in the experience of many years, and perhaps it is a formidable view of our situation, in which a man has been charged with an insurrectionary offence, whose crime could be traced to want or poverty."*—*Charge at Maryborough.*

This testimony of the Chief Justice is corroborated by that of the well known Dr. Doyle:—

*"I have seen and conversed with many individuals, who were once engaged in those wretched associations. I have not known one who was impelled by want to enter into them."*

ought to be inquired into, and if possible, the feelings, by which they are influenced, eradicated from the minds of the people.

“ 1478. Is not the use of ardent spirits one of the causes of it? This may account for those cases where murders take place at fairs; but many are committed in perfect cold blood. I could mention many instances of this sort.

“ Com. on the state of Ireland. Lieutenant General Sir Hussey Vivian, 16th June, 1838.

A combination, or confusion rather, of qualities, such as may be inferred from these testimonies, is not natural, nor explicable on the principles even of our fallen and vicious nature. A savage will be found perhaps treacherous, merciless, cruel, and may be endowed with qualities also of an opposite character; but the manifestations of those qualities will have their respective seasons and objects. His malignant passions will be wreaked upon enemies. The gentler affections will be exercised towards his friends. There will be distinctions between war and peace; and when the savage has put away the equipments in which he is girded for battle, he will put off with them, too, the stern and revolting attributes by which barbarous warfare is distinguished. In Ireland alone the worst cruelties of war are visited on those who should be accounted friends, and treachery more abominable than the fiercest war would admit, is employed to procure success for murderous attempts planned in cold blood, and without even the sinful excuse of public or of personal animosity.

This is the phenomenon which the gallant officer felt it difficult to explain. It is not rash to affirm that the difficulty was of his own creation. Had he known what was in the heart of Ireland as he had studied its surface, he would not have been thus embarrassed—he would have learned to understand the phenomena which disturbed him—he would have seen the country as they represented it—he would have seen that there was war there—on the one side the warlike array of England with her laws, and her military, and her magistrates—on the other side the war which does not vaunt or exhibit its array; but merely manifests its power and spreads its terror by its victims; and his question to priests and people would be—not, why are Irishmen regardless of life? He would no more put this question in Ireland than he would propose it to the veterans whom he has headed in battle in so many a victorious charge. His question would be, what are the contrivances or the circumstances by which the Irish

people are influenced, to think themselves justified in exercising the privileges, and employing the stratagems of war—in keeping no faith with those whom they profess to regard as neighbours and brothers—in evading and violating laws to which they have sworn obedience; and in scorning that most solemn command against the shedding of blood, which God has written in his law, and graven deepest among the instincts of the human heart.

The question to be proposed is this—by what means have the people, or rather by what means has the great mass of the Roman Catholic population in Ireland become thus perverted—become so changed from what nature made them, that they shall account perjury and murder among the legitimate, the laudable, means of accomplishing their objects? Nature has not made them liars and assassins. What has made them such? There is a ready answer to this question often hazarded. Their crimes and their fall are charged upon England. You attempted to force upon them a church which they disliked—you provoked thus the hostility which has kept their country disquieted, and thus you were, indirectly, the authors of their crimes and vices. The answer then to your question—what has corrupted the Irish people—is at hand; it is—the establishment of a Protestant Church? But this answer cannot bear examination. Supposing it true that the Protestant Church were new, and that you forced it upon a reluctant people, your invasion of their rights might naturally enough exasperate them into hostility. It would not have necessarily the power to infuse treachery into their bosoms—it would not recommend to them sentiments of dishonour, nor compel them to become more conspicuous in the disgraces with which they were covered, than for the wrongs and injuries they sustained, and for their efforts vain or successful to avenge them. Further—such an invasion could not explain this phenomenon, and render it compatible with what is to be believed of a brave and generous people—that so long as the laws by which they were oppressed were severe and cruel—so long as they were wronged and scorned—they were patient and submissive; and that when the severities of penal statutes had been withdrawn—when all that they complained of in by-gone days had been redressed—when they were admitted to the rights and equalities of free-born men, and had sworn new oaths of fealty and gratitude—in that day of freedom and favour they should break out into excesses to which the insult and oppression of intolerant

edicts had never enflamed them, and render their day of freedom opprobrious for vices, by which the period of their slavery was not dishonoured. These are things for which the endeavour to force upon them the establishment of a new church (supposing the church new) can afford no adequate explanation.

Should we not be prepared to expect another and a very different solution? We desire to know why the principles of Irish Roman Catholics are so erroneous—not, merely, why they commit crimes, but why they have adopted a system of morals which seems to recognise and recommend crimes as duties. We desire to know through what instrumentality a portion of the Irish people has become instructed in such principles as these. Are we to seek the instructor in a church which they reject, or in a church which they reverence and obey? Are we to seek the instructor in a church which strongly and unequivocally condemns all such principles, or in a church which indirectly but authoritatively permits and teaches them? This is the question which demands an answer. The Church of Rome communicates instructions, to whose operation and influence the altered and depraved principles of her votaries in Ireland could naturally be ascribed. Is she to be charged with the guilt of having depraved them? You can better determine how this question ought to be answered, when proofs of the anti-social and demoralising doctrines of Romanism have been submitted to you.

Before, however, I enter upon this duty, allow me to protect my statements from misconception. I wish to distinguish between Roman Catholics and the doctrines of their church. I am free and happy to declare my belief, notwithstanding the disappointments which charitable men have experienced, that there are, among the professors of the creed of Rome, numbers far more considerable than have yet avowed themselves, who would abide steadily by their sworn and their honourable engagements, and whose moral sentiments are generally conformable to those principles which a virtuous people would love to cherish. I believe that many such exist in communion with the Church of Rome, and I believe that she profits by the favour which they procure for her, not less than by the enterprising efforts of more unscrupulous votaries, to advance her interests. Let me not be mistaken, as if, when I expose the iniquities of the system of Romanism, I desire to excite feelings of hostility towards those who unconsciously

support it. At the same time, I should be wanting to the cause of truth, if I did not plainly affirm that such a state of things creates a peculiar and a momentous duty—a duty devolving upon all who maintain an intercourse with honorable and rational Roman Catholics. It is this—to warn them of the evil they are doing, in lending their countenance to a system of which they know not the nature or the design. They should be entreated to inquire into the real character and constitution of their church—to demand—does it teach ungodly and anti-social principles—and to exercise their reason in judging of the answers? They should be taught to account themselves responsible, not alone to their conscience, but also to their country and to society, for the actions and principles at which they connive, or which they ignorantly countenance, and to think themselves dishonoured if their good name among men be made a cloak for iniquities which they promote, although they would not practice them—if their engaging qualities and their liberal professions are taken advantage of, to aid the cause of a church opposed to freedom, knowledge, and all the best interests of man. It is not desiring evil to the most amiable to wish that warnings such as these should be conveyed to them.

There was a time when the connection of the most honourable men with the Church of Rome occasioned no perplexity—no wonder. It was boldly said that that church had experienced the beneficial effects of a change which had affected the whole frame-work of society. If any demanded where were the evidences of the change—why had not Rome renounced formally the offensive doctrines of her darker days. They were silenced by assurances that the tacit renunciation was sufficient—that a more formal rejection would be attended by inconveniences which need not be encountered—that in short all matter of offence had quietly gone into disuse, and that more was not desirable. This is a plea which no rational man can now advance. The character and the purposes of Romanism have been made manifest, by a discovery which cannot be called less than providential.

[Here Mr. O'Sullivan recapitulated the account of the manner in which the Complete Theology of Dens had been discovered, and cited various passages from it to the same effect as those which were quoted at the meetings in Exeter Hall. He then proceeded to the following effect:]

Thus far in what I have stated respecting the pestilent disquisitions of Dens, I have done little more than repeat the substance of state-

ments already before the public. What I have now to submit to you is new. It is unnecessary for me to remind you that the Lord Bishop of Exeter, in his place in parliament, adverted to the Theology of Dens, and by his notice of it gave to the discovery of the work and of the office it served its merited interest and importance. It did not appear to that eminent prelate a right thing that Dr. Murray, the patron of such a publication as that of Dens, should hold from the government a place of so solemn trust as that confided to him in the superintendence of the system of National Education. This impression he stated in the House of Lords with his usual clearness and power. The consequence was a letter from Dr. Murray to Lord Melbourne, in which he seemed desirous to exonerate himself from the imputation which he conceived cast upon him.

"I did not," he wrote "direct the work of Dens to be published; it was undertaken by a respectable bookseller, as a speculation in trade, entirely at his own risk."

The letter in which this memorable passage is found, had appeared in the public prints before the second meeting at Exeter Hall, and, very naturally, held a prominent place in the proceedings of the day. It seemed to deny, in terms, all participation in the guilt of publishing Dens, while yet there were many strong, although perhaps indirect proofs of an understanding between Dr. Murray and the publisher. In fact, an edition of Dens had been published in 1808, by direction of the Roman Catholic Bishops—a new edition had been rendered necessary in 1832, by an arrangement of Dr. Murray himself, and it was difficult in such circumstances to give credit to the denial in his letter to Lord Melbourne. There was a direct proof in existence at the time of which neither my Rev. Brother Mr. M'Ghee nor I was aware. On the platform in Exeter Hall I received a note directing my attention to it, informing me that the Complete Theology of Dens had been by permission dedicated to Dr. Murray, and suggesting the propriety of stating the fact to the meeting. Immediately on receiving the note, I looked for the document to which it directed me. I had previously searched the volumes under an apprehension that some such token of respect ought to appear in them; but, before, and on the day of the meeting, my search was vain. I examined other copies of Dens beside my own, but with no better success; and although I had entire confidence in the gentleman who had favoured me with the



note, and much deference for his opinion, I would not venture to state even on his authority what I had not verified for myself, and the meeting broke up without any notice of the dedication.

In some days after, I had the pleasure to meet my informant, and was reminded by him of his note. "You did not" he said "think my suggestion worth attention." "On the contrary," I replied, "it seemed to me most important, but I could not act upon it, for no copy of *Dens* in the Hall contained the Dedication, nor have I yet been able to find one which does." "You may find one, was the reply, in the library of the Athenæum," and there accordingly, I was, at length, successful.

Now, however, I was to have ampler intelligence. An old and highly valued friend, (one of those who had looked with favour on the cause of Roman Catholics while recommended by penal disabilities, but whose intellect was too sound, and whose sense of honour was too quick and keen to admit of his being deceived into approval of proceedings like those by which the triumph of that cause had been solemnized) communicated to me a knowledge of the entire disreputable transaction. My Rev. Brother Robert M'Ghee, had given directions that fifty copies of the *Theology of Dens* should be transmitted to Mr. Seely of Fleet-street, London, and the copies, having been purchased, were sent to their direction, but before leaving the shop or the printing-office of Mr. Coyne, Dr. Murray's publisher, they were mutilated. The dedication was abstracted from them, one only, it would seem, escaping, and that providentially, being the copy supplied to the Athenæum Library.

My esteemed friend gave me further information. There were uncut copies of *Dens* in London. I should find them at Mr. Cowie's in the Poultry. He had procured a supply from a bookseller and publisher in Dublin, who, although not a Roman Catholic, has been concerned in Roman Catholic publications. That gentleman had provided himself with some copies of *Dens* before the researches of Mr. M'Ghee had directed especial attention to the work. His copies accordingly were perfect, and so I found them at Mr. Cowie's. In those copies I found the dedication of the second edition of the *Theology of Dens* to that same Dr. Murray who wrote, "I did not direct the publication of *Dens*, it was undertaken by a respectable bookseller as a speculation in trade entirely at his own risk." In those copies I found the dedication, affirming, that that work was undertaken

with the approbation of the Bishop, who so confidently disclaimed it. "Ejus cum approbatione susceptam."

Is not this a vile transaction? A Roman Catholic publisher, publisher to the College of Maynooth in Ireland, undertakes at his own cost and charge, to print three thousand copies of a work in eight substantial volumes. He communicates on the subject with his Bishop, whose permission was necessary to protect him from censure, and whose favour was indispensable to the success of his project, or, as Dr. Murray calls it, his "speculation." The Bishop approves of his design—the work is published. In process of time the detestable character of the work becomes known to a Protestant Minister. To insure it against the risk of being secreted, he orders that certain copies shall be sent to London. The copies are sent, but the evidence they contain of Episcopal Approbation is abstracted from them. The Bishop who was an accessory to the publication is charged with his offence, and he answers—"I did not direct." "It was undertaken by the publisher at his own risk." Is it hazarding too much to say that the Bishop who uttered this disclaimer, believed that the evidence which could correct him had been put out of the way; but the evidence comes back, "like curses and young chickens," it comes "home to roost." The dedication reappears, and Dr. Murray is convicted by it of having approved (which under the circumstances is equivalent to having caused or directed) the publication of that bad book which he affected to disclaim. It was altogether and in all its parts, a most disreputable transaction. I turn from it to matter more worthy to engage us.

I have said, Sir, that even were we to credit the statements which ascribe novelty to the Church of England, and antiquity to the Church of Rome, and to believe that the Protestant Establishment was forced tyrannically on the reluctant Roman Catholics of Ireland, we could not find in such a belief an explanation of their moral principles and conduct. But it should never be forgotten that for such a belief there is no foundation whatever—that the supposition is wholly gratuitous. I feel, however, that I ought not to assume your acquaintance, with the facts and arguments by which the truth of this matter is asserted and established. Except Romanists, few are industrious in Roman Catholic controversy, and therefore the most adventurous and least scrupulous among the advocates of the Church of Rome often are the most successful. Give me then I pray your attention; and to

the Roman Catholics in this assembly, I more especially address my request—give me I pray your attention, while I show you the novelty of your church even by the testimony of those witnesses to whom she ascribes her highest and most solemn authority.

The ecclesiastical assembly for which Romanism claims most respectful and submissive deference is the Council of Trent. Its decisions may, generally speaking, be regarded in two lights—they are decrees which Rome enacts on the authority of this great Synod, and to which she requires from all her votaries obedience—they are testimonies to be believed by all as the averments of a witness incapable of error. I offer one of those testimonies—that which was borne to the faith of the Catholic Church from its foundation to the year of the world 1546. In that year the Council of Trent held five sittings. The second of these, or the third session of the Council, was devoted to one object—that of declaring the faith of the Catholic Church. I read for you, from the decree, testimony thus, as Roman Catholics affirm, invested with the attribute of infallibility.

The Council professes to follow—

“The example of the Fathers, who, in all their more solemn synods, were wont to oppose this shield at the commencement of their proceedings against all heresies, by which alone they frequently brought over infidels to the faith, confounded heretics, and confirmed the faithful.”

It then proceeds thus—

“Wherefore the symbol of faith which the holy Roman Church uses, as that principle in which all who profess the faith of Christ necessarily agree, *the firm and only foundation against which the gates of hell shall never prevail*, in the words in which it is read in all churches, the Council declares shall be recited.”

Such is the testimony of a decree of the Council of Trent, passed in its third session. The creed enjoined follows, it is that which we read in our communion service—the Nicene Creed.

Thus, on the testimony of the Council of Trent, the Nicene Creed was, to the year 1546, the creed of the whole Catholic Church. It was the foundation of all Christian doctrine, a foundation against which the powers of hell should not prevail, and the only foundation which was thus impregnable. It was the shield by which the fiery darts of the wicked were repelled, and the criterion by which heresies were detected. To such uses was the Nicene Creed, and that creed

only, according to the testimony of the Council of Trent, found available. In bearing testimony to this effect, the Council naturally brings to our remembrance a decree passed in earlier times, by which its evidence is corroborated—I mean the well-known decree passed in the Council of Ephesus. The passage in it which concerns our present subject is to the following effect :—

“ The holy Synod has decreed that it is not lawful for any to produce or write or compose a creed other than that which has been appointed by the Holy Fathers, who were assembled in holy spirit at Nice. But, whosoever dare to compose or produce or offer another to such as turn to the true faith, either from Paganism or Judaism, or from any sect whatsoever ; if bishops, should be removed from their bishopricks ; if clergy, from their office ; but if laymen should be anathematized.”

Here, then, have we testimony, which the Church of Rome pronounces infallible, as to the faith of the Catholic Church :—A Council in the fourth century determining upon the creed in which it was to be expressed, and prohibiting by the severest penalties the offence of framing another—a Council in the sixteenth century testifying to the fact that no other had been framed, adding its authority to the confession of all preceding ages, that the creed which had been in use for so many centuries contained all that was necessary to salvation, and that none other should be enjoined within the church. Eighteen years after that decree was passed—two years after the last General Council (as Rome terms that of Trent) of the Catholic Church had held its last sitting—an individual, the Bishop of Rome, Pius IV., did that which the Council of Ephesus expressly prohibited, which the decree of Trent had condemned by anticipation. He framed a new creed—he required that all ecclesiastics should swear to receive it—that all heretics who were admitted into his church should make profession of it—that it should be, in short, the creed of his church. And this is the creed, and his is the church, of Romanism in Ireland. The Protestant Church there established retains the faith pronounced by the Council of Ephesus, and confessed by all succeeding councils to be Catholic ; the Roman Church in that country has adopted a new faith, that framed in 1564 by Pius IV. It is somewhat too extravagant in the professors of this sinful novelty to think, because England, adhering to Christian antiquity, refuses to embrace it, that

they are justified in the commission of any crimes by which they may bend or terrify her into submission.\*

But, indeed, it is by no means a matter of wonder to find much confusion in the Church of Rome on the subject of crime and virtue. The Creed of Pius IV. should prepare us to expect a very defective

\* The following passage in illustration of this subject, is from a speech delivered by Dr. O'Sullivan at the Belfast Conservative Festival, Dec. 20, 1836 :—

" I am to acknowledge—I wish I could do so in suitable language—your noble demonstrations of good-will to a church I love and reverence, and to a high personage to whom I feel attached by sharing in that public feeling of respect, of which your enthusiastic plaudits have been an expression, and by ties, also, of personal gratitude and affection. I need not detain you with his praises. The same eminence of virtue which renders panegyric unobtrusive, renders it also superfluous. The church towards which you have made such a demonstration of good will, is assailed by many enemies, and is undergoing sharp trials. In its difficulties it is not deserted by those, who, differing in matters of inferior importance, hold the same great doctrines of Christian revelation. If the weapons of the warfare with which we are assailed were such as Christian principle allows, the state of the contest would not be what it is. If by fair argument—by Scripture and right reason—points of doctrine or discipline in our ecclesiastical system were assailed, in this assembly there are many who would be calm observers of the contest, many who would, perhaps, array themselves against us—and there are some who, I need not say, would be amongst our most honoured and most formidable antagonists. Those are now on our side—because the fury of adversaries rages against us for maintaining the fundamental truths of religion—and because fraud, and force, and terror, are the only arguments with which they endeavour our overthrow. Therefore have we found noble aid among those who differ with us in matters of constitutional discipline, but are one with us in the great doctrine of the Gospel; and we accept their aid cordially, as brothers should, because, were our conditions reversed, we should be found equally prompt to throw aside all sordid impediments, and take our proper place in a Christian brotherhood to withstand and bid a holy defiance to the common enemy.

" The warfare against our church is (if not of a two-fold character) two-fold at least, in profession. On the one hand the Voluntary assails us—the Romanist on the other. To the one, our Protestantism is a thing of nought, because we are an establishment—the other cries out, that because of the Protestantism with which we defile it—the establishment ought to be wrested from us. I shall beg leave to offer a few words on the sections, respectively, which press those grounds of hostility, and to present to you, perhaps, a specimen of the reasoning in which each indulges. I begin with the latter.

" Our ecclesiastical endowments, they affirm, once belonged to their church—the state violently wrested them away and transferred them to us. Having laid down this as their matter of complaint, they go on to affirm that the state ought to compensate the iniquity of the past day, by perpetrating a second spoliation, that she ought to prove herself just by making her injustice impartial.

system of morals. In that part of the Creed which Pius contributed, one article contains a promise to receive every thing delivered, defined and declared in the canons and general councils—one contains a promise to reject the Scripture. By the former, hearts and minds are opened to the influence of doctrines which are faithfully represented

---

“ Now, the statement on which this recommendation rests is altogether untrue—untrue, not simply because the church of which they call themselves members had reformed itself, and did not forfeit its rights and possessions by correcting its abuses, *but because their church did not exist, and never had had existence at the time when our ecclesiastical policy was completed.* There are, no doubt, some here to whom this proposition is new; give me your patient attention, and I hope to render it intelligible. I promise that, although you must feel my explanation tedious—(no, no)—I fear you must—yet when it is ended you shall find that it has been brief—that is to say, provided you measure time, not by your weariness, but by your watches.

“ For convenience, I shall premise a few observations, which are necessary to the elucidation of my subject, and which, I have no doubt, will be universally admitted.

“ First—We learn what a church is, by its acknowledged formularies; thus, the national Church of England is known by its Book of Common Prayer; the national Church of Scotland by its Westminster Confession.

“ Second—In every church there will be an acknowledged difference between what are termed matters of faith, to which subscription and acceptance is required, and matters of opinion in which members and ministers may be permitted to differ.

“ Third—Sameness in the church depends upon the maintenance of the faith, and of that which is matter of faith, rather than on similitude in matters of opinion.

“ Fourth—The guilt and the consequence of causing schism, or separation, in the church, falls upon those who make changes in the rule of faith, either by omitting articles previously held essential, or by demanding assent to matters at variance with acknowledged principles, or which the constitution of the church pronounces indifferent.

“ These things being premised, I proceed to show that the state, so far from wresting from Catholicism (as the expression is used) its temporal possessions, only prevented their being alienated from the national Catholic Church to a new church which submitted itself to a foreign and unscriptural usurpation—to a church or sect opposed to ours, only in those particulars in which it is opposed also to Catholic antiquity.

“ A recent assertion of principle on the part of the Presbyterian body, (I am sure my Rev. Friends will pardon me for referring to it,) furnishes an example by which my meaning can readily be explained. If I am right in my judgment, some irregularities had been for a time admitted in matters of much importance, and injurious consequences were likely to follow. Ministers had not subscribed, without qualification, the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, and a dangerous latitude in religious belief would in time have been the result. The remedy was to be provided for by a recurrence to the old standard, and that remedy was sought and found. God was gracious! He raised up for the day of peril men

in the *Theology of Dens*. By the latter, hearts and minds are protected against the influence of the holy light which would render the evil communicatious of Dens, and those who resemble him, harmless. A word or two on this article respecting Scripture may not be inexpedient.

wise to see and mighty in his strength, to overcome evil. It is conceivable that their endeavours which have been so blessed, might have been made under less favourable circumstances, with a less happy issue. It is conceivable that, after arrangements had been made of the nature which have been found successful, after it had been ruled that the ancient confession of faith should be acknowledged,—a party, discontented with the proceeding, should take counsel together and frame for themselves a new confession, omitting articles of faith previously affirmed, or neutralizing them by the encumbrance of anti-Christian additions. If you wished, had such been the result, to ascertain where true Presbyterianism was to be found between the contending parties, what would you do? Would you reckon heads? No; you would ask which party stood upon the old ways, and you would acknowledge that with them was the right.

“ This acknowledgment I claim for the Church of England, for the national church in this country. She in some particulars made alterations which Rome had not approved. *They were alterations, however, which pure religion required— which the constitution of the church permitted.* Rome, on the other hand, made alterations which disfigured and corrupted the doctrine of faith, which were *alien from the constitutions of the church*, and in making which she *disregarded express prohibitions, and incurred canonical censure.* Which, then, is now the true and ancient church? The national church rectified erroneous opinions, corrected irregularities in discipline, and restored proprieties of worship—all which it was not alone her undoubted right, but her bounden duty to do. The Church of Rome *elevated erroneous opinions into the rank of articles of faith, endeavoured by establishing false rules of discipline to raise up and render permanent an unwholy despotism; and while she professed to reform abuses in public worship, directed that the most objectionable should be perpetuated.*

“ That is to say, the state of the church was found to require amendment. The national church in this country adopted amendments which Scripture demanded, and the existing ecclesiastical polity admitted—the Church of Rome adopted changes and affirmed principles—such as Scripture plainly condemns, and the laws of the church prohibited. Which is the church?

“ But, perhaps, the alterations of Romanism have the sanction of greater antiquity? No—they are of modern origin. We prove this by the testimony of Rome herself; out of her own mouth we condemn her. Judge whether we do not. According to the discipline of modern Romanism every member says, every beneficed clergyman swears, that he receives, without a doubt, whatsoever has been determined by canons and general councils, especially the Council of Trent. The Council of Trent informs us what was the faith of the Christian Church at the time when it was assembled. In that day, no doubt, there was a summary of belief, which all who professed and called themselves Christians, Catholic Christians, were understood to acknowledge. In the third session of the Council of Trent, that summary is recited, and is declared “ the firm and only

It expressed in these words—"I admit the Holy Scripture according to the sense which our holy mother the Church, whose it is to judge of the true sense of Scripture, has held and holds; neither will I ever take and interpret it unless according to the unanimous consent

---

foundation against which hell shall not prevail." This was in the year 1546. In that year the Council of Trent, by whose decrees every beneficed priest swears that he will abide, declared what was the creed which had been held from the early days of Christianity—a creed which a former Council, that of Ephesus, adopted, adding a prohibition against the framing of another, or the proposing another for adoption. Here, then, we have a creed set up in the early ages of the Christian Church—set up to the exclusion of any other—retaining its place as an acknowledged formulary for eleven centuries—and, at the end of that time, admitted and ratified by the Council of Trent as the summary of faith which Christians were to profess, and by which Catholics were to be kept together. They might differ on inferior matter—in this they must agree. What was the creed thus recognised and approved? The Nicene, substantially the same with that called the Apostle's Creed—that is to say, as affects our present inquiry, the creed of the national Churches of England and Scotland.

"Yes, sir, ours is the creed of the ancient times, and of the whole Christian world—the creed which, Rome must admit, had the sanction of all antiquity, and of all great councils, from that of Ephesus to the Council of Trent inclusive. The creed of Romanism is new. It is the composition of an individual. It never had the sanction of any council. It was framed by Pius IV. after the termination of the Council of Trent, in the year 1564. It never received the ratification of any general council. It has incurred the penalties pronounced in the Council of Ephesus. It is contrary to Scripture, and contrary to the constitution of the Catholic Church. What shall we say, then? Is the Catholic Church—ours, in which the faith of Catholic antiquity is preserved, or modern Romanism by which it is altered and outraged?

"Allow me, for the sake of putting this matter in a clearer light, to propose an imaginary case, in which I sought an opinion from our friends who sit here eminently learned in the law; they will pardon my unacquaintance with the requisite technicalities, and give me an indulgent hearing.

"In the year, let us suppose 1500, a bequest or grant is made to the national Church in Ireland, at that time in communion with the See of Rome. In a century after, two parties are found contending whose the grant should be. The one party show that their rule of faith, their doctrines, their discipline, are in substance the same as were held in the national church at the date of the devise; that although some matters of opinion were altered and improved, the alterations were in accordance with the rules and principles of the church, and that the doctrines of faith remained unaltered; on this ground they rest their claims to the disputed possession. The other party say, 'We are in communion with the See of Rome, with which we have maintained connexion, by adopting all changes which she directed. She has set up something which she terms unwritten tradition as of equal authority with Scripture—and we have added her doctrine on the subject to our rule of faith. She has commanded that none shall interpret Scrip-



of the Fathers." Thus every professor of the Creed of Pius, virtually renounces the word of God. He is not required to express his rejection of it in direct terms. He is only to postpone. When he can find the interpretation of the church, and the unanimous consent of the fathers, he is at liberty to read in them the blessed truths of Scripture; but for so long as the interpretation of the church is delayed, and wherever the fathers "have not been unanimous, the votary of Pius and of Rome has renounced his liberty, and rejected the Bible.

The conduct of the Roman Catholic Bishops in Ireland, appears very much to have been guided by the wisdom in which their Creed was framed. They have assured Protestants, and especially Parliamentary Committees of Lords and Commons, that they have not withheld the Bible from their people. On the contrary, it has been their earnest desire that those committed to their charge should read and understand. They require merely that they shall read in Bibles to which edifying and explanatory notes and comments have been

---

ture unless he find the Fathers unanimous. We have made obedience to this command matter of faith, although we are not blind to the impossibility of reconciling obedience with the study of the Bible. She has required, that implicit acquiescence shall be yielded to the decrees of canons and councils—the murderous and perfidious principles of Lateran and Constance included—we have submitted, and declared obedience here, also, necessary to salvation.' I think the answer to one question would settle the dispute. Our friends, I am persuaded, would ask—is there in the old constitution of the national church anything which renders the connexion with Rome essential? The answer is—no. On this answer, I have no doubt, an instant judgment would follow, that the national church, entitled to possession, was that which had kept the faith, and allowed Rome to proceed on her way—not that which abandoned or violated the faith, in order to follow Romanism.

"I thank you heartily for the patience with which you have endured this detailed exposition. It is useful that such an exposure should be made, and Romanism robbed of the pretext, that she has a claim to the ecclesiastical revenues of the country. Rely upon it, much good may be done by temperate and faithful statements of truth. Do not imagine that the great mass of Roman Catholics could be made the ministers of outrage and spoliation, if they conceived that their conduct was wholly without excuse. They are kept under a false impression, that there is a species of irregular justice which favours them and approves of their enormity. Dissipate this delusion; it will require time and persevering industry to do so, but let it be done. Dissipate this delusion, and multitudes will come forth from the adverse faction, and withdraw their hands from violence and wrong."

appended. Without the protection of such approved notes they do not think the study of Scripture safe, and accordingly are not disposed to encourage or allow it. This, too, is not altogether, under the circumstances in which they are placed, to be severely censured. In fact, all went smoothly until a question was proposed respecting the notes, those indispensable accompaniments to the permitted Bible. It was a meddling and officious question, for, provokingly enough, it showed that there were no such notes in existence. The testimony of Dr. Murray and Dr. Doyle was decisive as to the fact, that Roman Catholics were at liberty to read the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, as they were enriched and illustrated with approved notes, and not otherwise. The same testimony was equally decisive to the fact that up to the year 1825, there were in Ireland no copies of the Bible thus illustrated and guarded. This want of Bibles in which Roman Catholics might read, somewhat lessened the credit to which the bishops had seemed entitled for their liberal professions. In truth, more than the suspicious will doubt the sincerity of parties who when they are asked—"Do you permit the study of Scripture in the vulgar tongue, without note or comment?" answer—"No."—and who repeat the No again, when asked are there any Bibles in the vulgar tongue to which approved notes and comments have been appended.—Such permission is very like prohibition.

It is an awful and appalling brand upon the brow of Romanism, this rejection of the divine word—that the frontlet by which she would be protected shall be not holy counsels and commandments of Scriptures, but menacing inscriptions by which the blessed Scriptures are proscribed. It is a fearful and a wonderful thing: there is one book which the Church of Rome confesses to be infallible—there is only one to which she ascribes this honour—only one which she confesses to have God alone for its author—and this is the only book which she forbids her votaries to study. Let it not be said that other books are prohibited by her congregations of the Index. The prohibitions of these congregations are not of paramount authority. They are not received in Ireland. Each nation may appoint its own, or may appoint none—may receive or may disregard the prohibitions of other places. Such prohibitions, therefore, have not the authority of the Church. That authority is reserved for the Creed; and it manifests a spirit of no ordinary arrogance and daring, to impose

upon each votary the duty of subscribing to a form of words which contain in substance, this—"I believe the Bible to be that book which God especially commanded to be written, but I set it aside because the church to which I belong has not thought proper to prepare an interpretation of it, and the fathers, whom I venerate, are not of one mind as to its meaning."

Can the phenomena of Irish disturbance and crime be thought inexplicable while this principle of estrangement from God and his word is held in remembrance. You see a fine people frightfully vitiated. Do you look longer for an explanation, when you are taught that they have been educated in a church which renounces the authority of the sacred Scriptures, and adopts and recommends as the best book of religious instruction the execrable Theology of Dens? No where can cause and effect in moral things be more plainly discernable. The peculiarity to be explained in Ireland, is not the habit of crime merely, but, also, sinful principles and sentiments. Such principles and sentiments can be imbibed from Dens. In Dens, priests are taught to seek the knowledge by which their intercourse with the people shall be guided. To the principles, therefore, of the Romish Church, we are justified in ascribing that change in the character of a fine people, in which their operation and their presence is visible. I shall add but one observation. Adversaries say to us—"You attach too much importance, far more than we do, to Dens. We are not bound to conform to his maxims, or to those of any individual." This is my reply. Not to Dens, but to the questions discussed in conferences by Irish Roman Catholic priests do we ascribe that deep importance which compels us thus to bear testimony against the church which entertains them. Answers to these questions are given in Dens. Let Romanists name a book of equal authority, and equally comprehensive in which milder answers are given. Until they do so, they must bear the disgrace of Dens—until that disgrace is removed—until Dens, and writers like him, cease to poison the education of the Roman Catholic priesthood—until the disavowal of their pernicious tenets and principles has been as unambiguous and complete as the evidences are at this day, by which we prove that those evil tenets have been adopted—it remains a solemn and imperative duty on all Protestants who would act, not to say, the part of servants of the Lord, but even of good citizens; of all who would not make themselves partakers in the iniquity of corrupting a people, to resist to the

utmost of their power the progress of so pernicious principles, and to rescue wretched beings, too long neglected, from their influence.

But can we hope to succeed by such endeavours? Can we hope to prevail with the Roman Catholic priesthood to lay aside the Complete Theology of Dens, or to succeed with the people in withdrawing them from the influence of a clergy who will not give them better instructions? Many will tell us that if we entertain such a hope we deceive ourselves. You were warned as you entered here to-day of the contemptuous taunts by which you must expect to hear your hopes and labours derided. This meeting, the placard at the gate has warned you, is a "Theological Farce," an assembly in which we are exposing our own absurdity. It is well that we should be thus reminded that our cause must stand the test of ridicule, and that none should engage in it without counting calmly the cost of his undertaking. But should we be discouraged by such taunts and apprehensions, or by what is of far greater moment the real difficulty we have to encounter? Have we nothing but dissuasives to think of in forming our determination? Sir, we have a great encouragement—an encouragement especially applicable to the circumstances in which we meet, I may well conclude by bringing it to your remembrance.

I have already shown you that Romanism renounces holy Scripture, requiring of her votaries that they promise to postpone the study of it until certain impossible conditions can be complied with. Notwithstanding this, two editions of the Douay Bible have of late years issued from the press in Ireland, and the copies are sold at prices which render them reasonably accessible to the people. Roman Catholic bishops also have declared that they may be read, and although they protect themselves by requiring that the due conditions be observed and the proper dispositions cultivated in their perusal, yet, still, the word has been suffered to go forth, and men will be thus encouraged and even allured to learn wisdom from it. How is this anomalous procedure to be understood? The answer is at hand. It was the result of Protestant exertion. When, after too long silence, and too much provocation, the Protestants of Ireland addressed themselves to the duty of exposing the unscriptural character and pretensions of the Church of Rome—no topic, as might naturally have been anticipated, was of more prevailing efficacy than that which was found in the prohibition of the holy Bible. Multitudes of Roman Catholics who could not or would not enter into niceties in controversial argu-

ment, understood and felt at once, the power of an appeal for the freedom of God's word. The priests felt its power. They could not dare to resist it. How did they defend themselves and their church? By disclaiming the principle—the great principle—of that church, and proclaiming free permission to read the word of God. We live in an age when such permission cannot remain long theoretical. Romanism must show by some act that she was sincere—she must satisfy the cravings of those who *would* be fed. Hence the stereotyped editions of the Bible which Irish Roman Catholics have, to an enlarged extent, the liberty of reading.

And this should be an encouragement to us. The instinct of the human heart which rejects the abominations of Dens is scarcely more prompt and intelligent, than that which condemns the prohibition of Scripture. Let it be our part to awaken and direct it. No men, except murderers or perjurers will endure to have principles of perjury and murder taught as religion. But no men, except of that class in which the judgment is weak, and whose assistance and approbation are worthless, can believe, except on the plainest evidence, that abominable principles are thus imparted. Let the evidence we offer be scrupulously examined—let the truths it establishes be made known—and be assured they will not be without effect. Be you in your respective spheres, diligent in acquiring and communicating these truths, and the testimonies which prove them; and rely upon it, that when the public mind becomes thoroughly awakened to their importance, Romanism will be no more enabled to retain Dens among her agencies, than she was of late years enabled to keep the Bible clasped and sealed.

Sir M. BLAKISTON said he should make but a few observations after the able and satisfactory address of the reverend gentleman. The religion of Protestants, it should never be forgotten, was founded solely upon the Bible. It was their belief, that sinners could be saved only by the name of Christ, and when he found a church which restricted its communicants from being fully acquainted with the words of their Saviour, he could only conclude that that church was not the church of Christ. The honorable baronet concluded, by moving a resolution to the effect, that a Protestant Association be established in Worcester, for disseminating a knowledge of the principles of Popery, and promoting the cause of Protestantism.

The Rev. Mr. BENSON, who seconded the resolution, spoke as follows:—I shall make only a few remarks in defence of this resolution, because I have ever been, and am, well convinced of the propriety of Protestant principles, and the important distinction which exists between us and the Roman Catholic church. That is the ground on which I think the intended association ought to rest, and upon which, we should rest our power to fulfil the objects which this association is intended to fulfil. In our intention to disseminate a knowledge of the principles and practices of Popery, and to promote the great principles of the Protestant church, you will perceive there is nothing whatever of a personal nature. Whoever is a sincere Roman Catholic, can never object to the full exposition which this society intends to put forward, of the principles which he professes. If he think his principles are of that nature that, when properly expounded, will be generally received, there is not a man, be he Catholic or Protestant, who ought to object to the dissemination of a knowledge of his principles. We, as Protestants, are bound by the very term which we have assumed, to promote to the utmost of our power, the principles of the faith we have espoused. Religion is not a matter of to-day or to-morrow, but of for ever. Whoever is impressed with such principles as he considers will contribute to his eternal welfare, will be ready strenuously to promote them. All, therefore, that it appears to me necessary to defend on the present occasion, is the propriety of forming an association for that purpose, and of forming it now.

Now, let me ask, are we, as sincere Protestants, one and all of us, strongly impressed by two circumstances of importance recently made known to us? I allude to the diligent exertions made by the Roman Catholics themselves, to promote and propagate the principles of their own faith, and to the very great degree of ignorance, misapprehension, or perversion, which seems to exist in the minds of many Protestants, who would persuade their brethren in faith, that there is no essential distinction between the Protestant and Roman Catholic religions. I think that an association of this nature is called for by the diligent exertions of the Roman Catholics to promote their own faith.—For making those exertions I blame them not. Whatever a man believes will conduce to his eternal welfare and that of others, he is bound to promote, with this proviso, however, that he doeth not evil that good may come—that his exertions be unaccompanied by violence on the one hand, and by deceit

on the other. Well, let us now consider the reason for the formation of this association. Let me ask, what is the real distinction between our two creeds? Can I as a member of the Protestant Church of England, say, that there is no essential difference between us and the Roman Catholics? Can I proclaim myself a schismatic, which I should do, were I to affirm that no such distinction existed?—Why did we, or why did our forefathers, separate from her? Because it was conceived that there was a powerfully essential distinction in important matters of faith and practice. I will not condemn our forefathers of folly, nor in support of that Church shall I be lukewarm. I will not eat the bread of my own church, and lift my heel against her. I will defend her as long as I eat her bread, and when I eat it not, I will defend it for conscience sake. This is the principle for which we contend. How can it be contended, that no difference exists between the two churches? Look at the distinction between us and the Jews. We have been told by some reasoners of high authority in the House of Lords, that there is no distinction between us and the Catholics, because we mutually believe the fundamentals of religion. But if that principle be sound, consider how it will affect the Jews. They believe in God, and are diligent searchers after his truth. But they do not believe, as we believe, that out of Jesus there is no salvation. That is the additional principle of our faith. Then comes the important distinction between us and the Catholics. We believe in the fundamentals of religion with them; but we do not yield our assent to the superstructure which they have built upon the Christian religion. We hold one God and a Saviour between God and man. What do they believe in addition? That out of their church there is no salvation. This we must believe, or they say we shall not be saved. Now, to believe in their church, is to believe the whole body of those doctrines which have been laid before you this day, and which on former occasions, have been laid before other meetings. I say there is an essential distinction between the Roman Catholic and the Protestant religions, for they say to us, what we say to the Jews. When I see the efforts which they are making to promote their faith, and when I know the essential distinction which thus exists, I do not think that I act consistently as a Protestant, if I endeavour not to exhibit the principles of that religion which I oppose, contrasted with the principles of that which I maintain. We

have no intolerance, and it is a matter to me of indifference, by what name I am designated by the Roman Catholics. They are not my judges, and when they call me heretic, the weapon falls, and I feel no pain. I lament that they should hold doctrines which compel them to stigmatize me as a heretic. I want to convince them of that; I want to bring before them, the true principles of the religion they profess. So far from lamenting that indignation which was displayed by some present, at the mention of certain doctrines said to be maintained by the Church of Rome, I rejoiced, as I humbly hoped, that that indignation was with those who expressed it, a mark of odium, and a disavowal of the principles which it is the object of this assembly to unveil. If when we have unveiled them, the faith of the Church shall be renounced by any of its communicants, as it is to be hoped it may, we shall be rejoiced to receive them as our own. At any rate, I hope that the result will be, that the opinions of honest, conscientious, and right-feeling men, will soften and control the severity of some of those doctrines which the Catholic Clergy of Ireland seemed prepared to maintain.

But, on the other hand, we must say, without regarding the Roman Catholic disciples, the interests of our own church, demand the formation of an association such as this. It is a fact, that its ministers had not during the last century, been so constantly bringing before their congregations, as they had formerly done, the grand difference between the Protestant and Roman Catholic faith. I trust they have not been wrong in thus dropping the war of polemics, trusting, as they no doubt did, that there was an amelioration going on among the professors of Catholicism in this country, which it would have been unwise to disturb. They had, however, been mistaken; the removal of the weight which kept down the Roman Catholics, and tended to produce that appearance of amelioration, had caused the old principles again to revive, and the Protestants must now support themselves against them. The laws now no longer present a barrier, as formerly, to the Catholics, and now is the time therefore, for the Protestants to come forward, and place the two creeds in juxta-position, and then leave the mind to judge which was worthy of all acceptance. I trust I have said enough to justify my presence here this day. I am not anxious to appear in turbulent meetings, but I would never give up the right of a British



citizen, because I am a British clergyman. The reverend gentleman concluded by showing that it was equally the duty of Dissenters as of Churchmen, to come forward on this occasion, seeing that it was the Protestant religion, and not merely the established church of that religion, which the Catholics sought to overthrow.\*

The resolution for forming the association was then put and carried, with three dissentients.

Colonel TAYLOR moved the adoption of the laws by which the association was proposed to be governed.

The Rev. GEORGE TURBERVILLE, seconded the proposition.

The laws having been read by the Chairman, were by him put to the meeting, and adopted unanimously.

The Rev. Mr. CAWOOD, moved the third resolution. He said they had that day heard much of Peter Dens' Theology. There was nothing in that heavy leaden book of bigotry and blasphemy, which was not to be met with, in the ancient councils of the Church of Rome; so that it appeared that the Catholic Church, at the present day, was as idolatrous and blasphemous as ever. Popery was unchanged, and unchangeable—if ever it ceased to be infallible, it ceased to be Popery. Some allusions had been made by their Chairman, to the property of the church. Now he (Mr. Cawood,) did not mean so to connect the property, with the principles of the Church of England, as to assert, that if one was destroyed, so were the other. No—its revenues might be utterly swept away, but her doctrines would last till time shall be no longer, for those doctrines were based on the Word of God. There was, he believed, a great deal of ignorance, where there ought rather to be a great deal of knowledge, with respect to the property of the church. It was said to be the property of the nation. He, however, denied it. He had seen many of the ancient charters, conferring property on the church, and they usually opened with words declaring that the property was "bequeathed unto God." Now, in his opinion, there were but two modes by which the property so left, could be alienated: the first was, by proving the nullity of the gifts, and if that could be done, why then no property in Britain was safe. The other mode was, by God's own renunciation of the gift. Until, therefore, the sky was opened, and God should speak in thunder

---

\* The Editors regret that they have been able to obtain but an imperfect report of this interesting speech, especially towards the conclusion.

to that effect, he contended the property of the church could not be taken away for any purpose whatsoever. The Church of England, he was sorry to say, had been almost fast asleep in the important matter of that day's meeting: but he trusted that henceforward, the pulpits throughout England would resound, as in the days of the tyrant James, with the doctrines of Protestantism, and an exposure of the errors of Popery. A poet—John Dryden—who was once a Protestant, but who in his old days, changeling as he was, became a Papist, had, in one of his pieces, compared the Church of Rome to the milk-white hind, and the Church of England to the panther. He would take the liberty however, of reversing the emblems, and make the panther represent the Roman Catholic religion. He said, then, there was a time when this ferocious panther was securely caged in iron, so that it could do little or no mischief; but of late years the cage has been removed, and the animal allowed to rove at large; if he could be scarcely kept under, when so caged, how was it to be accomplished, now he was at liberty? He replied, that it was to be done only by means of the Word of God, spoken through the medium of Protestant principles. Mr. Cawood concluded, by moving the third resolution, which was seconded by John Brown, esq. and carried unanimously.

Doctor BEALE COOPER, in moving the next resolution, briefly alluded to the baneful effects of Popery on the Continent, and, in countries where the principles of Protestantism were not inculcated.

GEORGE HAWKINS, esq. seconded the resolution, which included a vote of thanks to Mr. O'Sullivan, and was carried unanimously.

SAMUEL KENT, esq. moved, and the Rev. Mr. CHESHYRE, seconded a vote of thanks to the Mayor, for the use of the hall, which was carried unanimously.

Mr. SPOONER, then left the chair, which was taken by John Brown, esq. when a vote of thanks to the Chairman, was carried by acclamation.

Mr. SPOONER returned thanks; he felt deeply the high honour conferred upon him, in placing him in the chair on that important occasion, and if he had discharged the duties to the satisfaction of the meeting, he was amply repaid. He could not suffer them to depart without reminding them, that they had not assembled there that day for the purpose of displaying any hostile feeling. Far from it; they were actuated by christian principles and a high sense of duty, and their only object was to point out the errors of the Romish Church,

and to promote the extension of the principles of Protestantism. He entreated them therefore, to lay aside any hostile feeling which the details laid before them that day, might possibly have called forth, and remember that their cause was peaceful, and by peace and good will alone, could it be promoted.

The meeting then separated. Though it lasted four hours, it was evident to the last, that the auditors were deeply interested by the proceedings.

# GREAT PROTESTANT MEETING

AT

## HEREFORD,

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9TH, 1835.

---

Immediately after the meeting of the 7th, at Worcester, another meeting was held in the Town Hall, at Hereford, as by the following Report.

THE public meeting of the recently-established Protestant Association, for the city and county of Hereford, was held at the Shire Hall in that city, on Wednesday, the 9th of September, 1835, and was attended at the request of the Association, by the Rev. R. M'Ghee, the Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan, and the Rev. Edward Tottenham; by the former of whom there had been previously addressed, through the *Dublin Evening Mail*, the following letter to the Rev. Patrick Woods, which also appeared in the *Hereford Times*.

“ TO THE REV. PATRICK WOODS, COMPILER OF THE ‘PRIEST’S DIRECTORY,’ UNDER THE AUSPICES OF DR. MURRAY.

“ SIR—England is beginning to ask herself whether, after all the professions of liberalism and toleration with which the Church of Rome has mocked her, it is really a fact that the bishops and priests maintain the doctrines of intolerance, persecution, and cruelty, exhibited in the ‘Theology of Peter Dens.’ She is beginning to inquire whether those men ought to be the representatives of a free and an enlightened nation, who are ready to bow her liberties and her religion at the foot of a few tools of the Papal tyranny.

“ The exposures of Exeter Hall are making slow but steady progress among that reflecting people; her counties are raising investi-

gation on the subject, and are determining that truth shall be brought out.

“ An association of some of the most respectable and influential men in the county and city of Hereford have determined to call a meeting for this purpose, which is to be held at the Town Hall of Hereford, on September 9th. I have perceived from the committee of this association a pressing invitation to go over on that occasion. It would be very inconvenient for me at present to go ; but I should gladly sacrifice any personal convenience to the elucidation of truth on such an important occasion. There is no man more competent to throw light on this subject than yourself. The attempt that Dr. Murray has made, at the expense of his oath, to deny the principles of Peter Dens—the efforts which you have so unsuccessfully made to exculpate him and your church—Mr. O’Connell’s cowardice, and Dr. MacHale’s fury on the subject—all prove how you are alarmed, and most justly alarmed, at the awful nature of the facts demonstrated against you.

“ Now, sir, you complained of want of fairness in not letting you know the charges to be brought against your church at Exeter Hall ; you complained of the unkindness of not offering to bear your expenses to go over there to defend your bishops and brethren ; you complained of the improbability of obtaining a fair hearing in such an assembly.

“ Now, to meet all your complaints, and to obviate all possible difficulty in the way of elucidating the facts, and affording you every opportunity of exculpation—though we have hitherto demanded the authority of your bishop for any one to appear, yet, I think, that as compiler of the Directory, and being so deeply implicated in the facts, you have a right to a dispensation in this particular ; therefore, I hope it will be admitted as just and fair to offer you the following opportunity, in addition to all that has been done :—

“ I will go, please God, if you choose to consent, and meet you and any friend you like to bring with you (as I believe Mr. O’Sullivan will be there), at Hereford, on the 9th instant, that is, Wednesday æ’nnight.

“ The charges you know, as to the adoption of Dens’s Theology for your standard of conference. I need not specify them, as you have them in the reports of the Exeter Hall meetings.

“ I will give you fifty guineas to bear your own expenses, and those of your friend.

“ The evidence to be adduced shall be—bring over yourself your own Directories, since the time you began to compile them to this year ; I will bring Dens’s Theology, Dr. Murray’s letter to Lord Melborne, and your own letter to the *Dublin Evening Post*.

"As to a fair hearing, I pledge myself that you shall be heard with as much attention as I shall be; and if you are not, I shall get up with you, and quit a meeting that could act so indecorously.

"Expecting your answer in the pages of the *Dublin Evening Mail* on Friday, I have the honour to be, sir, your obedient servant,

"August 31."

"R. M'GHEE."

Following the precedent of the Exeter Hall meetings, the admission was by tickets, and such was the eagerness with which applications were made for them from all quarters, that nearly the whole number printed (1200) were exhausted several days prior to the meeting. So numerous, indeed, were the disappointments to those who were late in applying, and so intense the anxiety evinced to obtain them, that the committee felt themselves called upon, as will be seen on perusal of the proceedings, to hold an adjourned meeting on the evening of the same day, and although the Concert-room in the Shire Hall had been selected as being the largest in the county, and two temporary galleries erected on each side of the orchestra at the upper end of the room, the accommodation was insufficient for the numbers. Every precaution, however, was taken to prevent confusion, and to enable those provided with tickets of admission, to take their places without difficulty or mutual annoyance, and it is by all admitted that the arrangements made for the purpose proved to be most completely successful. At an early hour on the morning of Wednesday, the city of Hereford was thronged. The doors of the Shire Hall were beset long before the hour of opening, eleven; the body of the room was soon crowded, and before twelve, all the reserved seats in and about the orchestra, which had been set apart for persons of the highest station, were completely occupied. The total number of persons present were within a very few of 1200, including many individuals of the highest consideration in the county and their families, a numerous body of the clergy, a great number of the respectable residents and tradesmen of Hereford, and many of the tenants and yeomanry of the county, as well as several gentlemen from the adjoining counties. It was universally admitted that such an assemblage, either in point of number or station, was never before witnessed in the county of Hereford. It is impossible to particularize all, but among those present were the following:—

Sir J. G. Cotterell, Bart.; Sir E. F. S. Stanhope, Bart.; the Venerable Archdeacon Wetherell; the Rev. Dr. Prosser; the Rev.

Chancellor of the Diocese ; Rev. Dr. Clutton, Rev. Canon Matthews, Rev. Custos Garbett, and from eighty to a hundred of the clergy of the diocese.

A great number of gentlemen of the county.

The Mayor, most of the Aldermen, and many resident gentlemen of the city.

Among the Ladies were—The Dowager Lady Southampton, Lady Scudamore Stanhope, Lady Coffin Greenly, Mrs. and Miss Cotterells, Hon. Mrs. Allen, Mrs. Archdeacon Wetherell, &c. &c.

A platform was erected in the orchestra for the speakers ; and precisely at twelve o'clock Sir Edwyn Stanhope entered the room, accompanied by the Rev. Mr. M'Ghee, the Rev. Mr. O'Sullivan, the Rev. Mr. Tottenham, the Vice Presidents of the Association, and the Members of the Committee. These gentlemen having taken their seats,—

It was moved by Sir J. Cotterell, Bart., and seconded by Mr. Archdeacon Wetherell, that Sir E. F. S. Stanhope, Bart., do take the chair, which was carried by acclamation.

The CHAIRMAN then addressed the assemblage, and said that, having met for objects of such high and solemn importance, he was sure they would agree with him in the propriety of commencing their proceedings by prayer for the blessing of God upon their undertaking, and he should, therefore, call upon Mr. Archdeacon Wetherell for that purpose.

An appropriate prayer was accordingly read by the Venerable Archdeacon.

The CHAIRMAN then rose, and spoke as follows—Ladies and Gentlemen, although I am reluctant to trespass upon the time of the meeting, I cannot refrain from making one observation, with the view of disabusing the minds of those who conceive that the object of the association is political. So far from such being the case, pressing invitations to attend the meeting were dispatched to the gentlemen in the city and county of Hereford known to advocate liberal politics, and every possible measure has been adopted by the committee to show that the object of the meeting was not a party one, or connected with political views. Their efforts, it appears, however, have not been attended with success. I hold in my hand a handbill addressed to the electors of Hereford, in which my name occupies a conspicuous situation. Whether the object of that was to intimidate me, or those

who have taken an active part in these proceedings, I do not know. If, however, it was so intended, I have only to say that the scheme has signally failed. I do not mean to say that I am not to be influenced by fear, but then it is the fear of God and not the fear of man. On the part of the Protestant Association, I again beg leave to disclaim, in the most peremptory terms, any intention beyond that of holding fast by the blessings which we enjoy from the established religion of the country. That religion is the Protestant religion, and I may add that it is incumbent upon Protestants of all denominations, especially those who claim to be more zealous than the members of the Church of England in the maintenance of civil and religious liberty, to weigh well the important facts which will be laid before them this day. Those Protestants I call upon deliberately to consider whether, conscientiously, they can uphold the doctrines of the Church of Rome by weakening and endangering the power and stability of the Established Church of England. I think, after the statements which it is intended to lay before them have been made, it will by all be agreed that the object of the meeting involves far higher considerations than the politics of the day, and that it is addressed to all, and concerns their most important interests. Before I sit down, I will read the notice convening this meeting, and the rules by which those who attend it must be content to be bound; and if there should be, which I am sure there will not, any disposition to disturb or interrupt the meeting, I shall feel it my duty strictly to enforce them. The following is the notice:—

“Protestant Association of the city and county of Hereford, for disseminating a knowledge of the principles and practices of Popery, and promoting the great principles of Protestantism, as maintained by the Established Church of England and Ireland.

“A meeting of persons friendly to the objects of the above Association will be held in the large room, at the Shire Hall, Hereford, on Wednesday, September 9th, 1835, for making known, from authentic documents, the real tenets of Popery, as now held by the Roman Catholic bishops, and priests of Ireland, contrasted with the principles of Protestantism, as maintained by the Established Church of England and Ireland.”

And these are the rules of the meeting:—

1.—No person to be admitted without a ticket.

2.—As the meeting is not convened for discussion, no persons



but those deputed by the committee will be allowed to address the meeting.

3.—Every person using the privilege of a ticket, is considered as pledged to adhere to the rules of the meeting, and to submit to the chair.

I will not detain you any longer, but proceed at once to the business of the meeting, by calling on the Rev. Mr. M'Ghee.

The Rev. R. M'GHEE rose and spoke as follows—Mr. Chairman, In presenting ourselves before this meeting, my reverend brethren and and I are delivered from the embarrassing apprehension that we shall not receive a patient and attentive hearing—we cannot fear a kind reception from those at whose special instance and invitation we have the honour to appear in the Shire Hall of Hereford this day; our only apprehension arises from a sense of our own incompetence to do justice to the vast importance of the subject, for the consideration of which your meeting has been convened; and to the deep-felt sense of that importance, which we doubt not is entertained by every individual who hears us. You are not convened to listen to empty declamation, but to investigate important facts. You come here, we trust, in a spirit of calm sobriety, to learn for yourselves the real nature of those facts and documents, the very report of which has awakened such astonishment and alarm in your breasts, and not in yours alone, but I believe in the breast of every man of sober reflection and of sound religion, who has heard of them through the length and breadth of England. You wish to be satisfied whether it can really be demonstrated to your own eyes and ears, that a body of men are to be found professing to be ministers of christianity, who are the spiritual instructors of above seven millions of your fellow-subjects, who really hold as a system, principles in the middle of the nineteenth century which have been justly considered as a disgrace to mankind in the darkest ages of the world; for you cannot consider that a system deserves the name of christian, whose principles are alike abhorrent from all the doctrines of true religion, and revolting to all the feelings of humanity. You wish to ascertain how far it can be proved that the worst anticipations of those who opposed the concession of political power to Popery have been more than realized—whether the faithlessness, the treachery, the perjury, the intolerance, the persecution, the cruelty, of which you have been reading in your daily journals, and have been exemplified

in every grade of society, from the dock to the senate, are to be considered merely as the crimes of individuals, or to be traced to the dark destructive principles systematically inculcated by the doctrines and ministers of their religion. These are the important subjects which you desire to investigate; and, to give whatever information I can convey on them, I shall proceed without further preface to lay before you—

First, a summary statement of the case, as it stood at the close of our last meeting at Exeter Hall, on the 11th of July.

Secondly, I shall show you the various opportunities that have been afforded to the Roman Catholic bishops, priests, and demagogues, of confronting the statements there made, had they been able to do so.

Thirdly, I shall show you the fresh light that has been thrown on the subject by new documents and proofs that have come before us since that meeting.

First, then—The reports of our meetings at Exeter Hall, and of the statements there made, have been so amply laid before you in the cheap form in which they have been published, and are so easily accessible to all, that it is unnecessary to take up your attention, or the pages of the public press, with any lengthened details of them; and I only just advert to them sufficiently to connect the facts, and to show the books to those who may be curious to see such a magazine of iniquity. [Here the Rev. Gentleman held up *Dens's Theology* to the meeting, and briefly recapitulated the facts and proofs already so clearly put before the public at the former meeting; and having done so he proceeded.]

I shall now, in the second place, show you the opportunities which have been afforded to the Roman Catholic Church, of meeting these facts and proofs.

1.—The advertisement signed by three deans, one fellow of Dublin University, and sixteen of the clergy of Dublin, before the first meeting of the 20th of June, specifying the nature of the charges to be brought against them, and inviting the Roman Catholic bishops, and especially Dr. Murray, either to come themselves, or to appoint any priest or layman to meet them.

2.—A letter was addressed to Mr. O'Connell in the *Standard*, on June 17, apprising him of the meeting at Exeter Hall on the 20th, and inviting him to come, if he was able, to defend his bishops.

3.—Before the second meeting on the 11th of July, a private letter was delivered to Dr. Murray, informing him of the second meeting, referring him to the report of the first for the charges, and documents that proved them, and inviting him to delegate either any of the priests, or Mr. O'Connell, or Mr. Sheil, or any one he pleased, on the spot, to meet the case, which should be re-stated.

4.—After the second meeting, when Mr. O'Connell affected to throw contempt on charges which he was unable to answer, and called us all mountebanks, a letter was addressed to him in the *Times* of July 17, in which the following challenge was conveyed—

“ I challenge you now, sir, in the face of all England, to meet these charges, if you are able, under the following circumstances :—Choose any one or two men, priests or laymen, to stand beside you, and you shall be met by either two or three of those whom (where you know they cannot meet you) you call mountebanks ; select on your side two English lawyers, and we will select two more ; let those lawyers on each side choose respectively six members of the House of Lords, and six of the House of Commons, that will give us fourteen persons on each side, and let them choose a chairman. Now, I challenge you to debate before this select body of noblemen and gentlemen, men of talent and professional skill, this question, which is not a question of theology in which we might be supposed to have an advantage, but of plain, legal documentary evidence, in the consideration of which you are thoroughly practised.”

5.—On the day of our second meeting, July the 11th, a letter was addressed by Mr. Woods, the Roman Catholic priest, who compiled the Directories under Dr. Murray's orders, to the *Dublin Evening Post*, in which he makes three complaints in the shape of questions to the Editor of the *Standard*, as follow :—

“ 1st. If the Rev. Gentlemen who spoke on that occasion, felt all the anxiety they expressed for the spiritual regeneration of the Irish priests and people, why did they not bring the word of salvation home to our doors ? The Rotundo, in Dublin, is just as commodious as Exeter Hall in the sister capital.

“ 2nd. He asks, ‘ Was the constitution or character of that meeting such as to induce Catholics to suppose they should obtain an impartial hearing ?’

“ 3rd. Was it kind to invite us over to London, and not to name the pious fund on which we were to draw for our travelling expenses ?”

can only hope to stand and prevail, by purifying and perfecting itself, never by heaping injuries upon its adversary." Exaggerated representations! What are they? What representations of the facts that have been brought before the public respecting the Church of Rome have been exaggerated? I must take the liberty of saying, that this reverend gentleman would have served the cause of truth more effectually had he come forward here upon this platform to-day to prove this asserted exaggeration, than by sitting down to write the assertion in a letter to the *Hereford Times*;—and as to the motives for this exaggeration, which he ascribes to us—namely, that it is "to screen and perpetuate equal if not worse deformities in another church," I shall only answer this by suggesting to the reverend author that if he considers there are less deformities in the Church of Rome than in the Church of England, the best and most conscientious act he can perform is to associate himself with the church in which he thinks the least deformity is to be found. But what is the authority for his assertion which he adduces?—a speech of Mr. Sheil's, and a note upon that speech. When a member of the House of Commons chooses to publish a speech he has delivered, he foregoes the protection of his privilege, and challenges the public attention to the document. I therefore avail myself of this circumstance to make some remarks on this speech of Mr. Sheil's. It is as follows:—

SPEECH:—"And with this small sum religion thrives in Belgium (religion never dies except of pecuniary repletion :) while the Protestant Church in Ireland, with all its wealth, makes in conversion no way. How much more rational it is to appeal to the example of the Belgian people than to the doctrines, the detestable doctrines, of a Belgian professor, and to try the Catholic religion by the practice of the great body of its professors, than to determine it by ponderous volumes of exploded theology, which give aliment to prejudices viler than the worms by which those tomes of virulent divinity are consumed! In Belgium the Protestant clergy are supported by grants made by a Catholic parliament, and not only is not the allowance a narrow one, but in consideration of the charges attendant on the Protestant pastor, he receives a larger stipend than the Roman Catholic rector. The statesmen of Exeter Hall, however, shutting out these facts, would blow the dust that covers the work of Dens into the eyes of the British people. Because here are abominable opinions in Dens, there are to be abominable sinecures in Ireland; because priests are charged with a disposi-

tion to propagate religion with the sword, parsons are to levy tithes with the bayonet. Are you to have your Rathcormacks, because we had our auto-da-fes?"

**NOTE.**—"Since this speech was spoken, the copy of Dens, which was in the possession of Dr. Doyle, has been put into my hands. A commentary is attached, in the handwriting of that eminent prelate, to the passages which have excited some sensation in this country. To the question, 'An hæretici recte puniantur morte?' (whether heretics may justly be punished with death?) Dens answers in the affirmative. Dr. Doyle annexes the following pithy remark to the text, 'Shocking! false.' Dens appeals to the old Jewish law: Dr. Doyle says, 'A theocracy is no rule for us.' Dens lays it down, 'Infideles baptizati possunt compelli.' (Unbelievers may be compelled to receive baptism). Dr. Doyle observes, 'Dominus non indiget auxilio hominum: non sic docuerunt Apostoli' (The Lord needs not the aid of men: nor have the Apostles so taught)."

The doctrine of Dens, "exploded theology!"—most impudent assertion! What! a work published by the command of his bishops in 1808—re-published for the standard of their conferences in 1832—"exploded theology!" We would blow, indeed, "the dust that covers the works of Dens into the eyes of the British public!" I know not what dust is to be found on the works of Dens, unless his priests have thumbed into dust the edition of 1808, and so made a new edition necessary in 1832. Now I can forgive a man a mistake, but I cannot forgive him a wilful, deliberate, intentional misrepresentation of a fact. Mr. Sheil knew the facts of this case as well as I know them—he knew that neither he nor Mr. O'Connell dared to stand forward on the public platform to contradict them—he had in his possession the work of Dens to read—I know he had it—he had access to the Directories sent over by his priests to Mr. O'Connell, and lodged in evidence before the Orange committee; he knew the questions debated by his priests in 1832—he had all the documents before him; and in the face of these well-known and established facts he has the presumption to stand forward in the House of Commons and call the work of Dens—"exploded theology," a work yet fresh and uncut upon the shelves of the bookseller of his bishops. Perhaps the gentleman will tell us that this was a mere "rhetorical flourish" in the House; but I beg to inform him that such rhetorical flourishes only gain their deserved contempt in the estimation of a well-principled and reflecting nation; they do not serve to throw discredit on the facts of Dens's Theology, they only prove that the man who makes them has been educated in its principles.

But now let us examine the sentiments that are laid down in this vaunted speech of Mr. Sheil. He says, "How much more rational is it, to appeal to the example of the Belgian people than to the doctrines, the detestable doctrines of a Belgian professor, and to try the Catholic religion by the practice of the great body of the professors, than to determine it by ponderous volumes of exploded theology!"

There is nothing which has more struck me throughout all the case of this theology of Dens, than the remarkable directions of Divine Providence in various circumstances concerning it. I confess I think it important to trace the hand of Providence in those circumstances which we are often so ready to ascribe to what we call accident. Now I never saw Mr. Sheil's speech till yesterday. I could have had no anticipation that this rev. gentleman would quote it in the *Hereford Times*; but I put into my portmanteau a paper, without the least idea that I should ever require to use it, which enables me to bring this speech of Mr. Sheil to a test, for which I believe that gentleman was little prepared. I hold here a document of no ordinary importance to throw light upon this subject, and it is this—a copy of several articles of the Constitution drawn up at the time that the kingdoms of Holland and the Netherlands were united in the year 1815, which articles were presented to the Belgian bishops, to swear to observe them; and I have here the articles in the original French, with the answers of the bishops thereon, which I shall now translate. We shall first see the article on religious liberty:—

CONSTITUTION.

"ART. 190. Liberty of religious opinions is guaranteed to all.

"ART. 191. Equal protection is granted to all religious communions which exist in the kingdom.

Now what did the Bishops answer to these articles? Their answer is as follows:—

"ART. 190, 191. To swear to maintain the liberty of religious opinions, and equal protection to all kinds of religious worship, what is this else but to swear to maintain and protect error as the truth?"

CONSTITUTION.

"ART. 192. All subjects of the King, without distinction of religious belief, are to enjoy the same civil and political rights, and are eligible to all dignities and all employments whatsoever."

## ANSWER OF THE BISHOPS TO THIS.

"ART. 192. To swear to maintain the observance of a law which renders all subjects of the King, of whatsoever religious belief they may be, eligible to possess all dignities and employments whatsoever, this would be to justify beforehand, and to sanction, the measures which might be taken to confide the interests of our holy religion in the provinces, so eminently Catholic, to Protestant functionaries."

## CONSTITUTION.

"ART. 193. The exercise of no public worship is to be hindered, unless in any case where it might disturb the public order and tranquillity.

## ANSWER OF BISHOPS.

"ART. 193.—To swear to observe and to maintain a law which places in the hands of the government the power to stop the exercise of the Catholic religion, if it should prove an occasion of trouble to the state, is only to make, for the future, the exercise of our holy religion depend, as far as in us lies, on the will of its enemies and the malice of the wicked."

## CONSTITUTION.

"ART. 196.—The King takes care that no religious worship should be molested in the liberty of that exercise which the fundamental law assures to it; he also takes care that all religions should restrain themselves within that obedience which they owe to the laws of the state."

## ANSWER OF BISHOPS.

"ART. 196.—To swear to observe and to maintain a law which supposes that the Catholic Church is subject to the laws of the state, is plainly to expose ourselves to co-operate in the subjugation of the church. This is in fact to submit, according to the expression of our Holy Father the Pope, 'the spiritual power to the caprices of the secular power.'"—(Bull of the 10th June, 1809.)

## CONSTITUTION.

"ART. 145.—The states are charged with the laws relative to the protection of the different religions and their public worship, to the public instruction, to the administration of public charity, to the encouragement of agriculture, commerce, and manufactures, as well as with all other laws which the King entrusts to them for this purpose."

## ANSWER OF BISHOPS.

"ART 145.—To swear to observe and to maintain a law which authorises the provincial states to execute the laws relative to the protection of the different religions, and their public worship, to public instruction—is not this to confide the most important interests of religion to laymen? God forbid that any son of the church should consent by such a solemn oath to maintain such an order of things."

I shall not read any other except the following extract from the conclusion of the bishops' address on the constitution as follows :—

“There are yet other articles which a true son of the church could not engage himself by an oath to observe and maintain, such as in particular the 227th, which authorises the liberty of the press.”

Here now we follow Mr. Sheil's advice—we go to the actual facts—we go to the Belgian bishops, to “the great body of the professors” of the Church of Rome in Belgium. We have here their sentiments solemnly and collectively expressed on the important subjects of *religious liberty, equal political privileges, toleration of Protestant worship, subjection to a Protestant government, and the vaunted boast of liberty of the press*; and what do we find? We find the whole body of the Belgian bishops strictly adhering to the theology of Peter Dens. Mr. Sheil is most unfortunate in his reference to his bishops; he referred us to the oaths of the Irish bishops abjuring the persecuting doctrines. We went to their oaths, and we compared their public oaths with their published authorised standard of theology—with the actual questions and answers of their diocesan conferences, and we found them guilty in that oath of a confederated act of perjury. He refers us now to the liberal principles of the Belgian bishops; we go to those bishops, and we find in the public documents submitted to the King, in their public refusal to take the oaths prescribed to them, not indeed that they violated their oaths, but that, to save themselves from the commission of perjury, they preferred the alternative of intolerance and persecution. So much for Mr. Sheil's speech on his bishops. Now we come to the note; and we find him informing us that the copy of Dens that had been in the possession of Dr. Doyle, had come into his hands with a note written in that prelate's own hand, on these persecuting doctrines which we shall consider.

I regret that Mr. Sheil has introduced the name of Dr. Doyle. When men have long been dead, and when sorrow and sympathy have long subsided for their loss, we refer to their works, and canvass their opinions, and criticise or condemn them, without scruple or remorse; but when men have recently departed from this life, there is a sort of reverential feeling for the dead that imposes a sacred silence on the tongue of reprehension of their memory; perhaps it is a feeling of awe at the remembrance that they have passed so lately



to that eternal tribunal to which we ourselves are soon to follow them. This feeling, I confess, has prevented me throughout this whole subject from casting any personal reflection on Dr. Doyle; but all such feelings must give way to the elucidation of truth; and since Mr. Sheil has dragged him forward, we must state the facts. Never, then, I say, was there a more contemptible imposture trumped up to blind the public than this pretended note of Dr. Doyle. I do not charge it on Mr. Sheil; perhaps he has been himself imposed on; but come from whence it may, it is utterly absurd—for what is the fact?—Was not Dr. Doyle one of the four bishops of the province of Leinster that adopted Deus's Theology as the conference book for his diocese? Were not the questions of 1832 discussed by his own clergy in his own presence? Was not that question proposed—"What are the penalties decreed, *late*, decreed by the laws of the infallible church against those infected with heresy?" and is it a likely story that he approved and appointed the book and the question, and then, indeed, wrote, "*Shockingly false*," on the foot of his own appointed answer? Absurd. But, continues Mr. Sheil in his note—"Dens appeals to the old Jewish law; Dr. Doyle says, a theocracy is no rule for us." Now, this is a point on which we can throw some light. What is the authority of the Jewish law to which Dens appeals, and what interpretation have the Irish Roman Catholic bishops put upon that law? Dens, in the chapter on which he asserts the propriety of putting heretics to death, adds as follows:—

"This is confirmed, because God in the Old Testament ordered the false prophets to be slain, and in Deut. chap. xvii. ver. 12, it is ordained that whosoever is proud and unwilling to obey the commands of the priest, let him be put to death.

"The same is proved by the condemnation of the 14th article of John Huss in the council of Constance."

Here we see this is proved not only on the authority of the Jewish law, but also by the decree of the infallible council of Constance. But now let us see whether the Romish bishops agree or not with Dens in his construction of the Jewish law, and here you shall see in another document how exactly they tally on the subject.

I hold in my hands the celebrated quarto Bible, published under the authority of Dr. Troy, the then Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, in the year 1816, by Mr. Coyne. This was the Bible against which Mr. O'Connell pretended to make an outcry, when the *British Critic*

called it into notice for the intolerance and wickedness of its notes, but which notes never were withdrawn to this day. This is the Bible which Mr. Coyne so honestly and firmly asserted to have been printed by Dr. Troy's order, when that prelate wanted to shift the imputation from himself, because, as he said, it injured the cause of emancipation. Now, let me read it to you from this Bible the note published by this authority on this very passage, which Dens quotes as authorizing the murder of heretics :—

“ Note.—Deut. xvii.—Here we see what authority God was pleased to give to the church guides of the Old Testament, in deciding without appeal all controversies relating to the law, promising that they should not err therein; and punishing with death such as proudly refused to obey their decisions; and surely he has not done less for the church guides of the New Testament.”

Mark, here, the comment of these bishops and priests on this passage; they corroborate its application by Dens—they assert that it gives them the same authority that he does, and so far from saying that a Jewish theocracy is no rule for them, they make it their rule for this very crime of murdering heretics. Bear this in mind, and tell your children that you have seen the Bible published by the Roman Catholic priests and bishops of Ireland, in which they make the God of heaven to sanction the crime of murder by men who, under the Christian dispensation, are, or at least profess to be, ministers of the New Testament. Now, this note has been stereotyped in two editions of the Bible since, omitting merely a few words which do not in the least derogate from its object or its authority, and you may see from these facts how the story of Dr. Doyle is to be depended on, asserting that a “theocracy is no rule for them.” But this is not all. Dr. Doyle's own opinions are on record, and I shall read to you a document, an extract from a letter of his own; this letter was published in August, 1825, on the following occasion :—The priests had interrupted the clergy at the meetings of the Bible Societies, and there was a challenge to the priests from five Protestant clergymen to meet them and discuss the right and duty of reading the Scriptures. Dr. Doyle wrote a letter to his priests to forbid the discussion—this letter I hold in my hand, and I find in it the following passage :—

“ The errors maintained by the members of the Bible Society regard either the primary articles of the Christian faith, or truths already defined by the church. Both these classes of truths are immovably and definitively settled; God or his church, or rather both, have

spoken; and as St. Augustine said to the Pelagians—'The cause is concluded; I wish the error would at length cease—*causa finita est, utinam aliquando finiretur error.*' There can be no new hearing, no new trial. The church at Trent invited the heretics of the sixteenth century (those who broached or renewed the errors which are now revived) to plead their own cause before the council: these blind and obstinate men refused to do so, but their cause was examined fully and dispassionately—sentence at length was passed, and the matter set at rest for ever. *Causa finita est.* It can never be revived; it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to our fathers so to determine; there can be no rehearing of it. There is no higher tribunal constituted by God, no one or many to whom a new issue could be directed for trial; whosoever does not hear the church let him be a heathen and a publican. Those who are cut off on account of their obstinacy may complain, but there is no remedy for them but in submission; the church may soothe, may explain; she may relax or alter her discipline to favour their weakness or to assist them to return; but the one faith she cannot alter; it is as simple and as immutable as God himself."

Such were Dr. Doyle's opinions as to heretics, and I believe they are sufficiently intolerant and persecuting to show what credit is to be attached to the note brought forward by Mr. Sheil—notwithstanding the accumulation of weight and authority which it derives from the Rev. author who has transcribed it, in a letter to the *Hereford Times*, and to whose kind assistance we are indebted for this additional illustration of *Dens's Theology*.

The next document that appears to have thrown fresh light on the subject, is the postscript to a pamphlet of Mr. Croly, a Roman Catholic priest—it is as follows:—

POSTSCRIPT TO MR. CROLY'S SECOND PAMPHLET.

"*Omnibus quorum interest.*—The Theology of Peter Dens, which is now before the world, is a standard work of Irish Catholic orthodoxy and of Roman Catholic orthodoxy universally. It was published in Ireland and on the Continent in the customary way, 'permissu superiorum'—with the full sanction and approbation of episcopal authority. No exception was ever taken to it in whole or in part. It was printed in Ireland expressly for the use of the Irish Catholic priests—to be their guide in casuistry and speculation. In the library of Dr. Murphy's seminary in Cork, there were fifty or sixty copies of it, for the use of the seminary and the diocesan clergy. It should be remarked here, that Dens is not singular in his doctrine respecting

‘heretics.’ Every Roman Catholic theologian who has written on the same subject, coincides with Dens. This matter shall be handled in my next publication.”

The next document which has since come to light to illustrate this subject, is the dedication to Dr. Murray himself, in which the book is stated to be undertaken expressly with his approbation—

“Ejus cum approbatione susceptam.”

To suppose that a Roman Catholic prelate would allow a work on all the doctrines of his church to be dedicated to him with a most elaborate and encomiastic dedication, as undertaken by his authority, when it really was not undertaken by his authority, is an absurdity too great to admit of a moment’s entertainment. There were several copies to which this dedication had not been prefixed, and those in our possession at Exeter Hall, were among them; but I here hold in my hand a copy with the dedication prefixed, which I have since procured.

The next document which I hold in my hand, without having a direct bearing on the evidence of the case, throws such a relative light on it, and affords such a practical specimen of the adoption of the principles of Peter Dens by the bishops themselves, that I cannot but quote it as one of exquisite singularity. It is, perhaps, within the recollection of many in this assembly, that in the year 1808, and before and after that time, it was a point much discussed by Roman Catholics, as well as by members of the senate, whether they might not be admitted to political power, the king of England having a *veto* on the appointment of the Roman Catholic bishops. Among other places, this point was agitated in Kilkenny—I know not at all the particulars of the facts, nor are they of any importance to the case; but it is only necessary to remark that the documents refer to this subject. The first which I shall read is signed “George Bryan;” this gentleman, known as Major Bryan, is a Roman Catholic gentleman, of the first property and respectability in the county of Kilkenny the same, if I mistake not, whose claim to the Slane peerage has just been before the House of Lords; this is the gentleman whose signature is affixed to this first document. It is as follows:—

“Jenkinstown, November 4, 1808.

“Reports having been most industriously circulated, in order to injure the Roman Catholic committee for the county and city of Kilkenny in the estimation of their Roman Catholic brethren, I feel

myself called upon to lay the following statement before the public :— On the 17th of October last, the committee met and voted addresses to Lords Fingall and Grenville, and to Messrs. Grattan and Ponsonby ; it was then thought advisable to apply to Dr. Lanigan, the titular Bishop of Ossory, for his signature. We, in consequence, sent him a deputation for that purpose, and adjourned until the 20th, in order to give him time to consider of the answer he might think proper to return. On the 20th we accordingly again met, when the deputation reported to us that the bishop had promised to sign our addresses. What then must have been our astonishment to find that on the 22d he refused to fulfil his solemn promise given to our deputation ? I cannot avoid saying, that the manner in which Dr. Lanigan has acted on this occasion, convinces me more than ever, how very necessary it is that the Crown should have a veto on the nomination of Irish Roman Catholic Bishops.

“ GEORGE BRYAN,

“ Chairman of the Roman Catholic Committee for the  
“ County and City of Kilkenny.”

[See *Leinster Journal*, Saturday, Nov. 5, 1808.]

In the next *Leinster Journal* the following appeared :—

“ BISHOP LANIGAN'S FIVE REASONS.

“ Kilkenny, November 8, 1808.

“ An advertisement appeared in the *Leinster Journal* of last Saturday, signed ‘ George Bryan,’ in which I am charged with a breach of a solemn promise. A public attack of this kind necessarily calls upon any man to justify his conduct, if in his power. A plain narrative of facts as they happened, and an explanation of the motives on which I acted, will complete this justification, I hope, in the eyes of any impartial man.

“ 1st. I acknowledge that I promised some gentlemen of the committee that I would sign these addresses, when some lines to which I objected would be expunged. But I utterly deny having made any solemn promise, if by a solemn promise Mr. Bryan means any more than a serious promise ; for nothing in actions, expressions, or writing, was added to the verbal declaration I made of signing the addresses when corrected ; the nature of the case did not at all require a solemn promise, and the gentlemen who presented these petitions to me had too much sagacity and judgment to alarm my suspicions by such a proposal, for the consequences would probably be a rejection of the addresses on the spot. 2ndly. Some days elapsed before the corrected addresses were again brought to me to be signed. In this interval

many of the clergy and laity of this city came to me and remonstrated against my signing these addresses; they urged that these addresses were calculated to pass an indirect censure on the proceedings of the prelates in Dublin, and to diminish the respect due to their late resolutions—that they were preparatory steps to the concession of a veto to the government in the nomination of the Catholic prelates of Ireland; and that a general dislike and disapprobation of these addresses prevailed amongst the great majority of the priests and Catholic laity of the city. When I ascertained this last fact I resolved not to sign the addresses, and was at the same time convinced that I was guilty of no sin or crime in such a refusal. I am convinced that a serious, sincere, and a voluntary promise binds a man who makes it, under the pain of sin, to fulfil it; but I am likewise convinced that the obligation arising from a promise also ceases in the following cases:—

“ 1st. If a man promises a thing impossible, for no man can be bound to do a thing impossible to be done.

“ 2nd. If a man promises to do anything sinful or unlawful, for no promise, though confirmed with an oath, can bind a man to commit sin.

“ 3rd. When a person in whose favour a promise is made, releases the promiser from the promise he has made.

“ 4th. When a man promises a thing pernicious or useless to the person in whose favour the promise is made.

“ 5th. When before the promise is fulfilled, the circumstances become so changed that the person promising, had he foreseen those circumstances, would never have made the promise.

“ On this case I rest my justification: for had I foreseen or known that my signing the addresses would produce such alarm and consternation, such dislike and disapprobation, as I afterwards found they would in the minds of the great majority of the Catholic priests and laity of this city, I would by no means have consented to sign them.

“ St. Thomas says that a man is not guilty of an untruth in such cases, because when he promised he intended to perform his promise; nor is he unfaithful to his promise, because the circumstances are changed afterwards. This is not only the opinion of St. Thomas, but it is also the opinion of all the theologians and canonists I ever saw or read.

“ JAMES LANIGAN.”

[See *Leinster Journal* of above date.]

(This letter was heard throughout by the meeting with continued successions of cheers and laughter.)

The following advertisement appeared in the next paper:—

“Jenkinstown, November 11, 1808.

“The explanation given by Dr. Lanigan, which appeared in the *Leinster Journal* of Wednesday last, (in answer to my advertisement,) does not, in my opinion, require an answer. It is for the public to determine whether Dr. Lanigan’s justification is (as he terms it) complete.

“GEORGE BRYAN.”

[See *Leinster Journal*, Nov. 12, 1808.]

These documents I have had some time in my hands; they excited a great sensation at the time when the transaction occurred; a few days ago, on looking over them, it occurred to me that I certainly had met with Dr. Lanigan’s Reasons somewhere before, and I thought I should be able to trace them to their real author: what was my satisfaction when I found them, except in the arrangement of their order, a literal translation of Peter Dens! I find them here in the 3d vol. p. 297.

“Quomodo cessat obligatio promissionis ?

“How does the obligation of a promise cease to bind ?

“1st, says the Doctor, If a man promises a thing impossible.

“Dens—Si res promissa fiat impossibilis.

“Dr. Lanigan, 2d—If a man promises to do anything unlawful.

“Dens—Si res promissa fiat illicita.

“Dr. Lanigan, 3d—When a person in whose favour a promise is made, releases the promiser from the promise he has made.

“Dens—Absolute cessat promissio per liberam promissarii remissionem.

“Dr. Lanigan, 4th—When a man promises a thing pernicious or useless to the person in whose favour the promise is made.

“Dens—(Si res promissa fiat) damnosa aut inutilis.

“Dr. Lanigan, 5th—When before the promise is fulfilled the circumstances become so changed, that the person promising, had he foreseen these circumstances, would never have made the promise.

“Dens—Generatim potest revocari promissio dum supervenit talis mutatio status aut rerum, ut promissor non censeatur se voluisse obligare in tali eventu.”

(Mr. McGehee translated these passages as he read them.) The most awful part of the story remains behind, that all this lying equi-

vocation about promises is in the next sentence of *Dens* transferred to oaths.

“This is also true, although the promise should be confirmed by an oath, because an oath may be considered to be taken under the same exceptions under which a promise has been made.

“*Id etiam verum est etsi promissio foret jurata, quia juramentum censetur adhiberi sub iisdem exceptionibus sub quibus facta est promissio.*”

What saith the holy word of the living God? “He that sweareth unto his neighbour and disappointeth him not though it were to his own hindrance.” What saith the iniquity of the Church of Rome? That whenever it becomes a man’s interest to break his promise or his oath, then he is at perfect liberty to do so. No man would make a promise or an oath against his own interest in the first instance,—and what is the rule of Popery laid down in this iniquitous standard of her principles? That in every change of circumstances under which he would not have originally bound himself by his promise or his oath, there he is to be considered at liberty to break it; so that he has not even any need of a dispensation for the crimes of faithlessness or perjury. Every vow, every oath that Popery can make under the present circumstances to any individual, permit her, when they are altered, to address them in the epigrammatic language of the profligate husband to his wife:—

“I loved thee, beautiful and kind,  
And plighted an eternal vow,  
So altered are thy face and mind,  
’Twere perjury to love thee now.”

It gives no small additional importance to this, that this transaction occurred entirely between Roman Catholics themselves. Major Bryan, as I have stated, is a Roman Catholic—so were the committee who waited on Dr. Lanigan—so were the proprietors of the paper in which it was published. I trust it may serve as a warning to them to open their eyes to the iniquity of their system.

The peculiar reference which it has to the present question is this, not only that these principles were translated out of *Dens*, but that this transaction happened in October, 1808, one month after the bishops of Ireland met in convocation, to which Dr. Lanigan refers in his letter, and ordered Coyne to print *Dens’s Theology*, as the best and safest guide for the Roman Catholic priesthood of Ireland.



The last document which I shall intrude on your time is the most important of all ; it is a letter addressed by the Rev. Patrick Woods, the compiler of the Directory, the secretary of Dr. Murray, to the editor of the *Dublin Evening Post* ; it is dated July 11, 1835, the very day of our last meeting at Exeter Hall.

Little did we dream, that when we were engaged in that immense public meeting, endeavouring to establish the facts as to Dr. Murray and his bishops ; little did we dream that at that very moment the Rev. Patrick Woods, the Doctor's own secretary, was occupied most diligently with his pen, in the retirement of his study, corroborating and reiterating every fact we stated ; so that if a single iota had been wanting to finish out the proof, Mr. Woods was at that moment supplying it to our hand. He states in the commencement of his letter what its object is—that as “ an attempt is made to fasten certain opinions and principles upon his ecclesiastical superior, the respect he feels towards his exalted person and character induces him to place before the public a plain and simple statement of facts.” The Rev. Gentleman, it must be confessed, has been for the most part true to his word ; so I pray you, as we proceed, to attend to his facts. He says, “ I shall not distort facts, nor indulge in coarse invectives, neither shall I attempt to stir up the passions and prejudices of the people, against my Protestant brethren and their doctrines. Before I received the imposition of hands, the directors of my collegiate course carefully informed me that I was about to become the minister of Him who was meek and humble of heart, and that I was not only to preach, but also to practise before all things mutual charity.” Would to God such principles were either instilled or practised in the Church of Rome—the gloss of charity upon the face of such a case as this reminds me of the fair phosphoric gleams that I was admiring the other night, as they flashed over the surface of the waves that rippled beneath the keel of the vessel, when I was crossing the Channel on my voyage to your city. Wonderful, indeed, and beautiful it was, to see a glow of fire on such an uncongenial element ; but it was only mocking, with the fantastic semblances of light and heat, the dark, cold gulf of death that yawned beneath it. Charity ! Christian charity upon the lips of a Popish priest that transcribed with his own hand by this, his own confession, the questions of his church's guilty horrible decrees to refuse toleration to our worship of our God, and to compel us to embrace the faith of Popery by confiscation, exile, imprison-

ment, and death! Charity upon the lips of a Popish bishop that commanded it! Charity upon the lips of a dark and guilty conclave that debated it! I can brave the threats of the Church of Rome—I can face her persecutions—but I confess I shrink with an instinctive horror from her charity. A murderer in any guise is a dark and horrid monster. But a murderer who steals up towards you with the smooth unruffled smile of charity upon his lips—who muffles his dagger beneath the cowl of the monk, or the vestments of the priest, is the deepest, darkest, deadliest assassin that ever drew a poinard from his breast. I will not say that Mr. Woods—I will not say that Dr. Murray—would be guilty of the atrocious crime of murder; but this I say, that it is the dark infernal principle of their system, printed before the world in the pages of Peter Dens. I will bear my testimony against the horrible iniquity of that system, but I must leave to God to judge how far any individuals are better than the system they profess. I trust they may be here delivered from its guilt, and hereafter escape from its condemnation. Mr. Woods informs us that in the year 1828, Dr. Murray laid his commands on him to compile the Directory for the following year; he then gives a description of what the Directory is. He says afterwards—

“ Mr. Coyne is not empowered or employed in any way by Dr. Murray to print or publish the Directory. That respectable and worthy individual has hitherto printed and published it in consequence of a private agreement between him and myself.”

You have heard of a man between two stools falling to the ground. Certainly Coyne is an exception, for he is ably supported on all sides. On the one, “ That respectable bookseller,” says Dr. Murray; “ respectable and worthy individual,” says Mr. Woods: honest, steady, respectable, and worthy Richard Coyne, say I. Mr. Woods is as delicate to Coyne as the Doctor. Like him, he does not like to press Dens too closely upon Coyne; he might find him less yielding than solid in his resistance to the pressure—

“ *Et fragili querens illidere DENTEM,  
Offendet solido.*”

I must say that every fact that is elicited establishes the literal veracity of every statement of Coyne. Mr. Woods proceeds—

“ When I was named to compile the Directory, the questions for discussion for Dublin only were prepared by me. Every other diocese had its own matter of conference.”

Perfectly true ; and this establishes the fact, as proved at our last Exeter Hall meeting—that before 1831 the conferences were diocesan.

He then states—

“ By a subsequent arrangement the bishops of the province of Leinster, four in number, agreed to have the same matter discussed, and the same order observed in discussion, at their respective conferences.

Most true ; and this establishes the fact in Coyne's advertisement, which we have proved over and over at both meetings, that the bishops of Leinster united in 1831 to make their conferences provincial—as they have continued to this day.

He goes on—

“ The person who furnished the questions before me was understood to have followed the order of Antoine—my education at Maynooth gave me a bias in favour of the treatises most familiar to me, and I adopted that of Bailly ; the provincial bishops, however, judged it expedient to have a fixed order, and gave the preference to that of Dens.”

He proceeds—

“ When the time for the publication of the Directory next following this arrangement arrived, Dr. Murray announced to me that we were to discuss the three treatises on human acts, sins, and conscience, in the subsequent conferences of the following year, and that the questions were to be taken in the order of Dens.”

Now let us see here the facts that Mr. Woods does really establish, and let us examine the principle that he intends to establish. He establishes the fact, first, as stated in the advertisement of honest worthy Mr. Coyne, that Dr. Murray and the provincial bishops selected Dens as the conference book for the province of Leinster ; he establishes the fact, if his assertion were perfectly true, that they superseded Antoine's Theology, which he says his predecessor used ; that they superseded Bailly's Theology, which he says he used, and which is the appointed class-book for the priests of Maynooth, and that they adopted Dens in preference to both. He establishes another fact, that Dr. Murray, in his own person, gave the orders for the conference to him. Dr. Murray says in his letter to Lord Melbourne—“ I did not make it the text-book for our theological conferences ;” while here we have the evidence of his own secretary, his defender, his apologist,

that he actually did make it so—that he announced to him that they were to make it their book for conferences—he told him the actual points they were to discuss, fixed the identical treatises, and the identical page where they were to begin their discussion. So much for Dr. Murray's veracity as to the actual matter of fact.

Now, let me first ask, on this case, this question—Dr. Murray's pretence to Lord Melbourn is, that there are some of the opinions of Dens "obsolete, wholly unconnected with any article of catholic faith." Well, now, Dr. Murray, on the evidence of his own secretary or compiler of his directories, announced to him that he was to prepare his questions of conference on *human acts, sins, and conscience*—and these treatises commenced in the very middle of the first volume of Dens—the preceding part of this volume is occupied with a disquisition on the Trinity, on the Divine attributes, on angels, &c.—now, Dr. Murray expressly orders these to be omitted, and that Mr. Woods is to compile the conferences from the middle of the first volume—now, since Dr. Murray omits the beginning of the first volume, in which the fundamental principles of Christianity are, why does he not omit the beginning of the second volume, in which all the doctrines of persecution are contained? Is the doctrine of the Trinity obsolete? No. Are the Divine attributes obsolete? No. Are the angels obsolete? No. Dr. Murray worships them all. Yet by his own express order these fundamental principles of his faith are all omitted, and by the same order the persecuting doctrines, which are all obsolete, are retained.

Again, Mr. Woods's aim and effort to exculpate Dr. Murray is founded on this principle—that he was desired to adopt merely the order of questions from Dens, and that the clergy were not to take the answers from that book.

Although the able and incontrovertible answer given to this principle by my Rev. brother, Mr. O'Sullivan, might preclude all further notice of it, still it is needful to point out how Mr. Woods supplies the refutation of his own principle.

He tells us his predecessor adopted the theology of Antoine for his conferences, but his education at Maynooth gave him a bias in favour of Bailly, and he adopted Bailly—now grant this, what follows? Does he mean to say that when he adopted the questions of conference from Bailly, a book that contained the principles in which he and his brother priests were educated, that he did not take the

answers from that book? Were the clergy educated in these principles as answers to these questions at Maynooth, and did they reject their principles, and find answers somewhere else, when this same book was adopted by him as the guide of his conferences?—the very question is absurd; he could not say it was possible. How then stands his argument? he took the questions from Bailly; he took the answers from Bailly when he used that book for his conferences, and Dr. Murray ordered him to supersede that book, and to take his questions from Dens, but not to take the answers from Dens—he superseded a book that contained the principles of his church—by a book that did not contain those principles! he superseded the standard containing the approved and authoritative system of education for his priests, by a book whose principles are so bad that he disclaims them on his oath in his letter to Lord Melbourne!!

“ O, what a tangled web we weave  
When first we practise to deceive.”

But I must not dismiss this, without denying the assertion of Mr. Woods, that his predecessor had taken his questions of conference from Antoine. I hold in my hand the printed questions of conference of 1825, 1826, and 1828—questions which I had compared and authenticated by Mr. Maxwell and Mr. Finch, from the priest's own directories lodged by Mr. O'Connell in evidence before the Orange committee. I have myself compared those questions with their answers, and I assert, that those questions were taken, and those answers are found in the Theology of Peter Dens; and while Dr. Murray was giving in on his oath, in evidence before the committees of parliament, the false standards of his Church, Holden's Analysis, and Verron's Rule of Faith, in 1825; the questions of conference in that year, for his own diocese, signed by his own hand, were taken, not from these, but from Dens's Theology,—not, indeed, as now, in regular consecutive order, but up and down, as I have marked the pages in this paper. Here is now another remarkable fact as to this subject, I wrote to a clergyman, a friend of mine, to beg he would call on Mr. Coyne, to try if he could get Antoine's Theology, or Holden, or Verron, and to ask Mr. Coyne if he had printed these books. I received his answer yesterday. (Here the Rev. Gentleman read the letter, stating, that Mr. Coyne had not a copy of Antoine—that it was almost impossible to get it—that he had not known of an edition of it for forty years—that he had a copy of Holden and Verron in his own private library, but none to sell, and that they

were difficult to procure.) Here, now, we perceive, from the highest authority, the impossibility of procuring these false standards, and have only to compare this fact, with the two recent and numerous editions of Dens's Theology.

But Mr. Woods proceeds :—

“Some of the clergy had been previously complaining, that they did not know whence the questions were taken, and to obviate this difficulty, as well as to avoid being taunted with having set down for discussion, matter which the priests might consider useless, light, or trifling, I honestly gave in crotches, at the head of the questions, the name of the author, from whose work I had taken them by command. Of this, Doctor Murray knew nothing, until the Directory was printed and put into his hand. Nay further, he never desired me to publish the name of Dens, nor to announce it to the Clergy. He proposed that author to me for my guidance in preparing questions; he did not name any book whence the clergy were to gather their solutions, and he publicly declared so, at a full and numerous attended conference of the metropolitan clergy.”

Now really this is too ridiculous—let me illustrate it. The Bishop of Hereford wishes to have a conference among his Clergy, on certain points of divinity, and he says, “Mr. Archdeacon, you will be so good as to prepare a series of questions from Butler's Analogy, but take care you don't tell the clergy, where the answers are to be found.” The archdeacon complies—the poor clergy are reduced to sad perplexity: one goes to look in Pearson on the Creed, another goes to hunt in Burnet, on the Articles, and they are all confounded at his lordship's ingenuity; this is exactly the case with Dr. Murray; the doctor wanted to play a game of hide and go seek with his diocese. And had it not been for the kindness of honest Mr. Woods, they never would have thought of looking for the solutions of those questions in Dens's Theology; but honest Mr. Woods, “honestly gave, in crotchets, at the head of the questions, the name of the author from whose work he had taken them by command.” But the poor doctor “knew nothing of this, until the Directory was printed, and put into his hand.” Nay, he actually “never desired Mr. Woods to publish the name of Dens, nor to announce it to the clergy.” What could the poor clergy have done, had it not been for the kindness of honest Mr. Woods? But Mr. Woods asks—

“But what is the whole upshot of this monstrous discovery? 1st. The Catholic Prelacy of Ireland approved of Dens's Theology in the

year 1808. 2ndly. Doctor Murray confirmed the act of the Bishops of 1808, by a new appropriation in 1832. This his Grace has emphatically denied."

True; Dr. Murray has emphatically denied it, but the dedication stating the work to be

"Ejus cum approbatione susceptam"

is a melancholy proof that Dr. Murray's denial is untrue, a proof strikingly corroborated by what Mr. Woods states in the next paragraph. He says—

"'But he approved of an eighth volume, and thereby sanctioned the foregoing seven.' When the new edition of Dens was nearly ready to issue from the press, it was suggested to Mr. Coyne by a friend, that a volume, not at all by Dens, (as the advertisement in the Directory clearly shows,) would prove a useful supplement to the forthcoming work, Doctor Murray was already aware of the value of the information contained in this proposed supplemental volume, and he gave his sanction to its publication, without reference to Dens or any other work."

Now I pray you attend most carefully to this, for it is one of the most important statements and admissions in the whole case. You perceive here, Mr. Woods asserts, that Dr. Murray knew well the value of the information this 8th volume contained, and that he gave his sanction to its publication—his salvo for Dr. Murray is, that this "is not at all by Dens," and that he sanctioned it, "without reference to Dens or any other work." Here, then, we have the evidence of this unquestionable witness, the confidential friend of Dr. Murray, that he knew the contents, approved their value, and sanctioned the publication of this 8th volume. Now what will be the refuge for Dr. Murray and Mr. Woods, when it is stated, what are the contents of this same 8th volume? I assert, that it is as intolerant and vile as any of the preceding seven, and that the following principles are to be found within its contents:—

1st. "That, as in Dens, it is proved, that all baptized persons are subject to the power of the Church of Rome."

2nd. "That the bishop is bound to exterminate all heretics out of his diocese, only that in so doing, he is not to interfere with the inquisitor."

3rd. "That no place, not even the altar, shall afford a sanctuary for heretics, the inquisitor is authorised to drag him from the sanctuary of the very altar, only he must inform his friend and brother persecutor, the bishop."

4th. "That the very fundamental principles of Protestant freedom—the very first rights and privileges of man, as an immortal being, as a freeman, and a Christian—the right to read his Bible—and not only this, but every doctrine that a Protestant holds dear, subjects him to this persecution and this murder; and this by a papal law, which Dr. Murray has published in the 8th vol., and sworn in his evidence to be in force in Ireland, the bull *Unigenitus*."

5th. "Not only are these principles in force against Protestants, but the sacrament is denied to every poor Roman Catholic, that refuses to consent to this infamous, this infernal bull."

These are the principles known, sanctioned, approved, published by here by Dr. Murray, on the evidence now given to us by his own friend and secretary. To prove these five principles, I find in this 8th vol., p. 319, as follows:—

1st. "That all, (*viz.* Jews in any way baptized,) so baptized, are bound to observe the Catholic faith, in the same way as those who, induced by either threats or terror, have given their consent to the reception of baptism."

2nd. I find, p. 82:—

"The bishop is bound, even in places where the office of the Holy Inquisition is in force, sedulously to take care that he may purge the diocese entrusted to him, from heretics," (observe heretics, not doctrines or errors, but persons); "and if he find any, he is to punish him with the canonical punishments, but he ought to take care that he do not hinder the inquisitors of the faith from discharging their duty."

Here you see the bishop is only not to impede his brother persecutor, the inquisitor.

3rdly. In page 88 I find.

"Heretics, or those suspected of heresy, Jews after baptism, lapsed into apostasy, can be dragged by the inquisitors out of a church, but before or after their capture, the bishop ought to be informed."

Here you see, the inquisitor is only bound to act in concert with his brother persecutor, the bishop.

4thly. Now we come to the bull *Unigenitus*, p. 207, a Papal law or decree, published by Clement the Eleventh against the Jansenists, condemning the principles of a book entitled "*Quesnel's Moral Reflections on the New Testament*," so late as A. D. 1713. This decree has, in the mind of a Roman Catholic, and in the canon law of Rome, the same authority as an infallible council, and is, as Dr. Murray has



sworn, in force in Ireland. Now I cannot detain you with reading all, or many of these condemned propositions; one or two will be enough.

PROP. 80. "The reading of the sacred Scriptures is for all persons."

PROP. 81. "The obscurity of the word of God is no reason to the laity for excusing themselves from reading it."

PROP. 82. "The Lord's day ought to be kept holy by Christians, by reading works of piety, and above all, of the Holy Scriptures; it is injurious to wish to withdraw a Christian from this study."

Now these are innocent and righteous principles—these are fundamental principles with any Protestant. These are our right and our inheritance in this free land: yet what saith this iniquitous bull?—what epithet does it bestow on these principles; "scandalous, pernicious, injurious to the practice of the church, seditious, impious, blasphemous, favouring heretics and heresies, heretical," &c. &c. And what are the denunciations against those who hold these principles? Mark this bull —

"We command furthermore our venerable brothers, patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, and other ordinaries of places; likewise the inquisitors of heretical pravity, that they should by all means coerce and compel all contradictors and rebels whatsoever, by the censures and punishments aforesaid, and all other remedies of the law and the fact, invoking also if need be the aid of the secular arm."

Here, now, are the principles approved, maintained, published—sworn to by Dr. Murray—confessed and declared by his own friend and secretary—and this in the year 1832. Look at the miserable come-off of Mr. Woods for his friend. He says, Dr. Murray sanctioned the publication of this volume "without reference to Dens or any other work whatsoever." Now, not to speak of the absurdity of a man sanctioning an eighth volume of a set of books without reference to the seven volumes that went before it, I say, the internal evidence of this eighth volume proves, in a most remarkable manner, that it has a reference to every one of the preceding volumes; for every constitution, every bull, every decree published in this eighth volume has, at its very head, a special reference to some of the chapters in the preceding volumes of Dens, to show how far they are maintained and supported by the laws and canons of the Church of Rome. It not only refers to, but ratifies that work and proves, on its own evidence,

that the man who sanctioned it, not only approved, but sanctioned and ratified all the rest of the work. [Here the reverend gentleman read several headings of the eighth volume, referring to chapters in Dens.] But what is Mr. Woods's other attempt at an apology for this eighth volume? He says it is "*not all by Dens*," as if all the iniquity of Popery, was only bound up in the seven volumes of Dens. He says true, it is not by Dens, but by whom is it written? Dr. Murray's miserable apology for Dens as a conference book, is, that it contains "much valuable matter, but some obsolete opinions." Well, what can he say of this eighth volume? This is not the work of any author containing consecutive opinions, of which some may be good and some be bad; but this eighth volume is a volume selected, chosen, culled, as the very best and purest and most authoritative principles of moral theology and canon law; and these from the bulls, decretals, and constitutions of the Popes, which not only Dr. Murray dare not deny, but which he is sworn on his oath of fealty to his church, to maintain to the latest hour of his existence, and they contain, as you have seen, the identical principles of Peter Dens, with this especial difference, that they are ratified by the sanction of the infallible authority of Rome. What then becomes of Dr. Murray's oath abjuring these principles to Lord Melbourne? When I spoke of his oath before, at Exeter Hall, and expressed as I had intended, my earnest hope that God would deliver him from the crime of such an abjuration, the editor of the *Dublin Weekly Register* remarks upon that passage in my speech—thus,

"God of our fathers! that men should patiently listen to this—cheer too, the bad hearted propounder of a malignant denunciation couched in the form of a prayer. O, the cant of hypocrisy, which seeks to damn a fellow being here, by seeming to ask mercy for him hereafter!"

What! does the editor mean to insinuate, that I shrunk from the fearless assertion that Dr. Murray had violated his oath?—then I tell that editor, I fearlessly assert it here then—I assert, that if Dr. Murray swore truly to Lord Melbourne in abjuring those principles he was a guilty traitor in violating his oath to his church; and I assert, that if he is not false to the established laws and doctrines and canons of his church, and to his oath as a bishop, there is not a shadow of truth in his oath of abjuration of those principles to Lord Melbourne. I tell the editor of that journal, that if he knew the evil of his own sinful heart, he would know he speaks the truth when

he calls my heart wicked—it is very sinful ; and while I denounce the iniquity of the Church of Rome, and the iniquities of those who would carry them into effect, I say of Dr. Murray, and I say of any other fellow sinner, however sinful he may be, that I dare not set myself above him, or throw a stone at him before God ; but I tell Dr. Murray this, and the editor of that paper, and all Roman Catholics, for whom I can truly say I long for their salvation, that for all their iniquities there is no refuge for their souls, in any of the lying abominations of their superstition, neither in their masses, nor their penances, nor bloodless offerings, nor purgatories. I tell them the only refuge for their souls, is the same refuge that there is for a sinner like me, in the atoning blood of that blessed Redeemer, whose blood cleanseth from all sin.

I cannot close, without adverting to the charge that is continually made, that these exhibitions of Popery at Exeter Hall, were merely got up by politicians for a political purpose, and kept for the time when the attack was being made on the Irish Church, to cause a diversion in her favour. Now I can truly and solemnly assert, that this is not the case ; there was never a more wonderful circumstance in my view, in all the history of literature, than the successful concealment of Peter Dens's Theology ; to think that 6000 sets of such a work should be printed—that they should be in every parish in Ireland, the text book of their priests, the standard of their church, and that no individual except themselves, was acquainted with them. Their bishops, their professors, were all examined, and ably examined by the Commissioners of Education, as to their standards of theology, but no cross examination could ever elicit one word of Peter Dens.

Dr. Murray, Dr. Doyle, and several others, were examined before the Houses of Parliament on their standards, and all subjects connected with their church, but no cross examination could ever drag forth a confession as to Peter Dens.

There have been various controversial disputations in Ireland, in different parts, from north to south, and many priests engaged in them ; but not one, either in the hurry of quotation, or the heat of argument, was ever betrayed into a disclosure of the authority of Peter Dens. I must say that a most striking proof of the conscious guilt of the adoption of these principles is to be found in the deep determination and marvellous success of their concealment. And

now I can only say, that so far from there being any political purposes of politicians engaged in bringing forward this subject, the discovery of it is not to be traced either to the research or ingenuity of any individual on earth, but simply and solely to the providential dispensation of God. The book was brought before a clergyman by a bookseller, who did not know its contents, and it was bought and left lying on that clergyman's table for several months unopened. A volume of it was taken up, and the nature of the book was seen—a person, without knowing or intending to discover anything, gave him a Priest's Directory, which proved the adoption of that work as the standard, by the bishops; he consulted with some of his brethren, they considered the nature of the facts; they thought they ought to be openly brought out before the nation; they published an advertisement, they appointed a deputation to go to London; the evidence of the fact was brought before the notice of the clergymen on the 16th of April, and on the 20th of June the facts were set forth in a public meeting in Exeter Hall; of all the clergy who signed that document I believe there were not more than two that ever were members of even a Conservative Society, or that ever took any part in any political concern.

It seems, then, to me, calculated to inspire confidence and resolution in the cause, that it is really not a work of man, but of the providence of God, the deep and dark principles of falsehood are brought to light by the power of the God of Truth, and I trust it will prove of infinite importance to both Protestants and Roman Catholics of this empire. I trust it will prove a warning to Protestants to awaken from their false security—to make them sensible of the blessings of civil and religious liberty—and stir them up in the name of the God of Truth to vindicate and to maintain the blessings of their laws and true religion, from the dark and guilty designs of Papal persecution and Papal tyranny; to Roman Catholics I trust the blessing will be greater still, that it will tend to open their eyes to see the dreadful guilt and iniquity of an antichristian system, which will not for a moment endure the light of day, or they must see that the very men who profess to maintain it dare not come forth to vindicate it in the open face of men, and that, since it cannot bear the judgment of their fellow-sinners, they may be led to reflect before it be too late how it can stand the judgment of the holy God. I would warn them that, bad as are

the principles of Dens's Theology for Protestants, they are ten thousand times worse for Roman Catholics; to us they can only threaten temporary evils, but to them, deluding them with countless falsehoods and superstitions, they threaten ruin for eternity. I speak to them with fidelity, but I trust in a spirit of charity and christian love. I repudiate, I reject, I abhor, I denounce the false unchristian charity which pretends not to speak to men of the evils or guilt of their superstitions, lest you should offend their prejudices. This is the charity that would see his neighbour's house on fire, and not knock at his door lest you might disturb him from his sleep; that would see him drowning in the flood, and would not seize him by the hair, lest you should hurt him by the grasp. True charity will lift its voice like a trumpet to warn the sinner from his way, and point him to the refuge, the only refuge of his soul. Such is my earnest desire for my Roman Catholic friends, neighbours, and countrymen, in denouncing, as I do, the guilt and superstition of the Church of Rome; and I trust in God that his blessing may rest on our exertions; that he may give effect and permanency to our labours; and that all may be led by the power of the God of Truth into the real knowledge and blessing to be derived only from the truth of God. [The Rev. Speaker here sat down amidst loud and long protracted cheering from all parts of the Hall.]

Sir E. Stanhope then called on the Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan.

The Rev. M. O'SULLIVAN rose and said—After the ample recital you have heard of opportunities afforded to members of the Church of Rome to examine the charges brought against her by my Reverend Friend, you will not readily believe that he is chargeable with any omission. And yet, Sir, he is; one which, perhaps, in his present forgetfulness, is not less creditable to him personally, than was his conduct on the occasion which he appears to have forgotten. I will beg permission to recal it to my friend's remembrance, because it should not be denied to this distinguished assembly. My friend has made reference to a parliamentary committee, appointed to inquire into the character of Orange Societies, in Ireland, and has stated that various of the documents which he has exhibited to you were submitted to it. He has not told you that he had consented to undergo, in his own person, the scrutiny to which, as a witness before that committee, he would have been subjected. When you are informed that four of the most distinguished among the Roman

Catholic body, including Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Sheil, were members of it, and that a majority of the members belonged to Mr. O'Connell's party, you will understand the value of my Rev. Friend's consent. It was, I believe, at my suggestion the request was made to him that he should become a witness, and I stated to him explicitly the grounds on which I thought he should yield compliance. There is, I said, a committee now sitting, having four distinguished barristers, belonging to the Church of Rome, its most prominent members. A question respecting the tenets of the Church of Rome has been raised. In proving that the Orange society was strictly defensive, that its exclusion of Roman Catholics was not hostile, but cautionary, it became necessary to advert to matters of doctrine. In the same manner as the Orange society defended its organization, by making known the conspiracies which were in so fearful operation at the time when a Protestant confederation effected what the law was incapable of accomplishing, the tranquillization of that part of Ireland in which the Orange system prevailed; so was it necessary also to allude to the tenets of the Church of Rome, and to show that they constituted a just ground for excluding all who professed them from a society having for its especial object to maintain a religious system which the Church of Rome abhorred and would destroy. Thus, questions of doctrinal character were brought under consideration of the Orange committee, and I suggested to my friend that if he confined himself to the challenge he had given Mr. O'Connell, inviting him to take a part in the proceeding at Exeter Hall, it would be said that he called upon him to defend his church before an unfavourable tribunal, where declamation might pass for argument, and that he would not meet him where Mr. O'Connell's party was strong, and where he must submit to the test of sober inquiry, and maintain his statements against the effects of artful and searching interrogatories. To this my Rev. Friend, estranged as his life had been from all political contention, nevertheless assented; the proposal that he should be examined was formally made to the committee, and the proposal was rejected. Instead of Mr. M'Ghee, Mr. O'Connell declared he would himself be a witness, for the purpose of refuting statements which I had previously submitted. It was agreed that I should continue my testimony—that I should produce the books of authority by which my statements were confirmed—that Mr. O'Connell should be

examined in answer to them, and when he had given testimony, that I should be resummoned to reply.

What was the result? The accusations against the Church of Rome are recorded in the report of evidence; but it has not been found convenient to offer a defence. Her adoption of Dens, as a book of suitable instruction—the abominable doctrines which he teaches and recommends—collateral testimonies to the assertion of the same tenets in other works of authority have been put in evidence, but testimony such as Mr. O'Connell promised has not been given. How did that hon. member keep his word and his faith? On the last day on which the committee sat, he appeared with a statement, which he requested permission to put in evidence in contradiction to mine. When the understanding that I was to be again examined could not be kept, and, as in truth, his attempt at contradiction was only confirmation, the friends of the Protestant cause, as well as the promoters of inquiry, thought it needless to deny him the permission he claimed, and thus are the charges against the Church of Rome in Ireland rendered the more conclusive by the withdrawal of Mr. O'Connell from his promise that he would reply to them, from his feeling it necessary to attempt an ineffectual notice of matters superinduced in the inquiry, wholly extraneous from its proper business, and from his leaving the charge of adopting Dens, and teaching in various works his abominable doctrines, all the authority it derives from having been under such circumstances advanced and not disputed. I thought it right that the meeting should be acquainted with this incident. Had Mr. O'Connell thought it possible to defend his church from the accusations of my Rev. Friend, he could have desired no better opportunity of confronting him. Had my friend doubted the strength of his case, he would not have courted, under such circumstances, a meeting with so resolute and so able an antagonist.

Surely, when you remember, sir, how many invitations were addressed to the Church of Rome to appear, by accredited champions, and defend herself, you will not be disposed to pay much attention to the defences volunteered in her behalf by anonymous apologists, or even by an individual who has a name, although the name be, as of him whose epistle has been read for you, that of a minister of the Church of England. I am here assuming that the extract which my friend has read, was designed to be what it seems to profess. This, however, is not quite clear. The Rev. Mr. James may, perhaps, have had a covert purpose to display

the iniquity of the system he apparently defended. Is it altogether certain that the design of even Mr. Sheil was not similar? Nothing can be more unequivocal than his condemnation of the works of Dens; they are volumes of "virulent theology"—they contain "abominable doctrines;" and he asks, "How much more rational to appeal to the example of the Belgian people, than to the doctrines, the detestable doctrines, of a Belgian professor, and to try the Catholic religion by the practice of the great body of its professors, than to determine it by ponderous volumes of exploded theology, which give aliment to prejudices viler than the worms by which those tomes of virulent divinity are consumed!" Is it not, sir, at least questionable, how the censure expressed in this passage is to be applied? Some individuals are condemned for adopting the virulent theology of a Belgian professor, and for neglecting the example of the Belgian people. The theology is detestable, the example excellent. Has my Reverend Friend adopted the theology? No; he anticipates Mr. Sheil in condemnation of it, and detests it assuredly with equal sincerity. But somebody has adopted this abominable system of doctrine. Mr. M'Ghee affirms, that the whole Roman clergy in Ireland have adopted it. He says they disregarded the moderate and praiseworthy example of the Belgian people, and they seek instruction from the flagitious code of morals, which, perhaps, the vilest of their professors has laid down. This Mr. M'Ghee has said, and this the clergy of the Church of Rome in Ireland may now be considered as acknowledging. Is it quite certain, therefore, that (contrary to the plain sense of words, erring from the application which circumstances seem to insist upon our making,) we should suppose that Mr. Sheil means to accuse my Rev. Friend, or the Protestant clergy who act with him, of adopting the theology of Peter Dens, when they are in no other way concerned in the matter than in making it public that the Romish clergy in Ireland have taken from Belgium and the Belgian people nothing but that pestilent theology which the learned gentleman joins us in exposing to universal abhorrence and indignation? Is not this the manner in which naturally we should understand how the letter of the Protestant minister and the censures of the Roman Catholic member are to be understood? The fact is, Mr. Sheil is scarcely more remarkable for professional ingenuity than he is personally distinguished for candour. It may be, that his appeal is to be ascribed to the combined influence of both. The defence of the



Church of Rome galled him, and he allows a hint to escape him that his cause is bad; and, under the pretence of assailing the statesmen, as he says, of Exeter Hall, he insinuates an advice to the priests and bishops of his own church, recommending them to addict themselves to an example of which the moderation and charity will bring them praise, and to renounce the detestable maxims which have done them such dishonour. I am always willing to suppose the best, and will hope that Mr. Maurice James, the clergyman who has made so skilful a selection from Mr. Sheil's speech, is not ranking himself on the side of Dens, but adroitly urging the friends of Dr. Murray, the Roman Catholic archbishop, to follow Mr. Sheil's example, and denounce intolerant doctrines and practice. If we had time to debate such matters, I would put it to the test, by proposing a vote of thanks to the Rev. Gentleman who has furnished the valuable and instructive extract in which Mr. Sheil condemns parties who, instead of imitating the example of the Belgian people, called out from the oblivion in which it was deservedly covered, and sent forth to vitiate sentiment and morals, the pestilence of their exploded theology. When so distinguished an advocate feels constrained to describe in terms so severe, the works which Roman Catholic bishops in Ireland recommend to their clergy as the best and safest guides they can afford—when daily experience makes it, unhappily, too plain that these guides have done their deadly office well—is it a matter of surprise that Protestants in Ireland anxiously implore you to consider whether you will allow the church of Peter Dens to be reared on the ruins of a Scriptural establishment? We entertain fears, not alone because persecution has visited us in Ireland, but because the maxims which regulate the morals of the disturbers there, seem to be recognised by many, too many, here, as principles of legislation. We complain that in a bill recently introduced into Parliament, the destruction of the Protestant religion was contemplated. We do not say that many of those who advocated such a measure knew what its effects would be; but that its contrivers, those who commanded the obsequious introducers of the measure, did not know what it was calculated to effect, we cannot for an instant imagine.

We are well aware that contending predictions have been hazarded as to the probable or natural consequences of the bill—some affirming that it would bring peace to the country, and add strength to the Protestant Church—some declaring that it would destroy the church, and

increase the disorders of the country. Now, what would you propose to do if you desired to ascertain the degree of confidence to be reposed in the promises of rival expounders of the future? Probably you would judge of the character of the contending claimants, and you would compare their predictions with the circumstances in which they were uttered, and with what you believed to be probable. If you found that the prognosticators of one class had been repeatedly found in error, had always been enterprising to predict, and had always had the mortification to see their predictions falsified; and if you found that the other class had been cautious and abstinent in the exercise of their art, but had uniformly been found in accordance with truth, you would feel disposed certainly to place more confidence in the cautious and true, than in the false and adventurous. If, further, you found that the probabilities were at the same side with those whose predictions experience taught you to respect, the difficulty of judging would be greatly lessened, and you would determine in favour of those whose words fact and reason coincided in recommending. Now, who are they whose predictions speak smooth things to be the consequences of measures such as those lately proposed for the government of the church in Ireland? They are the same individuals whose prophecies were confident on past occasions, and who, notwithstanding the violation of every pledge they gave the nation, have never ceased to predict, and to have their predictions falsified. Shall they, with the broken promises of their whole public lives remembered against them, succeed in gaining credit to the promises with which now they would win public acquiescence to their enterprising proposals? And who are they who deprecate the measures thus recommended? Men who have hitherto been cautious and abstinent in their predictions, but who, in all that concerns my unhappy country, have had a melancholy compensation for the paucity of their prophecies in the unhappy verification of them. Those who told the people in 1829 that the Roman Catholic Relief Bill would tranquillize Ireland, and fully satisfy those to whom it gave power, now tell you that you will win all hearts and promote all good purposes of peace and harmony by establishing a principle that it is right to take from the Church of England a portion of her revenues, and to employ them under another name for the benefit of the Church of Rome. Who are they who anticipate evils to the Protestant religion in Ireland? Its ministers—the bishops in the church. But interest may influence them? No;

their private interests would perhaps suggest to them a different counsel from that which they have adopted. Their petitions prove that it is not private or personal interests they regard. They were willing to purchase that crippled and narrowed measure of right which it was proposed to deal out to them, by any sacrifice which affected only their personal condition; they deprecated only the enactment of a measure which must do irreparable injury to the church. Even the enormous deduction from their legal and equitable income which the lately contemplated measure demanded, they did not contest; they merely petitioned that the church should not be made the sacrifice. Here, in this petition which I hold in my hand, you have the sentiments of the church in Ireland embodied. It is signed by all the bishops in that church with but two exceptions. Although it is long, I will beg to read it, because it embodies the substance of all that may be said with respect to the church question lately under discussion, and displays alike the moderation and wisdom of the distinguished body from whom it has proceeded:—

**COPY OF THE PETITION OF THE ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS OF IRELAND.**

**“ TO THE LORDS SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED.**

*“ The humble Petition of the undersigned Archbishops and Bishops, of the United Church of England and Ireland, established in Ireland,*

Sheweth,—That your petitioners, actuated by no ungenerous or uncharitable feeling, desire for themselves, for the ministers of the Established Church, and for their Protestant brethren, no other privileges and protection than such as may be consistent with the public good in its connexion with the institutions of the empire, and necessary to secure the interests of pure religion, which in this, and in every other State, is confessedly the only solid basis of national and individual prosperity.

“ That upon this foundation your petitioners rest their claim to the interposition of your Lordships' House for the maintenance of the Established Church in Ireland; a church truly catholic and apostolical in her doctrines, worship, and polity, deeply seated in the affections of the most enlightened part of the Irish community, diffusing her kindly influences through all the national establishments, and intimately interwoven with them; the steady and tried supporter of British connexion and civil order; and the great bulwark against the inroads of Romish usurpation, in a land where disaffection to the British name, contempt of legal authority, and blind obedience to the Papal see, appear in their undisguised forms, and prevail to a formidable extent.

“ That such a church, deserving, as it should seem, to be cherished and supported in proportion to the need of her holy and counteracting influence, your petitioners fondly trusted had been with equal wisdom and piety connected in

indissoluble association with the State by the fundamental laws of the empire, and recognised and formally pronounced to be so connected by the solemn Act of Union.

“ That your petitioners behold, with mingled emotions of surprise and dismay, the establishment of this church about to be undermined, and in many districts of Ireland utterly dismembered and overthrown, by the provisions of a bill recently introduced into Parliament—her property alienated from its rightful owners, and appropriated to other uses than those of divine worship and sound religious instruction under a duly constituted and legally established ministry, to which uses that property was originally dedicated, and has been since guaranteed by repeated Acts of Parliament.

“ That under these afflicting circumstances your petitioners are constrained by the sacred obligation imposed on them to watch over the interests of their brethren, and of the flocks committed to their charge; but, above all, by their duty to Almighty God, who will demand of them an account of their stewardship, to lay before your Lordships the genuine feelings of their hearts, and to appeal to your pious solicitude for the well-being of a church, which is on every consideration, civil and religious, entitled to your zealous protection.

“ That your petitioners disclaim every purpose of embarrassing his Majesty's Government, by insisting on any rights, which, however just in themselves, may not be strictly connected with the preservation of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Ireland. If, notwithstanding the alterations which have been made by late enactments in the concerns of the church, improvements are still required, your petitioners are most willing to contribute to their introduction; and if the distribution of the church revenues be so unequal as to impair her usefulness, they are desirous to see them applied in such a way as may best increase her efficiency, seeking only to render her, under God's grace, a more powerful instrument of edification. Meanwhile, the ministers of the church set themselves in opposition to no salutary arrangements, by which those revenues may be collected without danger of collision with the passions of an adverse party, and by which tranquillity and kind feeling may be restored to a long distracted part of his Majesty's dominions.

“ That although your petitioners consider it more especially their duty to vindicate the right of the National Church to the undisturbed possession of its property, they cannot, at the same time, refrain from adding, that such proceeding as the meditated diversion of ecclesiastical revenue, would weaken the security of all other property, and create an universal distrust of the national faith, and of the validity of every act of settlement.

“ That your petitioners would further most earnestly impress upon the minds of your Lordships, that the suppression, as proposed by the bill, of eight hundred and sixty parishes in Ireland, which now strictly form parts of consolidated benefices, but which it is proposed arbitrarily to dismember from adjoining parts, solely for the purpose, as it should seem, of making out a striking case of the numerical inferiority of church Protestants in the parishes thus separately considered, is founded upon a principle of partial calculation subversive of every church establishment, and is equally applicable to parts of parishes in England in which dissent abounds; that the operation of this principle in Ireland would be to strip the incumbents of large Protestant parishes of their entire parochial income, in all instances in which that income is now derived from the part of an united benefice, where the population may happen to be almost exclusively Roman Catholic, and could not at the

same time fail to be productive of results most injurious in a religious point of view, as inevitably depriving many members of the church of the spiritual blessings now enjoyed by them, as leading to an incalculable diminution of Protestants, and as holding out a dangerous incitement to persecution.

“ That your petitioners further most respectfully submit to your Lordships, that what is alleged in vindication of this provision of the bill, namely, that it is unjust that the Roman Catholic should be called upon to pay for spiritual services, which he neither requires nor receives, is founded on palpable misrepresentation, inasmuch as the Roman Catholic pays for no such spiritual services, but in satisfying the demands for tithes composition, merely discharges an engagement on the faith of which he occupies his land. In truth, the Protestant incumbent is paid by no one, but in return for the duties which he performs (of which every parishioner who chooses may avail himself) enjoys a portion of a corporate endowment, to which he alone can prefer a legal claim, and which is secured to him by a title more ancient than that of any other species of property. That the principle implied in this vindication would moreover convert the clergy into mere stipendiaries of the state, or render them dependent upon the voluntary contributions of their parishioners, than which nothing can be conceived more adverse to one great end of the ministry, the inculcating of sound doctrine through ‘evil report and good report,’ nothing more injurious to the real spiritual welfare of the people: That the unprecedented powers proposed by the bill to be vested in the Lord Lieutenant of diminishing ecclesiastical income to the standard of £300 a year, in parishes reported to exceed that sum in value, would, if acted upon, on the one hand reduce the clergy to comparative poverty, and to a disparity with the members of other liberal professions, deprive them of a fair and reasonable motive to professional diligence, and exclude them from their due station in society; whilst, on the other hand, these powers would constitute the executive government the sole judge of ministerial qualification, and of parochial exigencies, and the dispenser of ecclesiastical rewards.

“ That your petitioners would, in conclusion, most respectfully impress on your Lordships’ minds, that the time chosen for thus infringing the rights and impairing the efficiency of the church, is one in which the prudent zeal confirmed with knowledge, now so conspicuously displayed by her ministers, holds out the fairest hope of the extension of her influence, if not deprived of suitable advantages for its exertions; that in the foregoing and other provisions of the bill, your petitioners discern but too plainly a direct tendency to promote the objects of a party, which is to be satisfied with nothing less than the total and not far distant subversion of the Protestant Church Establishment in Ireland, and the erection of Romish superstition on its ruins; and your petitioners, therefore, with united voice, would humbly implore your Lordships in the most urgent terms that language can supply, or our great apprehensions dictate, not for ourselves only, but in the name of our religion, our country, our altars, our children, and our flocks—for the sake of all that has been hitherto held sacred, for the honour of God and for the purity of our holy faith, to avert from us this impending consummation of evil.

“ That in thus making this solemn appeal to your Lordships, who have so often interposed for the preservation of the civil and religious rights of the empire, your petitioners have done what, in an honest conscience, and to their best judgment, they are persuaded to be their duty. It remains for them to command your

Lordships by their prayers to the Throne of Grace, and to entreat Almighty God, that in this and in every other trying conjuncture, he will be pleased to direct your Lordships' deliberations as may best tend to his glory and the well-being of his church.

“ JOHN G. ARMAGH,  
R. CASHEL,  
POWER, TUAM, &c.  
NATH. MEATH,  
CHARLES KILDARE,  
GEO. KILMORE,  
J. ELPHIN,  
J. DRUMORE,

T. CLOYNE,  
S. CORK AND ROSS,  
RICHARD DOWN AND CONNOR  
EDMOND LIMERICK, ARDFERT, AND  
AGHADOE,  
ROBERT CLOGHER,  
ROBERT OSBORY,  
CHRISTOPHER KILLALOE & CLOWFERT.”

The same body which in this wise and Christian petition declares its willingness to consent to any advisable measure, whatever present inconvenience it might occasion to individuals, and which protests against the meditated enactment, solely because they believe it would destroy the permanence of the Church Establishment, addressed a statement of their convictions and fears to His Majesty, George IV. on a memorable occasion. It was in the year 1829; in that address they “desire earnestly but respectfully to represent, that after the most painful and dispassionate consideration of the subject, they are persuaded that the admission of Roman Catholics to a share in the legislature, is a measure calculated to subvert the established religion, which it was his Majesty’s pious and unalterable determination to uphold.” They state the grounds of their disapproval of the measure called the Roman Catholic Relief Bill—“We object to the admission of Roman Catholics to the privilege in question, solely because we cannot perceive how that admission can be made compatible with the church’s security.” The address from which these extracts are taken was presented to his Majesty by the great body of the bishops in Ireland. It was read by a prelate whose loss to the Irish branch of the church must long be deplored, whose memory cannot be lost—Dr. Magee, the late archbishop of Dublin. The first name on the list of the bishops was, John George, Armagh, but when the address was presented, he was in his place in the House of Lords, advocating and explaining the principles which the address embodied. I will not now read at length passages from the speech which the archbishop of Armagh delivered on that occasion; but this I am bold to say, that if that eminent individual were at this moment to write an accurate and extended survey of the character of the events which have taken place since he delivered that remarkable speech—of the tempers and

passions which have been manifested in Ireland—the principles of legislation which have here been recognised and adopted—the arguments by which measures of great moment have been advocated and carried—the disappointment in which the hopes of all those expired who, in that great discussion, spoke with confidence of the good that was to ensue—he could not select more appropriate language; he need not enlarge, nor need he qualify by a single limitation the prophetic delineation which he offered to the view of the British peers, as the ground on which he dissented from what was then the prevailing opinion. This speech is on record—it is conformable in spirit and character to the sentiments then expressed by those who now see danger in the threatened innovations. And the speeches of the advocates of church spoliation are also recorded, and their confident anticipations of good from past concessions are set down and may be read.

Shall it not be remembered that their past predictions were all deceit—their promises hollow—their pledges violated, and shall not experience be called in to set to its seal or stigma of reprobation on promises and prophecies still hazarded by those who, on so momentous occasions heretofore, had deceived themselves or the nation? But is it only by the remembrance of former delusions we should be warned? Is there not in measures recently threatened against the church, a visible warning of their danger? Can we not see in the unnatural combination of political parties, a prohibition not to put our trust in their professions? Is this a time when the adoption of a principle that the Protestant Church in Ireland may be despoiled, is likely long to remain unfruitful? Is this a time when measures dictated to a ministry so supported, so coerced, as those who constitute the present Government, are likely to be to the Protestant Church, measures of salutary reform? Is it possible for Protestants and Englishmen to look upon any measures so presented to them without feelings of alarm and distrust? What! when Mr. O'Connell is described to be the dictator of ministerial measures—when he is, confessedly a ministerial associate? Well might Sir Robert Peel express his amazement to see the individual whom Government, in February 1834, denounced as an unprincipled agitator, adopted as their friend, almost acknowledged as their master, in February 1835. What an instrument to have recourse to! How can England or Ireland or Protestantism look on without alarm, when they see their interests embarked in a vessel which has Mr. O'Connell for its propelling power, and no better

guidance than the Government which is his following? It is not wonderful that one must go far to seek a comparison for such a state of things. I go to the western world, and will beg to relate the result of an experiment similar to that which our rulers have instituted, and which was tried upon the bay of Fundi.

An Indian had cut down a tree, which he thought gave, in its harsh fruits, but a bad return for the nutriment with which the soil liberally fed it. The tree was an offence to him when growing, it was an annoyance even after its fall; and he considered whether it was not possible for him, by an ingenious contrivance, to turn it to good account. Would it not answer in the place of sails for his canoe? The thought was worth attention; he saw how the progress of various vessels was facilitated, "and here," said he, "I can have a fixed sail to catch every breeze that blows; it is ready made to my hand, so here I shall set it up." He did not bear in mind, and perhaps he was to be pardoned for forgetting, because this Indian was a "minute" philosopher, that safety was no less important than speed—that in naval, as in civil politics or contrivances, the principle of permanence was no less momentous than the principle of progression.

Some warnings were addressed to him, but with no good effect. He set up the tree, and for a time exulted in the success of his experiment. His little boat was borne proudly over the waters, and swept triumphantly onwards. He passed barks in which the principle of motion was of a more guarded nature, and he scorned the suggestions of their timorous steersmen. But his triumph was not of long duration. So long as all the elements were tranquil he was safe; the lightest breeze that breathed was courted to his umbrageous canvass, and when less perilously-furnished boats were becalmed, he was carried on with a constant, if not altogether agreeable motion. But the skies darkened—a gale arose—and then he began to feel how terrible was the mastery of his worse than *inutile lignum*. He dared not attempt to bring it down—the slightest effort to displace it would send his bark and its contents to the gulf beneath: no help, no hope was near; he felt (as he looked round and saw each bark in view promptly adjusting its sails to the exigencies of the augmenting perils,) how totally he was abandoned; and those who saw and could not save, have said that they can never lose the remembrance of the piteous spectacle they beheld, when they saw this poor Indian looking up despairingly to the stern controller of his destiny, and as he and his frail canoe were



hurried on to oblivion, shrieking in hopeless agony, "*Doo moshe boosh, doo moshe boosh.*"

How can we look without alarm on the progress of that bark of state—that political party which has such a moving and such a (seemingly) guiding power as that which is not here unaptly represented? Especially, I would ask, how can we look upon the fortune of our religious institutions without anxious apprehension, when they are to have such a party engaged in deciding upon them? Is it reformation which is desired? What is the time chosen? A time when, by the acknowledgment of every member of the ministry, the church in Ireland could boast of a pure and apostolic ministry, and was assiduous in endeavours to discharge its solemn duty; a time when it was confessed that persecution had arisen against its ministers because they had diligently exerted themselves to make the truth of the Christian religion manifest to a people for whom they had incurred grave responsibility. Is it unreasonable to fear that measures of spoliation, proposed at such a time, under such circumstances, at the dictation of such advisers, were not designed to reform the Protestant establishment—were not designed to facilitate the conversion of Roman Catholics?

Yet we are not to deny that some have said—and some who are reputed sincere—that even at such a time it is right to call the late contemplated enactments measures of reform, and that more may be expected from the church in its tribulation than it could effect in days of prosperity. Persecution, they say, has improved the church—they seem to argue that a continuance of it may be beneficial to the tormentors. Let us give—we can imagine them to say—let us give the instrument of torture another turn and see its effects, not on the sufferer, but on the barbarous aspects which are contemplating the new pangs inflicted.

It is a new epoch in the march of intellect when a sect like this has started into existence. Shall we congratulate its members, whoever they may be, that they can pursue their majestic task, above the stir and strife of this low world, disdaining to be moved by vulgar sympathies, and resolved, in scenes where common natures would thrill at the agony they beheld, to discern only the presence and progress of a good principle which challenges all admiration? I congratulate them on a distinction which is little likely to be taken from them, and I congratulate the country on its possession of individuals occupying stations of wealth and power, who can quietly contemplate

the process by which virtuous hearts are pierced and broken, and can retain their self-possession, can quietly explore the expression of the aspect which pain and virtue wears, and calculate the chances how far the demeanour of the good in their distress shall operate beneficially on the barbarous natures which have brought them into tribulation.

Shall we look at one of the pictures on which these friends of the human race may be supposed to dwell with so dignified a resignation and composure? It is the home of a persecuted minister of the church in Ireland, one whom evil days have overtaken, and found, in temporal matters, unprovided, because he had never hoarded, (except, as he may have thought, in the memories of those who tasted his bounty,) whatever of income strict economy had set apart as a surplus. He has been for some time under sore affliction. The external appearance of the house shows you that it once had little embellishments of taste which are now going to decay. We pass into the chamber where the sufferer has withdrawn to solitary prayer and meditation. The shelves and presses, and a few books still remaining, show you that this had been a library. There is an open letter lying on the table; it tells that the last day has come on which payment of an assurance can be legally tendered. It is a sore calamity that he cannot meet this demand. He had adopted every practicable retrenchment—he had recalled his sons from literary studies—given up for a time the effort to continue their instruction, and availed himself of their assistance to till the ground, and procure by the labour of their hands some scanty sustenance, by which life could be painfully protracted. Until this distressing day, by much self-denial and strenuous exertion, he had been enabled to lay up that provision which was to relieve his widow and children from the most appalling evils of orphanage and destitution. As a last resource, he has been walking even to the houses of his merciless debtors, soliciting that, as a charity, they will succour him. He has felt that the ban is in force against him—that the anathema is in operation—looks of stern defiance, averted eyes, brief or contemptuous refusals, have told him that here there is no hope. He has communed in the solitude of his chamber with his heart, and is now still. He is on his knees, and the prayer of the meek sufferer is silent resignation—he feels and looks the prayer—“Thy will be done.”

We will look to another part of the picture—another stage in the political experiment. The wife, the daughter, of this sufferer, are scared from the air and light of day—if they presume to go forth,

brows scowling menace, words of disgusting import, drive them back affrighted to the sad shelter of their home. The shelter is now a prison. Look in upon those female forms—fears and privations have marred and wasted them, but the contumely from which they have hurried to escape has sent a flush over each faded countenance. The suffering father scarcely can retain composure as he struggles to console them—his words of hope and encouragement, the counsel to be of good cheer, the assurance that England will not much longer permit afflictions like this to continue, fall tremulously from his lips, and have lost the power to call up in answer looks of even counterfeited expectation. Shall we not congratulate the sublime philosophy of the man who can tranquilly meditate on hundreds of cases like this? I will not ask you to go with me through all the chambers of affliction; but we must proceed to another stage in the experiment.

The venerable minister of the gospel has been permitted to suffer as much preliminary affliction, as cruelty in Ireland, or pious speculations here, hold necessary. He is now to be dismissed to his rest—not with the stern mercy in which justice gives a delinquent to death—not with the sudden destruction in which the passion of revenge pours out the storm of its fury—he is not shot—he is not with one fierce stroke smitten and cloven down—no; there is a malignity which thirsts for more prolonged enjoyment; life must be drained from the victim by drops. It is the broad day—passengers are on the way side—husbandmen busy in the field—the venerable minister is walking slowly, for he is feeble, and he has been visiting in the abode of sickness, and is pondering thoughts which are congenial to such ministrations; his abode is in sight, but his murderers are around him; there is no rage in their looks, but there is the cruelty which knows no remission. I will not dwell on the picture, nor show you the mangled form in which life lingered, nor speak of the anguish and agony in which the martyr was mourned. But another stage must be noticed, because it teaches the result in which the costly experiment may be expected to issue.

Now, it might be presumed, the tormentors are satisfied, vengeance has been slaked, and the great truth that the blood of martyrs is the seed of the church, shall be confirmed in the conversion of those who persecuted him to death.—The broken-hearted widow, the desolate orphans, are assailed with howlings and menace. Philosophers may come to witness a new phenomenon. A family of helpless

females whom murder had reft of their best earthly protection; whom liberal, and so far as religious distinctions are concerned, undiscriminating, charities had made poor, dare not to go seek an humble asylum in a less barbarous land, without an armed escort; and cannot proceed, when this strong guard keep sanguinary violence from their persons, without having their ears shocked, and their hearts torn, by cruel and contumelious revilings. This is new—helpless females, known in happier days more by their readiness to do deeds of mercy than by outward trappings of wealth and place—thus persecuted in their affliction. But all must be endured to promote the great experiment. I do not think converts are ever to be made to Protestantism merely by tormenting its professors. It is very difficult to believe that those who command the resources of the Government can entertain any such expectation—or that while they see natures so changed by acrimonious bigotry, as to retain no pity, they can hope by indulging their malignity with spectacles of distress, to appease and win them. Nor had they to look abroad for manifestations of this mournful and humbling perversion of the human heart. They were brought home here, to their own doors, exhibited among the elegancies of their literary enjoyments.

If you were familiar with representations of the state of society in Ireland, I might with much boldness appeal to you, whether I have in the slightest degree, exaggerated the sufferings to which many faithful ministers are exposed, or added a single incident to the story of their afflictions. No; I have spared you many a detail; and it is only that I may not be unpardonably prolix, that I have abstained from quoting the multiplied proofs which may be advanced to establish the subdued correctness of my representations. I could even appeal to proofs of effects produced, in some few instances, in hearts not altogether obdurate, where men have shrouded themselves in midnight darkness, and with the same stealthy step as in other places, men would move to the commission of crime, with a caution, such as certainty of death following on detection necessarily produces, have sought the clergyman's sorrowful abode, and at hazard of their lives have made payment of their debts, because they could no longer endure the pain of being the agents in visiting the severest calamity, on uncomplaining and so blameless sufferers. But there are natures upon which the process of refinement has succeeded in obliterating the traces of

compunction and mercy. The Church of Rome has had many advocates—the ruthless ministers of her malignity in Ireland, have found here, in the highest region of English society, an apologist, an associate. How does Mr. Moore speak of the afflictions to which undefended victims in Ireland have been exposed? In graceful sympathy? With burning reprobation of their brutal and cowardly assassins? Alas! no! had he done so, he would have rendered service to the principle of good, and made compensation for many an outrage against morals and virtue. He did not make such compensation. He wrote as one who glories in the dark murders which disgrace his country—he wrote as one who teaches murderers to think lightly of crimes which he, their favoured poet, commemorates, as if they were matters for sport and levity. He has been pleased to honour me with a notice which, under other circumstances, would have ensured my silence; but reasons of too great moment to be disregarded, unseal my lips to speak of the spirit in which he discourses of crimes and sufferings, which are a national calamity and disgrace; and of the notice by which his cruel ironies have been rewarded. I abstain, of course, from all reference to his observations on me. Even his pasquinade, at least his late one, has not invested me with consequence enough to detain you on such a subject; but of the afflictions of a clergy to whom none deny praise, whom all confess to be most sorely wronged—he says, that I

will tell

To all who still the Church's part take  
Tales of parsonic woe—that well  
Might make even grim Dissenters' hearts ache.

Then, after uttering some coarse and false calumnies, which here would be disregarded, but which might assist in exasperating a truculent spirit in Ireland against men, who, because they are known to be defenceless, can easily be made marks for malignant passions, he continues to say, that I will make

“ of each a perfect martyr,  
Brought to the stake, i. e., a beef one,  
Of all their martyrdoms the chief one;  
Though try them even at this—they'll bear it,  
If tender, and washed down in claret. (Cries of shame.)

This is the poetry of Mr. Moore. Safe from danger, affluent, in all the enjoyments of domestic life, of public favour, of powerful friends—thus he writes of the afflictions and wrongs of a class of men

like the Protestant clergy of the south and west of Ireland—thus he writes of men surrounded by brutal and pampered tormentors—thus he writes, whose words have, as he well knows, power to exasperate these remorseless enemies, and to point their fell passions towards unprotected victims. I did not think there could be found, in any circle in England, one individual who could be guilty of such an offence—so wanton, so heartless. But why do I disgust you with the thought of it? Because the Government, which will not give the famishing clergy of Ireland bread, unless they purchase it by selling their souls, have pensioned the author of this unmanly sarcasm over their griefs, and over the scarce closed graves of martyrs whose names shall endure for ever. Was this a time, when a government which desired good for the Church in Ireland, should have chosen to pension its calumniator? They knew Mr. Moore's deservings; for five years they had power to give him his reward, and during the five years of power, he was unremembered or neglected; but he insulted a virtuous and afflicted body of christian men; he defamed them, he reviled them, he made their sufferings the theme of unmanly merriment; and as soon as he had disgraced his genius by this pusillanimous atrocity, he was lifted up into the sunshine of ministerial favour, and largely pensioned. Can a transaction such as this, prove uninstrucive? Can you believe, that you may safely abandon the care of the Protestant religion, to a ministry who have so distinguished themselves, identifying themselves thus closely, with the party whom less than the destruction of Protestantism will not satisfy? If you value the blessings which have been bestowed upon you, you will guard them vigilantly; you will guard them, not by attaching yourselves to this party or that, but by requiring that whosoever claims your support, must satisfy you that he will guard your Protestant Institutions. [The Rev. gentleman here paused amidst the most boisterous cheering, which did not cease for some minutes.]

On the subsiding of which, he moved the following resolution:—

Resolved—“That it has been established to the satisfaction of this meeting, that Dens's Theology has been adopted generally by the Irish Roman Catholic Bishops and Priests, as the standard of their Church since the year 1808, and especially as the text book of the secret conferences of the Bishops and Clergy of the province of Leinster, since the year 1831, and that this book contains the tyrannical and antichristian doctrines of intolerance, cruelty and persecution, which have distinguished the Church of Rome in former days.

“That it appears to this Meeting, that every fair opportunity has been afforded to the Roman Catholic Hierarchy, and to Mr. O’Connell, to meet these facts both in England and in Ireland, which they have appeared incompetent to do.

That the attempts which are made to deny and abjure these principles, while they cannot disprove the facts, seem to this meeting, only to illustrate and aggravate the iniquity of the Church of Rome.

“That it therefore appears to this Meeting, that it is the imperative duty of Protestants of all denominations, who value the salvation of their fellow-creatures, to use all means to make these facts known to their Roman Catholic neighbours, to warn them against the iniquity of such a system; that it is imperative on all Christian Ministers, to try to convert them from it; and that it is the duty of all men who value the rights and privileges of conscience, of true religion, and of civil liberty, to endeavour to oppose and counteract the encroachments of Papal darkness, and Papal tyranny, in the United Kingdom.”

The Rev. R. M’GHEE, seconded the resolution, which was then put from the chair and agreed to, not only without a dissentient voice, but with general acclamation.

Sir EDWYN STANHOPE then informed the meeting, that in consequence of the impossibility of affording accommodation to the numerous applicants for tickets of admission, it had been determined by the Committee of the Association, to hold an Adjourned Meeting at half-past six in the evening, when the Rev. Mr. Tottenham, and other gentlemen, would deliver addresses containing much important matter.

ARCHDEACON WETHERELL having taken the chair,

The Rev. Mr. M’GHEE moved a vote of thanks to Sir Edwyn Stanhope, for his effective and dignified conduct in the chair.

The Rev. Mr. O’SULLIVAN seconded the motion, which was passed amidst loud applause.

Sir EDWYN STANHOPE moved a vote of thanks to the Rev. Mr. M’Ghee and the Rev. Mr. O’Sullivan, for their able and instructive speeches.

The Rev. Dr. PROSSER seconded the resolution, which was passed unanimously.

Mr. O’SULLIVAN having briefly acknowledged the vote, the meeting was adjourned.

## EVENING MEETING.

Before six o'clock in the evening, the Great Room of the Shire-hall, was again completely filled, more than 1000 tickets having been issued to respectable persons of all classes. At half-past six, on the motion of Mr. BELLAMY, seconded by the Rev. BENNETT HOSKINS, the Chair was taken by Mr. ALDERMAN GRIFFITHS, amidst repeated plaudits. The Rev. H. ALLEN, opened the meeting with an appropriate prayer, the assembly joining in the Lord's prayer, by which it was followed. The worthy Chairman then shortly addressed the audience, on the objects for which they were assembled, and expressed his confidence, that the same order and decorum would be observed, as had distinguished the Morning Meeting.

The Rev. E. TOTTENHAM rose and addressed the assembly, in a long and able speech. He said, that although the number of documents he had to adduce, relative to both the principles and practice of Popery, prevented him from entering into many preliminary remarks, yet he could not avoid congratulating the city and county of Hereford, on taking the lead in the formation of Protestant Associations. This was a time, in which the advocates of error were unremitting in their exertions. Popery, as he would afterwards show, was making a startling advance upon the country, and therefore he trusted, that the proceedings of this day, were but the earnest of what would yet be done throughout the extent of the kingdom. The Rev. gentleman then alluded to the meeting of the morning—the proofs which had been adduced, that the Theology of Peter Dens had been adopted and sanctioned by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy of Ireland—the intolerant and persecuting character of the book in question, and said, that he should feel it his duty to point out to the meeting, the bearing of all this, not merely on the circumstances of Ireland, but also of England and Scotland. Before, however, entering upon this part of the subject, he would advert to certain letters which had appeared in opposition to the proceedings of this day. The first was, from one who signed himself a "Protestant Dissenter." He could not help noticing the strange misconception or misrepresentation of the object of their meeting. The writer says that its "express object is, the perpetuating of Catholic grievances, and the civil and religious thral-



dom of Catholic Ireland." Now, in fact, the meeting of this Association had reference mainly to England, and if it bore at all upon the circumstances of Ireland, it was for the promotion of its spiritual emancipation, and not of its religious thralldom. In following this point, Mr. Tottenham produced several proofs of the tyranny exercised by the Romish Priesthood in Ireland. He referred to the communication of certain individuals in the parish of Raban, county of Cork, and to the consequent persecutions and misery they endured, because they had presumed to send their children to scriptural schools—to instances of Bibles being burnt either by order, or the very hand of the Priest—to the persecutions practised in the Missionary settlement of the Isle of Achill, on the west coast of Ireland—to facts of the same description that had come under his own observation—and also to the testimony of the late Mr. Inglis, in his "Ireland in 1834," respecting the agitating and persecuting character of the Irish Priesthood.

Here, he observed, was full practical proof of the working of those principles inculcated in Deus's Theology. The Rev. gentleman proceeded then, to notice the other parts of the letter of the "Protestant Dissenter," and insisted upon the inconsistency of his sanctioning the principle of attacking the Church of England, and yet objecting to the principle of protesting against the Church of Rome, when he believed her to be in error. Another letter signed by a "*True Protestant*," was also alluded to; and Mr. Tottenham observed, that he wished this individual had taken a little more pains to discover what Protestantism really was, before he ventured to subscribe himself "*a True Protestant*." His letter betrayed the most marvellous ignorance of both Protestantism and Popery. On this two-fold exhibition of the writers want of knowledge, the Rev. gentleman commented; and when dwelling on the latter, took the opportunity of quoting largely, from the authorized documents, formularies, and books of devotion of the Church of Rome, in order to prove that she had overlaid the truth of God, with a heap of erroneous doctrines and practices, which were ruinous to man, as well as dishonourable to the Most High. After dwelling upon the remaining part of the letter, he next alluded to the importance of bringing forward these subjects in England, in which a great ignorance prevailed, as to the real character of Popery, which he believed, was one of the chief reasons why it was making an advance amongst us at the present day.

Popery was presented to the people in a modified form, and thus, because of their want of previous knowledge, they were easily deceived. In proof of the exertions of Roman Catholics in this country, and of the great extent to which they had succeeded, several instances were adduced, pointing out the increase of chapels, colleges, convents, and individuals, during some years. Several purchases of ground and of buildings were made, wherever there was a possibility, and every exertion made use of, to proselytize the people. The Rev. gentleman referred to different places he named in proof of his assertions, and quoted from the Magazines of the Roman Catholic party in this country, showing their high expectations, and the attitude they were assuming. Under these circumstances, it was important for Protestants to unite, for the preservation of the truth of God, and to use every legitimate means for the accomplishment of this object. This was the design of the Protestant Association, and he trusted therefore, it would be efficiently supported. If an attempt was made to sap the foundations of Protestantism, surely it was their right and duty to counteract the attempt, and to diffuse at once, a knowledge of genuine Protestant Christianity, and of the principles of those with whom they had to contend. The Rev. gentleman concluded by an appeal to the meeting, respecting the privileges which God had bestowed on them, and the consequent responsibility under which they lay.

The Rev. MORTIMER O'SULLIVAN being called on again, addressed the meeting with the same, or even greater effect, than in the morning, his strength being unabated, and the force and eloquence of his observations undiminished. He adverted to the virulence and despotic intolerance, which was the inherent character of the dogmas and doctrines of the Romish Church, and which her own assumption of being immutable and infallible, inevitably precluded her from denying or foregoing. He then read from our Prayer book some of those beautiful prayers, in which the charity and the pity with which the Protestant Church speaks of her adversaries, form so striking and scriptural a contrast to the persecutions and exterminating doctrines of the Church of Rome—doctrines which she never dispenses with the re-assumption of, however she may feel it expedient, for a time to keep them down or in reserve. He warned the Protestants of England not to relax one moment from their vigilance, which he trusted, had been yet timely awakened—and though he exhorted them to the exercise of scripture charity, and good will towards all Roman Catholics as individuals, he called upon

every Protestant to resist, to the utmost of his power, the advances of a religion whose tenets became only the more dangerous and intolerable, in proportion as they were annexed to individual excellence and worth.

[The addresses of which the above passing notices are given, were loudly and frequently applauded throughout; and the respective speakers were followed in their treatment of the important topics, with the most marked and close attention. Each was greeted on concluding, with long-continued cheering.]

### POSTSCRIPT.

It is with sincere regret that, owing to the unavoidable absence of the Reporter from the Evening Meeting, in order to prepare his morning report for the London Papers, and from the Evening Meeting itself, being altogether unexpected and therefore unprovided for, the Committee find themselves unable to give any but the foregoing brief notices of the addresses of the Rev. Mr. Tottenham, and the Rev. Mr. O'Sullivan, in the evening. The Committee, however have the consolation of feeling, that the high established reputation of those gentlemen, cannot be at all affected by the injustice done to them, whilst in the deep and anxious interest with which they were each listened to throughout, *they* will feel well assured, that their labours were not in vain.\*

---

\* The above report is taken from a pamphlet published by the Committee of the Hereford Protestant Association, shortly after the meeting.

[From Hereford Dr. O'Sullivan proceeded to Glasgow, where he was to meet, by invitation, James Edward Gordon, Esq. and with that distinguished gentleman, to hold one or more public meetings. At this time Mr. O'Connell was on a tour of agitation through Scotland, and it will be seen in the following reports, that his speeches sometimes suggested topics for observation at Protestant meetings. The first of these was held September 17, 1835.]

---

## GREAT PROTESTANT MEETING

HELD AT

HOPE-STREET GAELIC CHURCH, GLASGOW,

ON

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 17<sup>TH</sup>, 1835.

---

\* At this meeting, the Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan and other gentlemen engaged to prove, by authentic documents, "What are the real tenets of the Church of Rome, as now held by the Roman Catholic bishops and priests of Ireland." Nothing could exceed the eager interest of all classes to obtain tickets; and long before the proceedings commenced, the church was crowded in every part, by one of the most respectable assemblages we have ever seen, collected on any occasion, in Glasgow.

On the platform, and in the body of the meeting, we observed the Rev. Dr. Smyth, Rev. Messrs. Almond, C. J. Brown, Buchanan, Forbes, Gibson, Henderson, Lorimer, Paterson, Turner, and Willis, of this city; Mr. Burns of Kilsyth; Dr. Burns, Mr. Macnair, Mr. M'Naughten, and Mr. Symington, of Paisley; Mr. Fleming of Neilston; Mr. M'Kellar of Mearns; Mr. M'Indoe of Chirnside; Mr. Logan of Stenton; Mr. Leishman of Govan; Mr. Smith of Cathcart, and many other ministers both of the Established Church and of the Original Seceders and Reformed Presbyterians. Mr. Colquhoun of Killermont, Mr. Crawford of Crawfordland, Captain Gordon, Mr.

---

\* From Report in the *Scottish Guardian*.

Hamilton of Barns, Mr. Stirling of Kenmure, Mr. Fergusson, yr. of Kilkerran, Mr. Makenzie of Craigpark, Mr. Simpson of Paisley, Mr. Houston, yr. of Johnstone, Mr. Dunlop of Craigton, Messrs. John Alston, W. Brown, W. Collins, H. Cogan, Bailie Gilmour, Convenor M'Lellan, A. M'George, J. Leadbetter, H. Paul, W. Leckie Ewing, D. Stow, A. Wingate, G. Lewis, jun. Mr. Motherwell of the *Courier*, and Mr. Bennett of the *Constitutional*, and many other influential gentlemen of the city and neighbourhood.

On the motion of ANDREW MACGEORGE, Esq. J. C. COLQUHOUN, Esq. of Killermont, was called to the Chair.

The Rev. Dr. SMYTH, of St. George's, commenced the proceedings with an impressive prayer.

The CHAIRMAN—It seems to me hardly necessary to preface the business of this day's meeting with any remarks commending to you its importance. No one can have watched the signs of these times, which I may well call eventful times, without perceiving the progress of Roman Catholic doctrines in the country, and of Roman Catholic influence in Parliament; and it therefore becomes a question no longer of curious speculation, but of deep practical interest, what are the doctrines of the Roman Catholic religion—what is their spirit, and what their tendency? You will find, I am satisfied, from the statements of the Rev. Gentleman whom I shall soon have the pleasure of introducing to you, that whatever were the doctrines of the Roman Catholic religion once, these are its doctrines now—whatever was its spirit in former times, its spirit remains unabated, and its tendencies the same.

But I am sure that the Rev. Gentleman will not blame me if I anticipate him in one observation, that whatever may be the strength of exposure with which he shall feel it his duty to visit the doctrines of that religion and the practices of its priesthood—however stern may be his condemnation of these, the feeling with which he and all of us regard our Roman Catholic brethren, whether in Ireland or Scotland, are those of cordial regard and unfeigned sympathy. Whatever we may think of their errors—and we are not Protestants unless we hold them to be in grievous error: however anxious we feel to secure them from these—and we are not humane men unless for this we put forth every exertion; yet to them have we but one feeling, and that is an earnest desire for their well-being. Therefore, every remark which may fall from us, you will hold to be confined to the faith and to its priesthood,

for of these, I greatly fear, if we follow truth and our conviction, we must speak in terms of strong and deliberate reprobation. But I can imagine that one objection may meet us at this point, and that from many quarters; many will say to me, suppose that it is proved to us that the doctrines and the practices of Roman Catholics are the same now as heretofore, that its creed is as cruel, its spirit as persecuting, what is that to us? Do you mean to say that there is any fear lest the people of Scotland will be converted to Popery, or, that remaining Protestants, we shall be exposed to such persecutions as our fathers met with? You will observe, however, that dangers may be as real though they assume a different shape. I have no fear that the fires will again be lighted at Smithfield, or that the sword of a Stuart persecution will again be bared against Scotland; but I do say, that if it be the characteristic of the Roman Catholic faith to employ physical force to raise their own religion and put down heresy, then will they use for this end the instruments which have power in the age in which they live; and if it be the character of the Roman Catholic priests to select the best means for their end—and I give them full credit for this, for I think them wise and discerning men—then will they apply themselves for the powers which they want, to those hands with whom power is lodged. It is quite true, that in this age they will not have recourse to the monarchy, as they did in the times of Mary or of the Stuarts. In these days the monarchical was the prevailing power; and if the priesthood could obtain influence in the cabinet of the monarch, then could they wield the sword and issue the edict, which in England lighted up the fires of persecution, and in Scotland sent a merciless soldiery to harrass our covenanting fathers. But such powers are gone from monarchy, which is stripped of all despotic influence. The power has now passed into another quarter, and is concentrated in the hands of the people. Against that power I am sure I shall say nothing hostile, because I have no unfriendly feelings. On the contrary, I think, and have ever thought, that the perfection of human government is where a wise and free opinion rises from the breasts of an intelligent and virtuous people, and has such power as to overmaster all other influences, and to guide and regulate all the proceedings of the state. But still, just as monarchy, though most useful in itself, may be perverted into despotism, so may public opinion lapse into ignorance or be corrupted into vice; and as there are in every body bad and noxious humours, these may be so increased and drawn into

one point, that there shall swell a vast and loathsome tumour, which drawing increase from the strength of the body, and collecting into it the humours of the body, shall so be augmented as to burst and cover the whole mass with its fetid virulence, and convert it into one foul and loathsome disease. Now, if there exists an influence so malignant as to be feeding these bad humours in society, and collecting them together, that is an influence which is by all men to be dreaded, and firmly to be withstood: and if there be a body of men possessing this influence, and using it for these ends, you will agree with me that that is a body greatly to be feared.

Now, I beg you to consider with me what the Roman Catholic priests of Ireland have been doing during these last twelve years. Previous to that time they took little part in politics—they were occupied with their own religion—they attempted nothing beyond it; but at that time it became necessary for the purposes of the political agitators, that the priests should join in politics—they had great influence over their flocks, and it was necessary, as Mr. Croly, himself a priest, informs us, that that influence should be enlisted on the side of the agitators. After a short struggle this was accomplished; and as proof of it, I may inform you, on the authority of Mr. Wyse, the present Roman Catholic member for Waterford, that in the Catholic Association there were enrolled as members, 2600 priests, twenty bishops, and four archbishops. Their influence was soon turned to control the elections for members of Parliament. The first instance of this was, in the election for the county of Waterford, in 1824. There the priests openly canvassed, and used all the terrors of religion to intimidate the electors. “Political and factious harangues,” to use Mr. Croly’s words, “were made from their altars at the celebration of divine worship, and their churches were surrendered to be used as political club-houses.” The Clare election, at which Mr. O’Connell was returned, was another instance of the same. There, hundreds of priests were seen flying in every direction over the county—every altar rung with addresses—Messrs. Sheil and Lawless, accompanied by two priests, Fathers Murphy and Maguire, scoured the county; and to produce more effect, held midnight meetings in the chapels. The freeholders were driven up to the hustings, like so many sheep, by the priests. That you may understand the means which the priests employ to intimidate the electors on such occasions, I will quote to you a few instances from the newspapers of last winter. The first is

from the county of Carlow, which is given by one of the members, Colonel Bruen, who describes, in an address to his constituents, the means used by the priests to intimidate the electors from voting for him. "One priest threatened that the very moment a poor man who voted for me returned home he would clap a pair of horns on his head. Another protested that if he had not forgotten his crucifix and breviary, he would on the spot turn his rebellious parishioners into flaggers. A third gravely told them that their food should melt in their hands; while a fourth swore if they went against him, he would turn them into four-footed beasts, and put them on their bellies for the rest of their lives." It is natural that, in such a meeting as this, such threats should only produce laughter; but you will remember how different is their effect among an ignorant and credulous people, who believe in the absolute power of the priest.

Now let me give you some instances of the manner in which the priests wreak their vengeance upon those who would not vote as they directed. "In the parish of Sancroft, the persons who voted for Pensonby at the last Kildare election, are pointed at as they go along—no one dare hold the slightest intercourse with them, under the penalty of the withering malediction of the priest, who, after, from the altar, holding them up to the infuriated passions of the mob, ordered, on pain of excommunication, no person either to sell to or admit one of the recreants into their houses. Repeated attacks have been made on a number of persons who attend at the chapel of Castle-Dermot. Informations have been sworn by several of them, that their lives are in danger, in consequence of which, a party of the police from Athy were ordered to proceed there on Sunday last. At the chapel of New-Town, two men, tenants of Lord Beresford, having been assured by the priest that their personal safety would not be in danger by attendance at the chapel, proceeded to it; but on their appearance in the chapel-yard, they were attacked by about one hundred ruffians, who pelted them with stones, from which they narrowly escaped. In no part of the Queen's County have the mandates of the priests been more brutally exercised than at Clonaslee. After last mass on Sunday, Michael Finn, (who voted for Mr. Charles Coote,) and his children, were assailed in the street at Clonaslee, and pelted with stones by a mob of savages. Finn and his family escaped with difficulty into his father's house after having received much injury."

I might enumerate many more cases of similar scenes of outrage,



which are detailed as having occurred in no less than nine chapels in the county of Carlow and in the county of Kilkenny—of dark lists posted up at the chapel, and attended to by the priest, of those who had ventured to vote against his will, and of the barbarities to which those persons were exposed. Why, even in Lancashire, curses were delivered from the altars of the Roman Catholic priests against every one who should presume to vote against the Radical candidates. But that I may give you a specimen of the language which the priests employ on these occasions, I will quote to you the words of one of them, delivered at the altar on Sunday, during the late Carlow election. The priest denounced any man who should hesitate to vote for Messrs. Raphael and Vigors, Mr. O'Connell's candidates, as a "renegade and an apostate;" and then singling out one of them, he says, "Do you know who I mean? I mean —, the hypocritical, proselyte, apostate lickspittle. I say you are a detestable, hypocritical, apostate lickspittle, a ruffian and a miscreant, to be held by the finger to scorn, and detestation, and contempt."

With such means and such power, you will not wonder that the priests should have acquired a vast ascendancy over the elections in Ireland,—that they should have hurled out of forty seats in that country the Protestant representatives, and placed in their stead forty tools of their own,—and that they should have acquired an influence over at least twenty more. But it was necessary not only to have representatives but money to support them,—not only the hireling, but the hire for his crimes. By the same means by which the priests intimidated their parishioners to vote, they intimidated them to pay. Enormous sums were levied from them for the Catholic Association—  
an enormous sum is annually drawn from them under the name of O'Connell Rent, which is, in other words, the pay of the priests' representatives—a sum so large as already to have amounted to £80,000.

Such, then, being the power of the priests in Ireland, you may well believe that the Protestants do not escape its influence. What is the feeling which they inculcate on their flocks towards their Protestant neighbours? There is not a sermon, not a catechism, in which our religion is not denounced as heresy, and in which the curses of heresy, thick and deadly, are not denounced upon all who profess it. Archbishop Murray, in his evidence before the House of Lords, in 1825,

confesses that the bishops and priests warn their parishioners that it is a mortal sin to intermarry with a Protestant, thereby holding out Protestant blood as tainted and accursed. We need not wonder, therefore, that the Roman Catholic associations, whether of Ribbonmen or of Whitefeet, whatever other objects they have, always profess as one of their great objects the extermination of Protestants. The Whitefeet oath is, "never to spare but to persevere, and wade knee-deep in Orange blood; and when the day comes, to fight and wade knee-deep in the oppressors' blood; and that neither the groans of men, nor the moans of women, shall daunt him for the ingratitude shown by the oppressors to the Catholic Church." The Ribbonman's oath—an oath which is read every quarter in the Ribbon associations which are spread over Ireland, is, "to walk in the blood of the heretical class, and to support and uphold the holy mother Church of Rome."

Now, you will remember that of all these oaths every priest in Ireland is cognizant, and that not one of these oaths have they condemned; on the contrary, we have it in evidence, that in the diocese of Down and Connor, the priests openly patronise the Ribbonmen; and that in Kilkenny and Queen's County, the priests never interfered with the Whitefeet, until the Whitefeet disregarded the priest's authority and outraged the property of the Catholics. So long as the Whitefeet merely harrassed the Protestants, and swore to wade knee-deep in Protestant blood, the priests did not interfere with them. Well may Mr. Inglis say in his travels in Ireland, and his authority is all the stronger that it is that of a liberal and a whig, "In no country in Europe, no not even in Spain, is the spirit of Popery so intensely anti-Protestant as in Ireland. The priests are quite prepared to re-establish the horrors of the inquisition." Every Protestant, accordingly, is held up by the priest to popular indignation; the magistrates have been proclaimed by them as "a curse and a scourge;" and such is the personal danger which they incur, that a witness declares that conceives he runs greater risk in accepting a commission of the peace, than in accepting a commission as captain of a troop of horse. The landlords are held out by them as "oppressors of the people, and men that should be hunted out of the country." Here is a specimen of the language which a priest in his chapel this very summer has used respecting them, "Who are these bloody landlords, these tyrannical despots? A time will soon come that will call upon them to

prove what right they have to their usurped possessions. I hope it will not be necessary for us to draw the sword; the very sight of the scabbard will be enough to terrify them. We'll not be beat; but if we are, rivers of blood will flow broader and deeper than are the waters of the Barrow."

The Protestant clergy are no less the objects of the priests' attacks; for, as we are informed by an intelligent witness before the Parliamentary Committee of 1832, there was not a single anti-tithe meeting which they did not attend. Priests issued the placards, they distributed the handbills, they excited and kindled the people. But, as if to show more strongly how in Ireland the Protestants are surrounded by determined and vindictive enemies, there came forth in 1832 the sign of the lighted turf; the object of this, as the press in Ireland declared, was to show that the Catholics, though dispersed over the country, were, like one great regiment, in perfect discipline, ready, as the Catholic newspapers described it, "to rise on a given signal and fall upon their enemies." In Ulster, where the Catholics and Protestants are mixed together, this red-cross of the Papacy passed fearfully among them in the summer of 1832, spreading anxiety and terror among all the Protestant inhabitants. At midnight the Protestant was disturbed in his slumber by hearing a knock at the door of his Catholic neighbour. The lighted turf was brought to the Catholic's door, and passed on by him to the house of the next Catholic,—thus did it go on, visiting no Protestant, passing by no Catholic; showing that the troops were all mustered, that the victims were all marked out, and that it wanted but a signal from the priests who had devised this plan, to make the merciless rise upon their victims. If you add to this the actual assaults upon the Protestants, the attacks upon them in many parts of Ulster, waylaid on the roads, fired at in Kilkenny and Queen's County as they went to church, hooted at in the streets, pointed at in the markets, you will not wonder that so many should have fled from scenes of such personal danger, alarm, and wearing annoyance. You will not wonder to hear, what we have in evidence, and what Mr. Wyse boasts of, that a far greater proportion of Protestants have emigrated in these late years than of Catholics; and that from all parts of Ireland, and even from Ulster itself, there has ran strong and deep the stream of Protestant emigration.

Thus, powerful over their own flocks, and triumphant over the Protestants, the priests in Ireland have now begun to raise the shout of malignant exultation; and one of them, Mr. Burke, in transport at the prospect which this withering cruelty opened to him, broke forth at his altar in this exclamation, "Boys, the tottering fabric of heresy is falling, and the Catholic Church is rising in glory. Ireland was once Catholic, it shall be Catholic again." But this was not all. There are darker deeds behind. It is not enough that the Protestants in Ireland should be persecuted,—it is not enough that they should be driven out of the country, branded as heretics, denounced from the altar, cursed to the child in his catechism, cursed at the altar by the priest, murdered in their houses, watched and waylaid on the highway, with the brand of the church put upon them, and the fingers pointed at them which are ready to be dipped in their blood. All this was not enough: more malignant tortures were behind. You have all read the instruments of the persecution which our fathers had to endure. You have heard of the Council Chamber in Edinburgh, where sat the dark-robed and merciless judges; and in that chamber of gloom the instruments of torture lying ready for the victim—the thumb-screw, the boot, and the rack; the executioner ready to apply them, and the surgeon standing by to tell how much human nature could endure. But these tortures, merciless as they were, had their alleviation: they exhibited the patience and the constancy of the victim, and threw round his character a lustre of which his enemies could not deprive him.

But the Protestants of Ireland were to suffer more cruel tortures than these; for while in Ireland the priests were inflicting on them this grinding persecution, the representatives of the priests in Parliament were busy in blackening their characters; and while Mr. Sheil had the effrontery to praise the priests, whom I have described as "the best, the purest, the most zealous clerical body in the Christian world," every term of reproach and mark of infamy were applied to the unhappy Protestants; and men of purest character and scrupulous virtue had to bear that their characters should be lacerated by mercenaries, and that the steel of their cold calumnies should enter into their bosoms. I would say to the priests of Ireland, the traveller informs us that you are ready to revive the horrors of the inquisition.

Do so, I conjure you ; bring out again the thumb-screw and the rack, submit your victims to the torture, shed the blood for which you are thirsting ; but do not exceed the cruelties of the inquisition—do not blacken before you murder—do not defame those whom you destroy—spare at least their characters—do not put to the rack their reputation, do not rob them of our sympathies ; and if they must be driven from Ireland, if they must be run down and hunted out of their country, leave us at least to cherish their memory, to venerate and admire their virtues.

It was said by a very wise statesman, that if a body of thirty or forty men united together for one object, and acting together, were to be placed in Parliament, it would form a confederacy so formidable that scarce any ministry could resist it. I have already shown that such a confederacy exists in the thirty or forty Roman Catholic members of Parliament. Such a body, however, require a leader, and if the priests have been successful in collecting their troops, and the funds for their troops, they are not without a general, as well fitted for his enterprise as were Dundee or Dalzell for theirs. They had the qualities for their campaign of military persecutions ; he has qualities for a campaign on a different field, but perhaps for not less terrible objects. Resolution at least, and deep dissembling, and various eloquence, sarcasm and powers of attack, and bitter taunts and unscrupulous assertions,—if these be fit weapons, these are not wanting.

But you will observe that under this leader are arrayed not merely the Roman Catholic members, but all to whom religion is hateful and the constitution is an offence. The Socinian and the Infidel, and all the destructives of every shape and hue, range themselves under the banner of one whose ascendancy they acknowledge and whose tactics they approve. To these are added, I grieve to say it, representatives of a very different character—those who hold the principles of orthodox dissent, but are seduced by the hope that in destroying the Established Church they will extend their own. Thus powerful in Parliament, Mr. O'Connell has achieved a yet prouder triumph. You are all aware what are the feelings which government entertain towards him. It may be well to remind you on what these feelings are founded. In April, 1834, Lord Wellesley, then Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, in a despatch addressed to Lord Melbourne, declared that every crime and every outrage in Ireland, was, to a great degree, connected with the political agitation then in progress. It would be idle to dissemble

that the great political agitator of Ireland is Mr. O'Connell; therefore, at his door did Lord Wellesley place the crimes and miseries of Ireland. But even before this, so thoroughly were the government convinced of the fact, that in the speech from the throne they did what was an unusual procedure, they singled out Mr. O'Connell, and denounced him as the author of Irish outrages. That was the opinion, the deliberate opinion, which the present government had formed of Mr. O'Connell. What his opinion was of them I need hardly remind you. I need not tell you in what terms of reproach and contempt he has assailed every one of the ministers—Lord John Russell by name, Lord Lansdowne, Lord Duncannon, and Lord Melbourne—heaping upon them every opprobrious epithet which can mark them with the perfidy of traitors and the incompetency of fools. So far am I from joining in the language in which he has characterised them, that I desire to speak of his Majesty's government with that respect that belongs to their station. If, indeed, private feelings could have any weight with me, the warm attachment which I feel towards one of the members of their government, would influence my sentiments in their favour; but I must remember facts, and I must be allowed to ask the government one question. I will throw aside all vain rumours; I will not ask whether your Irish appointments were prescribed and dictated by Mr. O'Connell, but I ask you to tell me how it was that, during this session, you introduced four bills, most justly rejected by the House of Lords, which had an evident tendency to increase his power? How you proposed the constabulary bill, which was to throw the police of Ireland into his hand?—the registry bill, which was to place the Protestant constituency under his feet?—the Irish Church bill, which was to overthrow the Protestant Church?—and the Irish corporation bill, which was to drive out Protestants from the corporations and let in the votaries of the priest? These are the measures by which you were to extend the power of Popery in Ireland; and as if that you might falsify, at the close of the session, the assurances which you gave at its commencement, that you had no connection with Mr. O'Connell, the chief of your government, Lord Melbourne, declared in his place in the House of Lords, that such was Mr. O'Connell's influence, that it was impossible for any ministry to overlook it. Was I wrong, then, in the assertion that a desperate party of thirty or forty men planted in Parliament, might even bring to bay the ministry of

Britain, and make them bend their heads in the dust of degradation, at the feet of one whom they hate—who hates and despises them.

Gentlemen, for this monstrous state of things I have sought for a parallel, and I assure you I have sought for it in vain. Neither at the time of the Reformation, nor during the periods of persecution in Scotland, have I found any resemblance to this iniquitous usurpation; but in the page of ancient story I find a fit illustration. In this we have recorded the infamy of a man who in his day acquired power and name—a bold, bad man, of great natural gifts, of high accomplishments, in eloquence remarkable, still more remarkable for consummate art and power of persuasion, of deep and dark ambition, yet able to cover that ambition by an appearance of patriotism,—that man, drawing from every part of society its depraved and abandoned members, the voluptuary and the bigot, the man of pleasure and the man of crime, gathered them around him, armed them with a confidence not their own, directed them with talents far superior to their own, and prepared them for the scheme of his unprincipled enterprise; and then having prepared his plan, he, at the dead hour of midnight, convoked them in a secret chamber, and there, while the solitary lamp glared upon their dark countenances and their deep and guilty schemes, he presented to them, as a fit emblem of his purpose and its means, a goblet of human blood, and on that he bade them take the oath, and vow the vow that should bind them to destroy the institutions of their country. I know that there was no goblet of human blood, for none such was necessary; they had made, to use their own words, rivers of blood to flow, broad and deep as the waters of the Barrow. I know that it was not in the midnight hour, nor was it in the secret chamber, for that would argue some shame at least, if no remorse; but it was in the broad light of the sun, which I am sure never shone upon so dark a confederacy, and it was at the altars of the church, those altars said to be the altars of God, but then resounding with the malignant curses of man, that the leader called together his banded associates—the monk and the friar, the scowling priest and the mitred bishop—and there did he bind them by the vow and the curse; a curse against all Protestants, a vow fearfully observed, to unite in a dark confederacy against the faith and rights of Protestants, the horrors of which it is their task to execute, the evils of which it is your duty to withstand.

I appeal to you, my fellow-countrymen, if you value the liberties of

Scotland, if you value your Protestant faith, forget all minor differences, throw aside the idle names of party, unite in one Protestant association against the dangers which are imminent. If there be any of my dissenting brethren within these walls, to them I appeal. You conceive that the Protestant religion would be advanced without an established church—we think an established church useful to promote it. On this point we differ. I do not enter into the question—I have no time and no thought for it. Grant, if you will, that you are right and that we are wrong; at all events, we agree in cherishing the Protestant faith.

Act then, I beseech you, as wise men, as practical men, as Christian men. See the thunder-cloud which is gathering over your head; see how the lightning from that cloud has scorched and blasted Ireland—it is coming to you; join us in withstanding its progress, otherwise it requires no prophet to predict your doom. One of the party has already announced it. "Let us first settle the church," he exclaimed, "and we will soon put down the Dissenters." The leader of these bad attempts is now on his way—victorious in parliament, victorious over the cabinet, trampling the ministry under his feet—now parading his triumph through the country, to exult over the fall of Protestantism. Manchester has welcomed him; Newcastle is to receive him; and, alas for Scotland! Edinburgh is this day to greet him. Nay, more monstrous still, to this Protestant city—to this city of our fathers, which bore so much and braved so much for the faith which he now tramples upon—to this city, where the spirit of the Covenanters was so strong, the arm of the Covenanters so firm—even here does he come; and shame to us, here are found men who will scandalize Scotland and outrage religion by preparing here their monstrous revelries, that they may greet the oppressor of the Protestants with the shouts of their bacchanalian orgies. Let it be our duty now to hear from this Reverend Gentleman what Protestantism is now suffering in Ireland; and the evil deeds which Popery has done.

The Rev. MORTIMER O'SULLIVAN was received with loud plaudits. He commenced by saying—Our respected chairman has dwelt with much eloquence on the efforts to deprive a persecuted church in Ireland of the sympathy to which suffering virtue is entitled—efforts painfully felt in their present effects, and formidable as indications of malignant purposes and passions not yet sated. If they were to be successful—if the characters of ministers of the Gospel in Ireland



were to become so stained and disfigured that England and Scotland felt but little interest in their sufferings, there can be no doubt that the adversaries who malign us would profit by the opportunity, to work us severer harm ; and having estranged from us the kindly, and, I would say, not unmerited, consolation by which, hitherto, we have been cheered, and they have been restrained, would feel themselves encouraged to inflict, upon forsaken men, wrongs and hardships and insults still more painful to be borne than even those cruelties which they have already experienced.

It must be confessed that the devices by which the enemies of Protestantism would bereave Protestant ministers of protectors and friends, have been artfully constructed. They were the contrivances of men who would not suffer truth or pity to embarrass or obstruct them in their plans, and who have acquaintance enough with the instincts of the human heart, to understand how even good feelings may be engaged on the side of injustice. They have been assiduous in their endeavours to make the establishment of the Protestant Church in Ireland appear as a wrong done to a Roman Catholic majority. The conspiracy to defraud and impoverish unoffending individuals they have ascribed to an honorable resolution to be relieved from a great national oppression, and by misinterpreting history, they have fabricated precedents, which they offer as a justification for their own misdeeds, and through which they strive to make to themselves an interest in the noblest prejudices by which the heart of man is affected. You heard our respected chairman declare, that he can find no parallel to the persecution now suffered by Protestant ministers in Ireland, and to the efforts of the party by whom the cruelties have been inflicted : if you listen to that party, they will show you a parallel and a precedent—here. They will tell you, that, as your illustrious ancestors did in the days of old, so do they now,—as, in the old time, tyrant power attempted to force an unacceptable form of worship on a reluctant people here in Scotland, and was defeated in the unjust aggression, such is the guilt now of those who would maintain in Ireland a religious establishment, to which the mass of the people are opposed ; and as is the judgment you pronounce upon the conduct of those who suffered and fought for their best rights, when they were invaded here, so should you judge of Roman Catholics, who now resist laws favourable to a Protestant establishment in Ireland.

Circumstances have so magnified the importance of this unfair argument, that I shall, perhaps, at some length endeavour to exhibit it in its real strength and weakness ; but, previously, I shall beg your attention to another form in which hostility to our church is manifested—that of scaring all who would advocate her cause by a lavish use of the foulest and most unfounded calumnies, and of the most virulent invectives. Let me not be mistaken, as if I deprecated severe censure on any unscrupulous or even incautious advocate who has misrepresented facts, or as if I complained of exposures, however scornful, of inconclusive reasoning. No, sir, if we were accused justly, even of exaggeration, or of uncharitable severity in our administration of merited rebukes, I would submit to a censure which, at least, to some extent, had been merited. The species of aggression and abuse of which I complain is this—wilful and most unfair misrepresentation of our statements—groundless and malevolent imputation of corrupt motives—scurrilous, although vague invective—and a cautious avoidance of all the facts of the case at issue, as if the doctrines of Romanism, and of the Protestant Church in Ireland, and the conduct of their respective ministers, were to be judged, not by the merits of the cause, but by the motives which may have actuated advocates who discharge what they at least profess to regard as a duty.

With your permission, Sir, I shall give, although at the disadvantage of relating an incident in which I am myself, personally concerned, an instance of the description of *criticism* to which I allude. It was my fortune to be summoned recently before a Committee of the House of Commons, of which five leading Roman Catholics were members, and of which they and the party with which they act, constituted a majority ; and to be for six days under (I may call it) the cross-examination of these honourable gentlemen. It is not for me to say what was the character of the evidence which I gave under these rather trying circumstances ; but an Irish newspaper (the *Northern Herald*) which I received yesterday, contains some strictures on it, to which I feel impelled to beg from you a brief attention. It devotes nearly two columns of indignation and eloquence, (for falsehood has its own eloquence) to me and my testimony, in which after the usual compliments to my head and heart, and the usual protestations that there was no truth in me, the censor condescended to have recourse to facts, and to select from my six day's examination the instance upon which he holds it wisest to insist, in proof of my delinquency. The crime

thus selected from the mass of my misdeeds, by which my character, and, may I not add, that of my accusers also, can be judged, is an opinion I expressed in the course of my evidence, and one of the statements by which I sought to explain it.

This opinion was called forth by inquiries respecting the security of landed property in Ireland, as it might be affected by popular notions on the subject of what are called the forfeited estates. I had occasion to notice in the conduct of Roman Catholic agitators, lay and clerical, acts by which popular excitement on this dangerous subject was likely to be raised and sustained, and quoted some passages in which it had supplied very unsafe topics for thought and declamation. To these I adverted, not with a view to inculcate the motives of those who had put them forward, but to direct attention to their probable influence on the masses who should hear and who should read them. In this part of my examination I referred to some Irish newspapers, and experienced, in consequence, from one of these prints, the punishment which my rashness provoked and merited. It was administered in the usual manner. The opinions I expressed were grossly misrepresented and distorted, and my purpose, in citing from the angry journal, was belied. In the passage of which I availed myself the views of the journalist were, it was said, widely different from those which I had ascribed to him, and I was accordingly malicious and unjust. This is the charge against me. It is curious that my accuser makes no attempt to sustain it by citing the passage upon which it is grounded, or the comments by which I endeavoured to illustrate its meaning.

The reason for this abstinence, is perhaps, more curious still—I had not quoted any passage whatsoever from his journal—and a circumstance, certainly not less instructive and characteristic, is that, in the long discourse to which my delinquency furnished an occasion, the censor never thought it necessary to state that I had not made the citation of which he complains, the Committee having ruled, before hearing it read, that it should not be received in evidence—you remember the manner in which the keeper of relics in a continental church is said to have corrected himself when he had inadvertently showed the knife which had been used by Balaam. “But Balaam had no knife,” was the objection made—“he only wished for one”—“Yes,” said the ready Circerone, “quite true, and this is the identical knife he wished for.” So has it fared with me: I proposed to give a

quotation as evidence—the Committee refuse, because I cannot produce the paper in which it is contained, to receive or to insert it in their reports—and the journalist whom I had thus offended, knowing, like Sir Lucius O'Trigger, that a man may think a lie as well as speak one, not only plucks out my unread, unpublished opinion, but also penetrates boldly into the thoughts which I had not expressed, and judges me for the judgment which, if permitted, I was to have pronounced, or the quotation, I was, if permitted, to have given in evidence. This is an instance and example of the manner in which Protestant advocates are often assailed and slandered. It is a curious procedure. I refer to various newspapers, and quote from some. Those from which I quote are silent, or else content themselves with the ordinary calumny respecting corrupt motives. There is one from which I quote nothing, and this is the paper which makes a specific charge against me on account of my uncited quotation and of the unexpressed comments by which it should have been, but was not, and was not designed to have been, accompanied.

I feel that I have detained you on a matter in every way insignificant, one upon which, had I ever before been privileged to address you, I should not have tried your patience; but knowing as I do the artifices which are frequently employed by the adversaries of Protestantism to damage the testimonies of all who witness in its favour, I thought I might be pardoned for exhibiting to you the latest specimen with which I had become acquainted. I return to the more important subject.

It would be impossible for me to forget, even had not the forcible address of our president reminded me, that subtle and industrious efforts have been made to withdraw the sympathies of the Scottish people from a persecuted church in Ireland, and if I abstained from all allusion to them, I could have little reason to hope that you would accord me a patient, not to say indulgent, hearing. My desire and purpose are to give them a full and fair consideration.

It is a favourite topic with some who defend the conduct pursued by members of the Church of Rome in Ireland towards the Protestant establishment in that country, to compare it with the strenuous and daring exertions by which Scotland maintained her religious independence. The men of Scotland, they say, would not brook the yoke of a foreign establishment—they shook it off—and although in the struggle to achieve their liberty, wild perils were encountered and

deeds of violence done, they never reflected with feelings other than of thanksgiving and exultation on their memorable toils, and their bold achievements—nor have their descendants even to the present day ever thought the history of those turbulent times a blot upon their lineage. Why then, they go on to argue, should not the cordial good will of Scotland be with the Catholics, as they call themselves, in Ireland, in the struggle out of which they hope to see the church of which they are members, placed in the condition to which they hold her entitled.

If there be a similarity between the contest in which the Scottish Protestants engaged for their religious freedom and that which members of the Church of Rome in Ireland are now waging, I confess I have no just title to hope that you should withstand appeals which they address to the most powerful impulses of your nature; but if it shall appear that there is no ground whatever for the comparison they institute, that it is profanation to the memory of Scotland's martyrs to have their cause assimilated to that which has so disturbed and dishonoured Ireland, will you not learn to look with increased suspicion on the statements and arguments of men, who in their adventurous endeavours to provide themselves with friends, have shown so little concern as to the means by which they could become successful.—I beg your attention to a brief statement of the present condition of Ireland, and that you will compare its disorders with those memorable struggles in which your ancestors contended for their freedom.

To prove the justice of the comparison which has been made, it should be shown that the circumstances of the contest in the two cases were similar—that the objects of contention were of equal value.—I beg a brief attention from you to each of these particulars the circumstances of the Scottish struggle—those of the Irish—the religion for which your ancestors contended—that which the agitators in Ireland champion.—I have no doubt that the result of a simple statement of facts will satisfy you that never was comparison more audacious and less defensible, and that, if the case of Scotland and of Romanism in Ireland, are to be looked at at all, in connection, the relation by which they shall seem connected must be one of contrast, not similitude.

First then for the character of the struggle. And here, Sir, I feel I should be doing much injustice to my cause if I failed to grace and strengthen it by the words of an honoured countryman of yours, the

beloved representative of one of your northern counties. I mean Sir George Sinclair. That distinguished gentleman—distinguished not less for high accomplishments and extensive acquirements than for generous principle and pure piety, by one happy sentence assigned to the Scottish struggle and the Irish, the places which they ought respectively to occupy in history. He said in his place in Parliament—

“Allusion is frequently made to the case of Scotland. The honourable and learned member for Dublin (Mr. O’Connell) delights in adverting to the days of our clans and claymores. In the Roman Catholic times our forefathers were exposed to fire-and-faggot argument, by which Roman Catholic archbishops evinced their respect for liberty of conscience, and their Christian affection for their Protestant brethren; and in the days of episcopal persecution they were fighting for the free exercise of their religion, and the power of worshipping God after the fashion dearest to their hearts.”

I am not able to deny the justice of this charge of persecution. I am free to admit that there lingered for some time, even in the abodes of reformed religion, some portion of that spirit of intolerance which is the animating principle of the Papal system. Men who had been sincere worshippers in an unscriptural church, who renounced it when they had discovered that it was enmity with God—who came out from it, and found no model of charity and toleration in any existing system by which they could be guided, may be pardoned for not all at once discerning the precise boundaries within which lawful authority should be exercised and restricted. I am free to confess that the ordinary maxims of state policy imparted some of their despotism to the rule of governance which was sought to be applied towards the religion professed in Scotland—that, in the time of the first Charles, an unrighteous attempt was made to intrude into your church a ritual of which your fathers did not approve—that, in the time of the second Charles, (a part of the system by which he, a disguised member of the Church of Rome, laboured to extend the influence of that church over his dominions,) Protestants in this land were driven forth, if they would worship God after the dictates of their conscience, to the wastes and recesses of their native land, where they could obtain, however comfortless, a shelter; or into far foreign lands, where spiritual despotism could persecute no longer. I acknowledge all this—and I ask, can it be denied that your distinguished countryman spoke the precise truth, when he affirmed, that it was under these circumstances your ancestors resisted. What did they resist? Was it the Protestantism of the Church of England? No. In the formularies of her faith—

her articles—her liturgy—there is not the minutest trace of precept or principle by which such intolerance could be recommended. She pronounces faithfully the precepts which she holds herself commissioned to deliver—she does not shrink from accompanying them with the recital of those cautions, those solemn warnings, without which her message would be incomplete; but, having recommended, thus, the doctrines she has been commissioned to promulgate, to the most serious consideration of all, she leaves her warnings to be understood in the same strictness, and with the same qualifications as may be applied to warnings in the Scripture. She would recommend, convince, persuade; but, not being endowed with irresistible power to bring conviction to the mind, and to govern with absolute authority the will, she would not exercise any external force to procure, perhaps, an outward and deceitful submission, that the world might applaud her for having made a convert, when, in the sight of God, she was guilty of having slain a soul. It was not, then, against a church like this—it was not against a government in accordance with its spirit, your ancestors successfully contended. No. The circumstances were exactly as if Popery attempted to enforce upon their acceptance Protestant doctrines. The terms of acceptance—the character of the offer, must have vitiated the gift. Men who had achieved their liberation from slavery of thought, could not value such a gift. They knew that God was not in the whirlwind or flame, therefore they stood erect and resisted, and their resistance prevailed. The storm and fire, which were dread emissaries of Popery as she advanced, were quelled and subdued into the weak violence of her departing terrors. Look now to the contention which has been carried on in Ireland, and say whether it is of a similar character.

What is it for which Roman Catholics in that country make light of their solemn engagements, and convulse the land with strife and crime? Is freedom of conscience denied them? Do they fear to worship according to the dictates of their hearts? Do they fear to rear up their chapels in the crowded ways? Do their priests fear to recommend their own religion by the best arguments ingenuity and study can supply to them, and to impugn the religion of Protestants and of the Established Church with all the aids of sophistry and declamation? Are they restrained by fear of the law—by respect for an oath—by pity or decorum? Can they affirm that they have not freedom of action—or freedom of speech—who have pronounced the

religion which the Sovereign is sworn to protect, a nuisance which must be destroyed,—and who have set a brand upon the ministers of that religion which draws the hatred of a savage people upon them, and (if there had not been friends raised up here and in England) would have caused them to be hunted down and exterminated as if, as they were described, they were devouring wolves? In a country where such things are, are we to be told that it is for the sake of liberty, Roman Catholics are lawless and forsworn?

But, they were not always free. Long years of slavery passed over them. The Penal Laws bound them down in unholy oppression. I will not dilate upon this topic. I should be merely echoing phrases which have been thousands of times repeated, and with which every man at years of discretion in these countries is familiarly acquainted. They have done their work well. I need not, then, descant on the severity of those Penal or Popery laws which kept Ireland in fetters for sixty years, and to which all the evils of that country, past, present, and to come, are unhesitatingly attributed. Neither is it my purpose here to take a side among the parties by which the laws have been eulogised or censured. I would merely observe, in passing, that penal disabilities for religious belief are not ascribable properly to the genius of Protestantism or of the British constitution. That genius is, essentially, tolerant. Its earliest effort in framing laws may be said to have been governed by a spirit of mercy. Where it dared not to repeal, it defined, it mitigated, it limited, narrowing the boundaries within which force was to oppress conscience; and when it had attained the strength and wisdom of maturity, it dispensed with all precautionary restraints which were not essential to the general well-being. The penal laws were forced upon the policy of this Protestant nation. They were a faint copy of those by which Protestantism was persecuted in France, of laws which, if artfully concerted and remorselessly executed projects took effect, England herself must have groaned under. They were laws passed at a time when, day after day, fugitives escaping from intolerable cruelty to a hospitable refuge in Great Britain, imparted, with the knowledge of their virtues, hatred and apprehension of the practices which had driven them from their homes, and influenced the judgments or the passions of men, so that they would guard themselves from the intolerable evil they dreaded, by transferring to those whom they suspected, a portion of those evils against which they strove to be themselves protected.



But the justice or necessity of the penal laws is not the matter with which I am now concerned. I am to consider only their effects. I see Roman Catholics in Ireland endeavouring, by violence and perfidy, to overthrow that ecclesiastical establishment which they had secured, even against themselves, by an oath—I see them thus contending against law and justice, at a time when no restriction upon liberty, no violence to conscience, can excuse their crimes; and, I say, this is not in accordance with the apology made for them—it does not justify the comparison which would countenance their lawlessness by the precedent of Scotland: the present circumstances of Ireland are not like those in which your fathers resisted. I am referred to times past. I am told, that although Roman Catholics have little to complain of now, they may smart under the thought of what their fathers suffered, and may be, in their lawless excesses, avenging angry recollections. Still less do they in this resemble champions and martyrs and confessors, zealous for the faith in Scotland. For, pray observe, the longest period of repose—the period least marked by crime—which Ireland has ever known, was that through which those stern and exasperating penal laws were in authority. Pray, let this peculiarity have its due weight with you. As you trace out the dark and troubled history of Ireland, you arrive at one section, of a character resembling nothing which had gone before, nor has it found a counterpart in the years by which it has been followed. In that portion of time, history ceased to be a record of crime and calamity. It was marked by no agrarian tumults—no political insurrection—and, with the exception of one insignificant plot, by no religious conspiracy. There was no organised system of assassination, more formidable than law—few victims perished by the hands of the murderer—offended justice required few examples—the throne and government was not shaken by masked or manifested treason, and the loyal subject reposed in peace within the protection of the laws. This was a season which ought to be remembered in the history of Ireland. And what was it? When were those halcyon days vouchsafed to her? They were the days of the penal laws—the days when Roman Catholics were, as it is said, oppressed and contemned—when they could not possess landed property—could not acquire political privilege—could not, except by connivance, exercise freedom of conscience—and when they lived under the frown of a severe and a suspicious government. So long as this stern rule prevailed (for a space of sixty years) Ireland was tran-

quil. Whenever the Roman Catholics ventured to approach the representative of the crown, it was with language of gratitude and respect; whenever leaders, lay or clerical, addressed the people, it was to recommend that they be not weary in well-doing, but that they continue to deserve the good repute which had been won for them by habitual good conduct.

Such were the weapons of the warfare in which the Roman Catholics of Ireland overcame. The arts they waged against the penal laws, against the prejudices or the fears to which their enactments or continuance was owing, were acts of persuasion—habits of submission—professions of loyalty and affection. By these arts they prevailed; and then, when they were free, then came the sterner conflict. While governments maintained towards them a demeanour that might be called contemptuous, their language was such as flatterers use; but as soon as the maxims of government changed—as soon as their peaceful conduct had told, in engaging for them favour and confidence, and government had become lenient in their principles and courteous in their bearing, then they began to learn another tongue—murmurs and menaces could be heard even while their fetters were loosing; but it was not until every restraint had been cast aside, that the vindictive and remorseless purpose, as of a beast starting suddenly unto its own likeness, manifesting its untamed ferocity, became so fearfully conspicuous. They did not desist from the warfare of professions when relieved from the penal laws—they waged the same arts against the religious disabilities. They said, “We have no hostility to your church as a temporal establishment—we dissent from its doctrines—we care not for its wealth—the property of the church is, as all other property, the creation of law, and law must deal with it—as religionists it concerns us not—you fear if you gave us power we might wield it against those temporalities—we tell you, no—you believe us honourable in the intercourse of social life—will you doubt the sincerity of our pledges when we offer you our oaths—our solemn oaths, that we will not disturb the settlement of property or of your church establishment.

How long were these promises kept? Not for two years after they had served their purpose. They had been embodied in petitions and professions of lay and ecclesiastical leaders. They had been proffered in every available form, sworn and unsworn, before Parliamentary Committees in 1826. They had been ratified by a solemn oath and

made the basis of a great national compact in 1829, and before two years had passed away, they were given to the winds, or effaced in the confessional, and a tithe-war, unexampled in cruelty and violence, was raging throughout every Roman Catholic district in Ireland. Within two years it was pronounced a duty—a national and a religious duty—to violate an oath, and to betray the credulity which trusted to it—men, whose personal characters had been given as a guarantee for the engagements which Roman Catholics had voluntarily and to their profit contracted, called upon these same Roman Catholics to break their engagements while retaining privileges which had been purchased by them; and a distinguished individual, whose assurances had been very effectual in removing the suspicion that to give power to Roman Catholics would be to put the church establishment in peril, was to be found leading the war against it, and exhorting a fierce and lawless multitude to employ against it every resource of wit and ingenuity, and all means allowed by law, even, no doubt, those means which sworn disclaimers of any hostile purpose had placed at their disposal.

The exhortation was not neglected. A cruel war was waged against the ministers of the Protestant Church—a war of calumny, as well as of the most brutal persecution. They were described as plunderers, if they demanded their just and very moderate rights—the foulest of all murders, when one of these men was the victim, was justified as if it were the punishment of a robber—in Roman Catholic districts juries could not be expected to return true verdicts if the case of a Protestant minister were given to them for trial, and many of these ministers, until then, objects of at least apparent reverence and love, were, some murdered—some driven from their homes—all impoverished. Such was the manner in which Roman Catholics, where they were powerful, celebrated the triumph they had won—freeholders, sworn to maintain property as established by law, exercising all their strength and ingenuity to disturb that settlement, and giving their votes upon the hustings avowedly with the same perfidious purpose—members of parliament, sent as their representatives, swearing, on their entrance into the House of Commons, an oath, that they too would protect property, that they renounced all intention of disturbing the church, (an oath taken by Roman Catholic members only,) and in the House of Parliament, and out of it, acting as if they had incurred no particular obligation. I repeat my former question, and ask whether

this was the conduct your fathers adopted—or if it do not far more closely resemble the tyranny and the treachery which, valiant for the faith, they resisted?

What answer do you find in history? Does it teach you that the epoch of peace and professions of content and thankfulness—the epoch of flatteries from the people to the government in Scotland—was the season of religious and political despotism? Does history tell of Scotland, that the weapons of her warfare were not claymores but perjuries—that the concessions yielded to her were won by promises which equivocation loosed, or previous and concealed obligations precluded from the power of binding? Is the history of Scotland the very reverse of this? Then the case of the Church of Rome in Ireland is not like that to which her advocates have compared it.

It is not necessary, as you have plainly, and agreeably, taught me, to add further proof that, if a comparison be instituted between Ireland of the present day and the former years of Scotland, the Protestant clergy and people occupy the place of the persecuted, and the party which clamour about the wrongs—the wrongs, forsooth—they endure, are they who exercise a fiercer tyranny and display a fouler spirit than the contrivers and agents of persecution, while the Hill-people of this country struggled for their religious liberty. If more were wanting it has been supplied. Have you read a letter addressed by Mr. O'Connell to His Grace the Duke of Wellington? Mr. O'Connell was invited to appear before an assembly at Exeter Hall, and defend his church from the charge of upholding perfidious and intolerant doctrines. He declined the invitation. He was offered the opportunity of confuting Mr. McGhee in a Committee of the House of Commons, of which he was a leading member, and in which his party was the stronger. He declined. He heard, while on that Committee, evidence given of the intolerance of his church; and having proffered himself to prove the untruth of the charge, in the capacity of a witness, and having boasted that he would submit to interrogatories for a week or longer, if necessary, he retracted the daring offer, and went back dismayed from his undertaking. By his silence, the charges preferred against his church may be set down as confirmed; but in his words, the character of that church and of that warfare in which he desires you to respect the strivings of your venerated fathers, may, most plainly be discerned. I read the passage:—

" We fear not your swaggering sword. We care not for your exaggerated report of the number of Orangemen. They are not altogether one hundred thousand, including the over-old, and the over-young—the halt, the blind, and the lame. Suppose them, however, one hundred thousand fighting men, there are six millions five hundred thousand Catholics; there could be, and if absolutely necessary, there would be, one million of fighting men in the field—aye, in the field, who would be glad to get leave to fight."

I do not know that the records of cruelty and cowardice contain any thing baser than this. What! the Orangemen less than 100,000 individuals, including halt and maimed, and blind, and a million of fighting men are ready to take the field against them, and would be "delighted to get leave to fight." He wrongs Ireland. Popery has branded deep—has grievously abased fine natures, but has not brought them down so low as this. A million of fighting men! delighted to encounter less than the tenth of their number, including those whom, even in the fellest encounter, war would spare—a million of Irishmen. Is this like Scotland? Is this—

" The stern joy that warriors feel  
At foemen—worthy of their steel?"

Is this the spirit of the chieftain who flung away his targe that he might meet an adversary in equal arms? A million of men!! delighted to get leave to fight!! to fight a tenth of their number—halt and maimed, and blind, included!! And this is called a battle!! And those who are impatient for it are fighting—fighting! men! Is this like Scotland? No, nor like Ireland. I am not, Sir, the representative of the passions of my country—nor the hired advocate of what is termed her cause; but in her name I protest against the foul imputation of her agitator. She has no such millions, so truculent and craven. Tens, or hundreds, or thousands, may have become debased to merit the dishonour put upon them, but, for the millions—I would appeal to the experience of that great Captain, to whom the slander was addressed—I would appeal to every soldier of England and Scotland, who has seen the men of Ireland in the field, advancing with equal step when Britain charged, or standing with bold front in the fraternal ranks, to abide and break the shock of adverse battle—are they of the nature which can delight in that vile anticipation of unresisted massacre which their advocate ascribes to them? No, Sir, the millions of Ireland are not thus cruel and coward in imagination or in act. The thousands whom the agitator knows best—the thou-

sands, who, in the unhappy circumstances of that country hold millions subject under their reign of terror—they may perhaps be faithfully described in the picture which slanders Ireland. Are you not truly grateful to the man who desires you to look upon it for the likeness of your fathers?

So much for the character of the conflict by which Roman Catholics in Ireland advance their purposes and pretensions. I have thought it pardonable and necessary to be diffuse as I have been, because of the recklessness with which our adversaries seek profit from the comparison in which they profane the memory of Scotland's martyrs and confessors—I have shown you that, in the circumstances and character of the struggles in your country and in Ireland, the relation is one of contrast. I proceed now to show that the objects of the conflict are not less strikingly dissimilar. The faith for which your ancestors contended was the faith of the Bible—the faith which cometh from God's holy revelation. That which Romanism would elevate is not the faith of the Bible, nor the religion of reason or of love—it is a religion or a system of intolerance and impurity with whose iniquitous doctrines multitudes who give it the protection or support of their names are unacquainted, but by whose deleterious influences even such votaries are seriously injured. The truths of the Bible, which your fathers asserted, you know; of the doctrines of Professor Dens, for which Romanism has gone to war, I have a few words to say to you. [Here followed an outline of the accusation of bishops of the Church of Rome in Ireland, for their adoption of the "Complete Theology of Dens," and proofs that the anti-social doctrines taught by that writer, are part and parcel of Romanism.] And this is the religion for which your sympathy and good will, and respect is bespoken. This is Romanism, with the Complete Theology of Dens for its law and gospel, with papal infallibility for its rule and governance; and you are entreated to think it worthy as the faith for which your ancestors contended—to bid "God speed" to the subtrefuges and the treacheries, and all the crimes and cruelties by which its interests are promoted, and to hold vileness and iniquity when employed in its service, consecrated and exalted to a rank with the heroism of the Scottish martyrs. (Long and loud cheering.) You have abundantly satisfied me that you reject the unrighteous comparison. Will you not be confirmed in a good resolution, that, so

far as in you lieth, you will prostrate the devices of those who dare to use it as a cover for their outrages against the laws of our country, against all moral and religious obligation, and against all the best interests of humanity?

The times demand the sustained exertions of all who would maintain the cause of order and true freedom. There is no record in the history of our country, of a period in which a warfare against the Protestant institutions of our country was rendered formidable by the conspiring together of such, one might have thought, irreconcilable principles. They who constitute the visible strength of this unholy war, have been trained in a moral system which has not only abased and vitiated conscience, but has so brought it under subjection to pernicious maxims, as that it shall hold truth, justice, pity—crimes; and account the instincts which would shrink from equivocation, perjury, murder, temptations to be repented of. Thus qualified and accomplished the war of crime commences, under an impression that the civil law is disabled so that it cannot prevent or punish—and is continued under a constantly strengthening persuasion, that faction has so perverted public spirit and opinion, that praise and disgrace have become irregular and capricious, and all power has departed from them. Remember that we are fallen on days, when, after all that has been conceded to Roman Catholics in these countries, their avowed representative shall express the truculent boast which I have already repeated to you, and the expression shall not have aroused the members of his own church to pronounce indignantly that they will not longer endure the disgrace of his advocacy, or awakened in Protestants the disgust which honourable hearts should be quick to feel from connection with such an associate. Such times and associates prescribe to every virtuous man, with a command not to be misinterpreted or withstood, his plain and momentous duties.

I return to that most disgraceful boast—indignation, when I first detailed it to you, marred my comments upon it—I return to speak a few words more upon it in a subdued spirit.

I still maintain my protest against its truth. Ireland has not a million of men who would rejoice in the cowardly and brutal butchery which the liberator would prefer to a battle; but she may have numbers considerable enough to work much woe, whose bosoms are one with his who has taken the post of their representative and leader.

There is a secret society in Ireland which meditates the extermination of Protestantism, and records an oath binding its guilty members to effect or promote that object, as opportunity serves, by massacre or murder. Mr. O'Connell once declared that he had been professionally consulted by this society, in a year when circumstances rendered his connection with it eminently suspicious. It was the year and the time of the year, when Dr. Drumgoole made his well known speech, proclaiming that the "columns of Catholicity were gathering," and denouncing destruction to the Protestant Church. At that time Mr. O'Connell announced his professional connection with one column of Catholicity—the Ribbon association in Ireland. The speech of the learned Doctor awakened some alarm and much attention. The far more important avowal of the learned counsellor was less noticed than it deserved. At a subsequent period, Mr. O'Connell gave further information respecting this secret society. He said that it was a continuance of the Defenders—a treasonable association of the last century—that it consisted exclusively of Roman Catholics, and that, among its meditated objects, one was the destruction of Orangemen, while he has himself given this ill-boding name with little remorse to all who will not submit to own him for their lord, pronouncing that not to vote as he directs, is to be proved an Orangeman; to fall under that sentence of proscription and death in comparison with which the sentence of the law is rest of majesty and terror. When an individual cognizant of the existence and of the secrets of a criminal association, knowing its purpose of destruction, and its oath of blood, has announced that there are a million of men eager to put its fell desires into execution, are we not justified in regarding his recent menace in connection with his former disclosures, and interpreting it as a notice that all Roman Catholics of the humbler classes in the rural districts in Ireland, at least, are professedly members of that confederation of murderers. It may be thought that in making such disclosures there is indiscretion. I am not so sure of this. They engage too little the attention of those whom they should warn, and they encourage much the bigoted and intolerant in every part of the world who desire the downfall of Great Britain. Wherever Romanism prevails, you may be assured, subtle spirits are continually on the watch how they may do England harm, or how they may establish a power within her from which Protestantism shall take hurt. Be assured that there is concert and quick



interchange of intelligence between those who would exalt the power of Rome, on every matter, by which this empire can be affected, and that there is no one object which so constantly engages the attention of all as how they may gain it over to their cause. Were England with them where would their career of power be arrested—with her wealth and intelligence, and morals, and strength to back them, by whom could they be withstood? Therefore it is that, as we are given to understand, the hoards of treasure long secured and secret, are unlocked, and wealth much wanted elsewhere, is hovering over England seeking out every spot on which it can alight with advantage. And therefore is it desirable that revelations of internal weakness and danger, here in Britain, shall be prudently made, so as to stimulate Popery at home and abroad, without pouring too broad a light on the dull eyes of Protestantism. Many an enigma in the tactics of Romanism can be unlocked by this explanation.

What effect should such menacing explanations have on men who prize religious truth? What effect, if the movements of the heart obeyed the commands of the judgment, would they have upon the wise? As is the spirit of him who looks on danger, so will be his ability to meet it. The dastard sees and shrinks—his thoughts waver and wander—his sinews lose their vigour—and his conscious and evident imbecility provokes from the cruel the assault he deprecates. The bold man as he looks upon the coming peril, feels resources within him of which he had been unconscious until the moment when they were needed, and the menace which would crush a timid and helpless victim often recoils harmless from the firmness by which it is boldly confronted. I will not ask how you will meet the menace either of foreign intrusion or of domestic treason—of the artifice which would convert Protestant rulers and governors into a secular arm for Rome, or of the menaced million of fighting men, who desire to do battle with a tenth of their number, including halt and maimed, and blind. I need not ask in what spirit such menaces would be received by the fathers of the Scottish reformation, and I will not doubt the constancy of their descendants.

HENRY DUNLOP, Esq. said he was sure that the meeting would cordially agree to the motion which he had to propose—that their thanks be now awarded to the gentleman who had so eloquently addressed them. (Applause.)

**BAILIE GILMOUR** moved a vote of thanks to the Chairman, which was cordially agreed to.

An individual in the gallery here rose, and, so far as we could understand him, complained of the injustice of not allowing Roman Catholics to reply to the charges brought against them.

The **CHAIRMAN** referred the speaker to the regulations of the meeting, requiring any Roman Catholic, before he could be allowed to speak, to procure the authority of one or more of the bishops of his church. He also intimated, that as Mr. O'Sullivan had been unable, from the limited time allotted to the meeting, to do more than overtake the preliminaries of his subject, another opportunity of listening to his details would be afforded on Friday evening, when the individual who had addressed them from the gallery, if properly authorised, would be ensured a patient hearing.

The meeting then separated.

---

## ADJOURNED PROCEEDINGS.

THE adjourned Protestant meeting was held in Hope-street Gaelic Church on Friday night, and was attended by an equally respectable and numerous audience with that of the preceding day. We are gratified to observe a large proportion of the working and middling classes present, who manifested the most intense interest in the proceedings. The whole of the vast assemblage were animated with the utmost enthusiasm throughout. The platform was occupied by nearly the same gentlemen who appeared on the previous day—among whom were James Ewing, Esq. of Levenside, who was greeted on his appearance with a round of applause.

On the motion of J. EWING, Esq. J. C. COLQUHOUN, Esq. M.P. of Killermont, was again called to the Chair.

The Rev. Mr. HENDERSON, of Saint Enoch's opened the meeting with a prayer.

The **CHAIRMAN**, in introducing the business of the evening, remarked, that if great interest had been excited by the dark and startling details of the Rev. Gentleman who addressed them yester-

day, he could promise them that that interest would sustain no diminution to-day, for there was a greater and darker revelation behind. (Cheers.)

\* CAPTAIN GORDON said, that perhaps he should have best consulted the interests of the objects in the furtherance of which they were met together, if he had refrained altogether from addressing them on a subject to which his distinguished friend, the Rev. Mr. O'Sullivan, was so much better calculated to do justice. He should, however, proceed, with their permission, to lay before them the proofs of the existence and authority of a work of which they had heard, and then to adduce a few specimens of its contents, with some examples of the manner in which these specimens are brought to bear in detail on the feelings of the Irish people. To every controvertialist who could pretend to even a smattering of the subject, it must be obvious that the doctrines of a church professing to be infallible, are incapable of change. In making this assertion, they had nevertheless to deal with two classes of opponents who denied this position, or who equivocated on the subject in such a manner as to leave the same impression on the public mind. These consisted of the members of the Church of Rome and her liberal Protestant advocates. The boast of the former was, that while Protestants are blown about with every wind of doctrine, they are built on the rock of ages, and on an immutable foundation. They would not admit that the doctrines of their church are changed, but they did what was tantamount to this—they assert that the maxims of persecution, associated in our minds with the burnings of Smithfield, are no longer received and acted upon. The liberal supporters of the Church of Rome told them that it had partaken of the ameliorating influence which time had wrought on the minds of society, and was no longer the Church of Rome in the ancient sense of the word—that the language of her adversaries was that of men determined to shut their eyes on the progress of events, and to uphold the exploded rant of bigotry and intolerance. But though that church was in reality just as bad as when repudiated by our reforming forefathers, the conjoint influence of these assertions had produced a very different impression.

---

\* The Editors are compelled to avail themselves of a report taken under circumstances which rendered it impossible to do justice to the Speaker's admirable and most effective address.

This had occasioned a fatal apathy to the efforts of the Roman Catholics. He hesitated not to say, that the inundation of Popery was approaching, and threatened soon to overwhelm them; but he would fearlessly say, Let the Roman Catholics triumph, their day of triumph is at hand; but the day of reckoning is at hand also. Popery, aided by Protestant differences, and by Protestant liberalism, was at this moment spreading its course over the length and breadth of the land. The speaker then proceeded to detail the various steps by which the work of Father Dens had been rescued from the obscurity in which the Roman Catholic prelates of Ireland had endeavoured to shroud it, and recapitulated the proofs of its authority and authenticity, which have already been laid before the public. He then proceeded, in fulfilment of the intention he had announced, to read from the work a series of extracts for the purpose of establishing the following positions:—

1st—"That Protestants of all denominations are accounted as heretics by the Church of Rome, and worse than Jews or Pagans."

2d—"That we are all, by baptism, placed under the power of her domination."

3d—"That so far from granting us toleration, it is her duty to exterminate the rites of our religion."

4th—"That it is her duty to compel us by corporal punishments to submit to her faith."

5th—"That the punishments she decrees are confiscation of property, exile, imprisonment and death."

Lastly—"That the only restraint (on the application of her doctrines,) is a mere question of expediency when it may suit the convenience of the Papal power."

In order to prove the first proposition, the following extract was adduced:—

"What is heresy?"

"IV. Answer. It is the unbelief of those who profess indeed that Christ has come, but who reject his doctrine as to any part as proposed by the church, such as Lutherans, Calvinists, &c."

"What kind of infidelity is the greatest sin?"

"V. We answer with St. Thomas, (quest. 10. art. 6.) by distinguishing. If the infidelity is considered objectively, or in reference to the subject-matter of it, then Paganism is worse than Judaism, and Judaism worse than heresy; because the Pagan errs in more particulars than the Jew, and the Jew in more than the heretic."

"But if it is considered subjectively, or in reference to the individuals or the pertinacity of the will and the resistance to the faith, then heresy is the worst, and Judaism generally worse than Paganism; because heretics are

went to have a greater knowledge of the truths of the faith than Jews, and Jews than Pagans, and so generally heresy is the greater crime."

The second position was thus borne out:—

"Are all who have been baptized, in the church?"

"We answer, No. And particularly heretics and apostates are evidently not of the church, because they do not profess the same faith and doctrine with those who are in the church, which, nevertheless, is expressed in the definition of the church.

"Objection. The church judges and punishes heretics, but she does not 'judge those that are without,' according to the Apostle, 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, chap. v. therefore heretics are in the church.

"We answer by denying the consequent; for although heretics are without the church, nevertheless they remain by reason of baptism subject to the church, whence she justly seizes them as deserters from the camp of the church, and so they are under the obligation of returning; but the Apostle is treating of those who have never entered the church, or who have not been baptized." (Dens, vol. ii. p. 114.)

Again, in the chapter of infidels and heretics being "subject to the law," the following passage is found:—

"Heretics, schismatics, apostates, and all similar persons who have been baptized, are bound by the laws of the church which concern them, nor are they more released from her laws than subjects rebelling against their lawful prince are released from the laws of that prince.

"Objection. Heretics are not in the church, therefore they are not subject to the church.

"We answer by distinguishing the antecedent. If it means that heretics are not in the church, as far as relates to the union of charity and communion of the saints, we grant it; but if it means that they are not in the church as to subjection, we deny it, for they are made by baptism subject to the church, and they remain personally subject to the church wheresoever they may be."

The following extracts show the truth of the third proposition—

"Is it lawful to tolerate the rites of unbelievers?"

"This is answered, first—The rites of the Jews, although they sin in exercising them, may be tolerated with a certain degree of moderation, because from thence great good accrues to the church, namely, that we have a testimony to our faith from our enemies, since by their rites those things which we believe are represented to us as in a figure.

"It is said, 'with a certain degree of moderation,' because 'if there be any danger that the Jews by their rites prove a scandal to Christians, the church can and ought to moderate, or even to prevent it, as may be expedient.

"We answer 2dly—The rites of the other unbelievers, namely, of Pagans and heretics, are not in themselves to be tolerated, because they are so bad that no truth or utility can from thence be derived to the good of the church.

"Except, however, that some greater evils might accrue from some other source, or some greater good be prevented.

"Objection I.—The Apostle, to the Romans, chap. xiv. verse 5, says, 'Let every man abound in his own sense,' (we translate the Greek, 'Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.')

Therefore, liberty of religion is to be left to every man.

"This is answered by denying the consequent—(that is, by denying that liberty of religion is to be left to every man)—for the Apostle is not treating of the rites of religion, but of the observance or non-observance of the difference of days and meats according to the law of Moses, either of which might well be done at that time."

There was another plea urged for liberty of conscience, which was—

"Objection II.—The dilemma of Gamaliel; Acts, chap. v. verses 38 and 39. Where he is speaking of those things which the Apostles were doing, 'Refrain from these men and let them alone, for if this counsel or this work be of man it will come to nought, but if it be of God ye cannot overthrow it.'

"We answer, 1st.—This is a dilemma not of the sacred Scripture, but of Gamaliel, who, by this apparent argument, wished to rescue the Apostles, whom he favoured, from present danger.

"We answer, 2dly.—That granting the argument of Gamaliel to be valid, there is this difference, that the cause of unbelievers is not doubtful to the judges of the church as that of the Apostles was to the Jews; but it is clear that it is certainly false and condemned, whence it is not to be tried or approved, but extirpated, unless there may be some prudential reasons which may induce us to tolerate it."—Dens, vol. ii. pp. 82-83.

The fourth proposition was thus proved—

"Are unbelievers to be compelled to join themselves to the bosom of the faithful?"

"I. We answer, first—Unbelievers who have never been baptized cannot be compelled to receive the faith in the first place, by the church, because she has no jurisdiction over the unbaptized, according to the 1st Corinthians, chap. v. ver. 12, 'What have I to do to judge them that are without?' nor even by secular princes, although their superiors, because they have only a political power over them, which merely respects the public peace and tranquillity.

"The same also is proved by the example of Christ, the doctrine and practice of the church, and the form prescribed to the Apostles in preaching. (Matt. x.)

"This is answered by denying the consequent; for according to St. Gregory, the words of the parable are to be understood of compulsion, improperly so called, which is used by preaching, persuasion, showing of miracles, &c.

"But if, with St. Augustine, you understand the words of compulsion, properly so called, then they are understood of heretics and schismatics, who have at some time made profession of faith, and who can, properly speaking, be compelled.

"II. We answer, secondly, to the question, that unbelievers who have been baptized as heretics and apostates generally, and also baptized schismatics, can be compelled by corporal punishments to return to the Catholic faith and the unity of the church.

“ The reason is, that they by baptism are made subjects of the church, and therefore the church has jurisdiction over them, and the power of compelling them by the appointed means to obedience, and to fulfil the obligations contracted in their baptism.

“ This also obtains in the case of those who have been baptized in their infancy, or who, compelled by fear of any necessity, have received baptism ; as the Council of Trent teaches, Session 7, Canon 14, and the 4th Council of Toledo, Can. 55.

“ You may object—‘ No one believes against his will, but the will cannot be compelled ; therefore no one can be compelled to the faith.’

“ We answer by denying the consequent, for he is not compelled to believe against his will, but that from being unwilling, he should be made willing.

“ You will urge again—‘ No one can be compelled to baptism, therefore no one to the faith.’

“ We answer with St. Thomas on this—‘ As to vow is the part of a willing mind, but to pay what is vowed is of necessity ; so, to receive the faith is the part of the will, but to hold it when received is of necessity, and therefore heretics can be compelled to hold the faith.’

“ Meantime it is not always expedient that the church should use this right, as will appear from what shall be said hereafter.”—Dens, vol. ii. pp. 79-81.

The 5th proposition relative to the punishments of confiscation, exile, imprisonment, and death, was also thus established :—

“ What are the punishments decreed against those infected with that stain ?

“ Heretics that are known to be such are infamous for this very cause itself, and are deprived of Christian burial.

“ Their temporal goods are for this very cause itself confiscated ; but before the execution of the act, the sentence declaratory of their crime ought to proceed from the ecclesiastical judge, because the cognizance of heresy lies in the ecclesiastical tribunal.

“ Finally, they are also justly afflicted with other corporal punishments, as with exile, imprisonment, &c.

“ Are heretics justly punished with death ?

“ St. Thomas answers, 22 question, 11 art. 3 in corp.—Yes ; because forgers of money, or other disturbers of the state, are justly punished with death ; therefore also heretics, who are forgers of the faith, and, as experience testifies, grievously disturb the state.

“ This is confirmed, because God, in the Old Testament, ordered the false prophets to be slain ; and in Deut. xvii. 12, it is decreed, that if any one will act proudly, and will not obey the commands of the priest, let him be put to death. See also the 18th chapter.

“ The same is proved from the condemnation of the 15th article of John Husa, in the Council of Constance.”

The last proposition, the speaker remarked, had been demonstrated by the passages now quoted. He then proceeded to impress on the meeting the important fact, that the Roman Catholic clergy, when examined relative to their standard authorities before the parliamen-

tary committees appointed to investigate the charges brought against their church, had uniformly disclaimed the intolerant doctrines now fixed upon them by the evidence of a work put forth under their sanction and authority, and the existence of which they had invariably and studiously endeavoured to conceal. Tell him not of their disclaimers upon oath, of their solemn and repeated abjurations of these intolerant doctrines. The heads of the church, met in solemn conclave, had adopted the work before the meeting, had secretly circulated it, and stamped it with an authority which necessitated every priest to study it as his best and safest guide, and to reduce it to practice. This having been established beyond the possibility of doubt, their disclaimers must therefore go, in the judgment of every sensible man, for just so much articulated air. At the time when Mr. Pitt was anxious to extend to the Roman Catholics the benefits of emancipation, he addressed a series of questions to four foreign Universities, with respect to the existence of the very principles set forth in this work of Peter Dens. The answer returned by each University was a strong disclaimer of the doctrines imputed to them. They were not such clumsy tacticians as not to adjust their sails to the prevailing current, well aware as they were of the drift of Mr. Pitt. Indeed, the faculty of divinity of Louvain received these questions with indignation and astonishment, that such doctrines were imputed to them by the Church of Rome by a British minister. The answer was as follows:—"The faculty of divinity of Louvain having been requested to give her opinion upon the questions above stated, does it with readiness, but struck with astonishment that such questions should, at the end of the eighteenth century, be proposed to any learned body by the inhabitants of a kingdom that glories in the talents and discernment of its natives. The faculty being assembled for the above purpose, it is, agreed, with the unanimous consent of all voices, to answer the queries absolutely in the negative." Now, what was the fact? Peter Dens, the author of this book, which is adopted and received as the standard theology of the Roman Catholic Church, was himself a doctor of the faculty of Louvain, and published this work just eighteen years before, and that work had received the sanction of the College of Louvain. So much for Roman Catholic consistency. After some farther remarks, the gallant Captain sat down amid loud plaudits.

The Rev. Dr. O'SULLIVAN then rose, and said—My valued friend has observed that there is a considerable discrepancy between the



professions of many Roman Catholics and the doctrines of the church to which they belong. This observation is undoubtedly correct, and the principle with which you heard it connected, incontrovertible. The allegations of individuals, contradictory to the tenets of the church of which they declare themselves members, are to be regarded "as so much articulated air." It would have been well for the nation if this great principle had been understood in time—matters may even, henceforth, become worse with us, if it continue unregarded.

The Church of Rome pronounces herself infallible—assuming thus an attribute which it is blasphemy to assign to any but to Him who made and sustains all things. To ascertain her doctrines, therefore, we should apply to authorities which she has duly accredited; and if professing members deliver opinions not conformable to her fixed and infallible decisions, we should not be for an instant at a loss to distinguish the tenets which Romanism teaches, from the rash and unauthorised fancies, which should be cast aside as mutable and erroneous. You have heard the most characteristic, perhaps, of the dogmas of Romanism, as defined and taught in her books of authority; if you listen to Roman Catholics professing to declare their own belief, you may hear every one of these offensive doctrines denied and reprobated. Where, then, is the Church of Rome? With the doctrines taught in her approved formularies of instruction?—With the unstable opinions of individuals to whom these doctrines are a scandal? Bear in mind the principle laid down by my friend, and this will be no longer a question to you. Romanism is that which she can be found to be from the documentary evidence to which she herself ascribes authority—the conclusion to which such evidence leads cannot be shaken by the contradictory statements of individuals.

But while thus denying that statements made by individual Roman Catholics should be received as evidence of the doctrines held in their church, I would not be understood to impugn their general truth, because I reject in this instance their testimony. Many are, I believe, unconscious of the worst enormities for which their church is answerable, and are left ignorant of them, because, otherwise, they could not be retained in external communion with an evil system. Their offence, however, is not light. They lend a countenance and support to the Church of Rome, which makes them indirectly responsible for all her misdoings; and they extend this favour to her, without taking pains to learn the character of the system with which they allow them-

selves to be identified. If there are any such members of the Church of Rome here, I would beseech of them, in some moment of repose, to question themselves; to say, "have I accomplished the duty of a Christian, of a citizen, in the endeavour to understand the character of my church—have I endeavoured to ascertain the answer which she gives authoritatively to the charges preferred against her—have I succeeded in discovering the organs through which that answer is given? Protestants open the books of my church, to produce from them strong testimony against her; have I any thing but the bare word of the interested and accused parties to show why these books and their testimony should be disregarded; how comes it to pass that the accusations of Protestants are supported by books of old authority in my church, and that my bishops and priests have nothing to advance in their defence, except their own uncorroborated disclaimers?"

Every honorable Roman Catholic is bound to examine himself by some such questions as these; but they would prove of evil consequence to his church, and therefore he is preoccupied against them, or sedulously diverted from them. He is not burdened with long formularies of faith. Even that form, which it is said all Roman Catholics believe—the Creed of Pius IV.—is not, generally speaking, inculcated upon him. If he professes willingness to believe his church infallible, to receive whatsoever she teaches, and to observe such discipline and offer such worship as she prescribes, he is regarded a dutiful subject and son, and is indulged in happy freedom from the necessity of prosecuting more abstruse theological studies. Thus Rome provides that, so far as she has power, curiosity shall have no stimulus; and contrives that, if by any means a spirit of inquiry has been aroused, it shall be allayed or diverted. Here, in this country, in Britain, Roman Catholics might be tempted by the manner in which accusations against their church are brought, to say, "are these things so? their accused church contrives a diversion, and would call in the aid of bad passions to assist her in shifting the question, which she would transfer from its proper object—her authoritative doctrine—to matters wholly extraneous to the dispute—the endowments of a Protestant Church, and the political purposes imputed, gratuitously, to her accusers. Here, in this country, Roman Catholics are censurable if they allow themselves thus to be led astray, and Protestants are censurable if they decline to contribute their part in exposing the deceits and iniquities of the church which would so mislead them.

The Church of Rome pronounces herself infallible. According to the doctrine of Dens, the divine attribute is (we would say blasphemously) assigned to the Pope. The Pope is infallible.

“The Sovereign Pontiff, defining, *ex cathedra*, things appertaining to faith and morals, IS INFALLIBLE.”—Vol ii. p. 159.

“He is held to speak *ex cathedra*, when he speaks from the fulness of power, prescribing to the whole church something to be believed as a dogma in faith, or to be observed in morals, or to be accepted as good and religious.”—*Ibid.*

This is a fearful article of belief—fearful in its nature, because it ascribes to man what we would hold especially as the incommunicable attribute of the great Creator—fearful in its consequences, because it places the faith and the morals of all who receive it, and the most precious and the most vulnerable interests of the countries in which they dwell, at the mercy of a man, capable, whatever else he may be, of countenancing the blasphemous notion that he is invested with the authority of that divine prerogative, infallibility.

To such an individual all members of the Church of Rome must render true obedience.

“All the faithful, even bishops and patriarchs, are held to be obedient to the Roman Pontiff, who is to be obeyed in all things which concern the Christian religion, and therefore, in faith, in morals, in rites, in ecclesiastical discipline. &c.”—Dens, vol. 2. p. 155.

A man to be obeyed in whatsoever matter, affecting religion, which he commands, to be believed in whatsoever he teaches, even as if his voice were the voice of God! To be believed and obeyed therefore, though he taught and commanded what the revealed word of God as promulgated in Holy Scripture, strictly prohibits! What a doctrine is this? But perhaps it may be said, that my inference is not justified—that the Pope is not to be obeyed and followed *except where his decrees are conformable to Scripture*. This very supposition is contemplated by Dens,—for the purpose of being condemned.

“Hence the *perverse comment* of the followers of Quesnel falls to the ground, to wit—that the Pope is not to be obeyed unless in those things which he prescribes conformably to Holy Scripture.”—Dens, vol. 2. p. 156.

This is a *perverse comment*, one which Romanism casts down. What then does she erect in its place? Evidently the contradictory maxim—that the Pope is to be obeyed, though he prescribe *not in conformity with Scripture*. This, if the comment of the Quesnellites

be pronounced untrue—this must be accepted as a truth\*—as a religious truth. What a doctrine to term religion ?

But infallibility is not lodged in the Pope alone. It is a very diffusive property, sometimes extending over the whole expanse of the church, sometimes seated with the Pope in his high estate, sometimes entering with the priest into the oracular recesses of the confessional. Yes, every priest in the Church of Rome becomes infallible, when he sits to hear confession. Not infallible however, to all men, upon all subjects. A distinction is made well worthy of your notice—I read from this “*Complete Theology of Dens.*”

“Is a parishioner, in matters of faith and morals, safe, when he follows the judgment of his pastor ?

The answer to the question is,

“*A simple and unlearned person safely follows, because he wisely accepts the judgment of his pastor as the doctrine of the church, provided the pastor be accounted wise and learned ; but if a man be wise and learned, he is not of necessity bound to follow to the letter the judgment of his pastor.*”

What is the value of this distinction ? It divides society into two classes, one of which shall supply missionaries for the delusion to be practised upon Protestants, one shall supply the materials upon which Romanism may stamp its likeness, which it shall modify and move by its own principles and spirit. The wise and the learned will disseminate through your societies a notion, that Romanism is liberal and indulgent, that its votaries may exercise their reason, may give

---

\* If it be false that the Pope is *never* to be obeyed unless when his commands or precepts are conformable with Scripture, it must be true, as every tyro in logic understands, that the Pope is *sometimes* to be obeyed when his precepts are not conformable, &c., for these are “*contradictory*” propositions. It may perhaps be said, that the proposition of Quesnel is termed *not false but perverse*, and is condemned as such. Is not the condemnation of it still more perverse ? If it be assumed by Romanists, that the Pope will not prescribe what Scripture does not also prescribe—the assumption might be employed to *correct* the inconvenient Quesnellism. The unqualified *rejection of it* in the passage from Dens in the text, seems equivalent to an approval of its contradiction. The Church of Rome could choose whether it would condemn the opinion of Quesnel *as an absurdity, because it assumed the possibility of a Pope’s judgment being contrary to a precept of Scripture, or as a scandal, because it imagined a case in which the Pope was to be disobeyed.* She has thought proper to pronounce her censure on the latter offence, and thus makes it clear that the crime she punishes, is that of refusing to yield an unqualified and blind obedience to the Pope’s commands.

way to the impulses of their own conscience, and may reject the counsels and commands of their priesthood, if abhorrent to reason, and to God's revealed word; and meanwhile, the other class shall be wrought upon by the maxims of that assuming priesthood, until it has yielded up all power and privilege of thought and free action, and submitted to be an unresisting instrument, to do whatsoever is enjoined it. You will not confound the submission claimed on the part of Romish Priests, with that deference and respect, to which every faithful minister of religion is justly entitled. It is right that the counsels of all who bear spiritual authority, shall be received with a disposition to respect them, and in a teachable spirit. It is right and just that even though they may for a moment appear to discountenance your prejudices or opinions, you should be willing to judge of them by a better standard than an ill-judging self-esteem would supply. Indeed it would be perhaps no more than right, that you should, generally, transfer to the counsels of your minister, the respect which pride would prompt you to entertain for your own. This would in many instances be a safe transfer; but that *a man* shall say to any individual, do this, believe this, and that what he announces or commands is received or executed—not because of the reasonableness or scriptural evidence of the dogma, or the fitness of the act, but because of the supreme, the irresistible authority of him who teaches or commands. Of what spirit should the man be, with whom authority like this is lodged? In what school should he have been instructed? How pure and holy should the precepts be by which his heart and intellect have been impressed and governed? Oh! if Dens has been his instructor—if his code of morals has been derived from the execrable volumes of that “best and safest guide,” and if with principles thus acquired and a judgment thus formed, his pestilent instruction is to go forth as if it were recommended with the impress of a divine authority—is it to be regarded with amazement that crimes of so portentous a character shall have blighted and branded my unhappy country? Is it wonderful that a peasantry abandoned to such influences, should be found bigoted and barbarous? Is it wonderful that they are stimulated into so abominable excesses;—when it is religion which thus applies the torch to the quick combustibles of their infuriate passions?

I have said that there were certain classes of Roman Catholics who were not required to yield unqualified submission to the behests of the confessor. The wise and learned are indulged in a certain latitude

of judgment and opinion. They are not, however, loosed so as that they may exercise a freedom which might prove dangerous to their church. They can be reached, if, at any time, their excursions become alarming, and can be recalled into the same servitude with men of inferior endowments. What is it which reduces them to this most ignoble of all bondages? Crime? Profligacy? Infidelity? No—It is the disease of “of a scrupulous conscience.” Not—understand—that conscience in such a state of excitement, influences them by its strong and subduing compulsion to yield without resistance to the command of the Priest, but that the same casuistry which, in consideration of their learning and wisdom, indulges them with a certain degree of freedom, pronounces, that they must surrender the privilege if they are smitten with what it regards as the disease of a “scrupulous conscience.” A few short extracts from Dens will explain my meaning. They describe certain symptoms of the malady.

“If a man doubt often of his salvation and anxiously question others, if he be distressed with various thoughts respecting faith and other virtues,” his conscience is probably effected by the disease of scrupulousness.

A second symptom is—“if one do not follow, unless with anxiety and apprehension, the decisions and counsels of the priest.”

A third symptom—“if men pious in their manners and habits examine dubious matters with apprehension.”

A fourth—“if one think that unlawful in itself which he can excuse in others.”

In these symptoms, I apprehend, you would discern the workings of a mind labouring under a conviction of sin, conscious of frailty, apprehensive of danger, burdened with a sense of Christian responsibility. They are symptoms which you would love to witness—Romanism does not so regard them. They denote a state of heart and mind upon which she looks with disapprobation and dismay, and for which, after her manner, she prescribes a strong remedy.

“As to the general remedies for” the disease of a scrupulous conscience, “the first is”—what, do you imagine? “It is an humble and BLIND OBEDIENCE TO THE CONFESSOR OR DIRECTOR.”

It is not prayer. It is not silent humiliation. It is not patient reflection. It is not the agony of supplication in which the contrite and broken hearted penitent casts himself in spirit at the feet of the Lord Jesus, imploring that he would send forth his grace to sanctify and enlighten him. It is not, either, the counsels and exhortations of a wise and faithful minister, who would gently admonish and instruct him, strengthening his reason, and enabling him to understand, to his souls profit, the warnings of a troubled conscience. No—this would be

beneath the dignity of Romanism. Her remedy is blindness. I recur again and again to the page to convince my eyes that the arrogant words are these—"a blind obedience to the confessor." The passage continues—"without examination of reasons or arguments; and this remedy is of so great importance and necessity, that without it others can profit nothing." That is to say, unless a man make his priest his God, he cannot hope deliverance from the disease of "a scrupulous conscience."

The confessor is to assist in this process. "To ensure a universal or unqualified (omnimodo) obedience the confessor shall make known certain principles—first, that a scrupulous man is not in a condition to direct himself, because his judgment is disturbed; secondly, that to prefer his own judgment, indicates a mind haughty and adverse to the claims of Christian modesty, prudence, and humility; thirdly, that although his confessor may err, the scrupulous man will not sin by obeying him" Why is this? "Because what the priest directs in the confessional, he orders as the REPRESENTATIVE OF GOD." He is therefore to be obeyed without deliberation or fear.

Let the nature of such a principle as this be judged by its tendency. Is it calculated to encourage crime? What counsel could be expected from a confessor who felt that the interests of his church were best served by a breach of the moral law? I have heard of a case in which a Roman Catholic gentleman consulted a friend—a lay friend—on the obligation he had incurred in his oath of allegiance. He was answered that he could not, without perjuring himself, vote in the affirmative on a question then pending. He expressed his approval of the answer given to him, and then voted so as to incur, according to the opinion he *had* entertained, the guilt of perjury. I am not at liberty to mention the names of the parties in this melancholy affair, or the name of my informant; but names are not necessary where the incident is no more than the necessary result of a principle. The hesitating perjurer was a person of "scrupulous conscience." He probably consulted the confessor when perplexed by the counsels of his friend. It is easy to imagine how the confessor instructed him. One can conjecture even the dialogue in which his scruples gave way.—"You are a member of the true Catholic Church?" questions the confessor.—The man of scrupulous conscience replies—"I am."—"You have taken an oath by which you think yourself disabled from hurting the Protestant

establishment?"—"Yes."—Do you not receive every thing which your own church teaches as bearing the stamp of authority not to be gainsaid?"—"Surely I do."—"Are you not aware that the Council of Lateran has taught, that, if you have taken an oath prejudicial to the interests of your church, it is a perjury to keep it? This is a doctrine which you are bound to receive. It not merely sets you at liberty, but requires of you to vote in support of the policy by which the Catholic faith may best be befriended. You are released from your oath."—Oh, Sir, the most limited faculties can understand that the priest who is set up to teach, as in the place of God, should be thoroughly instructed in the word which God has revealed; and when we find the church of Rome fabricating hindrances by which even her priests and bishops shall be embarrassed in the endeavour to make themselves acquainted with scripture, and recommending to each confessor, as his best and safest guide, the pestilent theology of such a writer as this impure and intolerant *Dens*; judge what must be the condition, the danger, of their penitents and pupils, when even reflected rays from the light of God's word may not reach them through the medium of their priest's instructions, and when the waters they are invited to drink are not pure, from a well springing up unto eternal life, but waters of bitterness and death, polluted, poisoned, by the execrable principles taught here (pointing to the volumes of *Dens*.) [The report adds here, tremendous cheering, mingled with a single hiss.] My poor, dear, friend, whoever you may be, accept in christian candor, what shall be a christian advice. Bend your knees, I implore you, in prayer to God this night, that he will enlighten and direct you. Do not take it for granted, that the doctrines in this book must be accordant with the divine mind and will, when you find them reprobated even by the instincts of your heart; do not take it for granted that your church is pure from the disgrace of teaching them, when you find that for three months she has been charged before the nation with holding them—so long has she listened to the call upon her to send forth her advocates to defend or disavow them—so long she has remained silent under the ineffaceable opprobrium and (the rest of the sentence, observes the newspaper report, was lost in tumultuous applause.)

I turn to another view of the subject which has engaged us. I have shown you that the confessors who represent God in their tribunal, do not make his divine revelation the supreme law to direct and



govern them. Let us now look upon them in the light of an inferior relation, and see how they are prepared for discharging the civil duties which every subject and citizen has contracted to his rulers, and to the community he lives in. A Roman Catholic priest, trained up in the principles inculcated in this Theology of Dens, can acknowledge no obligation to a Protestant state. The efficacy of law is twofold, as Dens instructs us—"coercive and directive." In the former capacity it punishes for disobedience; in the latter it prescribes but does not punish. With this preface you can understand the force of the following instructions. Dens asks

"Are the clergy subject to human laws."

The answer he gives is:—"They are subject to ecclesiastical laws, as concerning themselves, in their coercive and directive efficacy, they are amenable to civil laws not infringing their immunities in a directive not a coercive efficacy: but if the civil law infringe upon their immunities, or in any matter in which the clergy are exempt from civil authority, the clergy are not bound by it in either capacity either as compulsory or directive." To carry out this principle to its proper results, the *Bulla Cænæ Domini* ordains, that 'a judge who compels a priest to submit to a secular tribunal, incurs the penalty of excommunication.'" Thus carefully are Roman Catholic priests guarded, by the institutes of their religion, against all sense of duty to the state.

Is it to be expected of such instructors, that they will endeavour to stamp upon the minds of their people that sense of moral obligation against which they have themselves been elaborately fortified?

Observe how such principles as these act upon society. Judge to what a degree of slavery they have reduced the minds of Roman Catholics, when one of the most enlightened of their body enumerates it among the grievances to which they were exposed by the penal laws, that British law would give protection to all the subjects of the British Crown, and give redress even where a Roman Catholic bishop was the delinquent, and a lay Roman Catholic the sufferer—Yes, it is actually set down as a grievance by the author of the "Penal laws," that a Roman Catholic who has been excommunicated, (and who has thus incurred grievous evil and become exposed to imminent danger) can have redress at law against the ecclesiastic who has accursed him. Judge how the principles of Romanism are likely to

influence the thoughts and actions of Roman Catholic subjects. If a man persisted in sending his child to a school where the bible was read, he would be excommunicated, and suffered to die without the rites of the church. If he were a murderer, and a conspirator to murder, he would be absolved from his guilt, although he made no atonement to the offended laws of his country by a public confession, through which crime could be prevented. Is it difficult to trace, to the influence of a system like this, that profane and shameful disregard of sworn obligations by which all moral men have been in these latter years affrighted? Is it difficult to understand the source of that feeling which causes life to be taken in Ireland without remorse or fear of detection? Strive to imagine the same sentiments and opinions prevailing here—imagine that you are safe under the shelter of some mysterious protection, and while thus secured, imagine yourself roused at dead of night by the shocking intimation that a family in your neighbourhood were perishing in flames—imagine that you saw the barbarians by whom their burning house was surrounded—that you heard their shouts of triumph, and could distinguish the death shrieks of the perishing victims piercing through the din of their cannibal orgies—imagine that you had gone forth after the horrors of such a night—that you have gone from friend to friend and whispered your dismal story—and imagine the advice you received, to be—“be silent—divulge it not—do not bring down terrible ruin upon yourself and all dear to you—do not cover your family with the infamy of the informer.”—Oh, if such things could be here, how would you mourn for fair Scotland—and the land in which such things are, what must you think of it? what must you think of instructions given by men who tell you that they are in the place of God? If you find throughout their people that horror and detestation of the murderer has been obliterated from their minds, and has given place to a horror of the informer—if the people on whom this debasement has been effected are people who give up to the priest the conscience thus fearfully abused, kneeling duly in the confessional, and hearing the confessor command and instruct with the authority belonging to God—can you doubt that the instructions given in the confessional are conformable to the opinions which recommended the foulest atrocities to the wretched perpetrators? How could you doubt? Is it not reasonable to infer conformity between the habits of a people and the instructions of teachers whom they believe endowed with a

divine authority? If there be not conformity, if, while Roman Catholic clergy in Ireland pray, and preach, and instruct, piously, charitably, discreetly, their people are universally possessed with a spirit of preternatural malignity and crime, what has become, then, of the landed and boasted influence of their priesthood.

This is the priesthood, remember, to whom education in Ireland is now to be entrusted. What they have made of the generation passing away you know—does it encourage you to be well pleased that the rising generation are now wholly to be given up to the instructions which have embruted their fathers? And this is the recompense made for the violence and fraud by which the Protestant Church is dismantled. The Protestants of Ireland are to be despoiled of their best right, that of having pure religion preached to them—their churches are to be shut up, and their ministers murdered, or stoned, or banished, in order that schools may be opened where the patron of the Complete Theology of Dens may direct the studies of the Roman Catholics of Ireland. But then the church establishment in Ireland needed reform! Was this the reform it needed? Impoverishment is not reform, often it prevents reform. Romanism well knows that the church has been often least efficient when it was most squalidly poor; if she thought wealth injurious to her, what can be plainer than that she would be glad to see the church she considers in error sinking under its luxury? She is better advised. The reform which the church in Ireland demanded in matters of finance was that of some better distribution of revenues. The poverty brought on by injustice in former years had compelled unions of parishes into benefices. As wealth came in from new channels, the benefices, which had originally yielded bare competences, became greatly increased in value, while the care became too much for the incumbent. This needed reform, and reform was applied. The noble individual placed by divine providence at the head of the church in Ireland, with, it is pleasing to add, the concurrence of the other bishops, resolved on the reform, and, without bustle or ostentation, effected it. Pluralities have ceased in Ireland. As each incumbency is changed in Ireland, the union, if it were one, dissolves, and each parish obtains its minister. There was another inconvenience. The incomes of parishes were not apportioned to their respective duties. This, too, was in process of being remedied. But if the Romish reform of the Protestant Church were to succeed, all these fair processes would be arrested. The

parish where the income was deemed too abundant would be despoiled, but the poor parish would be robbed also, for the provision by which its deficiencies were to be supplied would be transferred to the schools, where, in order to make way for the chimera of "united instruction," the scripture was to be prohibited.

What a return is this—to open schools where the word of God may not be heard or read, as a compensation for shutting up and silencing many a church where the poor had had the gospel preached to them. Who are to have benefit from the change? Roman Catholics!—Protestants! What do Roman Catholics profit? What do they gain? Do you imagine they think it a good to be denied access to the bible? Never was mistake more widely erroneous. The church of Rome needs all the assistance the secular arm of the state can afford, in order to maintain her position—her unnatural position—that in which she withholds scripture from her people. Nature and thought resist her. No, Sir, she never could, without such aid as our Protestant state affords her, delude her people into a belief that the bible may not be read. What—to persuade a man that the book which God commanded to be written for our learning, in which he has taught us our duties, our condition, the end for which man was created and redeemed, to persuade a man that these blessed memorials are so executed, that, even with the grace which prayer implores, with the assistance of God's holy spirit, it is dangerous to contemplate them, and that "Peter Dens, Professor of Theology in the university of Louvain." [Here the voice of the speaker was lost in an indescribable burst of applause.\*]

No, sir; the Roman Catholics will not think it a gain that the individual who has introduced Dens into the conferences of the priests, has been empowered by the British Government to banish Scripture from the education of the people.

How fare the Protestants? Oh, sir, if one of those who in the days of old had induced British settlers to establish themselves in some part of Ireland where Romanism abounded, and who had reared up for them a decent church, and assured them of the services of a minister, were to return upon earth when the evil which is now meditated against the church has been done—if he were to enter, on some silent Sabbath, one of those parishes upon which the cruel mercies

---

\* See Report in the *Scottish Guardian*.

of the appropriation system are to be visited—to see there forty poor Protestants surrounded by barbarians hostile to what is thought their nation and their creed—surrounded, too, by fearful temptations to apostasy—witnessing in no human voice or countenance an expression of regard or sympathy—remembering the times when the church bell sent forth its summons of cheer and warning—when the Sabbath was a day of rest and congregational devotion—and now shrinking into their sad abodes, to shun the menaces and mockeries of savages, who, in their merriment, are casting down it may be the remains of the church where they had worshipped,—would he think himself upon British ground? And would he understand and approve the change, if he were told that the Protestant religion was thus forsaken, in order that a system of national education which was not scriptural should be reared up and supported? No, sir, he would recognise a two-fold evil. It was iniquity to break down the church—it was iniquity to exclude the holy Bible from the system of national education. If a government desired to try the profane experiment, they should have tried it at their proper cost and charge; they should at least have raised funds from independent sources, by which the cost of working it could be defrayed, and they should have surrendered the juggle of despoiling Protestant worship of the provision set apart for its maintenance; and pretending that they made sufficient compensation, when they devoted the spoil to the maintenance of a system based upon this principle—that secular education is in itself so desirable a good as to be well purchased at the enormous price of interdicting Scripture.

It is a time of rebuke and sadness when such things are, but we will not, I persuade myself, be appalled by the manifestations of actual or impending evil. A great and mysterious power, not to be moved from its course by fears or scruples, known to have at its command extensive resources, and known for the surpassing artifices by which its desires are advanced and covered, is encroaching silently upon the liberties of the British people, and is undermining the constitutional restraints, religious and political, by which their freedom is guarded, that it may rear up on the ruins a remorseless and all-grasping despotism. There is, in a state of things like this, it must be confessed, matter for serious reflection and alarm, but there is nothing in it which can make men, who believe in a present God, despond. Further, I would say, that even in the demonstrations which

Romanism makes, in the articles and enterprises by which she enlarges herself, and will not be satisfied, there is ground for encouragement and hope. She aspires daringly, because she cannot continue in one stay. She has no resources from within or from above by which she can maintain her place. She has no dependence on the continued attachment of a people to whom every augmentation of knowledge—every thing which increases their legitimate self-respect—will bring distrust and disrelish for her. She has fear, fear that never departs from her, of Protestantism and Scripture—and it is because her fear is sore, and her cause, consciously, indefensible, that she has betaken herself to those unpardonable offences, by which she has succeeded in embarrassing her adversaries, and winning a transitory success for her own schemes, but at the cost of covering herself, and her cause, and her chosen champions, with irretrievable dishonor. Success was never yet retained by vile practices. Protestants must be baser than Romanism has shown herself, if she be not speedily deposed from her ascendancy.

The CHAIRMAN then rose and said—Will you allow me, in conclusion, to say one word before we part, as to your duty as Scotsmen. In the words, in the feelings, in the expressive piety of the Reverend Gentleman who has just addressed you, you have a sample of those doctrines which he inculcates, and which the clergy of Ireland teach in their parishes. You have in that book, in that catalogue of monstrous infamy, a sample, and a clear and distinct sample, of the doctrines which the priests teach in their parishes. Now, when it was proposed to our ancestors, in similar circumstances, in this country, what remedies to apply, they said the Highlands of Scotland are plunged in the darkness of Popery—we will plant a minister in every parish; and, however dark it may be, though not a Protestant be there,—not a word of Protestant truth be there spoken,—though not a ray of light may be breaking there through the gloom, in it we shall plant a minister who may teach the people eternal truth, and guide them in the path of life. And are we to be told that the very contrary is the policy to be pursued in Ireland—that if a parish in Ireland shall be found where there are few Protestants or none, and where the communication of the truth is therefore more essentially necessary—will you, at the bidding of a reckless ministry—(immense and reiterated cheering, mingled with a few hisses, which were instantly drowned in general applause)—in compliance with those

expressions of disapprobation, I retract the word—I acquit them, it is not their wish—but will you at the bidding of their stern and imperious master—(tremendous and long-continued applause)—of that master who bids them perform his hard task, and enjoins them his reckless commands, and yet contemns when they obey—will you withdraw from such a parish the minister of truth, and yet leave in that parish the ministers of the doctrines of Dominus Dens ?

We are told that this is the way in which peace, and purity, and order, are to be established in Ireland ; now I put it to you as Scotsmen, versed in the history of your country—as wise men skilled in the experience of the plainest sense, whether this is the policy which you will adopt, and which you will sanction ? or whether you will resort to the old—the time-worn, but the time-sanctioned policy of your fathers ? I speak in behalf of you all I am sure—I speak only the feeling which is in the breast of every one of you, when I say that if we could plant not one but many such ministers in the parishes of Ireland, we should do them a great blessing. And yet the proposal of the last session of Parliament has been to withdraw from eight hundred parishes of Ireland such ministers as you see here—(pointing to Mr. O'Sullivan—tremendous cheering)—and to leave in those eight hundred parishes such ministers as you see there—(pointing to the work of Father Dens which lay on the table—renewed applause.) I am sure I speak your feelings, I rejoice to know that I speak the feelings of this Reverend Gentleman, when I say that with the pomps, the dignities, the splendours, the wealth (if there be any undue wealth) of the Irish church, we have no sympathy. We desire in all those matters its strong and searching reform ; but with their suffering piety—with their unwearied zeal—with their persevering energy—with their toil even unto death—with their love for perishing souls—with these if you did not sympathise, if I did not sympathise, if the very stones of this city did not sympathise, oh ! shame to Scotland, and shame to you ! Whatever welcome may be given to him who soon shall come amongst you—to him who has attempted on the altar of his policy to slay the infant truth in eight hundred parishes of Ireland—to put out the candle of the living God, and to place instead of it that dark and sanguinary altar from which emanate those monstrous tenets, and which streams with the blood of its slaughtered souls—whatever he shall tell you of his monstrous career of marked and signal criminality—I do not ask, and I do not wish to hear ; but

I am sure that the humblest minister of that Gospel which he endeavours to trample under foot, but which shall yet survive and triumph over him, will ever meet amongst you—will ever meet in Glasgow, with that reception, not marked by splendid revelry—not marked by the toasts and insensate shouts of these orgies of dissipation ; but will ever receive from you, in this the expression of your calm and deep-felt sentiment, the cordial welcome of honest hearts. Therefore, on behalf of you all, I here return to the Rev. Gentleman our thanks for his impressive eloquence ; and I feel satisfied that the cause of Protestantism in Scotland, and the cause of our brother Protestants in Ireland has been strengthened, and fortified, and extended by his visit to us here. (Mr. Colquhoun resumed his seat amid the most tumultuous acclamations.)

The Rev. Mr. ALMOND concluded the proceedings with an impressive prayer.

On the motion of WILLIAM BROWN, Esq., a hearty cheer was given to the Chairman for his conduct as President.

---

[While Mr. Gordon and Dr. O'Sullivan remained in Glasgow, numerous and urgent invitations reached them from various parts of Scotland. Many of these they were reluctantly constrained to decline. With some they were enabled to comply ; but the circumstances under which the consequent meetings were held, were such as to preclude, except in a few instances, the possibility of procuring accurate reports. The following is an abridged report of a meeting held at Paisley, as it appeared in the *Dublin Evening Mail*, extracted from the *Paisley Advertiser*. The Editors, unable to procure any other report, give it without correcting its inaccuracies.]



# GREAT PROTESTANT MEETING

HELD AT

PAISLEY,

ON

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22<sup>ND</sup>, 1835.

---

Tuesday evening last, a meeting was held in the High Church, to afford an opportunity to the friends of Protestantism to hear something of the present doctrines and workings of the church of Rome. To prevent over-crowding, access to the church was had by tickets, of which 2,200 were issued, and judging from the crowded state of the church, very nearly all these must have been used. The admission of ministers, elders, and strangers without tickets would account for the numbers on the stairs and in the passages. A few minutes after the appointed hour, (six o'clock,) Mr. O'Sullivan and Captain Gordon came on the platform; accompanied by the Rev. Mr. Routledge, of Glasgow; Dr. Black, of the Barony; Mr. Gibson, of Glasgow; Mr. Stephen, of Stewarton; Mr. Macnair, Mr. Wade, Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Stewart, &c. Dr. Burns was unavoidably absent, being engaged to preach at Helensburgh on Tuesday evening. On the motion of the Rev. W. M. Wade, the Rev. J. Macnaughten was called to the chair, and at his request the meeting was opened with prayer by the Rev. Robert Macnair.

Captain GORDON then came forward and addressed the meeting at great length, but our limited space does not afford room for more than a faint outline. He observed, in substance, that in discussing the differences between the religion of Protestantism and Popery, it was necessary to know what these religions really were. Protestants in describing the religion of Popery were usually accused of anti-quoted bigotry, deep-rooted prejudice, intolerance, &c., but most of

this was occasioned by Protestants not knowing fully of what Popery consisted. If the question was asked what Popery really was, he might give in answer what had once been said of it, that it was the Devil's master-piece. He would not, however, assume the definition of the Romish Church given of her by her enemies, but would take her as she represented herself in her various councils and decrees, not the character given her by Protestants, but that given her by her own infallible priests and bishops. Previous to the Council of Trent the Nicene Creed was recognised as the creed of christians, but at the Council of Trent twelve articles had been added, which in a great measure superseded the rest, and rendered it in fact a new and different religion. Having made profession of their faith they add, "This is the true Catholic faith, without which no man can be saved, and which at this time I freely confess and truly embrace; and I will take care, by the help of God, that the same be retained and firmly professed, whole and inviolate, as long as I live, and as much as in me lies; that it be held, taught, and preached, by all those that are under my power and by such as I have charge over in my profession, thus I, N. N., do promise, vow, and swear; so help me God, and these his holy Gospels." In a running commentary on these articles, he proceeded to show the baneful nature of the church which had sanctioned them, and by means of them had assumed the power to keep mankind in spiritual thralldom. These articles were to be received implicitly by all true Catholics, and were sworn to by every priest on being admitted into holy orders. If, therefore, the doctrines of the Church of Rome were libelled, she was libelled by her own councils and decrees. These articles established a new foundation of christian belief. Instead of resting on faith in Jesus Christ, as the only sure basis of a Christian's hope, they substituted the authority of the church, and the tradition of the fathers. With such a basis once laid down, it was not difficult to rear a superstructure that would deprive men of every particle of spiritual liberty. He then proceeded to quote and comment on the theology of Dens, which has of late excited so much attention. This work, the production of a priest of Louvain, had been selected by the Roman Catholic bishops of Ireland as the best book of doctrine and discipline that could be obtained for the guidance of the Catholic priesthood, and it was constantly used as a text book of the Catholic clergy at their conferences. He then took a view of the wretched condition to which the Church of Ireland had

been reduced by the united spirit of Popery and false liberalism which unhappily prevailed. The lives of her clergy, five of whom were recently murdered, were in continual jeopardy. When they went out on their ministering visits they might be said to have their lives in their hands, and knew not but they might be taken from them before their return. Their just dues were withheld, and they were subjected to every insult and to the horrors of starvation. He had travelled over the length and breadth of Ireland, and could pledge that nowhere was a branch of the Protestant Church more zealous, and more energetic in the performance of their ministerial duties. Yes, and that was the principal cause of the hostility to which she was subjected. While she was more indifferent, and all churches might be accused of indifference, no clamour was raised against her, and now that she had improved, and was improving vigorously, the yell of condemnation was raised against her, and she was proscribed, while the terms of cormorants and blood-suckers, and other opprobrious epithets, were heaped upon her ministers. He concluded by drawing a striking picture of the deplorable effects likely to be produced by withdrawing the machinery of the Church of England from Ireland, by withdrawing men, who, in the absence of her landed proprietors, were almost the only indications of civilization, of withdrawing men, whose residences formed the depository of bibles and tracts, and who were themselves the distributors, who encouraged and sheltered readers, who superintended schools, who, when famine stole over the land, formed the pure channels through which were distributed with augmentation the bounties of the beneficent, while the priests of another faith were ready to intercept, or subsequently to extort, a part of the bounty from their famishing flock. They were men who contended for the faith, and could make no compromise with supporters of a religion opposed to the genuine doctrines of the Gospel, and were these the men that were to be sacrificed on the shrine of false liberalism? Were these the men of whose services 850 parishes in Ireland were to be deprived, at the bidding of Papist demagogues?

The Rev. Mr. MACNAUGHTEN stated that he had the pleasure to introduce the Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan to the meeting (applause.)

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said the first question that might be asked was "Why are we met here?" He would answer, "that it was not to gratify any bad feeling against any body of men, but because your

invitation has called us here, who worship the same God and profess the same faith as yourselves. Captain Gordon had stated, that he had gone through the breadth and the length of Ireland, and he had borne testimony to the efficiency of the clergymen connected with the Protestant establishment in that country. Another individual from this country, Mr. Inglis, had also gone through Ireland in 1834, but had not had the same favourable opportunities as Captain Gordon. It became a matter of some consequence to obtain Mr. Inglis's opinion, as he was not favourable to church establishments. He also bore his testimony to this efficiency. It was a remarkable fact, and might be stated as a proof of the estimation in which the established clergy were held even by Roman Catholics, that many of them who had emigrated to America, and had sent home money, transmitted it to their friends through the hands of the ministers of the establishment: this they did from a knowledge of the previous characters of these clergymen, and reliance on the uprightness of their conduct.

It had been already stated, that no Roman Catholic would be permitted to take part in the discussion who was not properly authorised. This was a necessary precaution—because persons who were most deficient in their attainments were the likeliest to come forward with their shallow pretensions, and disturb the proceedings. But while he stated this, they wished it to be understood that they were willing to accept the challenge of any accredited individual from the Roman Catholic body. (Here the speaker read some extracts from a work sanctioned by their church, to show that Catholic laymen were not permitted to enter publicly upon discussions connected with their tenets, without being duly authorised, under pain of excommunication.) Sufficient time had been allowed for any individual who felt so inclined, to call upon his bishop, and should it have seemed meet, to obtain his consent to enter on the subjects to be discussed—but it would never do to allow a man unauthorised to come forward on an occasion of this kind, with the rope of excommunication around his neck. It was now several months since the humble individual who addressed them had attended a committee of the House of Commons, of which five Roman Catholics were members, and had recorded in their minutes, with the tacit concurrence of these men, his sense of the pestilent nature and destructive tendency of the doctrines of the Church of Rome. Under the workings of the Romish system, how many murders and dire crimes had the people of Ireland not to

deplore? This book (Den's) stated that the Pope, sitting in Rome, was infallible. The speaker at some length pointed out the absurdity of this, because it was one of those attributes that God had reserved to himself, and it was blasphemy for any individual to claim that attribute.

Here the Rev. Gentleman stated the pernicious effects resulting from the mode of granting of indulgences and pardons for the most horrid crimes. He pointed out the absurdity and wickedness of praying to sainted individuals, many of whom had acknowledged before their death that they had been guilty of the grossest offences. He entered at considerable length into the measures which had been adopted by the Church of Rome to prevent the circulation of the Bible. He stated, that as members of the Church of Ireland, they wished to see reformation carried into full effect where it was necessary, to the correction of every abuse—but they did not wish to receive this reformation from the hands of men who could not join with them in religious services. Could it be otherwise than that they would look with suspicion on a reform of their church from men who were violently opposed to it, and had declared that it was their determination to pull the church down; was it any way strange that they were afraid to receive reform from the hands of these men? They had appealed to England, they now appealed to Scotland, and they had endeavoured to show that, but for the circumstances in which she is now placed, the Church of Rome still continues to hold the same doctrines, and to act on the same principles that she has always done.

He concluded a long, eloquent, and powerful speech, which has only been briefly given here, by calling on the audience to lend all their energies in support of the Protestant religion, and depicted, in strong and emphatic language, the evils which would attend the predominance of the Roman Catholic religion. The Rev. Gentleman, during his speech, was several times loudly cheered, and sat down amidst the applause of the meeting.

Mr. MACNAIR said they could not part without tendering their sincere thanks to Captain Gordon and Mr. O'Sullivan, for the valuable information they had communicated, and while they did so, they would still cherish cordial feelings of brotherly love to their Catholic brethren, in the hope that they would see their errors and turn from them.

Mr. MACNAUGHTEN returned thanks in the name of the meeting to Captain Gordon and Mr. O'Sullivan. He had seen these gentlemen branded in the public papers, with every opprobrious epithet, but he hoped that they would still persevere in their labours in defence of the Protestant religion.

Dr. BLACK, from Glasgow, proposed a vote of thanks to the Chairman, which was carried with great applause, and after the benediction had been pronounced by Mr. Steven, from Stewarton, the meeting broke up.

---

[The next meeting was held, two days after, at Airdrie; Captain Gordon, owing to indisposition was unable to attend. The greater part of Dr. O'Sullivan's address was occupied upon the usual topics; those suggested by the anti-social character of the doctrines taught in Roman Catholic Theology. Of this portion of his discourse, however, no report has been preserved. If there had been a report of it in a publication like the present, it should have appeared in an abridged form. The notice given is taken from the *Glasgow Courier*. Dr. O'Sullivan, it will be seen, was following up and commenting on passages in speeches ascribed to Mr. O'Connell, who was then on a tour of "agitation" in Scotland, and whose invectives had appeared in the *Glasgow Courier*.]

# GREAT PROTESTANT MEETING

HELD AT

AIRDRIE,

ON THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 24th, 1835.

---

A public meeting was held in the New Church, Airdrie, on Thursday last, for the purpose of hearing an exposition of the tenets of the church of Rome. The following is a short report of the speech of the Rev. Mr. O'Sullivan, on that occasion :—

Mr. O'SULLIVAN apologised for Mr. Gordon's absence, and proceeded to say, that not having the advantage of his friend's introduction, it was well that, addressing an assembly where he was unknown and unacquainted, he could appeal to the testimony of an adversary to avouch his credibility. It is known perhaps, said the reverend speaker, that, in a speech recently delivered in Glasgow, Mr. O'Connell is reported to have distinguished me by some characteristic vituperation—it ought to be known then, that neither in that speech, nor in any other, has he directly contradicted any statement which I had advanced, or attempted to impugn any one of my arguments. The amount of his accusation against me is, that my name ought to be spelt in Irish, and that I was once a Roman Catholic. Now, really supposing him right in both of these charges, they do not furnish a creditable vindication of his church from the grave charges advanced against her ; and yet they constitute the only defence with which, so far as I am concerned, Mr. O'Connell has ever thought it necessary to favour her. It is now ten years since he first employed, it, and one year since he renewed it. A good thing, some think, cannot be too often said or done ; but still it would be hardly inexpedient to throw in a little variety ; and if this could not be accomplished, would it not be prudent to show how the crimes of which I am accused, can serve to exonerate the Church of Rome from the accusations

against her, or to justify or palliate her enormities? The Church of Rome, cries Mr. O'Sullivan, is intolerant and perfidious. Mr. O'Connell answers—how can Mr. O'Sullivan be believed, who has been guilty of forsaking her? The Church of Rome cries Mr. O'Sullivan, stands justly charged with the guilt of adopting the foul and cruel principles of Peter Dens. What matters this, cries Mr. O'Connell, in comparison with the guilt of Mr. O'Sullivan, who would not abide still in her communion? The Church of Rome in Ireland, Mr. O'Sullivan says, is of a more intolerable and intractable a spirit than is manifested elsewhere, because in Ireland national antipathy and religious bigotry mutually exasperate each other. How can this be, cries Mr. O'Connell, when Mr. O'Sullivan spells his name in English, and has renounced the Church of Rome? This has been ever Mr. O'Connell's defence. He has never even noticed the compromise I offered. I could not endeavour to propitiate him by a change of religious belief; but in the matter of the name, I could afford to be more complying, and, accordingly, I engaged to allow the full dimensions of my Hibernian name, Muiriertach—or, in accommodation to the degeneracy of modern organs of speech, Moriertagh, with all the abridgments and translations in which it was practised upon or attempted, to be cast into a crucible of etymology, and if the deposit were to be, not Mortimer, but Daniel, I would not be discouraged by the associations with which that venerable name has recently been profaned—but would consent to bear it, provided Mr. O'Connell and his friends would keep the oath they had sworn, not to attempt the subversion or injury of the church establishment in Ireland. I need not tell you whether this offer was accepted. It was made before the celebrated thirty-five, (who had sworn to maintain the settlement of property in these countries, and had solemnly abjured all intention of disturbing the church establishment, or weakening the Protestant religion,) rendered their objects more plain, and the character of their principles more notorious, by voting for a measure which would have the effect of unsettling property, by diverting the endowments of a Protestant Church to the uses of Popish education—would disturb the security of the Protestant establishment, by establishing a principle which a majority in parliament could apply to its utter subversion; and would weaken the Protestant religion, by denying to every parish in which there were not fifty Protestants (thus menacing parishes



where the number is larger,) the comfort and instruction of a resident minister.

The honourable member who is supposed to have influenced the Roman Catholic party in the House of Commons to regard their oath in such a light as should allow them to give this vote, is my accuser. He has, as he says, made himself acquainted even with the days of my infancy. He has recently had an opportunity of learning more. He was a leading member of a parliamentary committee, before which I was for six days under examination, and where, naturally, it would have been of moment to him to disparage my testimony. When, therefore, after a scrutiny of my life from the cradle to my present grave maturity, he advances against me such charges as I have noticed, it might tend to introduce into my mind, if there were not in every heart which will listen to its warning, a voice which speaketh wiser and better things even than the lips of an accuser, a false and dangerous complacency. No more on the subject of myself as regards Mr. O'Connell's defamation; henceforth he is at full liberty to speak, if he thinks me worthy of abuse, in full assurance that I shall not reply. I adverted to the subject to show you that even he has not disputed any of my statements, as, when at Glasgow, I noticed the eagerness of an Irish newspaper, the *Northern Herald*, which, desirous of imputing inaccuracy to me, imagines me to have made a quotation which I never made, and accuses me of making an inaccurate reference for it to an Irish paper, when in truth it was to be found, where certainly it would have much better suited my argument to have met with it—in an English paper. No more of myself; but because it will be conducive to the object of my addressing you, one incident in the public life of Mr. O'Connell. I shall be under the necessity of naming a calumniated body of men, but I shall do so, not for the purpose of entering into their defence, but of setting forth the character of Mr. O'Connell's proceedings. The boast which recently he was not ashamed to make in his letter to the Duke of Wellington, of there being a million of Roman Catholics, fighting men in Ireland, who would be delighted to get leave to fight, as he said, a tenth of their number, suggests the propriety of the short detail I am about to lay before you.

It may be in the remembrance of many here, that shortly after the Roman Catholics had obtained, by the relief bill, as it was called,

of outrage and crime unparalleled, perhaps, on the face of the earth. It was farther stated in evidence, as it is also perfectly well known, that there is a part of Ireland in which order prevails, and security is afforded to life and property in the same, or in a superior degree, to what could be found in the most favoured parts of Great Britain. It was further stated, that the parts of Ireland thus favourably distinguished, were those in which the Orange system prevailed. And all this was set forth on the admission of individuals whose political bias was adverse to the Orangemen, and who appeared before the committee for the purpose of bearing testimony against them. From their testimony, it was made evident that Ulster, in which about 1300 Orange lodges are organised, is tranquil—and that the other three provinces, in which not a fourth of the numbers of Ulster Orangemen can be found, are in continual disorder. Further, it was proved that the peace of Ulster was thus secured, although but two regiments were stationed in it, while security could not be obtained in the other provinces, although they were garrisoned by three-and-twenty, and to complete the proof that the paucity of both military and police stationed in Ulster, should be received as an acknowledgment of its tranquil state, it was shown that this compliment was paid by the Whig and Radical Government as well as by their predecessors—that in the administrations of Lord Grey and Lord Melbourne, as well as under the Duke of Wellington, Ulster, containing nearly a third of the population of Ireland, did not require a twelfth of the Irish establishment of military and police, in order to secure its quiet.

There remained but one more point to be established, in order to establish the character of the Orangemen in Ireland. It might be said that Ulster was tranquil, because of the linen manufacture—or of the number of Protestants who would, without confederation, ensure its quiet. The compliment this implied to Protestantism could not in its full extent be accepted—nor yet could the employment afforded by factories in Ulster claim the praise. It was shown that that now tranquil province was for a long series of years the most disturbed part of Ireland—that up to the year 1797, Ulster was in a state of disorganization and confusion, the theatre of the most frightful crimes, and the arena of the fiercest and bloodiest contentions. It was shown that it was the state of Ulster which required that severe measure—that suspension of the constitution authorised in what is called the

“insurrection act”—that the first application of this penal statute was to a county in Ulster, the county of Armagh. It was proved, also, that no Orange lodges had ever existed until the close of the year 1795; that at that time a hundred thousand men, known to each other by secret signs, spreading every where around a terror by their atrocities, were sworn by treasonable engagements to be faithful to the French revolutionary government; that, in order to afford mutual protection, to maintain law and defend their religion, under circumstances of appalling difficulty and alarm, a few Protestants associated together towards the close of that most troubled year, 1795; that, in the course of two years, their organization became extended and prosperous; and that, from the year 1798, in which it was completed, up to the year 1835, Ulster, governed by the ordinary laws, occupied by a most scanty garrison, has been preserved in a state of peacefulness and good order, which strikingly distinguish it from other parts of Ireland, and bear unequivocal testimony to the peaceful and peace-preserving character of the Orange institution. This part of the proofs in its favour was completed by the establishment of the truth, that even in the less favoured portions of my distracted country, the establishment of an Orange lodge had the effect of changing the aspect of society, and of rendering outrage less frequent, and giving life more security. This was the character of evidence offered before the Orange committee—evidence grounded on the histories of writers adverse to the cause of the Protestants, and in reports of parliamentary committees—evidence confirmed by the valuable acknowledgments of witnesses brought forward to testify against the Orange institution—some of whom could speak against Orangemen only while they retailed stories which they had heard, but whose testimony as to what they themselves knew was strikingly in their favour.

It was impossible, in the face of such evidence, to induce any men, who valued in the slightest degree their reputation, to sign a report against an institution so recommended. Accordingly such a report was not obtained. The evidence goes forth to the public as it was taken. And what does Mr. O’Connell in his disappointment? He proclaims that the Irish Orangemen are few, and that there are ten times their number of fighting men, who would be delighted to “get leave to fight them.” This is the winding up of that series of movements, commencing with abject flatteries, continued in the most

unscrupulous efforts to defame, and concluding with a brutal menace, that a million of men are prepared and impatient to engage them in the butchery which he dignifies with the name of a battle.

The Rev. Speaker, after commenting on the avowal of Mr. O'Connell, and showing the necessity thus rendered apparent on the part of Protestants, that they, too, should be prepared to withstand the threatened violence, entered upon an exposure of the doctrines of the Church of Rome, and established the charges he had previously made against that church, of holding as its principle to prohibit the free use of the Bible. He adverted to Dr. Murray's letters, and showed their inclusiveness, gave an account of the manner in which the work of Dens had been detected, and dwelt upon the guilt of the Church of Rome, in allowing its poisonous and intolerant principles to circulate with authority. He spoke of the hollowness of a pretence like that of Mr. O'Connell to advocate liberty, when he was the slave of a system which would not allow him freedom to think; and asked of what use was liberty, or what was that liberty, which required that man should be, even in his inward thoughts, the veriest slave? He also exposed the fallacy of a pretence to reform religion, on the part of one who, in explaining his conduct at the funeral of his friend, Mr. Cobbett, declared that his religion would not permit him to join in prayer with those whose creeds were different! Mr. O'Sullivan asked whether God-fearing men could unite with such a man; or whether it did not cast suspicion over any project, that men who engage to combine for its success must abjure the design of praying together that God would bless their endeavours! Was it a holy purpose to which the benefit of prayer was thus denied? When this denial on the part of Mr. O'Connell was considered, in connexion with the principles of his religion, Mr. O'Sullivan argued that it was impossible not to be made sensible of danger. This he rendered more obvious by an extended survey of the doctrines of Popery, as they are exhibited in authentic documents, and as they have been received and circulated since in the Theology of Dens.

We abstain from following the Rev. Gentleman in this part of his discourse, because our limits will not allow us to publish it, and also because we hope very soon to see in the hands of the Protestants of Glasgow, and its vicinity, a clear and able abstract of the doctrines

taught in Dens, and of the proofs by which the publication of his pernicious book is fixed upon the bishops of the Romish Church in Ireland.

It was interesting to observe the attention with which some of the humbler portion of his hearers appeared to examine the Reverend Speaker's statements; and their audible responses to his questions imparted at times considerable animation to the proceedings of the day.

---

[The next meeting was held in Edinburgh. An abridged report of the proceedings appeared in a pamphlet published on the occasion. The church in which the meeting was held was densely crowded in every part by persons of the highest respectability for character and station. The Editors adopt the report which appeared in the pamphlet, although from the abridgments, which were found convenient in order to render the pamphlet more suitable for distribution, injustice has been done to the addresses of many of the speakers.]

# GREAT PROTESTANT MEETING

HELD IN THE

WEST KIRK, EDINBURGH,

ON THURSDAY, THE 1<sup>ST</sup> OCTOBER, 1835.

---

THE REV. DR. THOMSON, MODERATOR OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY,  
IN THE CHAIR.

The CHAIRMAN said he presumed they were all acquainted with the great design of the present meeting. It had been called by those who were friendly to the principles and doctrines of the Reformation, for the purpose of explaining the true character and present position of Popery, and the duty of Protestants regarding it. He, therefore, thought that it was almost unnecessary to remark, that no individual would offer any sentiments which were unfriendly to those principles. We live, he said, in interesting, deeply interesting times; for a spirit is abroad in this, and other lands, which is calculated to inspire feelings of the deepest anxiety. The spirit of open infidelity and of absolutely damnable heresy is abroad—the spirit of foul Popery—the unholy spirit of Liberalism; and he regretted to say that many, who had been previously under the influence of genuine Christian principles, are now to be found who even think it no evil to join with those who are hostile to the faith once delivered to the saints—who think they may unite and associate with such on matters affecting the spiritual interests of the community. He lamented to say, that there is another spirit abroad, the object of which is to overthrow all establishments, and particularly the religious establishment of our beloved country. He rejoiced that, in these times, Providence has raised up an individual, endued with a boldness, firmness, and fearlessness of Christian principles, who has come among us to rouse us up to a sense

of our duty. He hailed the day when the inhabitants of the metropolis of Scotland were to hear, from the lips of that gentleman from the sister island, the true character of Popery in his native country and the demoralizing effects which it had upon a large portion of its inhabitants. When they heard his statements, he was sure they would all of them unite in contributing, as far as is in their power, to withstand the current of vice and Popery which is setting in upon our land. He (the Chairman) had been lately in London, and had heard that gentleman address a large assembly in Exeter Hall, and he should never forget the impression which that address had made upon his mind. It was altogether a feeling which he was quite unable to express; but he was confident that a similar impression would be that day made upon all their minds by that talented and respectable individual. It was of great importance that, in the proceedings of the day, the greatest propriety and decorum should be observed by every one present. He hoped that they would all remember that they were assembled in the house of God—in a place of worship; and to hear matters of the greatest moment to the best interests of the country, and of the Churches of Ireland and Scotland. If one of these churches should fall by the foul increase of superstition and infidelity, they might depend upon it the other must also go. Let them, therefore, hear with attention and then enter into resolutions to make those exertions which are necessary to promote the great end for which they were now met.

Dr. PATRICK MACFARLAN said he had been requested to propose the first resolution, which was of a comprehensive nature. He then went on to argue, in the spirit of his resolution, that Popery is inconsistent with the word of God, and injurious both to the temporal and spiritual interests of mankind. It is not only inconsistent with the word of God, but is in direct opposition to that word, being entirely and essentially, anti-Christian. He denounced the spirit of Liberalism in religion which is abroad, and strongly urged the duty of all true Christians to resist it. He combated the assertion that Popery has changed materially from what it was a century ago, contending that the system is still necessarily the same as it was when the decree of the Council of Trent was issued, forbidding the reading of the Scriptures by the common people; and he would ask if such a system should be encouraged which thus wilfully closed the door against the admission of spiritual light? The Rev. Doctor admitted and that he

rejoiced to do so, that some truth is to be found in Popery; but it is so mixed up with and neutralized by error, that it is God only who can teach men to separate the one from the other. There had been individuals in the Popish Church to whom God had given grace to separate the chaff from the wheat, and to find that consolation which alone could give them peace and security in the hour of death; yet still the doctrines and dogmas of that church are of the same apostate character as ever—the system is anti-Christian in its character, and altogether pernicious in its tendency. The divinity of Christ is maintained by that church; but that doctrine is altogether neutralized by the adoration paid to the Virgin Mary. In the same manner, the doctrine of the atonement is contradicted by the sacrifice of the mass, by penance, and by the supposed intercession of saints—by the doctrine of auricular confession, indulgences, &c. by which the attention of votaries is drawn away from dependence on the righteousness of Christ, as the only foundation of a sinner's hope. The use of images in the Roman Catholic Church, it was said, is only meant as an excitement to their devotions; but he contended that is a direct breach of the Second Commandment, which says—"Thou shalt not make unto thyself any graven image, to fall down before it and worship it." The opposition which they are now making to Popery is not from any feeling of hostility or unkindness to Roman Catholics, but is made out of love to their souls, and also for their own people, to prevent them being led away by the errors of Popery. He urged the necessity of such meetings as the one he addressed, and of forming such resolutions as he had no doubt would on this occasion be come to. He then referred to a resolution passed by one of the Houses of the Legislature, for taking away the light of Protestantism from those places in which it is at present shining in Ireland. (Hisses and cheers.) He knew what gave rise to that expression of disapprobation—it was the idea that this is a political warfare. He denied that it is such—it is a warfare against religious error. If men choose to call it a political warfare, they may call it so if they please; but he said it is a religious warfare, conducted against a party in the state which has adopted anti-Christian principles. Why he asked, should they be attacked, because it is said they meddle with politics? Why should it be accounted strange, if political men meddle with religion, that religious men should stand for the defence of the truth. What was it that Knox and Melville did? They opposed a false system of



politics, and laboured strenuously that true Christianity should be established in Scotland; and should not we follow such examples as these, by standing up in defence of all that is dear to us—of every thing which can comfort our souls in life, and cheer them in the hour of death? The Rev. Doctor concluded by proposing the first resolution:—

“That the system of Popery is inconsistent with the word of God, and injurious to the temporal and spiritual interests of men, both as individuals and communities; that it involves a denial or corruption of the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, the practice of superstition and idolatry in the worship of God, and the exercise of a debasing tyranny over the faith and consciences of men, and that every allegation that the Church of Rome has in any measure changed her doctrines, must be ascribed either to ignorance or to artifice, and is fitted, if not intended, to deceive the ignorant and unwary, and to promote the success of her ambitious and destructive schemes.”

Mr. HOGG, of Newliston, in the absence of Mr. Campbell Colquhoun, seconded the resolution, which was then put by the Chairman, and carried by acclamation.

The Rev. Mr. CRAIG said—It is with feelings of deep interest that I rise to move the resolution in my hand. The insidious progress of Romanism has long engaged my attention; and for years I have, with that which many thought a premature zeal, and which almost earned for me the character of an alarmist, endeavoured to arouse the public mind to the growing evil. I trust, however, that now the apathy of which I had to complain has passed away before the consciousness of a present and enormous evil. The insolence of Romish pretension, riding, like the old man of the mountain, upon the reluctant shoulders of popular feeling, has at length roused the indignation of the Scottish metropolis. I see around me a band of men, who, if they ever draw the sword, I know will fling away the scabbard. I stand before a meeting worthy of the Scottish metropolis—worthy of her ancient kirk; and I trust that to-day a flame will be lighted in this part of the land, never to be put out till all that is erroneous in doctrine and false in practice in the visible church shall be “consumed by the spirit of burning;” till the man of sin and his system of priestcraft shall be consumed by the breath of the Redeemer’s mouth, and by the brightness of his coming.

The main body of the question before us will be so fully handled to-day, by those who come after me, that I shall at once limit myself to a very small portion of it, which has some local interest. I will not

go back to the days of the Council of Trent, and to prove the holding of those doctrines which are nailed to the Church of Rome inseparably, by the declaration of her infallibility—to those anti-social doctrines which Dr. Murray and his priests solemnly swear to, and yet openly deny; but I will call your attention to something near at hand, to doctrines taught at our own doors. I hold in my hand “The Instructions for the Sacrament of Penance,” printed in Edinburgh, for James O’Donnell, the Roman Catholic bookseller, last year, and taught in the Romanist schools in this city, not only to Roman Catholics, but to Protestant children, clothed and bribed to learn these abominations. The copy which I possess was given by one of the scholars, who learned it and repeated it in their school. It is an abridgment of other well-known treatises on the subject. Now, I propose to show, from this catechism, that Romanism, as taught at this very time in our own city, is an evil, unholy, and injurious system; which it would be sinful to encourage, or be in alliance with, in any degree whatever. Let me call your attention, first, to the scriptural notion of repentance. It is *μετανοια*, a change of mind, in respect to moral and religious feeling—that change of mind by which a sinner turns towards the God he has offended, looks up for pardon through a Saviour, and confesses to God his transgression, with earnest and prayerful endeavours to forsake it in future. Our Lord gives an illustration of it in the prodigal, who, when he came to himself—that is, arrived at a change of mind—went to his father, and confessed his error with sincere sorrow of heart. The whole of Scripture bears out this idea of repentance. The guilty creature, sensible of his guilt, turns to the invisible omnipresent God, and confesses and laments over his sin, while he looks, by faith, to the finished work of Christ as his atoning and justifying Saviour, and finds in Him the assurance of reconciliation and peace. Nothing in this solemn transaction comes between the soul and God; all the Scriptures bear out this one idea of a direct intercourse of the soul with God. Now, let us look at the Romish doctrine which is substituted for repentance. It is not a solitary act, an emotion of the heart, with which God only has to do; but the Romish scheme renders it necessary to carry the priest along with you in every part of it, and to make him privy to all the transactions of your life, and all the feelings of your heart; and all their efficacy is made to flow entirely from his sanction. The transaction is not with God but with man. In the first place, this catechism affirms that “the sacrament

of penance is a sacrament by which the sins we fall into after baptism are forgiven us ;" that is, if we are baptized in infancy, all the sins of all our life ; and they affirm it to be the priest's office to grant this pardon of sins. The effects of the priest's act, in granting the pardon of sin, are declared to be, "the cleansing from all actual sin, and reconciling to God." This is an extraordinary power for a priest to be able to exercise, and it will appear still more extraordinary, when we show on what slight grounds this pardon is granted. But first, look at the nature of this pardon and reconciliation :—*Question*.—"Does the sacrament of penance remit all the punishment of sin ?" *Answer*.—No ; it only changes the eternal punishment which they have deserved into a temporal one." And this is further explained in page 29 :—"Are not our sins forgiven us by the absolution of the priest ?—Yes : as to the guilt and the eternal punishment they have deserved, but not as to the temporal punishment into which the eternal punishment has been *changed* by virtue of the sacrament of penance : and this remains to be expiated either in this world or in the flames of purgatory." So that, after freedom from actual sin and reconciliation to God, there remains still to the soul expiation by suffering, both in this world and in the world to come. We shall now see the working of the system. In page 29, it is asked, "How do you satisfy God for this temporal banishment ?" *i. e.* in purgatory ; and you will perceive that that from which the atoning blood of Christ could not set the soul free, is provided for elsewhere. Mark the answer :—"By good works and chiefly by sacramental satisfaction.—What is this sacramental satisfaction ?—It is a faithful performance of the penitential works imposed upon us by the priest ;" *i. e.* the priest's absolution clears us from the eternal punishment, and the penances imposed by the priest redeem us from purgatory. Here is an easy way of salvation ! The priest first commutes eternal punishment for temporary in the flames of purgatory ; and then takes his own way of letting us out of purgatory at his own price ! But even yet the facility of his reverence goes further. It is asked, "If he does not perform his penance, does this show that his confession is invalid ?—No ; provided that, when it was imposed, he *intended* to perform it." And, again, "Is it sufficient barely to perform the penance enjoined by the priest ?—Yes : with regard to the integrity of the sacrament." So that the sinner is taught, even with reference to this way of remission, that, though he neglect the enjoined duty, if he once desired it,

or if he perform this duty barely and heartlessly, and without one serious emotion, this is sufficient. Can it be possible to adopt any system more calculated for the encouragement of crime? The whole efficacy of this system is placed in the outward conformity to the priest's mandate. But there are two points in this system of great moment—1st, The one is the resolute pressure for the disclosure of all the secrets of the bosom. This is the *power* of the system. Its object is to obtain entire knowledge and dominion. Each one is enjoined to confess all his mortal sins, in number, in detail, in special character, however vile and disgusting; and, if one is omitted, he has no advantage of the sacrament. Page 23—"What is the condition of a person who wilfully conceals a mortal sin in confession?—He does not receive the pardon of the sins which he did confess. Why does he not receive the pardon of the sins which he did confess?—Because one mortal sin cannot be forgiven without all the rest; and as the sin, which he conceals, is not forgiven, it follows that none of the others are." And then observe the motives which are said to operate criminally to produce this concealment. Page 24—"What are the causes of this criminal concealment?—1st, Negligence; 2nd, Shame; 3d, Fear of what the confessor will think of us." Now, I say nothing of the utter want of Scripture to support these vile dogmas. I say nothing of the total absence of the atonement and merits of the Redeemer from this mode of expiation; but I look to the wicked use of this rack, this thumb-screw of the Romish Church, applied with all the raging and purient desire of the wicked priest to get at the secrets of the soul. I hold in my hand an elaborate Directory of Confessors—the 24th edition of it. The subjects there detailed are such as I could not attempt to read, they are so filthy. On all these points the priest is empowered to examine, to go down into the lowest depths of speculative sensuality; and if he has before him a poor penitent creature, conscious of the secret working of original corruption; and, when probed by the practised scrutineer, the acknowledgment of one single sin, either from negligence, shame, or any other such motive, trembles, and falters, and fails on her lip, she goes away without a blessing. Yes, because wicked curiosity has not been gratified, because the very violence of the pressure has defeated its object, she gains nothing; after all the agony of her effort, she goes away unsoiled; she must remain without mercy, because she is not altogether without shame. But there is another feature of the system—its

licentious indulgence of iniquity. The Church of Rome draws the distinction between mortal and venial sins; and it is fully recognized in all Roman Catholic books. This distinction is taught now in Edinburgh, in this way: that to steal a shilling from a poor man who would feel it, is a mortal sin, but to steal a shilling from a rich man who would not feel it, is only a venial sin; and this precise distinction is made in all Romish treatises on the subject. Now, what says the catechism before us? "Is it necessary to confess our venial sins?—No! Because we may obtain the pardon of them by other means." So that a man may live a life of habitual dishonesty and petty theft; and, if he only limits the amount, and wisely selects the parties from whom he steals, it is no impediment to the assurance of pardon; he need say nothing about it; he need have neither perfect nor imperfect contrition, nor attrition for such evils; he goes on his way rejoicing, perpetually guilty of petty larceny; but, if he confesses his greater and mortal sins—such as neglecting mass, and paying tithes and dues—he obtains the pardon of all his sins, though he dies with the shilling of a venial pilfering worm in his hand:—fit only for Bridewell in this world, but fit for heaven itself in the world to come, because the priest has said so! But even here the evil does not stop. This catechism has a remedy yet behind if all others fail. If a man fails through life to offer the satisfaction that the priest requires, he may do it by paying for indulgences on his deathbed, or even before. Observe this. In page 32, immediately following the view of the case of a man resolving, in his own person, not to satisfy God and his neighbour, comes this question—"Has the Church the power of supplying part of the satisfaction due to God for sin!—Yes; and this power she uses by the grant of indulgences to those who do what is requisite to gain them;" and, again, page 33—"Does the power which the Church has of remitting the punishment of sin extend to the next world?—Yes, indirectly; for the satisfaction which the sinner makes in this life exempts him from suffering in the next, in proportion to what he has suffered in this; and, as the indulgence which the Church grants to the sinner *stands him in lieu of this satisfaction*, it follows that she remits the punishment of the next world." Here then the priest may deal with the alarmed conscience near the confines of eternity, and make exorbitant terms for the remission of future punishment. And, if this resource also fail, there is another still open. It is competent to the poor sinful creature to

leave a sum of money in his will, to purchase prayers and masses, and through them the indulgence and exemption from suffering hereafter. Page 35—*Question*.—"Can the Church grant indulgences in favour of the souls in purgatory?—Yes; but not in the same way as she grants them to the faithful upon earth. She grants them to the living by way of absolution, but in favour of the dead only by way of suffrage and intercession." As a proof how this last notion operates, I will mention a fact that occurred not long since in Ireland:—An old woman, near death, sent for her lawyer to make her will, and desired him, among other bequests, to settle the interest of £1000, to be received annually by the priest, to pray her out of purgatory. The lawyer was a shrewd man, and said, "Madam, I can scarcely recommend that application of the money as wise; for, do you not see, that on that arrangement, he would always keep you in purgatory!" The old woman with all the quickness of her country, saw her error, and said—"How, then, would you advise me to settle the money, so as to attain my object?" To which he replied—"Put it in trust, for the interest to accumulate, and let the whole sum be paid over to the priest whenever he brings legal proof that he has prayed you out of purgatory." I am assured that this is true;—whether it be or not, it has its point—it shows the wretched folly of the system. But far be from us, on so awful a subject, the semblance of a jest. The doctrine which I have read to you, you can all judge of. It is not the teaching of this catechism only; it is in all their works; in Dr. Murray's edition of Dens; in the Council of Trent; in Doyle's Abridgement; in all their works of theology. Bad as it is, it is what they have invariably taught as the very essence of their system—that no sin shall stand in a man's way, if he will only come to the priest with confession for absolution. But now let us take the principles *here* laid down in one book, the "Catechism of Penance," together with the instructions to the confessor as to the mode of instituting a searching scrutiny of the heart, given in the other book, the "Directions for Confessions," and let us consider what must be the moral influence of such a system. Is it such that we can approve; and, with all the mystic shade that veils these clandestine operations of monkery, let in these wily agents and abettors of iniquity to the sanctuary of our homes? And, first, What is its influence on the priest? Ask any Protestant clergyman whether it is profitable, or in any degree needful, to himself or his people, to go into special details

of sin. But what, then, must be the state of his mind, who is tied up by a vow of celibacy; who is always listening to details of iniquity; whose curiosity is prompted even by reserve and modesty; who has the assumed power of withholding or granting pardon?—what a depository of iniquity must his bosom be! and what the practical result has been, let the history of Romish countries tell. But we will go to the law and to the testimony. Let the example of our blessed Lord speak with authority on the subject. When a poor woman had been brought to him, and the Pharisees, like the Romish priests, began to enter on the unholy particulars of her crime, did he encourage such a statement? He stooped down and wrote upon the ground, as though he heard not. And, when they continued to press the subject upon him, he said, to seal their condemnation, “He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her;” and, when they were gone out, did our Lord enter, as it were, into the confessional, and linger over her story, and authoritatively extract from her a confession of the details of her crime? No; as a pattern to all his followers, he at once dismissed her from his solitary presence, with “Go, and sin no more.” How utterly at variance is the practice of the two churches—the Church of Christ and the Church of Rome! But what must be the effect of this system upon the parties themselves? Look at the character of it. All mortal sin may be pardoned by the priests; no venial sin is of any importance. The only punishment to be dreaded is purgatory; and for this the church can grant, upon an adequate payment, plenary indulgence. And all these privileges are in the hands of a man with whom the weak creature is closetted for a short moment in assumed religious state, but associated with him, at other times, in all the familiarities and idle frivolities of social intercourse. I will not dwell on this. I will not answer my own question. Vice may easily arise to any extent, when the tempter comes in the form of God, and carries a plenary pardon in his hand. Well is it said of that apostate church, in Scripture, that there is upon her forehead a name written—*Mystery*, the mother of harlots. There is, in one word, the prophetic history of the confessional. But what must be the moral result of this on a community? Suppose a country inundated by thousands of men bound to this iniquitous system, diving into the secrets of all hearts, mixed up with the consciousness of the soul in its most concealed speculations, knowing the tendencies of

each person, and being, at the same time, men of like passions with ourselves—feeling every temptation which we feel—and wielding this tremendous power of pardon or appointed penance, be it what it may, light or heavy. Suppose the people trained from early days to this system; trained to disregard sins of a certain class, as venial; to measure sin as heinous rather in the act than in the habit; and to regard all mortal sin as pardonable upon penance or the purchase of indulgences;—suppose men and women, all going into the temptations of busy life so trained:—what must be the result? What is the fact? It is universal corruption! Let Spain and Portugal, who are at this moment heaving the horrid *incubus*, the stifling vampire, from their bosom, and struggling for it in the convulsive throes of death—let them declare the truth. Nay, my friends, decide the case for yourselves upon the evidence. Is this system scriptural? Is it holy, and just, and good? Is it profitable for doctrine? Is it the righteousness that exalteth a nation? Is it not rather a sinful abomination which is a disgrace to any people? Is it to be encouraged, to be palliated, to be parleyed with, to be allowed, in any shape or form, to approach our hearths? Never! never! Mr. Craig concluded by moving the second resolution:—

“ That it is sinful, and, therefore, infinitely dangerous, for any community or nation to contribute to the promotion of Popery, and even to be indifferent to its progress, or to fail in adopting proper measures for emancipating men from its yoke; and that there is clear ground in Scripture for expecting that God will signally manifest his displeasure against those kingdoms which contribute to its advancement, or which, through the neglect of the appropriate means for checking the progress of error, allow it to prevail or regain the ascendancy amongst them.”

The Rev. Mr. CUNNINGHAM seconded the resolution. He said that it was of great consequence that all men should now thoroughly understand the true nature of Popery, and be fully alive to the danger with which its existence and prevalence in any country must be attended. For Popery was not merely a system of gross error or heresy in doctrine, subversive of the fundamental principles of the oracles of God, opposed to right views of the standard of faith and duty, the ground of acceptance with God, and the way of salvation—it not only involved the grossest superstition and idolatry in the worship of God, and the exercise of a debasing tyranny over the faith and consciences of man; but, more particularly, it was clearly held forth in Scripture as the mystery of iniquity, as Satan's grand leading scheme



for frustrating God's gracious purposes with respect to the salvation of men. Popery, indeed, occupies substantially the same place under the peculiarly Christian dispensation, as the fall of man does in the general history of God's dealings with our race. When God had created man after his own image, Satan resolved upon attempting to frustrate his design, by introducing sin, and tempting to disobedience; and was permitted, in God's sovereign wisdom, for important ends, to succeed. And so, in like manner, when the Son of God appeared on earth to destroy the works of the devil, Satan devised the scheme of Popery to frustrate the great objects of the Christian revelation, by corrupting and perverting the doctrines which it reveals, and counter-acting their salutary and purifying influence upon character and conduct. And, accordingly, the apostle tells us that, even in his days, the mystery of iniquity was already working; and it is well known that the principles of the system were gradually developed, and its antichristian and ruinous tendencies progressively displayed, (in consequence, as the Scriptures inform us, of the peculiar activity of Satan;) until, at length, in the middle ages, when the tyranny of the Church of Rome was fully established, and reigned without controul, it seemed as if Satan's purpose had completely succeeded, as if every beneficial object of the christian revelation had been frustrated; and the christian world, if it might be so called, presented a scene which, in so far as regards opposition to God's will, in matters of doctrine, duty, and worship, had scarcely been surpassed in the whole history of heathenism. The Book of the Revelation is mainly intended to unfold to us the origin and progress, the triumph and the destruction of Popery; and we learn from it that Popery has been and will be closely connected with the history of the church in every age; that God's dealings with churches and nations will depend materially upon the position which they assume with regard to Popery, and the mode in which they discharge their duty with respect to it; that the progress of Popery will ever be attended with misery and ruin; and that God's people, therefore, are not only warranted, but required to cherish feelings of peculiar abhorrence, not against Papists, but against Popery; to oppose to the uttermost the progress of the system; and to rejoice when Christ finally triumphs over Satan, by completely defeating this his most formidable and successful scheme. To be indifferent about the progress of Popery, when its agents are so zealous

and active—when they have been so successful, and are so confident of farther success—and when so many circumstances conspire in favouring their machinations—would be a gross neglect of duty on the part of all true Protestants—would just be to submit quietly and coolly to have the mark of the beast engraven upon our forehead, and to expose ourselves to a share in those plagues and judgments that will yet be poured out upon the beast and false prophet. It is said that we are attempting to raise the “No Popery” cry, and this is spoken of by infidels and liberals as the most disgraceful and contemptible thing imaginable. But we are not in the least ashamed of the “No Popery” cry, because we are persuaded that it is a cry which resounds from every portion of the word of God, calling aloud that Popery is dishonouring to God, and ruinous to man. It was the cry of the Reformation, of Luther and Knox, and of the national Covenant of Scotland; and when honestly and intelligently employed, it was the genuine expression of the feelings and desires of God’s own people with regard to this monstrous system, from the time when the mystery of iniquity began to work, till the present day. In short, the “No Popery” cry was just substantially what was described in the Apocalypse as the cry of the blood of martyred saints from beneath the altar calling to God for vengeance upon their Popish murderers, and to those who still dwell upon earth, to take care that Popery shall never again have the power of persecuting. He would not occupy their time longer, because he hoped to have repeated opportunities of addressing his townsmen upon this subject; for they had taken up the protest of their forefathers against Popery, and they were determined to hold it fast; they had that day unfurled the banner of Protestantism; and they were resolved—relying upon Divine assistance—to bear it aloft, and to bear it onward, until Popery, with all its ten thousand plagues, and curses, and abominations, had been driven out of our land—until the man of sin was destroyed with the breath of Jehovah’s mouth, and consumed with the brightness of his coming—and until the cry should ascend from under the whole heaven, that “Babylon was fallen,” involving in one common destruction the schemes and the systems of those who had contributed to the promotion of Popery, or had sought its aid for the accomplishing of their own purposes—who had been relying upon the protection and assistance of this arch-enemy of Him who is King of kings and Lord of lords.

The resolution was then put and carried in the same manner as the first.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN then came forward, and was received with great cheering. He was happy that the cause for which he appeared had been already so eloquently urged, that it would be unnecessary for him to trespass on the meeting at any length. He then proceeded—If I have, within the last year, become engaged in a course of activities, alien alike to my dispositions and to the habits of my former life, it is because I have yielded to what I felt to be the constraint of an overruling necessity. As long as I thought it permitted me to enjoy the privileges of disengagement from public affairs, I remained occupied in the quiet and happy duties of my peculiar vocation; but when the notices of coming disaster or peril became more frequent and unambiguous, I felt that I, as every citizen, was subject to responsibilities large as his apprehension of his country's danger; and when it was firmly fixed in my mind, that, humanly speaking, nothing less than a union between the religious of all descriptions of Protestants, could be effectual to withstand the efforts artfully contrived to effect their destruction, it seemed to me a duty which it would be unpardonable to decline, that I should labour to make known, so far as power was given me, the character of that hostile system from which dangers were to be apprehended. Therefore it is that I have endeavoured, at various public meetings in Great Britain, and in my own country, to expose the principles and practices of the Church of Rome in Ireland; and with the same design I avail myself of the privilege to be here, and, in the presence of the assembled worth and wisdom of Scotland, to accuse that church of an ambition which blasphemously arrogates the power belonging to God—of intolerance, which would deny to man his especial and divinely-granted prerogative—and of a perfidy, which, if it do not pollute honour in the heart of individuals, wastes away all that sense of obligation by which human society is preserved.

These are the charges I advance against the Church of Rome, and which I urge alike against the principles which constitute her creed, and the practices in which her disposition and her designs are more plainly manifested. (Cheers and a hiss.) The Reverend Gentleman said—I shall not appeal to the chair for protection, but beg leave to address a request to the gentlemen who are engaged in

reporting. It is to note especially any expressions which appear to excite disapprobation. These are the passages which are felt to be the strongest. (Loud cheers and laughter.) When they subsided, the speaker continued—Perhaps they may serve Protestantism, by provoking from the heads of the Romish Church answers which, in the attempt to refute, shall confirm our accusations against her. He then continued—The creed of the Church of Rome we have no difficulty in ascertaining: bishops of that church in Ireland have declared it. Dr. Doyle was asked before a committee of the House of Lords, “Is the creed of Pius IV. the creed acknowledged in the Irish Roman Catholic Church?”—and the answer was, “Yes, every Roman Catholic acknowledges that creed.” Dr. Murray spoke to the same purpose. This creed was published in the year 1564, pursuant to a decree of the Council of Trent, ordering that beneficed clergymen should make a profession of faith, from every one of whom a profession of the creed is now required on pain of forfeiture. The doctrine of the Nicene Creed, or of the Apostles, substantially the same, contains the faith of the *Catholic Church*—the creed of Pius IV. directs us to the faith of the *Church of Rome*. I say directs us to that faith, because the creed does not profess to do more. It does not enumerate all the articles to which the votary’s assent is required; but having named many, requires a promised acceptance of many others—of all things, in short, which have been delivered, declared, and defined in the sacred canons and general councils.

The act which required a profession of this new creed, was, properly speaking, the erection of a new church. It becomes us to inquire what were the great principles of its constitution. They were chiefly three: that the Pope was to be obeyed as a Vicar of Christ; that the Holy Scriptures were to be renounced; and that the instructions and decrees of what were styled canons and councils should be received as of infallible authority, and set up as a rule for man, to be substituted in the place of the superseded Bible. The points to which I mean, on the present occasion, to confine my attention, are this adoption of canons and councils, and the restrictions placed upon Holy Scripture. Restrictions are thus imposed on the Holy Scriptures:—

“I admit also (the word also is used because the preceding clause respected tradition, which is most firmly admitted and embraced,) the sacred Scriptures, according to that sense which holy mother church, to whom it appertains to

judge of the true meaning and interpretation of the sacred Scriptures, hath holden and still holds; nor will I ever receive and interpret them unless according to the unanimous consent of the fathers."

Subscription to canons and councils is thus provided for—

"Farther, I do, without doubt, receive and profess all things which have been delivered, defined, and declared in the sacred canons and general councils, especially by the holy Council of Trent; and all things contrary thereto, and all heresies of whatsoever kind, which have been condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the church, I, in like manner, condemn, reject, and anathematize."

The creed from which these declarations are taken, is solemnly professed by a priest of the Church of Rome, on his induction to a parish. I shall recite the form of profession:—

"This true Catholic faith, out of which no one can be saved, which, by these presents, I profess and verily hold, I do promise, vow, and swear, most firmly to keep and confess, (by God's help,) entire and inviolate, to the last breath of my life; and that I will take care, as far as in me lies, that the same be holden, taught, and preached, by all who are subject to my control, or who are any way connected with my charge.—So help me God, and these the holy Gospels of God!"

I recite this formulary for the purpose of showing how solemnly the clergy of the Church of Rome pledge themselves to accept the authority of councils; and it would scarcely be too much to say, how awfully they confirm a renunciation of Scripture. I recite it for another reason also: the decree of the Council of Trent requires that this profession be made within two months after his induction, by every beneficed clergyman having cure of souls, to the bishop; or, if he were hindered from receiving it, to his vicar-general. Dr. Murray, Roman Catholic Archbishop in Dublin, had been a bishop more than fifteen years, when he was asked before a parliamentary committee—"Do priests take any oath similar to the bishop's oath?" and he answered, "No; *they take no oath but the oath of allegiance* to his Majesty; they make a promise of obedience at the time of their ordination—that is all." I offer no comment on this reply—I have neither time nor inclination to dwell upon it.

The Creed of Pius IV. interposes an impassable barrier between modern Romanism and the Catholic Church of all ages; it derogates from the authority of Holy Scripture; it forbids a scruple on any declaration of any general Council; and it assigns to the Roman Pontiff an office, and claims for him an obedience which no preceding

formulary of such and so general obligation, or of equal authority, had ascribed to him. Before this Creed was enjoined and professed, doubt was allowable as to what should be received or what might be rejected in councils—the limits of obedience to the Pope left space for the exercise of conscience and reason; and, although in practice there might be difficulties in the way of Scriptural studies, yet no promise had been required by which the Scriptures became a dead letter. In short, it might be argued that the right of private judgment existed, and the sense of responsibility by which it should be accompanied, until the creed of Pius IV. became adopted as the Confession of Faith. He who makes that confession resigns his judgment, and so, virtually, withdraws from the communion of saints in the Catholic Church, and enslaves himself to Popery. Before the adoption of that creed, there was nothing which rendered reformation impracticable: any branch of the Catholic Church might release itself from error and retain its original constitution. The admissions and promises in the creed of Pius IV. are such that their obligation must be withdrawn before any improvement can be effected. In a word, that creed has transposed the uncertainty which had in all time existed, throwing upon God's word the doubts which had previously hung over canons and councils; and it has, as it were, created for the Pope, by naming him the vicar of Christ, an office which—named not in the language of vague and declamatory boasting or eulogium, but in the precise and significant terms which befit a confession of faith—ought not to have been imagined so long as Christ was believed to be present with his church. Therefore, the church whose confession is a creed implying so grave alterations, is not the ancient or the catholic.

We are, I feel, much less concerned in the justice of any claims to antiquity which the church of Rome may urge, than in the truth and the tendency of her doctrines; but it cannot be unprofitable to disabuse many a mind of the delusion which too generally prevails on the subject of the Papal pretensions, and it is not without its use to show that the usurpations of Rome are of comparatively recent origin, and were hazarded only when the efforts of the human spirit had alarmed the maintainers of inveterate and pernicious abuses. That the restriction upon the study of Scripture imposed by the creed of Pius IV. had not previously been in force, a very brief consideration will show. I believe the first distinct and authoritative derogation from the dignity of the divine word committed by a general council,

was the outrage perpetrated by the Council of Trent, in the elevation of unwritten tradition into a species of co-partnership with the Bible, and in the decree which seems to ascribe to the interpretations of men, more of authority than to the Holy Scriptures themselves. But it is quite clear that the creed is far more tyrannical than the Council. This requires that none shall interpret the written word *contrary* to the meaning assigned by the church, or to the unanimous belief of the fathers. The creed demands that Scripture *shall not be admitted, unless according* to the consent of the fathers or the church. Between these requisitions, there is a sensible and most important distinction. The council regards the Scriptures as free, unless so far as the church may have closed them. The creed looks upon them as shut in, unless the church has in any particular thrown them open. By the council, you may read the Scripture and interpret. It is required only, that where the fathers are unanimous, or the church has pronounced, you shall not be found in opposition. The fewer, therefore the subjects on which the fathers have agreed, or on which the church has been silent, the larger your freedom to read and understand. Thus, at its rising for the last time, the Council of Trent left the privilege of Scripture. The creed inverts the order, and calls upon the votary to declare that where the fathers are not unanimous, and where the church has been silent, he must abstain. Now, between the council and the creed, the Scriptures are excluded from the religion of Romanism: the council proclaiming that the commentary, so far as it extends, shall be co-equal with the text—the creed affirming that, where there is no commentary, the text must remain unstudied, because value and currency are given to it, not in so much as God has spoken, but so far as the fathers and the church shall have stamped it with the seal of their approval.

Mr. O'Sullivan adverted then to the defence made for the Church of Rome against the charge of withholding the Bible; read a letter addressed by Dr. Murray to the *Morning Chronicle* on the subject; and showed that even the evidence borne by Dr. Murray and Dr. Doyle confirmed the charge against them. Mr. O'Sullivan said, that he had constantly asserted, as a proof of the benefits resulting from controversy, that the Romish Priests were compelled to allow the people to read the Bible; but he made a clear distinction between the practice of the priests and the doctrine of their church,

showing that they availed themselves of privileges allowed to them to give where they could not withhold, but, at the same time, gave obedience to the laws of their church, and to the profession made in the creed of Pius IV., which were useless to those who received it. He quoted from the evidence of both Dr. Murray and Dr. Doyle, proof that the Church of Rome did not allow the circulation of the Bible without note or comment, and that, up to the year 1825, no comment, approved by the Church of Rome, had been given. In regard to the circulation of the Bible, what was the language of Dr. Doyle? He is asked—"Have you in any instance allowed the circulation of the Bible among the laity, without notes?" He answers—"I do not know that we have." "You think it necessary that notes should accompany the Bible for the purpose of explanation?" *Answer*—"In our country, where religious controversy prevails to such an extent, I do think it necessary that short notes, explanatory of the text on which our differences turn, should be prefixed to the Bible." "You consider yourselves pledged to all matters contained in these notes?" The answer is—"No, by no means. On the contrary, there were notes affixed, I believe, to the Rheinish Testament, which were most objectionable; and, on being presented to us, we caused them to be expunged. *The notes carry in our editions of the Bible no weight*, for we do not know the writers of many of them." I do not wish to draw out these quotations to an unnecessary length, but I thought it right to give you proof from the testimony of one Bishop, examined on the same occasion with Dr. Murray, that the Church of Rome did not approve of circulating the Bible without notes, and that no copy of the Bible not furnished with notes, is approved by Romish bishops in Ireland. But, perhaps Dr. Murray held a different language. He was asked, and asked on that very day on which he dates the evidence he has quoted in his letter to the Editor of the *Morning Chronicle*—he was asked, "Do you approve the circulation of the Scriptures without notes, among the Roman Catholics?" He answered—"I do not approve of the circulation of the Scriptures, without notes; I wish there should be some notes appended to them, as an indication that they are not to be interpreted according to private judgment, but according to the authority of the church." So far there is agreement between the two bishops. Now comes a question which shall apply a stricter test to



try them;—"What are the particular notes—by what authority prepared—or *where are they to be found*, which, in your opinion, should accompany the Bible?" Here was a question which surely demanded—if there existed a copy of Scriptures containing, in Dr. Murray's opinion, unobjectionable notes—that it should be named. What is the answer? "I have myself procured an edition of the Bible, *which is now ready to be issued*, a stereotype edition, with such notes as I approve of." Is it necessary to add a word to this instructive answer? It is not in the least to distort Dr. Murray's answer to say that it contains an acknowledgment similar to that of his associate bishop, that, up to the year 1825, no Bible contained notes for which the Church of Rome in Ireland acknowledged the responsibility.\* Without vouching for the correctness of the report to which Doctor Murray has referred, I may affirm, as matter of fact, that it is substantially true, and that the most Rev. Prelate wasted his indignation upon it very unguardedly. I shall dwell no longer on this topic.

I beseech you to remember that our charge against the Church of Rome, as it respects her tyranny over the word of God, is not merely that she withholds it from the people; but also, that wherever circumstances constrain her to set it free, it goes forth depreciated by the doctrine which calls tradition its equal, and by the promise not to take or interpret it, unless according to the consent of the fathers and the exposition—never yet given—of the church. I shall turn to another engagement in the creed. It is that which regards canons and councils. There the hesitation with which the Scriptures could obtain a species of conditional tolerance is discarded. The definitions, declarations, and ordinances of canons and councils are received without a doubt. No restriction, no limitation, no condition is applied. All things delivered, declared, and defined, are, without any doubt, adopted. Talk of pledges offered and accepted by Members of Parliament—talk of sworn engagements hastily made and carelessly abandoned:—he that has sworn to have no doubt respecting the truth of every thing affirmed in the thirty-nine enormous folios of Labbe and Cossart; the Bullarium Romanum, consisting, I believe, of one hundred volumes; the Decretum Gratiani; the Sextus Decretalium; in short, the whole Corpus Juris Canonici; not to mention the boundless reserve of unwritten tradition—he that has, as they say of what is swallowed without mastication, bolted the professions of this mass

---

\* This subject is more fully discussed in Dr. O'Sullivan's Letters.

of obsolete theology, without examining, perhaps any part of it, has placed himself beyond the power of creating surprise at any undertaking he may subsequently make or violate. The time was when this engagement was looked upon by Protestants as a matter of slight concern. They had a vague notion that some such profession was made; made, however, not seriously, or with a mind observant of its meaning, but simply to comply with ancient custom, and made respecting dogmas which had gone down into oblivion, and could never again be summoned to reappear. The worst of them have reappeared. After working for twenty-seven years in the dark, they have been exposed, and the nation has had a solemn warning of the calamities, natural and spiritual, which they threaten.

Here the Rev. Speaker entered into an account of Dens's Theology, and the proofs by which its publication was brought home to the bishops of the Church of Rome. He showed that it had been appointed as their book of conference, and that it contained the foulest principles of intolerance, even teaching that heretics ought to be put to death if they would not embrace the Romish religion. He marked it also as worthy of note, that the book had not been appointed to this office until the claims of the Roman Catholics had been granted by the legislature. After commenting for some time on the doctrines taught in this book, and the evidence respecting it, he proceeded:— But there is another matter on which a few words may not be misapplied—the objections which have been made to the charges advanced against the Romish bishops in Ireland, on account of their concern in the publication of this pernicious book. And here, I must again advert to a letter from Dr. Murray, in which I am personally concerned. In consequence of a speech delivered by the Bishop of Exeter in the House of Lords, with his usual ability, a letter was addressed to Lord Melbourne by Dr. Murray, containing the following passage—“I did not direct the work of Dens to be published—it was undertaken by a respectable bookseller, as a speculation in trade, entirely at his own risk.” At the time when Dr. Murray disclaimed having directed the republication of the Theology of Dens, the copies of that work known to be in London, with but one exception, had been mutilated. They contained, originally, a dedication to Dr. Murray, and this was extracted from certain copies sent to London. At the time when Dr. Murray's letter to Lord Melbourne appeared, the fact

of the dedication to him was unknown, and his disclaimer of having directed the work, and his assertion that it had been undertaken entirely at the publisher's risk, were, by many, considered to exonerate him from all participation in it. Subsequently, the dedication was discovered. This would not, of necessity, involve a connection, but it declares that the work had been *undertaken with Dr. Murray's approbation*. Was not this, in a moral point of view, equivalent to direction. Mr. Coyne could or ought to calculate on the prospects of sale held out by the market which the archbishop had created; but there was another risk besides that of money—there was a risk that he who thus stooped to encourage the publication of a vile book might not disclose the full amount of his concern in it; and honourable minds will have little difficulty in deciding on the consequences of this risk, when they read Dr. Murray's denial of having directed the publishing of *Dens*—his assurance that Mr. Coyne had undertaken it entirely at his own risk—and his suppression of the momentous truth, that he had undertaken it with the approbation of his archbishop. I have no hesitation to affirm that every honourable man would pronounce this suppression of the truth, under all the circumstances of the case, an equivocation—an equivocation which Romanism allows, and which is, therefore, and only therefore, excusable in Dr. Murray. (Cheers.) I see you agree with me. I beg it to be understood that I never accused Dr. Murray of having directed the publication of *Dens*. I do not know that he was so accused—but I confess myself wholly incapable of seeing any moral difference between the part he confesses to have acted, and the giving such a direction. Recollect, that a word from him would have dissuaded the publisher from his discountenanced enterprise, and that not only he did not prevent the publication of that mass of impurity and intolerance, but that he approved and opened a market for it; and then decide whether he would morally have incurred more responsibility by directing it.

There is a defence from Doctor Murray against another imputation. We had observed that, on three solemn occasions, the Bishops of the Church of Rome abstained from naming the *Theology of Dens*; and, under the circumstances in which this took place, we thought the concealment was not accidental. How does Doctor Murray meet this? A Protestant bookseller in Dublin had procured copies from Mr. Coyne—therefore there was no concealment. If we had charged the publisher, there might be pertinacity in an argument

like this; but to allege Mr. Coyne's candour as a sufficient defence for the bishop's suspicious caution!! Nothing but the habits of thought, arising out of the doctrine of supererogation, could explain such an extravagance. Mr. Coyne was connected with a Protestant bookseller in the publication of the notorious Rhemish Testament. A Protestant bookseller may be, and has been, and, I dare say, continues to be, the organ through whom some country booksellers belonging to the Church of Rome are supplied and accommodated. What if the Theology of Dens passed thus through the hands of one accustomed to transmit Roman Catholic publications? But it is idle to dwell upon this matter. Until Mr. Coyne is accused of refusing to dispose of his books to Protestant purchasers, there can be no inconsistency in affirming that Protestant booksellers possessed them.

Two things are now established—Dens is the safest guide for the Romish clergy in Ireland. His Theology has been made their book of conference. These are Mr. Coyne's undisputed—indeed I may say, assented to—declarations. But there is yet no harm done. Dens is the guide of the Romish clergy—he furnishes their conference book, but only in so far as he supplies them with questions for discussion. Assuredly, this is the first instance in which a guide was appointed to such an office. What is to be thought of the guide who renders you no further service than the awakening uncomfortable scruples? Compare this interpretation of guidance with a similar agency in the natural world. You are travelling through an unknown country, and engage a guide to conduct you. He leads you off the public way where your course was safe, and entangles you in paths which are difficult and dangerous. He arouses your sense of perplexity and alarm, by intimating perils to be met with in the way, and then exercises his office by asking you what road to take. Would that be the office of a guide? Or consider the matter in this light. An individual whose judgment you respect, procures for you a guide, who, he tells you, is the best and safest you can have. What would you think if, afterwards, when you had gone grievously astray, and were complaining of having been misled, you were told that it was because you did not understand language, and did not know that "best and safest guide" meant one who would conduct you into the most dangerous places—whose questions you must earnestly consider, but whose answers to your interrogations you must disregard, if you would not be widely and fatally misled. Such a guide is Dens—suggesting ques-

tions that gender strife, and furnishing answers impious and abominable. Mr. O'Sullivan then quoted at some length from Dens' work, to show that it inculcated the doctrines that oaths were not binding on the faithful, and that heretics ought to be put to death. To the question—"What punishments have been decreed against heretics?" Dens answers, enumerating, in addition to spiritual censures, infamy, confiscation of goods, exile, imprisonment, and death. But let it for a moment be conceded that Dens is of authority only for questions—that Mr. Woods is justified in denying that his answers have been accepted—has it been thought advisable, by either Mr. Woods or Dr. Murray, to instruct us where authorized answers can be discovered? I shall select two questions proposed for conference in the year 1832, the year in which Dens seems named as the guide—" *Dominum Dens auctorem sequentes.*" "Is it lawful to tolerate the religious worship of heretics?" It has become so notorious that all Protestants are comprised under this name, that I abstain from reference to proofs. The other question is—"What punishments have been decreed against those infected with a heretical taint?" To the former, Dens returns for answer—"That the rites or religious worship of pagans and heretics are not for themselves to be tolerated, because they are evil, so that no advantage or utility could be derived from them to the church." To the latter the answer is—"That heretics may be punished by 'confiscation, imprisonment, exile, and death.'" The authorities are taken from the power of the priesthood in the Jewish law, and from the decisions of the Council of Constance. No reference is made to a justification from the civil law.

I state these things, because they show the irrelevance of an explanation by which the intolerance of Dens is sought to be palliated. He wrote, it is said, in times when civil governments exercised the impious authority he describes, and is to be regarded, therefore, as arguing from principles of civil government, not of religion. If this were true, Dens would have justified his dogma by reference to some existing national law. He makes no such reference.

Another defence offered by Dr. Murray and Mr. Woods, is that of an oath. We have sworn, they say, that it is not our belief that a man may justly be murdered for his religion. They have also sworn that they will, to the utmost of their power, maintain the settlement of property, as established by law in Ireland. Have they kept this

oath? The question should be put more largely. Have the members of the Church of Rome in Ireland kept it? If they *have not*, why will they require us to pay any respect to engagements which they have so disregarded and despised? If they *have*—if the conduct pursued in parliament, and out of it, be reconcilable with the true import of the oath they have taken—let there be disclosed the secret, the yet unintelligible process, by which opposites are thus amicably connected, and let us see that it is not a process which would reconcile the orthodoxy of Dens with Dr. Murray's respect for the oath of allegiance.

Granting, however, that the proclaiming Dens a safe guide, appointing his work to be a conference book, meant nothing; granting, that to select from his work questions for discussion, to inform a clergy, to whom his guidance had been recommended and his works proposed as their substitute for libraries, that the questions were extracted from his Theology, was not to expose them to the danger of seeking the answers in the same book; granting all this, how comes it that the public of this great nation is left so long in ignorance where the authorized answers shall be found? Is there any book which gives answers to these questions better entitled to respect than that from which the questions have been taken? Are these questions discussed in any one of the works which Roman Catholic bishops have pronounced to be of authority? I believe I may confidently affirm they are not.

Here the Rev. Speaker entered into a statement of the doctrines taught respecting toleration in the canons and councils of the Church of Rome. He instanced decisions in the third and fourth Lateran Councils, as well as in the decrees of popes, in proof of his assertion that the answers to the questions suggested by Dens, if taken from authentic sources, are not less objectionable than those which he has given; and concluded this part of his subject by asking whether it was not folly to suppose that the clergy or bishops of the Church of Rome would have left such an imputation as the questions from Dens involve, for a day hanging over them, if they had it in their power to remove them by quoting any one authority acknowledged as paramount and favourable to the principles of toleration?

But there is, (said the Rev. Gentleman) another defence.

Intolerance is not the vice of a church but of an age. As civilization advances, the virulence of religious bigotry becomes mitigated. Consult Dr. Milner, and, Dr. Murray affirms, you will consider Protestants

as tainted deeply with the guilt of persecution. Calvin, Luther, Knox, Cranmer—all, he informs us, held maxims of religious intolerance. Does he remember in what system they were instructed? Does he imagine that the feelings and sentiments become mild and merciful in the moment when religious error is detected? Assuredly the excesses of the early Reformers are to be ascribed to the church which teaches persecution, in which they were trained up—not to the Scriptures of truth which they embraced, or the systems which they endeavoured to frame in conformity with Scripture, and in which persecution is not inculcated. But we are directed to consult, as a book testifying truth, “*Dr. Milner’s End of Controversy!*” Opprobrium of Controversy it might more justly be called—a reservoir into which all that was disingenuous in controversy had poured itself—a book which I would be bold to say has no parallel for the audacious falsehood of its quotations. Consult Dr. Milner!—Dr. Milner! Is it forgotten that his brother vicars apostolic in England refused to meet him, and assigned as their reason that he had given utterance to defamation and untruth? Is it forgotten that their complaint against him was heard, and that he was reprimanded by the pope? Is it forgotten that the lay gentry of his church in England expelled him from their association, and assigned as a reason, that he had been guilty of uttering gross calumnies? And this individual, burnt in effigy by the people of Ireland, declined by his brother bishops, expelled by the gentry of his communion in England, reprimanded by the Pope—this twice branded calumniator is the authority to which Dr. Murray most appropriately betakes him, that he may rescue from its perils the church which the safe guidance of Mr. Dens appear to have brought into peril. I have not quoted from a Protestant writer. I hold in my hand Charles Butler’s “*History of the Roman Catholics.*” It contains these established accusations against Dr. Murray’s witness.

But it is unfair, (says his apologist) to object to such speculative wickedness as this of Dens. The world is renouncing it. See how mildly matters are progressing in Hungary and Poland. See what a glorious example was set by Ireland in the reign of Queen Mary. Why will men of ordinary sagacity persevere on this affront on common understanding. Ireland in a state of war—a war in which religion was not thought of—a war between the races—Irish against English. Ireland governed by the English party, did not

persecute individuals who came over from England, and who added strength to the English race. The religious division did not commence in Ireland until the following reign, when bulls from the pope, and a new descent of regular priests, introduced the new system of the Romish Church, and sowed the seed of lasting dissension. But, Dr. Murray continues. Tenets of intolerance are harmless in the present state of society. What! in the present state of society in Ireland?—with a million of men ready to take the field—impatient to get leave to fight?—Ireland parcelled out into knots of co-conspirators, sworn to keep down heresy and to walk in the blood of heretics—sworn to persevere and never spare—from the cradle to the crutch: Is that a state of society upon which it is safe to drop the sparks of bigotry and persecution? After having described the condition of Ireland, and remarked that the disorders were not the efforts of men who struggle to relieve themselves from a burden, but of those who laboured to root out Protestant religion—that it was not Roman Catholics striving to release themselves from payment of tithes, but requiring that the funds of Protestantism should be applied to purposes of Popish education—and having described the system of outrage by which these purposes are sought to be effected, the Reverend Speaker proceeded thus:—And this is the state of society which divests religious intolerance of its terrors. Ireland, the country where vile principles may safely be discussed—Ireland, where an exhibition of perfidy has been boastfully made, of which the world has not witnessed any previous example—where, in millions of men, consciences is seared with a red hot iron—where, beneath the incessant repetition of crime, beneath the constant rage of a cruelty, fed and sustained by indescribable horrors, the instincts of humanity have been scorched and shrivelled, where at this moment, elements have been congregated, and are in process of being arranged, for a consummation of ruin, and wickedness, and wo, in comparison with which the recorded enormities of the most fearful days that are passed shall have lost their sanguinary distinction. This Ireland is the country in which it is safe to familiarize the gods of the confessional, with doctrines which teach that oaths have no power to bind, and that heretics have no right to live. With Scotland, by her indifference, affirm so criminal a proposition, and account it harmless to teach doctrines, and to teach them as religious truth, which abuse even fallen humanity into a fouler resemblance of



the evil, which record their triumphs in the blood of those who resist and make merchandize of the souls of those who receive them? Oh! in the name, in the behalf of six millions of human beings, I implore you to withstand this mystery of iniquity. I do not plead for Protestants only, I implore mercy for their deluded oppressors. In the behalf of multitudes who are not reconciled to their hapless estate—who feel themselves in prison, and in chains—who know themselves to be surrounded by dangers which they shudder to contemplate—who feel themselves the slaves of a tyrannical system, and tremble as they meditate on thoughts which God sendeth at times to their hearts, and which they almost believe to be the truth—oh! in their name, and for God's command, do not strengthen the false church which sways them, by affecting to think their sorceries meet substitute for the light of God's word, and that she may make herself drunk with the blood of saints, without provoking the just judgment of general abhorrence and indignation.

Many a time have I been permitted to direct the thoughts of indulgent hearers towards the afflicted ministers of Christ in my interesting country—many a time have I shrunk from the attempt to speak of their sorrows and their submission, because I could not speak of them with the steadiness and self-command which becometh the dignity of their endurance; but never, when I spoke of their afflictions, or when I forbore, never have I for a moment abandoned the conviction that their cause and the cause of the misguided who despitely use and entreat them is one—never have I renounced my strong affection for all the people of my dear native land; nor have I had, for an instant, my hope darkened, that the day is coming when in the truth all shall be free.

And yet, it is impossible not to feel that a season of deep solicitude has arrived—that God hath a controversy with his people—has summoned them to draw near, that he and they may reason together; and who is the man that does not stand in awe while he meditates upon a trial like this, and while he abides its momentous issue. The issue must be indeed momentous—whether multitudes of responsible beings will continue slaves to an anti-Christian system, upon which its own maledictions have fallen; and whether multitudes who profess themselves free, will continue their alliance and assistance to a system in which if they do not behold enmity to all man's interests, they are

about its true nature and injurious tendency, are well fitted to call forth anxiety and alarm, and to lead to the adoption of decided measures on the part of all who understand and value the principles and doctrines of the Reformation."

Sir WM. SETON seconded the motion.

Mr. BEGG, of Liberton moved the fourth resolution—

"That we feel it to be incumbent upon us, from a regard to the glory of God, the interests of true Christianity, and the welfare of our country, not merely to protest against Popery, but to exert ourselves to the utmost, in the use of all proper means, for enlightening the minds of our countrymen as to its true nature, anti-Christian character, and ruinous tendency, with the view of putting Protestants on their guard against the machinations of the man of sin, and persuading our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects to use, and to use aright, their privilege of reading God's word, that they may thus attain to scriptural views of doctrine, duty, and worship, and cast off the yoke of that depraving and destructive system of falsehood to which they are now enslaved."

He then took occasion to read a lecture to the press for what he called its support of Popery, and said they forgot that, if Popery should ever obtain the ascendancy, its first step would be to put down the press and all free discussion.

Mr. D. MAITLAND M'GILL seconded the motion.

The CHAIRMAN now declared the business at an end; and after prayer by Dr. M'Keller, the meeting separated.

After the meeting at Edinburgh, Captain Gordon and Dr. O'Sullivan returned to Glasgow, where a Protestant Association had been formed, and assisted at its first meetings, which were held on Tuesday and Wednesday, October 6 and 7. The following report is taken from the *Scottish Guardian*.

# GREAT PROTESTANT MEETING,

HELD AT

HOPE-STREET GAELIC CHURCH, GLASGOW,

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1835.

---

A Protestant Association having been formed in this city, subsequent to the late exhibition by Mr. O'Sullivan, and other gentlemen, of the real tenets of Popery, its first public meeting was held on Tuesday night, in Hope-street Gaelic Church, for the purpose of directing public attention to the dangers which now threaten Protestantism. The anxiety to obtain tickets of admission, if possible, surpassed the eagerness manifested on former occasions, and long before the business commenced, the church was crowded in every part.

Among the gentlemen on the platform and its neighbourhood were—Rev. Dr. Brown, of St. John's; Rev. Mr. Routledge, Rev. Mr. Almond, Rev. Dr. M'Farlan, of Greenock; Rev. Mr. Macnair, and Rev. Mr. Macnaughtan, of Paisley; Rev. Dr. Muir, Rev. Dr. M'Leod, of Campsie; Rev. Mr. Patterson, Rev. Mr. Forbes, Rev. Mr. Buchanan, Rev. Mr. Henderson, Rev. Mr. Lorimer, Rev. Mr. Gibson, of the College Church; Rev. Mr. Gibson, of St. Ann's; Rev. Mr. Sommerville, of St. Thomas's; Rev. Mr. Napier, of St. George's-in-the-Fields; Rev. Professor Willis, Rev. Mr. Douie, of Dryfesdale; Rev. Mr. Anderson, of Helensburgh; Rev. Mr. Rosse, of Niggs, &c. Captain Gordon, James Dennistoun, Esq. of Dennistoun, William Brown, Esq., Wm. Leckie Ewing, Esq., Andrew MacGeorge, Esq., John Alston, Esq., Robert Dalgliah, Esq., Robert Forrester, Esq., William Davie, Esq., Henry Paul, Esq., James Wright, Esq., James Sinclair, Esq., Lachlan M'Lean, Esq. &c.

Mr. DENNISTOUN said he begged leave to move, in the absence of a gentleman whose name was well known to be associated in an eminent degree with the interests of the object which they had assembled here to promote—in the absence of his friend, Mr. Colquhoun,

of Killermont, who was unfortunately prevented from meeting with them to-night by indisposition—that the chair be taken by Mr. William Brown.

Mr. BROWN, on taking the chair, said, after the apology already offered in behalf of Mr. Colquhoun, he need not say more than that that gentleman was extremely sorry to be disappointed of the pleasure he had promised himself of being here to-night, by the state of his health; and he had also to apologise for the absence of Bailie Gilmour, who was detained at the death-bed of a near relation.

The Rev. Mr. FORBES opened the meeting with an impressive prayer.

The CHAIRMAN said, that having been very unexpectedly called to the honourable place he now occupied, he felt his incapacity to explain in a satisfactory manner the nature of this association; but he regretted this the less, that the meeting would now be addressed by those so much more able to place its objects before them. He begged, therefore, without further premising, to call upon the Reverend Mr. Patterson.

The Rev. NATHANIEL PATTERSON then rose, and said, the resolution committed to his care was in the following terms:—"That the aspect of the times is ominous of danger to the interests of Protestantism," &c. I find it no easy matter, Mr. Chairman, to stand up before you and this great assembly. In accounting for the part I now take, I am anxious not so much to avoid the appearance of presumption, as to defend the wisdom of my coadjutors in committee, who arranged the business of this meeting. It was not our intention that I should be here. We wished one able, from eye sight, to state the evils of Popery; and, accordingly, solicited the assistance of Dr. Cooke, of Belfast. That application having failed, I am set as an humble substitute to occupy that great blank. And I feel, sir, my weakness of nerve. I do boast some moral courage, and doubt not but I and all present are ready to stand in the breach, not in times ominous of danger, but, if such should be the Lord's will, when danger is come. But there is more than the great voice of this assembly to overawe me. When I think of this land, once so blessed with the knowledge of the Lord—when I think of this great empire, the most influential in the world—once the refuge and the stronghold of Protestantism, and whose legislation was wholly Protestant, now of wavering councils in that cause; when I think of a higher kingdom and the law of its

King, "the nations that will not serve him shall perish;" and when I think of one soul and its eternity, and count the millions of benighted mortals in this empire, and see the spreading of the dark cloud, armed not with a thunderbolt to kill one here and there, but involving all in death that sit under its shade, well may I, and you, and all in this house, be appalled, and sink under the grievous contemplation. But in this feeling it is possible, on the part of some, that we may find but little sympathy. They see no danger, they think that Popery is not so bad as it used to be, and surely it can never set up its face in this Protestant country. We have, therefore, more to encounter than the tremendous evils of Popery. We have the unwelcome task of sounding the alarm, the difficulty of communicating a sense of danger, and of arousing to the needful preparations. Were the danger seen, and you resolved in the strength of the Lord, all would yet be well for our land, and for our children. But I see it is one thing to get, and another to keep; one thing to strive for reformation, and another to preserve the treasure.

When our fathers contended for the faith, they knew well what they suffered; they had a distinct impression of the spiritual thralldom under which they groaned, and they as certainly toiled for freedom as a man in the deep will struggle for the shore. But we do not say you are drowning—we do not awaken you with the ringing sound of fainting in your ears—we only say the flood is coming, and we know how the world despised such warnings before. Men are often enraged at warnings. There is contempt often for the man that gives warning of danger. He is pusillanimous, he is cowardly, he belongs to that class that are always croaking. Then we are not moved, though the signs be clear, if the danger be distant. We are told there is a snake in the grass, and we take two or three cautious steps, and then walk with levity. But let the eye catch a glimpse of the reptile as it glides along, or the foot light on the stiff writhing folds of the monster, then the staring pause and the powerless consternation find no other support than the consciousness of warning despised. Such is the difference of things heard, and of things seen—of danger apprehended, and of danger encountered; such is the difference of viewing that which is distant as if it were at your door. But more untractable still is the temper of those who not only will not see danger, but are unwilling to be disturbed. They love quiescence, and only wish that you would let things alone. They have no objection to the dust that

soils and then buries their old books, old swords, and bones of the dead—"frying pans, an' sauld sa't buckets, afore the flood." They have no objection to the dust, if only it got leave to lie as it is, and on things as they are. We could sympathise with their love of peace, were it not that it is bought too dear, and is neither honourable nor lasting. And the same peace-lovers, we find, have just the same dislike to have their own hearts disturbed. Touch the conscience, and they complain. They were all quiet and satisfied, and saw nothing wrong; now you have laid open an ant's-hill, (as old Boston would have said,) and I am shocked at the sight of so many creeping things—madly carrying their eggs, and seeking a shelter in my very ears. Why, the love of peace is a right thing, if the way of peace be rightly known. We say, cast out the evil thing, and bar the door against it, and then have peace. But they think the enemy will be made worse by any notice of his encroachments, and any show of resistance. This may be correct in the case of some enemies; but there is one, in dealing with whom there is no wisdom in the peaceful plan. There is an enemy whom no agitation, no standing on defence, no declaration of war, can make one whit worse than he is. And if in your quietness he neither rages nor comes to rend you, it is only because your peace gives better surety of the prey. It is wise to let sleeping dogs lie, because in their sleep they do no ill, and it may be they will bite when invaded in their natural rights, and if you provoke their revenge; but it is not wise to adopt the same policy towards a sleeping devil, because his slumber is guile, and his revenge is already determined. "We can do all things through Christ strengthening us; wherefore resist the devil and he will flee from you."

There is another enemy of this kind; one with whom there is no safety—who, when he sleeps, has one eye always open, whom resistance can make no worse, whom courage will subdue, and whom fraternal concord will fortify—one who will take a peace-offering, and with it buy the munitions of war—one who, with fawning lips, will take a piece from a silly child, and devour the hand that feeds him. Wherefore, do not fancy that your favour will do him good, nor fear that resistance will make him worse. But we assert that the danger is near—Popery is in our land, and not in Ireland alone, but spread all over the nation. I wish I could show you the map of British Popery, studded all over from Land's-end to John-o'-Groat's with the

bright gems of Catholic temples. The Pope has not now, as formerly, the complaint that religion is on the decline in Scotland. A nation is to be regarded as one family—some older, some younger—some strong, and some weak—all united by the social tie, and helpful one to another. If one of them be diseased, there is grief to all, and loss of strength to the household; and if the disease be mortal—lies in strife, drunkenness, angry passions, ending in confusion, murder, and other crimes—all suffer, all share in the shame, and damage, and final destruction. So in the national compact—the head may not say to the feet, I have no need of thee; or the belly to the hands, I have no need of thee; for all are members one of another—all bound like a piece of curiously wrought and interlocked machinery, yea, like the machinery of one human frame; and sick or well in whole, as it is sick or well in any of its parts. And if Popery be evil, and lodged in any limb, it is bad for the whole body; and that danger is not distant, seeing the evil is already lodged in our local frames. But we are asked, what new or near danger is there, if Popery has been so long in our land? Popery now mingles with the legislation of our country—it goes to the heart, and circulates in the vital fluid. It was before skin deep—now it is a constitutional malady; before it was a surface-wound, issuing its corruption—but now the purulent matter is absorbed, and the consequences are the wonted and distressing alternations of hectic fever and weakness—the weakness seen in the avowed incapacity of law to do justice in Ireland, to give to Protestant ministers their legal right—a moral impotency unworthy of the darkest ages; and here is its alternative, the re-action, the on-come of the hectic fit, the guilty, the impudent, the perjured boast of a Popish priesthood, that no tithes shall be paid this year, either to landlord or tenant, and that ere one other year revolve, there will not be a vestige of a Protestant church in Ireland.

Is there a distant danger? Dost thou sit at thine ease when thy neighbour's house is on fire? What house? Why, not a dwelling-house, only the church. (A laugh.) I do not speak as a Churchman, I speak as a native of a land where the Bible is printed pure and given to the people,—where every soul, from the toil-worn peasantry to the grand but mortal tenants of a palace, have the same rich and only precious treasure of the Word of God—humbling the high, and exalting the mean—guiding all by one equal law of rectitude—making

little of rank, for God is eternal, and time a vapour—and setting all on one common platform for the qualifications and hopes of eternity. Is this speaking like a Churchman for the charm of his temporalities? Would one of you, sons of this free soil, speak in other terms—sons of noble sires who bled for this privilege—sons of equal rights and honours, whereby a rustic boy comes to the shop, and from the shop to prosperous trade, and from trade to an estate with its peach garden, and vinery, and wood, and lawn—and where all the while the soul is free and civilized, and knows no better name, when death shall come—knows God, and goes to the fountain-head of living truth—goes to God himself by our first Mediator, and not by a second—a venal priest, who tells only what he pleases, and settles in money the terms of immortality. Is this our interest as poor servants in the Church, or your immortal privilege, we plead for? Farewell, O Scotland! to all thy prosperity, civil, social, and religious, if ever the infernal breath of Popery—a withering siroc wind—come over thy mountains, and glens, and woods, and spires.

The danger is not only near, but great. Popery destroys all that which God has sent to save the world. It makes void the commandments of God by its traditions. The first article of its creed is—“I most firmly admit and embrace the apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions.” The second is—“I also admit the Holy Scriptures, according to that sense which Holy Mother Church has held and does hold.” Now, let us see what the Scripture says in answer to the cordial embracing of traditions.—“Every word of God is pure; add not thou unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.” The use of traditions is to throw every soul of the people under dependence to the priest, and as one lie needs the help of another, thence comes the blasphemous fiction of infallibility. The Rev. gentleman then commented on the seven sacraments—their conveyance of grace by the priestly operation—on good works as meritorious—on fasts as atoning for sin—and then gave the following specimen of prayer:—“We beseech thee, O Lord, by the merits of thy saints whose relics are here, and of all the saints, that thou might deign to forgive all my sins.” He proceeded to animadvert on the doctrine that there is no sin for which penance cannot atone,—thence explaining the trade of indulgences, and illustrated the dogma of the efficacy of good works for salvation. Such, he re-



marked, were the good works of saints—bloody and deceitful men—works with which God can find no fault! These are stored up, and the priest opens his rag-shop, and doles out to the poor, if he can pay, the robes of immortality. “Oh! full of all subtlety and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord.”

The Rev. gentleman farther proceeded to illustrate the danger resulting from Popery. As it corrupts what God has sent for the healing of the nations, so it is the actual teacher of immorality. He referred to the seven sacraments of the Church of Rome, and pointed out their pernicious tendency. Such a system, he remarked, must destroy all truth, and undermine the security of national property. Go to Catholic countries—they have no factories—no farms in any decent state; but they have 3000 agitators, 3000 priests hounding on the people to deeds of blood. Was this a state of things they would wish to tolerate? Was it not a providential commentary on the text—“Godliness is profitable for all things?” It is a strict and unchangeable principle with them that the people must not see the light; for the priests are like screech-owls, they cannot bear the light of the Sun of Righteousness—it makes their eyes sore to the very sockets. They have recently murdered no less than four Protestant Bible readers—had this happened between you and John-o’-Groats, you would have turned pale, and the blood would have curdled at your hearts.

The Rev. gentleman, after a few other remarks, here enlarged on the danger to the spiritual interests of our own population from the influx of the natives of Ireland into our large manufacturing towns. He then adverted to the increase of Protestant Churches in Ireland, and stated that 600 churches had been built since the Union, and that 1000 working clergy had been added to the list—that there were now 2000 churches in Ireland, whereas 100 years ago there were only 1000. The real cause of the clamour raised by the Papists, was not the tithe, for out of many hundred parishes of which returns were made to the House of Commons, it appeared that £19 out of £20 were paid by Protestants; and in 600 livings, the tithes amounted only to 1s. per pound, while in 200 it only came to 6d. The cause—the true cause was the woful light that begins to dawn—the screech-owls cannot bear that—and it is for this that they have murdered the poor

Bible readers, who had no more connexion with tithes than any one of you.

After a number of eloquent remarks on various topics illustrative of his position, the Rev. gentleman proceeded :—There is a faction in our day distinguished by certain peculiar notions of reform. They complain of all movements that they are too slow. They are fond of mechanics ; but there is always one part of a machine that they mortally dislike. They have no objections to the clock. They like the sinks—they are the moving power. They like the hands—they are the signs of the times—but they have an unconquerable aversion to the pendulum—there it goes wag—wag—wag—with such sameness and slowness, and were it not for that, every wheel would run in fine style. They admire the mixed power and speed of the steam engine ; but the safety valve they heartily hate. There is a higher machinery that is nicely adjusted. God hath settled all things by weight and measure. There are disturbing forces ; but one of that kind is set over against another, and no disorder can ensue. There is a fine variety of orbits ; but there is still a rule of steadiness known by the terms—“ Equal areas in equal times ;” and the right path is kept by the balance of two powers so ordered as to keep each other in check. Could these lovers of rapid motion reach so high, they would cut off one of these opponent powers, to let the other go free ; and then would be seen Mercury, Venus, the Earth, Mars, Jupiter, Georgium Sidus and the new Comet—reeling and smoking headlong to the centre in one splendid crash. Men do meddle with the work of God—with one that is higher than this, and over all his other works ; and they would change if they could, for the sake of quicker driving, the very movements of the heavens. Such is the natural history of a class of men in all kingdoms. And we find no fault with them or with their functions. They are of real use in the moral world, just as the opposing powers are in the material ; for it is in strict analogy with nature’s plan, that men should be ranged under opposing agencies—one to hold and another to draw. We do not object to the drawing ; but we object to the arrogance of the drawers, who would have all power to themselves ; and we object to their rashness, which would, for the sake of rapid driving, first get rid of the bridle, and then lash on with the whip. There is one species of rapid movement, and even of destruction, which I can cordially enjoy. On climbing a mountain-summit,

it is pleasing to find a huge block of granite lying on a verge, like one too near the front of the bed, and easily pushed over. Unloose but a single wedge, and down goes the lump—with lazy motion at the first, but gathering force as it goes it leaps from the ground, and wheels on its ideal axle in perfect beauty; till it spends its force, and breaking to shivers fills the valley with its thunder. This kind of sight our rapid movers love, but always of things venerable for antiquity and of acknowledged use, and yet thought to stand somewhat in their way. Hence they would climb the mountain to get at lofty things; and then apply their crow-bar to the Church, the royal Crown, the Bench of justice, the House of Lords—sending all down the steep, the wreck of ages and the triumphs of an hour. This movement faction unanimously join to promote the Catholic power. But that which is most judgment-like in our land, is the Catholic union with Evangelical Dissenters. Evangelical ministers who join hands with Popery, and are wroth when we apply to Government for money for building churches, yet have no objection to the College of Maynooth, nor the national schools, twenty or thirty of which are taught in Popish chapels and convents, and by friars black or gray—nor to the spoliation of 800 parishes in Ireland, which are to be given over as a bribe to get more. After enlarging on the discordant materials of the union, the Rev. speaker said, in allusion to the danger to be apprehended from Popery, were it a foe in bodily shape—a fleet or armies for the invasion of our country, there would be neither fear nor doubt. The first sight would be the instant signal to a determination which the confederated powers of Europe could not shake. But by Heaven's own light we discern Heaven's foe, and judge the moral evil more vile and desolating than pestilence or sword. We will not have the civilization of this 19th century driven back by Popish invasion to the barbarism of the 12th. We will not have our Lord's Zion profaned by Popery, our churches polluted with the mass, and our schools made nurseries of superstition. We will not have our infants baptized under a curse, to the belief of a lie. We will not have our maidens catechised out of the obscenities of Dens. We will not have our spirited sons to quail under priestly power. Shall that spirit which, on battle-field, knelt only to God, and after prayer would conquer or die, crouch under Popish tyranny. Shall we abandon all truth, all duty, and God himself, and the hope of heaven;

and bring upon our land anarchy and Popish mummeries, to aid a selfish faction, and encourage a troop of agitators. Slavery is of two kinds: one bodily, and one mental. Slavery of the body, thy worst thing is thy chain. I can look upon that. It is cold, and heavy, and unkindly to the touch. But I look to one who wore it. "Would to God," he said, "that all men were, not only almost, but altogether, such as I am, except these bonds!" His mind was free, and his heart warm. The love of God burned in his heart, and hope was the light of that holy flame. But the victim of Popery is bound with a mental chain. The iron enters his soul; his heart turns cold; and he sits down in darkness and the shadow of death.

The Rev. gentleman, of whose long and eloquent speech we have only given an outline, sat down amid the most enthusiastic applause.

Dr. M'LEOD, of Campsie, then rose, and was received with great applause—He said, I consider it no ordinary privilege to take a part in the business of such a meeting as the present. Certainly, had I consulted my own feelings, I should have been much better pleased to be a hearer than a speaker; but considering that no man, especially no clergyman, has a right to be guided by feelings when called upon, as I consider myself now to be, to the discharge of a high public duty, I therefore have obeyed the injunction laid upon me, and I rise with great pleasure to second the motion that has now been made by my Reverend friend, who has so admirably opened this evening's discussion. I do greatly fear, Sir, that in the few observations that I am about to make, I shall detract from the powerful impression produced by my Reverend friend's splendid address: for a more happy mixture of the *seria mixta joci*, all bearing upon the motion intrusted to him, I never listened to. In looking at this platform, I see much to excite my diffidence; I see here some individuals distinguished for their intimate acquaintance with the subject to which our attention this night is to be directed; and famed all over the kingdom as the most eloquent advocates of Protestant truth and Protestant principles. I must therefore plead diffidence, a diffidence which, after the speech delivered by my friend who preceded me, would resolve itself into an oppressive and overwhelming embarrassment, but for the courtesy with which I was welcomed as I rose on this platform. If, however, I see something to agitate, I see much more to encourage and to delight my heart. Permit me, therefore, to congratulate you and all present

on the ready and enthusiastic response which the announcement of this meeting has called forth from the Protestant population of Glasgow; and indeed, Sir, what one object could have been devised better calculated to call together a numerous, respectable, and harmonious assemblage of good citizens, from all denominations of Protestant Christians? There never was a standard, around which clergy and laity of the Established and Dissenting interests could rally with more safety, honour, and true patriotism. Truly, Sir, I do trust that it is no vain hope I cherish when I consider that the association now being formed will act as a magnet, possessing the power of attracting and uniting all who value the volume of inspiration, for I consider that the best definition of the Protestant religion is to say that it is the religion of the Bible. Fervently, therefore, Sir, do I hope that this meeting, and every meeting that shall follow of this association, will prove an atmosphere to which the various vapours and mists of jealousies, prejudices, and party divisions, shall never be brought; that it shall prove a reviver of the feelings of Christian harmony, and tend mightily to heal those differences which have of late years but too much defaced the Protestant Churches of the land. Need I say, Mr. Chairman, that this is not a political association; true it is we have all our political opinions, for in this day of excitement, where is the man who has not? But while, Sir, we all hold our opinions, as free men in a free country are entitled to do, where is he who, looking at this platform, or at the mixed appearance of the multitude now assembled, could say, even if he knew the sentiments of every individual present, what the political character of the meeting is? Your presence in the chair, and the support of many by whom you are surrounded, is a sufficient guarantee that it is no Tory job,—the appearance of this great multitude declares that it is no hole or corner meeting—and, certainly, had the association been for the advancement of some of those more liberal measures about which the agitators of the present day harangue so much, the humble individual who now addresses you, would not have been upon the platform, nor many others much better known, and of far greater influence in society. Sir, the calm, the settled, and solemn expression of the two thousand countenances now around me, declares that there is some one subject of greater importance than the passing politics of the day, which so intensely interests them—that subject is their love for the Protestant religion, their dearest birthright, their most valuable inhe-

ritance ; that inheritance for which their forefathers suffered, and bled, and died, and which by the blessing of God they are determined to use all means in their power to transmit unimpaired to their latest posterity.

The question at issue between the Papists and Protestants involves matters of the highest importance. The contest is not a skirmishing about some inconsiderable and unimportant outpost, but a struggle for the very hearths and altars of Christianity. The controversy involves matters which regard the glory of God, the happiness of man, the dissemination of truth, and the establishment of civil and religious liberty. The question at issue is one of no temporary and local importance ; it is lasting as the highest and best interests of man. I am well aware, and I deeply lament, that there exists upon this subject, a woeful liberalism, which leads many professing Protestants to regard the points of difference as of no moment ; there is a fearful concession of principle upon this subject, by many from whom better things might be expected,—such modifications, such trimmings, such common cause-making with all creeds, as cannot but alarm every considerate and reflecting man. In forming this Protestant association, we must lay our account to misrepresentation as well as reproach—we shall be accused of a forgetfulness of the charities of christianity, of an intolerant zeal for the ascendancy of our own creed—of rousing dormant bigotry, reviving decayed prejudice, of wishing to perpetuate the reign of strife and polemical animosity, by meeting for the discussion of subjects which should be committed to the grave of oblivion. Such will be the charges brought against us by the spirit of the age : but it is just because the spirit of the age thus speaks, that we find a moral necessity laid upon us of associating fearlessly for the maintenance of our own principles, and for the defence of the faith once delivered to the saints. In speaking of Popery, I would deprecate the idea of uttering a word calculated to wound the feelings of a Roman Catholic, if there be any present. I know many of them whom I greatly esteem and value : I would desire, therefore, to remember, that I appear in the twofold character of a minister of the gospel of peace, but at the same time, the pledged and covenanted enemy of Popery, root and branch. It would be very unbecoming in me, after the luminous speech delivered by my Reverend brother, to occupy much of your time in discussing the various points at issue betwixt Papists and Protestants. My Rev. friend has ably brought

before you the unscriptural character of Popery. He has spoken to you concerning the errors and absurdities of oral tradition—the groundless claims of Popes and councils to infallibility—of the blasphemies of the mass. He has shown you how the Church of Rome has renounced the exclusive authority of Scripture—how she has multiplied mediators between God and man, and substituted the works of man for the merits of the Redeemer. He has spoken of auricular confession and priestly despotism—how the Church of Rome holds no faith with heretics—admits of no salvation beyond her own pale, and disregards the obligation and sacredness of oaths when supposed to interfere with the interests of the Mother Church. He has given you a peep into the dungeons of the Inquisition, and spoken concerning the torture of the stake.

Now, Sir, when we think of all these circumstances, and trace the effects of Popery in that part of the world where it has obtained power, we must feel a deep conviction, that it is a system of error so gross and so dangerous that no individual, or government, can without guilt leave one effort untried to prevent its ever recovering that ascendancy in our land which it lost at the Reformation. I am aware that the spirit of the age will reply to all this, that Popery is not what it once was, that it has lost the worst features of its character, and that it is rapidly approximating to the truth. So says the Premier of Britain, and the spirit of the age re-echoes the declaration. But who is he that is at all acquainted with the character of Popery, but must know that as a system it is incapable of change. If Popery is not now what it was in the days of the Inquisition of Spain, then is the immutable religion become mutable, and its infallibility fallible. True it is, that there is a striking discrepancy between the system and the practise: we do not now hear of the dungeon, and the rack, and the stake being applied to coerce men's consciences, nor do I accuse my Roman Catholic countrymen of any wish to revive them; a Papist may be tolerant, but Popery as a system is not so. Even at this moment, when the power of that fallen Church over a great part of Europe is but a name, its bulls despised, its authority disregarded, still the spirit of the Church is as despotic, as interfering, exclusive, and sanguinary as ever. Misfortune has not humbled her; she would be this day all she ever was if men would allow her, and she will continue to hold the same character, until that awful hour when a voice shall be heard proclaiming, that "Babylon the great is fallen,

fallen, and she is no more." I am aware that it is extremely difficult to convince Scotsmen of the real character of Popery. They judge of it from what they see in this country, where the influence of pure religion and education is so generally felt, that Popery is not permitted to develop its genuine character. Here, under the age of an enlightened community, the priest cannot as in other places "play such fantastic tricks before high heaven as would make an angel weep." But, Mr. Chairman, there is within sight of our own blue mountains, and within but a few hours sail of this city, a green island, than which no lovelier isle sits upon the bosom of the waters;—to use the words of one of Erin's warmest friends, "There is fertility in her soil, and majesty in her scenery; the navies of an empire would ride in her harbours, the commerce of the world would float on her rivers and lakes; yet in despite of all these advantages, Ireland is a degraded and half civilized country—there is no bringing out of her internal resources, violence is the atmosphere in which her children live, and human life is often but their plaything." Her people the first in valour and genius among the nations of the earth, but the last in the mighty march of mind.

And how, Mr. Chairman, are we to account for all this? Popery! Popery! lies at the bottom of all Erin's woes and all Erin's wretchedness. It is the genius of that religion to keep a rude people still rude, just because it keeps them still ignorant. What a striking contrast does the province of Ulster present when compared with that of Connaught! In Ulster, where Protestantism preponderates, there is wealth, comfort, peace, freedom, knowledge, enlightened and real loyalty. In Connaught, where Popery preponderates, there is penury, misery, slavery, barbarism, and dissatisfaction—approaching to open rebellion. In the North, law is respected, rights of property recognised, life protected, and thousands ready, if called upon, to die in support of the British Constitution, and Protestant principles, upon which it rests; while, in the Popish provinces, anarchy, and rapine, and assassinations, are the order of the day; and a million of bondmen ready, and, as we are told, anxious to fight for the subversion of that Constitution which has so long been the glory of Britain and the admiration of the world. Many of you are acquainted with Protestant Ulster. I have travelled through Popish Connaught, and did our time permit, I could place before you a revolting picture of the workings of Popery in that dark land. I could tell you of its holy wells,



and the fearful penances performed around them by the poor deluded devotees. I could speak to you of pilgrimages, masses, and scapulars, and the many hundred ways by which the Church of Rome keeps the poor people in utter ignorance and cruel thralldom. There the inhabitants dare not cast their nets into the sea when shoals of herring have entered the loch, although thousands of the inhabitants are in a state of actual starvation, until the despotic friars have fixed the day, and said their masses, and made their bargains for their proportion of what may be caught. There you will see three or four hundred fishing vessels with their tackling ready, lying idle in the harbour, until those spiritual tyrants grant them permission to sail; and should strangers from other parts of the world attempt, in the meantime, to cast a net, they would soon suffer for their temerity. Where is the great friend of civil and religious freedom, with his green coat and his cap of liberty, when he tolerates such tyranny in a land where he is the sole dictator, and which he professes to love in his "heart of hearts?" Ah! Sir, if my brethren in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland dared to issue such mandates, and attempted to prevent the fishing fleets from casting their nets in the Highland lochs—into Loch Roag, Loch Suinard, and Loch Scaffaag, until they had granted permission, or stirred up the people to acts of brutal violence against those who disregarded such mandate; a commission of inquiry had long since been instituted, and our liberal members would have deservedly dragged them to the bar of the House of Commons, to answer for their clerical domination; but because it is the doing of the priest, and strengthens the joints of the *mighty tail*, no voice is heard against it. In the *Galway Advertiser*, of date 4th April last, I find among the other trials before the petty sessions, that of Martin Connolly, parish priest of Achill. Wm. Reynolds being sworn, "deposes, the children attending his school were committed to his care by their parents, who expressed a fear in committing them to him, that they might be ill-used, and desired him to have the care of them; that he was returning home from his school when he met the Rev. Mr. Connolly; that he saluted Mr. Connolly; that Mr. Connolly fell to beating the scholars; that he tumbled one on the ground; that he struck another; pulled another by the hair; that one poor boy jumped into the sea to avoid him! that he got down on the bank and squeezed him under him! that he (the master) remonstrated with the priest; that Mr. Connolly called him a savage, a vagabond, a blackguard, and

lauded by its defenders for its great impartiality. One instance of this impartiality, which has come within my own knowledge, I shall state. In the town of Galway there are two national schools, each of which is attended by about 500 children—one of these is under the care of the Presentation nunnery, the other under the charge of the monks. In these schools are all the paraphernalia of Popery—the building is a convent—the teachers are nuns and monks, with their beads and rosaries, and other trumperies. In all this is there shown no preference to Popery? How could the attendance of Protestant children at such schools be expected?

As to the persecution of the Protestant Church of Ireland, and the measures contemplated in regard to it, I shall only observe that the tendency of these measures can only be the extermination of Protestantism. I do not defend the abuses which may have crept into that church in the course of years. I do not palliate or excuse their plurality of benefices, the non-residence of the clergy, and many other matters which may require reform: but this I know to be the fact, that there is not at present in any church on earth a more ardent, zealous, and devoted body of clergy than in the Protestant Church of Ireland. Yet see how she is beset and persecuted; antagonist forces are banded against her, they have consulted as with one consent for her overthrow. And who are her enemies? They are all the enemies of true and vital religion—the enemies of God and godliness. Not content with bringing her into a position in which little short of martyrdom is required on the part of her clergy, the utter spoliation of her revenues is designed, and that at a time when numbers of her faithful and devoted ministers are in a state of actual destitution. And when did this opposition and persecution arise? "For centuries," says the eloquent Doctor Cooke of Belfast, whose absence here we so much lament, "this church was inactive, her banners were furled, her sword undrawn, her hosts unmarshalled, her duties undone. Yet, during all that period she basked in the sunshine of favour, and enjoyed her emoluments in tranquil and palmy repose. But the moment it pleased the Lord to awaken her from the lethargy of ages, and inspirit her with the vigour of youth—the moment he loosed the tongue of her that had been dumb, and touched her lips as with fire from the altar of truth—that moment her sunshine of favour was withdrawn, clouds began to hang around her, and she is put into the furnace." In behalf of that persecuted church I could say much. I have one charge

against her, and as I feel it I must express it. She has despised the Irish language—the mantle of Bedel has not fallen upon her bishops—had they walked in his footsteps, Ireland would not be as she now is—wretched, and ignorant, and depraved, and rebellious. Had the Church of Ireland cultivated the language of Ireland, and sought to get at Irish hearts through the medium of the Irish language—that language which reaches the inmost soul of the children of Erin—which awakens their dearest recollections—in which their mothers soothed their infancy, and their fathers pronounced their dying blessing—then should Ireland indeed have risen up as the green isle of the ocean, and the music of peace be heard on her mountains.

But I proceed to call your attention, in the last place, to the progress of Popery in the land. In Scotland, I believe, there are few actual conversions to Popery. The raw material comes imported to us gratuitously from Ireland, so that every town and village in the land teems with Papists. In England the numbers who embrace the Popish profession are exceedingly great, amounting, as I understand, to one thousand per week; but this can hardly be called a conversion from one faith to another, but simply a political union of the mighty mass of Radicalism and infidelity, drawn together by the maddening harangues of agitating priests and political demagogues. In Leeds alone, there are hundreds at present under training, learning the exercises of the Catholic faith—all the crossing, and bending of knees, and counting of beads, in which the Popish worship so grossly consists. In Ireland a work of a very different character is progressing—there the conversions are from Popery to Protestantism—actual conversions from darkness to light, and from the kingdom of Satan to that of God's dear Son. There the Irish Bible is working wonders. No doubt the traveller, as he is hurled along on the outside of the mail coach, sees Catholic Churches with their ornamented towers and fine spires, rising up on all sides—he hears much of the arrival of splendid marble altars from Italy—of richly painted windows and noble-toned organs from the Continent, for the wealth of all Popish lands is pouring into Britain at present, to aid the cause of the Mother Church; but in despite of all this there is an under current at work, undermining the very foundations of that tottering church—journeys of thirty miles, under night, are taken over mountains and bogs to procure copies of the Irish Scriptures—there are thousands of Catholics in different

parts of Ireland engaged at present in the study of the word of God, and all the power of Rome cannot arrest the progress of the work. The efforts made by the Church of Rome are the desperate and last spasms of death—their new buildings are but the beams and buttresses applied to the old edifice, ready to fall about their ears. A great reformation has commenced in Ireland—it is the doing of the Lord, and calls for our grateful acknowledgment.

And now, Mr. Chairman, after all that has been said, need I ask, is this a time to be silent. Is this a day for apathy; shall we be intimidated by the sneers of an infidel and unprincipled press from speaking our minds fearlessly and fully; or by the reckless falsehoods which they may choose to send forth regarding our character and our motives? For my own part, I feel honored by their abuse: because it is evidence to me that they consider my principles as opposed to theirs, and my services as meriting their notice. I am at this moment placarded, I am told, on the streets of this city, traduced and belied by the very organ of falsehood. But I shall persevere through good report and bad report—and never flinch, when called upon, from avowing and defending my principles in the face of the world, and if need be at the hazard of my life. What remains, Mr. Chairman, but that we do this night unite in the support and promotion of Protestant truth and Protestant principle. Oh, Sir, it is the last lingering hope for the candlestick of the realm. Would, that all denominations of sound orthodox Protestants would lay aside their differences on minor points, and with heart and hand unite for the support of that faith once delivered to the saints, and I hope equally dear to them all. Why—why should the disputes of the Greek be a matter of joy to *Priam*, the common foe? Would that all men did but duly consider how much the atmosphere of civil liberty depends on the ascendancy of Protestant principle; and the Protestant principle is now violently assailed. Would that all they who idolize civil liberty, knew how soon this Diana of theirs would be driven to the dungeons and darkness of despotism, if a Reformed Church was crushed in the land, and that Popery gained the ascendancy. Would that all pretenders to patriotism did only for a moment reflect how much civil liberty rests upon a liberty to read the Bible—a liberty to think and judge for ourselves; but a liberty which Popery never gave—a liberty which Popery never will give. I have to crave your forgiveness, Mr. Chairman, for trespassing so much

upon your time; and I return my thanks to this respectable audience for their patient hearing.

The Rev. Gentleman concluded, amid the most enthusiastic plaudits by seconding the motion.

CAPTAIN GORDON said, that it was with very considerable reluctance he obtruded himself on the attention of the meeting at that late hour. After the two admirable speeches that had been addressed to them, perhaps he should best consult the interest of the objects which they were assembled to promote, by requesting the Chairman to adjourn the meeting under the influence of these speeches. However, if they wished it, he would proceed, though it would be under very embarrassing circumstances, not so much owing to the ability which had distinguished the addresses of the preceding speakers, as from the manner in which they had narrowed the ground on which he had intended to take his stand. The resolution which he held in his hand, however, presented such a view of the subject as would still leave something to say. It was as follows:—

“That Popery is the same in principle as it has always been, the source of ignorance, the enemy of Divine truth, intolerant, and only waiting a fit season for the display of its natural despotism.”

This was his text, and he would endeavour to keep as close to it as possible; but he would premise that he had merely received it late on the preceding afternoon, and had only had this day to prepare his sermon. The sameness of Popery depended on that attribute of infallibility which has bound the Romish Church to the profession of the same doctrines she held 400 years ago, and would bind her to them until that dreadful moment when the angel should pronounce her doom. Whatever the doctrines were, it was impossible for her to make the slightest change in them. They might be good, they might be bad, but they must remain unchanged, for she was bound irrevocably to maintain every article of her faith as long as she remained a church. What then is Popery? They were naturally led to ask. And he asserted, in reply, from Scripture, that it was the mystery of iniquity, simply because at every step it counterplotted the mystery of godliness. This question became of infinite importance, when they recollected that it had become a doubtful point with Protestants what doctrines the Church of Rome really held. It had been declared within the walls of parliament, by his Majesty's Prime

Minister, that there was no fundamental difference between Popery and Protestantism. When such sentiments were announced from such stations by such functionaries, it became of the utmost consequence to direct their attention to an inquiry so pregnant with importance. Some might assign this sentiment to the side of a by gone bigotry, but when they had the standards of Popery in their possession, it became their bounden duty to undeceive the country with respect to its real tenets.

He would then first read to them in a very few words the character of Popery, as presented to them by the Church of Rome herself. It was always satisfactory when they could take their stand on a sure foundation, and exhibit the opinions of an adversary from his own showing. He held in his hand the creed of Pope Pius IV. which contained the most approved summary of Roman Catholic doctrine, and which no Papist durst controvert or repudiate. (The speaker then read several extracts from the creed, declaratory of the obligation incurred by every true Catholic to receive the Ecclesiastical and Apostolical traditions; to receive the Bible according to the sense in which the church has held and does hold it, and to interpret it in no other way than that authorised by the unanimous consent of her doctors; as also regarding the nature and efficacy of the sacraments, the invocations of saints, purgatory, veneration of relics, honour paid to the images of saints and the Virgin, subjection to the Pope, the efficacy of indulgences, and the other articles of the Romish faith.) Here they had a definition of Roman Catholic doctrine by the church herself, and he would appeal to the meeting if there was not a fundamental difference between these tenets, and those of the Bible and of Protestantism. He would for the present leave this part of the subject, and give the meeting a few specimens of the influence of such dogmas on the mind and heart of their deluded votaries. He would refer to Roman Catholic authority for the condition of Papists in Ireland. He held in his hand a pamphlet published a few years since, by the Roman Catholic priest of a parish in the county of Wicklow, the following extract from which he would submit to their consideration:—

“ If you examine the inhabitants of any parish, you will perceive at once the fatal consequences of ignorance in their habits of cursing, swearing,

blasphemy, drunkenness, theft, shocking profanation of the Sabbath, with numerous instances of more flagrant crimes. That sacred day is impatiently expected through the week, not for the purpose of rendering homage to their Creator, but that they may abandon themselves to drinking, gambling, rioting, and intrigue, or turbulent sports, such as football, handball, &c., to the great scandal of our religion, and to the shame of its professors. Such are the purposes to which the day of God is peculiarly devoted; and, I believe, that 90 out of 100 Irish Catholics who would freely shed their blood for their religion, are living in the practice of those vices which St. Paul tells us exclude from the kingdom of heaven, and yet expect salvation with as much confidence as St. Paul himself, who was unconscious of transgression."

This was a description of the character and influence of Popery in Ireland which required no comment from him, and he thought this evidence would fully bear out the assertion of the resolution. My friend alluded to the moral condition of Galway, as manifesting itself in circumstances of such a revolting nature as prevented him from detailing them to the meeting. He said he had not been a spectator of such scenes himself, but he (Capt. Gordon,) could assure them he had been in the midst of 20,000 persons engaged in these horrid rites: the blood streaming from their lacerated knees, and soaking the gravel on which they knelt (sensation); performing such ceremonies as would disgrace the religion of the hindoos. He had seen what he durst not communicate to this meeting, even in illustration of their religion. He was anxious now to direct the attention of the meeting to the spiritual character of the doctrines of Popery, and thus to awaken a feeling in favour of those who were the unhappy victims of the delusion. If they extended their benevolence to those at the extremities of the world, who were sitting in the valley of darkness and the shadow of death, how much more ought they to bestow their charity on those who were perishing around them! He would proceed to read to the meeting extracts from the Catechism of the Council of Trent, which he held in his hand, to demonstrate how necessary it was, under every view of Christian consistency, to address themselves to the conversion of the adherents of Popery, at the same time that they defended those principles which their forefathers had asserted, and maintained even by their blood. The speaker then read a series of passages from the Catechism, relative to the seven sacraments of the Romish Church, their nature and tendency, and made a few remarks as he went along, pointing out the absurdity of the dogmas asserted. He then proceeded to say, that the Church of Rome had made the word of God a sealed book, and wholly extinguished revealed

truth. But not content with this, they brought forward mutilated texts to support their own impious and revolting tenets, and blasphemously altered the sacred writings, in order to make them bear a forced and distorted interpretation. The specimen of this, out of one hundred others that might be adduced, was supplied by the following questions and answers, taken from a Catechism published under the sanction of the late Dr. Doyle, and circulated in his diocese of Kildare and Leighlin :—

“ Is it lawful to honour the saints and angels ? Yes, with *duilia* or inferior honour. How prove you this ? 1st. Out of Joshua, where the angel saith, I am the prince of the host of the Lord, and Joshua fell flat on the ground and adored him.”

Now every child at school knew that this angel was no other than the true Prince of the host of the Lord—the Almighty himself. But a much more glaring instance of dishonesty followed.

“ 2d. Out of the Apocalypse, xxii. 8, where St. John saith : I fell down to adore before the feet of the angel who showed me these things.”

Every Protestant knew that this is only half the verse. Now let them mark what followed : the angel immediately replied, “ See thou do it not.” He would merely quote one other passage confirmatory of what had been already advanced.

“ How prove you that some sins are venial ? Out of St. John, where he saith, in speaking of such as walk in the light, that they are cleansed from all mortal sin by the blood of Christ.”

And here every Protestant would recollect that the words in the passage referred to were—“ They are cleansed from *all sin* by the blood of Christ,” and that the epithet mortal was a mere interpolation. The resolution further asserted that the Church of Rome was an intolerant church. He thought it unnecessary to expend more of their time in proving what had been already so completely demonstrated. These then were the doctrines, what our ancestors called the soul-destroying doctrines, of the Romish Church, and he trusted that the effect of the Protestant Association would be to call the attention of the population of Glasgow to the ruinous consequences they inevitably entailed. He hesitated not to say that God had a quarrel with the nation for the countenance it afforded to the monstrous heresy, and he would not scruple to assert that the British nation and government, in supporting a college for the education of Roman Catholic priests, were not only aiding and abetting idolatry



but had identified themselves with idolatry, and in the sight of heaven were part and parcel of that idolatrous system. The gallant Captain sat down amid loud and general cheering.

Mr. M'GEORGE said, at that late hour, and after the eloquent addresses to which they had listened, the meeting would agree with him that the most judicious course for him to pursue would be simply but sincerely, to second the resolution.

The resolution was then submitted to the meeting, and like its predecessors, carried with acclamation.

The Chairman then stated, that on account of the great interest excited by the subjects which had been brought before them, it had been thought proper to adjourn the meeting till to-morrow night, when they would be addressed by the Rev. Mr. Buchanan, and the Rev. Mr. O'Sullivan.

The Rev. Dr. MACFARLAN of Greenock, having offered up a short prayer, the large and most respectable meeting, who throughout manifested the profoundest interest in the proceedings, broke up a few minutes after ten o'clock.

---

## ADJOURNED MEETING.

The interest evinced by the public in the recent discussions, so far from having abated by the repeated opportunities of exhausting itself, had reached a height on Wednesday morning which we have never before seen equalled in Glasgow on any similar occasion. Considerably upwards of 2,000 tickets had been distributed at an early hour in the morning, and hundreds of applications for more, throughout the day, were met by the bitterest disappointment. The place of meeting was, of course, again crowded by a most respectable audience, long before the proceedings were resumed. The platform was occupied by nearly the same gentlemen as before.

On the motion of Mr. WILLIAM BROWN, Mr. COLQUHOUN, of Killermont, was called to the chair amid the cheers of the meeting.

The Rev. Mr. LORIMER opened the meeting with prayer.

The Rev. Mr. BUCHANAN rose and said—The resolution on which I have been requested to offer a few observations to this meeting,

springs naturally and necessarily out of those which preceded it. Having affirmed the existence of an alarming danger—having distinctly ascertained the character and working of the system from which that danger comes, the question among wise men must immediately arise—what in these circumstances shall we do? What in such an emergency does duty require? There are many in this audience who were old enough thirty years ago to participate in the feelings and the movements which a sense of national danger at that memorable period produced. The coasts of France, directly opposite to, and but three hours' sail distant from our own shores, were then bristling with arms. The storm of war, which had swept over and desolated so many of the continental kingdoms, was gathering together its elements of destruction, to discharge their collected thunders on the sacred soil of Britain. And what was the attitude which, in the face of this blackening tempest, our country's entire population assumed? As there must ever be in a land of freedom, there were then among them many and decided diversities of political opinion as to matters of internal legislation and government; there were questions and parties which divided society with their opposing and conflicting interests—there were all the usual contentions to which these various interests and sentiments unavoidably gave rise. But what was the effect instantaneously wrought on this variously divided people by the one feeling of a sense of danger to an object alike dear to them all—by a sense of danger to the unconquered liberty and independence of their common country? Did the party that had been worsted in any of the political contests of the time—did any of the sections of society, whose interests, as they might conceive, had in some social struggle been injured and overborne, for a moment entertain the base idea of indulging their discontent by courting a treacherous alliance with their country's deadliest and most formidable foe? Who does not know, on the contrary, how suddenly and simultaneously all these petty discords were forgotten? We are children of the same soil—we are members of the same national family—we are subjects of the same king—was the one absorbing consideration which filled every mind—which converted every mountain into a watch-tower, every citizen into a soldier, every field into a camp, and every town into a citadel—which banded an entire people into a defensive league, which the breath of the Lord, had He been against us, might indeed have dissolved, but from which the legions of France, led even by the warlike genius of Napoleon, turned back in despair.

Ought not the history of that period to dictate to us a lesson as to the conduct which becomes us now? True it is, the hosts that were then arrayed against us have fallen on other fields, and the tyrant who wielded, and wasted the earth with their destructive power, has long since been numbered with the dead. And casting their eyes around upon the nations, and seeing no harm anywhere lifted up against us, many may be ready to inquire where is the resemblance between the present time and the period from which you would exhort us to learn our duty? The question only reminds me how much less vigilant men are to detect a moral than a physical danger. And therefore, instead of giving it the direct and simple answer, which in other circumstances might suffice, I would meet it with another question addressed to those from whom the objection comes. I would ask, what was it that had made this country so worthy to be defended? What was it that had given to its inhabitants the chiefest of those blessings they were then so forward to guard? What was it that gained for them those sacred rights of property, of person, and of conscience, to maintain which against the despotism of an insolent invader they were so ready to hazard their lives? What was it that had made Britain the land of freedom, of honest industry, of noble enterprise, of social and domestic virtue, of contented and happy homes? Is there an individual within these walls who would for a moment hesitate to answer all these questions, by pointing to the Protestantism of the Bible? For never till the principles of that record of eternal truth had been installed in their rightful supremacy in the guidance and government of human affairs, till they had become the very foundation of our King's throne, the basis of our legislation, the pervading and purifying spirit that should mould and master all our social and political institutions—never till the Lord Jesus Christ, the ruler among the kingdoms of the earth, had thus set his seal upon us as a nation, did we become truly *free*. If, then, Protestantism be at once the source and the security of our best national blessings, surely that which assails it, which threatens its injury or its overthrow, is the deadliest enemy to the peace and the prosperity of our country. It needs not the artillery to break the fortress' wall; if the cement which binds its masses together, be dissolved, its own weight will suffice to bring it to the ground. And let but Popery, aided by its infidel allies, succeed in its present audacious attempt to waste away the cementing principles of Protestantism, which have so long bound, into a wall of

adamant, the constitutional bulwarks of Britain, and then may they be inscribed with the melancholy—Ichabod, Ichabod,—for the glory will be departed.

No doubt there are many around us who profess that they can see no evidence of the danger to the Protestantism of this country, to which I have now referred. Even across the English Channel, they could readily discern the gleam of Napoleon's hundred thousand bayonets. But Apollyon with his "lying wonders and with all the deceivableness of unrighteousness," has taught Popery the tactics of a different and less ostentatious form of war. It was a profound knowledge at once of the true character of Popery and of that human nature, to which it is so cunningly adapted, that dictated the well-known observation of Knox—an observation, the justness of which, the events of the present time may well teach us to appreciate. "Rather than hear one mass said in Edinburgh," said that sagacious Reformer, "I would sooner see 20,000 soldiers of France or Spain, landed in any part of this kingdom, avowedly, and by force of arms, to attempt the restoration of Popish ascendancy." But though the keener-sighted guardians of Protestantism, who have had their eyes fastened on every step of its insidious progress, as

" With tract oblique

At first, as one who sought access, but feared  
To interrupt, sidelong it wrought its way,  
As when a ship, by skilful steersman wrought  
Nigh river's mouth, or foreland, where the wind  
Veers oft, as oft so steers, and shifts her sail ;"

Though I say, the keener-sighted guardians of Protestantism, who all along have been watching the covert and tortuous movements by which Popery has been long and incessantly advancing its schemes, would in vain have laboured to arrest the attention of this liberal age upon any one individual step of its progress,—surely that man must be wilfully blind who sees not, in its present accumulated strength, the evidence of an imperious necessity for that cordial union, and strenuous resistance on the part of all true-hearted Protestants, which the resolution I hold in my hand so strongly recommends. Its fifty seminaries, where, 40 years ago, there were but two—its nine colleges, where there were none—its five hundred places of worship in England and Scotland, in which, forty years ago, not twenty Popish chapels could be found—its nunnery, planted in the very seat of Knox's

ministry—its endowed nursery of the priests of Dens's Theology at Maynooth—its Bible dishonouring system of national education, maintained at an expense to the public funds of £50,000 a-year in Ireland—its forty members, banded under a desperate and daring leader in Parliament—its sacrilegious attempt to extinguish the light of the Gospel in eight hundred parishes of a country which is, every year, discharging its thousands of the victims of superstition upon our shores; if there be Protestants amongst us, whom not even all these things will suffice to convince that there is a great and growing danger impending over the principles they profess to hold, I must be forgiven for taking leave to question the soundness either of their understanding or of their faith.

If what I have now stated were insufficient to demonstrate the fact, that there is a Popish influence powerfully at work in the direction of this country's public affairs, permit me to mention one other circumstance that leaves no room to question it. It is well known that Ireland contains from 2 to 3,000,000 of persons who speak the Irish tongue. The Scriptures have been translated into this language, but they have never yet been possessed of a metrical version of the Psalms of David. They delight in song, but they have never heard, in their own tongue, the soothing and sanctifying songs of Zion. A desire to enrich them with such a blessing prompted two individuals, an Irishman and a Scotsman—Mr. Connellan, and the Rev. Dr. M'Leod, of Campsie, to engage in the laborious, but to them delightful, work, for it was a work of Christian love, of throwing the book of Psalms into Irish verse. After many days and nights of toil, they at length completed the undertaking; and anxious to have immediately conferred upon the poor Irish the gift they had been preparing for them, and supported with the enthusiastic testimonies, in favour of their noble design, of the heads of the Irish Protestant Church, and of all devoted lovers of God's word in Ireland, they hastened, a few weeks ago, to Government, and entreated that a small grant of the public money might be given to enable them to throw into instantaneous and general circulation, a volume that could not fail to be as oil poured on the dark and troubled waters of Ireland. And what does this audience think was the answer which, from Lord J. Russell, they received? This Government loudly and ostentatiously proclaims itself the friend of Ireland—the chosen redresser of its wrongs. Here then was an opportunity of really proving their concern for the true interests of that

people. But no—the grant would further the cause of Protestantism—the cause of the Bible—and it was refused—refused in language deficient even in the common courtesy of civilized life! They had given £300 a-year as a pension, a few weeks before, to Mr. Thomas Moore, the author of some works of poetry—much of it beautiful, but much also whose moral character and tendency are more than questionable; the author, too, of the *Memoirs of Captain Rock*, and of a treatise, entitled, “A Gentleman in search of a Religion, a search, which conducted by a Papist, ends, as might have been supposed, in Popery. They had £300 a-year for this Popish poet—but nothing to bestow upon an undertaking that was to comfort, and purify, and elevate the souls of the Irish peasantry, with the poetry of the living God! What man of common candour, or of common sense, can for a moment look at these things without finding himself forced to the conclusion, that the Government either will not, or dare not, support the Protestantism of Ireland. But Protestantism is the cause of freedom—the cause of reformation, and how can the political power which Popery has acquired be dangerous to their interests, seeing that the Popish party are just the very loudest and most clamorous of all the advocates of liberty, and the most uncompromising enemies of every possible abuse! He must be silly indeed whom such professions deceive.

We need not to go back into the recesses of past history—we have but to open our eyes and look around us on the world, to see that Popery can undertake to play any part in the drama of human politics that will most effectually advance its own ends. If we look at this moment to Spain, we shall find Popery leading on the armies of Don Carlos under the consecrated banner of the Blessed Virgin, “our Lady of Sorrows,” as general-in-chief, to re-establish despotism and the inquisition. If we turn to France, we shall discover this same Popery employing the eloquence of Chateaubriand, to throw the mask of a religious sentimentalism over the principles and the pretences of Charles X. and holding up the infidel party to detestation and abhorrence. And here, at home among ourselves, this very Popery—the instigator of ultra despotism in Spain—the mild and specious advocate of a legitimate and aristocratic, but constitutional monarchy in France—this Proteus comes forth as the very champion of the rights and liberties of the people! Surely we may well exclaim at such a spectacle. Is Saul also among the prophets! The disciples of Peter Dens, the

men who teach as a cardinal doctrine, a blind obedience to the priest—who deny to the private individual the right of interpreting for himself the word of God—who denounce us as heretics—who represent our very blood as for that reason tainted—who hold our goods as lawfully subject to confiscation, and our persons to exile, imprisonment, and death; these men must indeed be admirable and most trustworthy guardians of the rights and liberties of a Protestant people! I trust, then, I have succeeded in showing, that there is, at least, so much of an analogy between the well-known period to which at the outset I referred, and the times in which it is our present lot to live, as to furnish a sufficient reason for imitating the cordial union, and steadfast resistance, which, by the Divine blessing, proved the security of the former days. Britons were then found to merge all their minor and internal differences in the one common determination to defend their country. And will not Protestants combine now with a like single-hearted resolution to maintain and defend their religion. The call which the occasion now addresses to them is in the language of the Resolution which I hold in my hand.

“That it is the duty of all ranks of society, and all denominations of Christians, professing the true faith, and Protestant principles, to unite and occupy one common ground, for the prevention of Popish ascendancy, and for the maintainance of religious liberty and gospel truth.”

Could such a union be accomplished, formed, and maintained, in the spirit of the faith it is intended to guard, there would be nothing to fear. But the difficulties which stand in the way of such a union, remind us of a very painful truth, that while the adherents of a false religion, whatever be their personal character, are ever found faithful to its interests; those only of the adherents to the true religion, who have some personal conviction and experience of its value and its power, can be trusted to abide by its cause in the day of trial. As there are among the body of nominal Protestants many who are unbelievers in their hearts and lives, we do not expect nor desire their aid. There is a sympathy, however strange at first sight the statement may seem, between infidelity and superstition; but there is a positive antipathy between infidelity and the holy and humbling doctrines of Jesus. It does not surprise us, therefore, that such so-called Protestants, who in the British Parliament voted against the preamble of the Cholera-bill, because it recognized the hand of God as present in that fearful pestilence, should fraternise so readily with Popery, or that a Popish leader should go out of his way to do any of them

homage. But it will indeed surprise us, and fill us both with shame and sorrow, if Protestant Dissenters shall be found having any thing in common, when their religion is concerned, with the supporters of a system, which God himself, in his own word, has denounced as the "mystery of iniquity," as the "mother of the abominations of the earth." What would have been said of any political party in this country that should have been guilty of the infamy of holding communication with the leader of the French armies, and of aiding him in his schemes of conquest against their native land? If your minds can simply suggest the language in which history would have recorded the treacherous deed, you may as easily be able to tell whether it shall reserve a brighter page for those who, in the present struggle, not for country but for Christianity, shall be found to desert from the standard of those Bible principles they profess to hold; and, in order to gain a victory over their Protestant brethren of the establishment, shall court the alliance and aid the enterprise of Antichrist. It is with extreme reluctance and pain that I contemplate even the possibility of such a blow—surely the unkindest cut of all, being thus dealt to Protestantism in the house of its friends. But when I find such language as I am now about to read in the recognised organs of Voluntaryism, it were no charity, but mere blindness and folly, to deny the possibility of such an alliance, on every account a most unholv one, as I have now described.

In the third number of the *Edinburgh Voluntary Churchman*, published last week, there is contained an account of a social meeting of the Edinburgh Young Men's Voluntary Church Association, held lately in the Calton Convening Room of that city. Let me premise, however, before reading the disgraceful sentiments which these periodicals contain, that I am very far from holding the opinion that all who have embraced the voluntary principle, approve them. On the contrary, I firmly believe, they would be repudiated with abhorrence by many who have been seduced by specious argument into the supporting of the system of voluntaryism. And, moreover, I have strong conviction, that the exhibition of such sentiments as I am now about to read, in connection with the voluntary cause, will be one of the first things to open the eyes of many who have rashly joined it, and to show them the dangerous character of the course in which they have consented to run. At that meeting, the chair was taken by the Rev. Mr. Hally, of the Se session Church at Leith, the same gentleman



who said grace at the O'Connell dinner. In the course of the evening, we find it stated that the Rev. Mr. James Borwick, student of theology, addressed the meeting, and that, "having occasion to refer to the alleged union of Papists, he introduced the name of O'Connell, and in the loud and continued applause with which the name of the agitator was received, we had abundant evidence of the fact, that Scotland will not to be deceived by the canting 'no Popery' cry which is at present rung in our ears." Again, in the 29th number of the *Voluntary Church Magazine*, published in this city in the month of July last, after recording with triumph the fact of Mr. O'Connell's appearance at the annual meeting in London, of the "Protestant Association for the Protection of Civil and Religious Liberty," we find the following commentaries upon the sentiments he expressed—

"Is there not matter of gratification in the fact that the man who may be regarded as the virtual representative of seven millions of our fellow-subjects, and these seven millions Irish Roman Catholics, is an avowed Voluntary, and that in advocating the doctrines of Voluntaryism he professes to speak the sentiments of the Catholic body. If we wish to see our principles spreading and bringing under their sway, not individuals here and there, but immense masses of the people, must we not contemplate such a fact with a degree of exultation? Who does not see that the object may now be considered as accomplished, which, not many months ago, we spoke of as a desirable one, but which we were somewhat at a loss how to effect, namely, the bringing O'Connell and his seven millions to join the Voluntary standard? We contend that Popery is no longer Popery when it declares on the side of Voluntaryism, at least it is no longer the Popery that has 'made war with the saints and overcome them,' and that has stained the annals of the world with blood."

What, Sir, is it come to this, that Protestant Dissenters have learned to stigmatise the rising opposition to Popery as a "canting cry?" What will these gentlemen say of the cry upon the same subject, which is heard resounding against the same soul-destroying system, in accents of thunder from the word of God? What will they say of the language in which that word denounces those who associate with the "Beast," so as to receive his "mark," not to say in their forehead but even in their hands? "The same" it is written in the book of the Revelation, "shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation." But Popery, it seems is no longer Popery, when it declares on the side of Voluntaryism; "at least it is no longer the Popery that has made war with the saints, and stained the annals of the world with blood." Does the writer of the paragraph, containing so

monstrous a sentiment, not know—as my friend, the Rev. Mr. Gibson—now on this platform, has well and ably demonstrated, in his Tract entitled “The principle of the Voluntary Churches proved to be the real origin of Romish and Priestly Domination”—that Popery has been on the side of Voluntaryism from the very beginning of its history; and if he will not read history so as to learn so notorious a truth, let him just look at the present Voluntary Popery of Ireland, and then, if he dare, have the effrontery to tell us that it is no longer the Popery which makes war with the saints. Let him read the Rev. Mr. Stoney’s letter to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland—let him follow the ignorant and debased peasantry who listened to the fierce declamation of Dr. M’Hale, the Popish archbishop of Tuam, and his thirteen priests, denouncing the religion of Protestants as a thing that had its origin in hell, and its creed in hell—denouncing “the preaching of Protestants as bellish and devilish”—let him follow the excited and barbarous audience who listened to these ferocious denunciations, to the fair green of Castlebar, and let him there just look at his “Voluntary” Papists beating with clubs, in open day, in the presence of hundreds of on-lookers, the mangled head of a poor Protestant, who could be charged with nothing but the reading to his benighted countrymen of the word of God; and after he has witnessed this savage and brutal tragedy, let him tell us, if his tongue be not palsied with horror, that Popery, now that it is on the side of Voluntaryism, is no longer the Popery that makes war with the saints of God!

Do I mention these things to inflame your feelings against the perpetrators of those fearful crimes? God forbid. I speak of them only to deepen your abhorrence of a system which fosters and cherishes the passions from which those crimes proceed. It is not more a concern for the lives and liberties of Protestants, than for the perishing souls of the deluded Papists themselves, that dictates the movement in which I have this evening engaged. It is one charge which the Bible brings against the Papal system, that in her “was found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth.” But there is another and a more fearful charge recorded against her still—that in her were found the murdered “souls” of her own disciples. Last week witnessed the execution in this city of a wretched man who had been condemned to death for the crime of taking away the life of a fellow-creature. Some days after his awful sentence had been pronounced, I went to see him in his cell. He

was a Papist. On the table before him lay various books, one of which he had just been reading. I took it up and found it to be a Roman Catholic "Manual of Devotion," arranged by the ladies of the Convent of St. Ursula, at Cork. I opened it at the place where a leaf had been folded down, whether the mark was his own, or made for him by his priest, I cannot tell. The place contained a series of prayers. And what prayers were they, does this audience think, that were thus assigned for the meditation of this unhappy being, whose days—whose very hours were numbered, and who was in danger of going down to an ignominious grave with the guilt of murder on his soul? Were they prayers to the Lord Jesus, to Him who hath commanded us to receive it as a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that He died for sinners, even for the chief; to Him who spoke in accents of mercy to the thief upon the cross, who felt that he was justly in that condemnation, and had entreated that the Saviour who was dying with him would remember him when He came into his kingdom? The prayers to which he had been directed were the "seven prayers to the Virgin Mary,"—prayers to a sinful and helpless mortal like himself, in every one of which, the person who read was made to address himself to the Virgin,—to give utterance to this petition of undisguised idolatry, "grant me a right and practical devotion towards thyself!" Not wishing to irritate prejudices which there was no time to enlighten, I directed his attention, without any remark on what I had observed, to a copy of the Bible belonging to the jail, which also lay upon his table. I inquired if he had been reading it. He said he preferred his own books,—meaning his Roman Catholic Books of devotion. I observed, that whatever good might be in them, they were the writings of misinformed men like himself, and might therefore contain an intermixture of error, whereas the Bible, being the pure revelation of God, could contain nothing but pure and saving truth. The Bible, he said—and I pray you to think what character belongs to a church that could teach its poor blinded followers to entertain so monstrous and impious a delusion—"the Bible, was it not made out of these Roman Catholic books of ours?" From this position I found it impossible to move him. The Bible, though it was lying before him, had no authority or value in his eyes. His priest could leave it with him in perfect safety—and the uninquiring Protestants who entered his gloomy cell might ignorantly regard it as an evidence, that the Popish Church allows her disciples free access

to the word of God. But she had taken off from it the seal of its infallibility, and placed it on the lying oracles of the mystery of her own iniquity. And in the felt powerlessness of a human hand to remove the veil that was thick woven around the poor prisoner's heart, I could but commend him to Him who, in the beginning, commanded the light to shine out of darkness. But suffer me, ere I sit down to make another application of this truly affecting history. Suppose the crime of that wretched being to have been one of a less fearful kind—one in regard to which the mercy of the sovereign might have been allowed to mitigate the sentence of the judge; and that, rescued from the scaffold, he had been transported to the distant colony to which such convicts are usually conveyed—what would we think of the influence which must be directing a government that would send out after him a Popish Bishop, paid with £1000 a year of the public money—as has just been done—as if it were resolved to make sure not only of the slavery of his body, but of the continued slavery of his soul. Oh! I think that there is no difference among religious Protestants that can possibly prevent their combining to resist the ascendancy, and to make war against the doctrines, of a system which is nothing less than a Satanic conspiracy against the civil and religious liberties of men,—against both the temporal and eternal welfare of this fallen world. But if there be any of the Protestant name, who, yielding to the suggestions of earthly politics, and bent on the accomplishment, at whatever cost, and by whatever aid, of their own rash and ruinous enterprise—who will not join our banner, neither lift up with us a testimony against a system which the Lord God of heaven hath sworn to destroy;—let them tremble lest they fall under the terrible anathema which was pronounced of old,—“Curse ye Meroz—said the angel of the Lord—curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof; because they came not to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty!”—The Reverend gentleman resumed his seat amid the most deafening and long continued applause.

Mr. DENNISTOUN, of Dennistoun, seconded the motion in a few spirited remarks, and the resolution was passed unanimously.

\* The Rev. Mr. O'SULLIVAN then rose, and was received with the

---

\* The corrected copy of this speech having been mislaid, the Editors, rather than delay the publication, give, with slight corrections, the report which appeared in the *Scottish Guardian*, taken with the usual ability of the reporters for that excellent paper, but without any assistance from Doctor O'Sullivan.

most enthusiastic applause. The Rev. Gentleman said, Mr. Chairman I stand here at present under circumstances differing materially from any in which I ever found myself placed before. I came in the expectation that I might contribute my humble portion to awaken the feelings of Protestants here, by directing their attention to the dangers resulting from the present state of Popery. I have been at the same time embarrassed and rewarded, by listening to the strains of that eloquence, rich and varied, and agitating, which you have heard, which sufficiently proves to me that my mission has assumed a new character, and that I am here to congratulate you on having such ministers to advance the great cause we have at heart, rather than to be in the list myself. But I will avail myself of the privilege to have my name enrolled among them. It would gratify me to dwell on what I have heard, but I will not disturb the impression it must have produced by any feeble comments of mine. The resolution which I have been requested to move, is in the following words:—

“That an Association be established in this city, to be called the Glasgow Protestant Association, of which the objects shall be to hold meetings for the purpose of exposing to public view the errors and the pernicious tendency of the Romish system—to raise funds for printing and extensively diffusing information on the progress of Popery, and the duties to which in these days Protestants are called—and to promote the formation of Branch Societies in the country round. That this Association disclaims all identity with party ends and party interests, and presents a centre of union to all who have at heart the promotion of Protestant principles, and the subversion of Romish error.”

This is the resolution I have now the honour to propose; the regulations of the Association are such as I have read to you, its objects such. I believe from the luminous exposé of the errors and dangers of Popery which has already been laid before you, it is quite unnecessary for me to show you that the impending dangers to the Protestant cause, call for Protestant exertion. It is high time that Associations such as this should be formed, and I will constrain myself to believe that even now, at this advanced hour of our peril, it is not too late to form them. You know that there are some who take upon themselves to lecture very learnedly on the inconvenience of forming such Associations, that there are some whose fears are those of having their complacency disturbed, not of having their safety perilled. They say they are quite unnecessary, and that they are unsuitable to the

genius of our constitution, which does not recognise them favourably. They tell you too that the consequence will be, that if you form such Associations, others will form Associations of a contrary character, and that thus the seeds of dissension will be sown, and the peace of society marred. Now it is precisely because our constitution has not taken the proper notice of such societies already formed, dangerous in their nature and tendency, and widely disseminated over these realms, that it becomes our duty to confederate together.

If there were in existence, discovered by careful inquiry, a society which had for its object to effect the establishment of a dangerous and destructive power—a society each of whose members recognised in every one around him, who did not embrace the views he held, and maintain the principles he was bound to advance, an enemy—if there were a society which had no respect for the honour of the country, the welfare of the people, further than which was consistent with the secret designs this Association had in view—if it taught its members to regard every individual not within its pale as one over whom the curse of heaven hung—and whom heaven's delegated representatives on earth smote with a tremendous anathema—and if this society had its members bound together by a solemn and a secret oath to further its interests and objects, whatever these might be—will any sane man then tell me, that it is not the duty of the wise and virtuous to combine together, and to seek in combination the advantages which union gives, to avert the evils threatened by that awful and inscrutable conspiracy. I say that there are Irish Societies which constitute such a conspiracy—I say that Romish Societies constitute such a conspiracy—I say that the leading members of the Church of Rome, are bound by a dread and fearful vow, by an oath which they are constrained to swear to their bishop, and which one of their bishops has denied at a solemn examination before a Parliamentary Committee, to receive doctrines which compel them, under the penalty of excommunication on earth, and the sentence of eternal exclusion from heaven hereafter, to regard every living Protestant as one that bears about him a forfeit life, to be taken whenever it shall be convenient to exact the sacrifice; and I ask, if this be true, as who shall gainsay it—what man will deny that all Protestants should stand together, united in one firm phalanx, to resist the encroachments of so tremendous a confederacy?

It is far better, Sir, that I should take care to establish my charge by evidence, than that I should occupy your time by mere assertions.

The oath to which I allude as taken in the Church of Rome, is contained in the Creed of Pope Pius IV.; and I will just remind you, of what has been repeatedly pressed on your consideration, that every Popish priest, on being inducted into a benefice in his church, is bound to come before a bishop or his vicar-general to swear to that creed. (The Rev. Gentleman then read the oath of allegiance to his superiors taken by the Catholic clergy, which has been already repeatedly laid before the public.) I am not blaming the man who takes this oath for fulfilling with fidelity the obligations he incurs by it; but the same considerations which mark the man sworn by it as an object, it may be, of respectful commiseration, make it incumbent on all who would guard the faith, to see that he shall be carefully watched and manfully resisted. Every priest of the Romish Church swears that he does not believe that any man can be saved without the pale of his church. I know that excuses are made and distinctions assigned between what is called vincible and invincible ignorance; but at all events, the spirit of the oath applies to every individual in these countries, because every individual who has an opportunity of knowing what the church considers truth and who refuses to receive it is included among those who cannot be saved. What is the duty of the priest who swears that oath? He should assuredly labour with all his might to bring individuals within the pale of salvation. Now, when we recollect that he is bound by a distinct clause of the oath to the utmost of his power to execute the injunctions of his superiors—when we recollect that he is regarded by the great mass of his congregation as one who speaks with the authority and in the place of God—that he sits in the confessional thinking what he shall offer to the Lord as compensation for the sins of the people—that every penitent comes to the confessional with the full assurance, that unless he submit himself to his confessor, he can never be at peace on earth, or in heaven—that the individual whom the priest has at his feet will receive whatever he commands as though God had spoken it—that he must of necessity impart to many the same spirit by which he is himself possessed, must we not fear that thus the whole mass of the Roman Catholic community shall become prepared as a body to carry out and execute whatever designs the church proposes, and whatever counsels the priest enjoins them to adopt. The priests, with the various orders of regular clergy, Franciscans, Dominicans, Jesuits, and Carmelites, besides the various lay fraternities, amounting to several thousand

individuals, are bound by the same obligation. The next clause which I would consider is—

“ I likewise undoubtedly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and general councils; and I likewise reject, condemn, and anathematize all things contrary thereto; all things which the church has rejected, condemned, and anathematized.”

The former clause commands the priest to extend the interests of his church—this enjoins him to receive, without any doubt, the decrees and ordinances of canons and of general councils. The mass of the community are under obligations to obey as he directs; and the priest is bound, on the other hand, to receive his directions from the councils; and thus the councils of the old times, and the priests and people of modern days, are brought into a close alliance for the furtherance of the same grand purpose. The doctrine of these councils is briefly and generally this—(I mean that doctrine with which we are on this occasion, most concerned)—that the Popish hierarchy shall rank above the state, and prescribe to the state its duty—that if the government, at its command refuse to extirpate heretics from its dominions, the prince forfeits his right to reign—is to be considered as deposed from his throne, that his subjects are released from their allegiance, and that all princes who value the faith are required on to take up arms for the purpose of denuding him of his dominions, and establishing themselves masters of the land. Wherever heretics shall be found, they are to be bound in chains of iron, and reserved in dungeons for the judgment. And what is a heretic? One who turns away from God's word, and reposes faith in human devices? No; if any man shall dare without permission, to read God's blessed Scripture, and shall apply to his own soul's comfort a passage in his word, on which the Church of Rome has not written that it may be read—who, when God speaks in his own language, he will receive the word without waiting for poor puny man to corroborate it, that man is a heretic—is smitten with the blight of the anathema—shall have chains of iron bound upon him here, and be dismissed to an unhappy eternity hereafter.

These doctrines have been brought into fearful notoriety before the English people—a book has been discovered professing to afford to the Irish priests a safer guide than the Bible, in their theological studies. I will not now occupy your time by telling you what this book contains; but I will remind you, that, for their concern in publishing it a charge has been, for four months, ringing in the ears of



England, and reiterated against the bishops of the Church of Rome in Ireland; and notwithstanding that they have been dared by all they hold sacred to come forward and confront those who made the charge, with a dignified and manly denial; it is right that you should know, that the only manner in which they have answered this most grave accusation, is by attacking with gross and slanderous calumnies the men who preferred it. They have pried into all the secrecies of private life to discover one ground of complaint against the individuals who stood forward, and they have found none. They have assailed them with low ribaldry, and "jesting which is not convenient," which is unworthy of answer, and which only manifests the temper of the spirit which dictated it. We have offered to meet the priesthood either by members of their own body, or if they prefer it by deputy—we have conceded to them the privilege of searching through the length and breadth of the land, for those who might be able to undertake their defence—of having their discussion conducted either in public or private—we have proposed that each should select two English lawyers of eminence—that they should appoint, if they chose, Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Sheil, and that we, on our part, would confront them with Mr. McGhee and the humble individual who now addresses you. We would put our case and dependance to the issue—we would rely on Him who brings the truth to light, and leave it to be decided as a mere matter of evidence, by the legal gentlemen, on which side the truth lay. I never yet understood satisfactorily what was the reason that the Church of Rome in Ireland and England thus abandoned her cause. I did conceive that, if there were in it no feeling of religious faith, at least, a sense of personal honour, would force an answer from her.

Having, as I long rejoice to have had, many dear acquaintances in the Church of Rome—men for whose private honour I would myself stand forth and pledge my life and character—knowing as I do of men who give their names to her communion, but who are totally unacquainted with the doctrines she held; feeling that they must feel hurt, and farther having the assurance of some that they did feel wounded—I looked to see whether at length the bishops would not be ready to undertake their defence. We have been from time to time grievously misrepresented; and may I request that the gentlemen of the press, who have already shown themselves so far above all provincial competition by their accurate reports of these

proceedings, will take particular notice of what I am about to say; say; and if there be any individual in this assembly who feels himself aggrieved by my words, I pray him to remember that we are demonstrating unwelcome truths—not inventing charges against them. Why did Dr. Murray not appear on the platform to meet us, in the face of the people of England? Dr. Murray stated, "It is true we have selected the questions of our conference from Dens—it was actually necessary to do so"—perhaps because the Roman Catholics, having sworn that they did not hold such abominable doctrines as those imputed to them—having sworn that they did not think it right to put men to death for disbelief of their own religious opinions, it was right that the Romish priests should be fortified with the arguments by virtue of which these doctrines were annulled and suppressed.

Suppose Dr. Murray here, and that he says, as he has said before, I admit Dens was the book from which the questions were selected—my proposal would be, will you have the goodness to state, for the information of this assembly, what is the book of authority in which we can find the answers? If he named a book bearing no mark of authority but that of a private individual, I would point to his answer, that no individual was a prominent authority in the church. I would take up the book of Dens, and say, the twenty-three Romish bishops have agreed that the Theology of Dens is the best and safest guide for their inferior clergy, and I call on you to state what is the book approved by twenty-three Romish bishops, answering the questions taken from Dens, and answering in a less intolerant spirit? I state as the reason why Dr. Murray and Mr. O'Connell, with their coadjutors, shrunk from a public discussion, that were we to seek for the answers to his abominable questions in other Roman Catholic books, there is none which we should not find to answer those questions in a manner more abominable, more flagitious, more revolting to common sense, and offensive to human feeling, than even the pestilent Theology of Dens. We are told to turn from the books which contain these doctrines, to the people who exhibit their influence and character in the tenor of their lives. This, it is said, is the true mode of ascertaining what is the real tendency of the faith of Rome. But when we have looked at a whole people organized and confederated against the law, we are told that this is not a fair instance to adduce, that a people harrassed by continued annoyances will vent their indignant feelings in those acts of perjury and murder which have lately become so

common. Oh! they say, there is less of plunder and murder in other countries, in short, every thing admirable is exhibited by the church everywhere but where we look. I recollect that there was a series of miracles performing in Ireland some years ago by Prince Hohenloe, and that some of my friends took great pains to find out whether there was any truth in the reports of them. They heard that a most extraordinary miracle had been performed in a certain village—thither they repaired, and were referred to the next, but when they arrived at that, they were told to go a stage further; but the further they advanced, they found the miracle the more distant, receding like the horizon before them. This is somewhat similar to the case of the Venerable Bede, a man held in deserved reverence by more than Roman Catholics. He relates the occurrence of miracles in every convent of England except his own, though his own was not the least respected. He had heard of these miracles, and narrated them as undoubted facts, but he was too honest a man to relate of in his own convent what had never occurred—so that one would suppose the miracle performed where Bede himself resided was its being free from any miracle whatever.

It has been observed by a wise statesman, that there is no part of the world in which Popery has prevailed in which it is not controlled with more jealous vigilance than this—none in which the legislature or the monarch has not endeavoured to guard against the encroachments of Papal despotism. Freedom has been found incompatible with Popery. Your trial by jury, your extended system of representation, your law, all those grand privileges which constitute the glory of England, and make the independence of England descend in a regular and beautiful chain of ranks, from the monarch on the throne to the humblest peasant—all these are superseded by the iron tyranny of Popery. In every Popish country the deficiency of religious influence, and the want of a religious education, is necessarily made up by a terrible increase in the severity of human enactments.

We ought to keep in mind that Roman Catholic monarchs will not allow Popery to be established in their dominions, unless subject to such modifications as disarm it for the time of its terrors. It should not be forgotten also, that Popery possesses within itself a principle by which it can accommodate itself to circumstances. It marks out a threefold distinction between the modes in which it wishes its canons observed. It commands, it indulges, it tolerates. It commands its canons to be

enforced—it indulges that, in particular circumstances, they be relaxed; it tolerates, that where there would be great inconvenience, the violation of them should not be punished. When the people are vigilant it would seem to slumber, but when the people are slumbering, it will be widely and fearfully awake.

After some further observations relative to the conduct of the thirty-five Irish Catholic members of Parliament, who voted for the appropriation clause, which the great length to which our report has already extended, reluctantly compels us to omit; Mr. O'Sullivan proceeded to remark on the desire of the Irish church to supply the want of a vernacular translation of the Scriptures to the Irish people, and stated that, notwithstanding the loudly vaunted patriotism and exertions of the Romish priests, the only Irish version of the Bible, of the least authority, was that of Bishop Bedel, and that the Romish clergy had neither printed nor circulated a single copy. The Rev. Gentleman then recapitulated the substance of the Rev. Michael Seymour's letter to the Bishop of London, and commented on its shocking details with the most impassioned eloquence. After a series of observations on the national schools of Ireland, and other topics, Mr. O'Sullivan said, in reference to the promptitude with which the association had been formed—You have chosen an honourable post, and you will not long be alone. When your beacon light is gleaming from place to place, and your rallying cry is rousing the spirit of the olden time, which is yet slumbering on your hill-sides—when it echoes from village to village, and from mountain to mountain, and from vale to vale, throughout your own beautiful land, it will come back to you with power; and when you are sounding an alarm from every watch-tower, oh! do not think it a light thing that you are sending a voice of encouragement over the waters which divide your country from mine! Do not think it a little thing that you are sending forth to England and to Ireland, to the east, to the west, and to the south, a voice of cheering and encouragement to desponding friends, and persecuted brethren—a voice, which when you lift up your banner here, will rouse to energy and courage as noble hearts as were ever banded together to support a just though a suffering cause. Nor think it little that your aspect of common care and concern will quell the felon purpose of many a coward heart, and subdue the spirit which would precipitate millions of infuriated savages on a foe unable to resist, but would no

more stand to contemplate with unblenching eye, and unquailing spirit, the aspect of aroused and awakened and marshalled Scotland, than it would meet in a fair field and on an open platform the men whom it had slandered and calumniated. (This allusion to a passage of Mr. O'Connell's letter called forth three rounds of enthusiastic applause.) I said that you would—I cannot say it—I cannot speak. (The Rev. Gentleman's voice here became so tremulous with emotion that he was obliged to pause to collect himself. The applause was renewed, and became absolutely deafening.)

You will enable persecuted Christian ministers to lay their heads upon the pillow, without the apprehension that a murderer stands at their gate; and you will cause that the tears which course down gentler faces, as they murmur prayers and blessings for their friends here, shall cease to be the tears of bitterness. (The applause which followed the conclusion of the Rev. Gentleman's speech beggars all description.)

Bailie MITCHELL, in a few remarks, seconded the resolution, which was then carried unanimously.

Rev. Mr. LORIMER moved the appointment of a committee of management, remarking that he would not lighten by the weight of a feather the powerful impression which must have been made on the mind of the meeting by the most eloquent address to which they had been listening. He had only to hope that its influence would be felt and responded to over the length and breadth of the land.

Mr. HENRY PAUL seconded the motion.

The CHAIRMAN then rose and said—And now, my friends, before we part, let us gather one short practical lesson from the impressive speeches which you have heard. Let us learn that the time is come when each man who is truly a Protestant should enrol himself as a member of a Protestant association. Let us set the example in Glasgow, and that example will, I trust, be speedily followed, till in every town, village, and hamlet of Scotland, there shall spring up associations to maintain our principles. It was so in former times, when Protestants were then few, and many were the Roman Catholics around them; and Protestants then associated themselves, and bound themselves in close fraternal union; and thus, between all parts of Scotland there arose a warm sympathy, and cordial correspondence, and the men of Fife interchanged their resolutions with the men of

Ayrshire, and Ayrshire passed them on to Dumfries, and from the South they were speeded to the farthest North. Even so now let the thoughts and resolutions of Protestants be interchanged with these associations, that the word, and the signal, and the firm resolve, and the intrepid purpose, may be passed on from town to town, and from hamlet to hamlet, till every part of Scotland springs again in defence of her country's principles, and her country's God.

But there is a charge brought against these associations. They will lead us, it is said, into politics. Surely when the men of old followed the guiding pillar, they did not, I presume, inquire where it was to lead them; whether into the waste or the pathless wilderness, or across the torrent's roar, or to the shores of the restless sea;—enough to them that it was their shelter by day from the scorching heat—by night their cheering guide. Nor do we ask of that Protestant principle which we embrace and shall follow, where it may lead us, nor shall we stop to inquire. It may lead us into the waste, into that wilderness of blighting intrigues and unsocial passions which men call politics; but wherever it leads us, of this I am well assured—that it cannot lead us wrong. Lead us where it will, it will arm us with the like purpose to quit ourselves as Protestants, and in the midst of the roar of angry passions, to look as our guide to the maintenance of Protestant truth. Aye, but I hear it said, these associations will bring us into collision with Government, with his Majesty's present Ministers. What would you think when the eagle is about to spring from earth into its kindred skies, if the tribes of insects which dance their giddy mazes in mid-air, and play in the sunbeam—insects alive to-day and gone to-morrow—if they were to attempt to arrest the eagle's flight, because in its progress it would interfere with the courses of their giddy dance?—and when we grasp that principle which is high as the heaven and firm as the earth, which rises to the sky from which it comes, and spreads wide over the universe for which it lives, and resolve to follow it, and to rise with its strength—are we to be told that we must not commit ourselves to its guidance, because we shall run athwart the poor intrigues, and disturb and cross the petty purposes of these creatures of a day? If, indeed, they suppose that all this array of Scottish principle, and that all this mighty gathering of Scotchmen, of which we have the first rank to-day, but which will soon call behind it its many-marshalled hosts—that all this deep and concentrated mustering

is a confederacy against their powers—that we are forming this movement in order to hunt these men from their seat—if this is their notion, I pray them to correct it. Let them be at rest, they greatly over-rate the place they hold in our thoughts. We take no note of their plans—we have no thought of crossing them. Let the poor politicians follow out their petty movements—weave their little intrigues, and lose themselves in their mazes—then struggle for their objects—for place and for power, the Whig against the Tory, and the Tory against the Whig, and the Minister against the Opposition. We have no concern with them; but if they would know how they will array us against them, if they wish to learn how they will draw down on their own heads the concentrated energies of Scotland, let them but assail one principle, let them but lay their finger on that Protestant truth which we have taken into our hands, and which we will give up but with our lives, then will they learn for what purpose are these Protestant associations, and to what end they will be turned.

And is it not high time that these associations should be formed? They have been delayed too long. For want of them the spoiler has been at work, and politicians, for their paltry purposes, have laid their hands upon our Protestant principles. They have endowed a college for Popery—a college to train up the priests in those infamous doctrines. That was the work of a Tory ministry. They have endowed schools for Popery. That was the work of a Whig ministry. Schools of which they boast—I quote the words of their own commissioners, that they “rest not upon a Protestant principle”—“that they exclude the Bible from the course of daily instruction,—and that thus (I pray you to mark their own words) “they are preparing the children for those more strict religious exercises which it is the peculiar province of the ministers of religion to superintend, and for which stated times are set apart in each school.” It is, then, their boast, that by their system of education, they are preparing the Irish children, (I admit that they are preparing them well,) to be committed to the charge of those priests of superstition, who will train them in all the lessons of that infamous school—imbue them with all the passions which it expresses, until they cover Ireland with the crimes and misery, to which such passions lead. Yet are there at this moment 1300 schools in Ireland of this nature, which they have the boldness to call national schools—under the charge of 1300 priests, with an expenditure of

near £70,000 per annum. They propose, moreover, to erect 5,000 such schools, and to expend upon them £2,000,000 of the public money. Is it not high time that Protestants should associate ?

But more than this, not satisfied with devoting the public money to training Roman Catholic priests, and to train children to be Roman Catholics—they propose to overthrow the teaching of Protestant truth. There are now 3,000 priests who teach in Ireland the creed of darkness—there are about 3,000 Protestant ministers who teach the truths of the Bible. They leave the one number undiminished, but they propose to strike off a third of the other. The ministers of darkness they leave untouched, but they assail, and would expel the ministers of light. Now I say, that we care not through what channel the light be spread in Ireland. Protestant truth may be taught by the Episcopalian, or by the Presbyterian—by the minister in his pulpit, or by the humble Moravian. But we demand that it should be taught—that through some lips it should reach the peasant's ear—that, in the wildest mountain, in the lowest valley, in the farthest solitudes of Ireland, in its deepest darkness the glad message should be delivered and spread abroad ; and, when they propose to drive these accents away, and leave nothing but the hoarse and harsh sounds of Roman Catholic superstition, I ask you whether it is not full time that Protestants should bestir themselves,—that they should now be up and be doing ? I call, then, on all to unite with us. We invite the highest peer, we welcome the humblest peasant. To the peer we say, enrol yourself in our ranks ; proud though your honours may be, though the star and the coronet glitter on your escutcheon, we offer you a prouder honour here. There will your name be enrolled with the good and the great of past times—with the men who in dark and declining days stood firm for their faith, with Knox and Melville, the patriots of Scotland, and our martyred fathers. To be ranked with them is an honour higher than earthly courts can confer, one which will endure in imperishable records, when these have passed away, and the pomp of present pagantry been forgotten. But if you will not come, then to you, my countrymen, I turn to you of every class, and of every occupation. I commit this cause into your hands. They were the poor of former days, who fought for it, and who won it. It is your cause still. Take it and cherish it now, and rest assured that if it is a cause worthy to enroll among its defen-



ders the dignity and the wealth of Scotland, not the less is it worthy to draw to it that which is better than its wealth, the energy, and the faith, and the virtues of our countrymen.

On the motion of Mr. John Alston, an enthusiastic vote of thanks was given to the Chairman; and the Rev. Mr. Routledge having pronounced the benediction, the meeting was dismissed.

# GREAT PROTESTANT MEETING

HELD AT

## GREENOCK,

ON

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 10th, 1835.

---

[The following notice of this meeting the Editors extract from a report of the proceedings published at the time. They annex an abridged report of the substance of Dr. O'Sullivan's speech on the occasion, and give some extracts from it.]

The Protestant Meeting, which had for some time been looked forward to with intense interest by the people of Greenock, was not held on the evening of Friday, the 9th October (as advertised), in consequence of the detection of *several hundreds of forged tickets*, issued for the purpose of introducing into the church a body of individuals who had previously expressed their determination to disturb the meeting.

On Saturday, the 10th October, a large body of our respectable inhabitants were congregated at the entrance to the North Parish Church (Mr. Morren's), at nine a. m., from which time till the hour of meeting, numbers continued to assemble. At ten o'clock, the chair was taken by our highly respected Provost, James Watt, Esq., who was accompanied by the Rev. Mr. O'Sullivan and Captain Gordon.

Among the company and on the platform we observed the Rev. Dr. M'Farlan, Rev. Mr. Storie, (Roseneath) Rev. Messrs. Smith, Menies, Martin, Moscrip, Bonar, Dunn, Starke, Melville, and Muir, (Port-Glasgow) Bailies Ker, M'Fie, Stuart, and Stewart; Alex. Dunlop, Esq. (Keppoch) Major Brown, David Johnstone, Esq. (Port-Glasgow) Dr. Speirs, Collectors Saunders and Wharton, Messrs. Aytoun, Scott, Noble, R. D. Ker, Turner, Johnston, Angus, Williamson, Lindsay, Hart, Lusk, Denniston, and Stuart MacGoun.

The Rev. Dr. M'FARLAN having opened the meeting with an appropriate prayer, the Chairman read the regulations, and introduced to the audience the Rev. Mr. O'Sullivan.

Rev. Mr. O'SULLIVAN.—Before addressing myself to the subject which assembles us together, I beg leave to say a word, which the circumstances under which we meet seem to render expedient respecting myself. It is to remind the meeting that I am here in compliance with an earnest invitation, which I am entitled to consider as the invitation of those who have done me the honor to meet me. In this instance, as in all others, in which meetings have been held to receive statements respecting the disclosures made at Exeter Hall in the month of June, it has been my rule and practice never to obtrude myself on any assembly, but to be assured, by the character of the invitation I received, that there was a desire to hear my statements wherever I was requested to make them. Such are the circumstances under which I appear before you, and if, in the discharge of a duty, or, as I feel it, in the exercise of a privilege which you have confided to me, I am constrained to speak truths which may prove unacceptable to some who hear them, I trust it will be remembered that I have not volunteered them, that I have been invited here, and that all who are voluntarily present to receive me should regard themselves as parties to the invitation.

I undertake, however, to promise that if I must speak unpleasing truths, I will not aggravate the effect of them by undue harshness of expression. If the simple statements of fact I am to make have a character of severity, I cannot, in Christian sincerity, suppress any portion of my case for the sake of rendering it less repulsive. This, however, I can truly say, that whatever my feelings may be with respect to the system I shall have to describe, my feelings towards misguided individuals are as affectionate as they are faithful, and such as, I am confident, will protect me from the hazard of being betrayed into the vice of using unnecessarily harsh or irritating language. Having made this introduction, I beg to add that I do not at all deprecate from the assembly testimonies of disapprobation if I shall seem to have deserved them. My cause is of a nature to overpower all personal considerations. All I solicit for it is that you will grant me a dispassionate and impartial hearing.

Dr. O'Sullivan then noticed the false rumours which had been circulated respecting the character of the meeting, and showed their

incorrectness. After some observations on the rumour that it was proposed to hold an Orange meeting, and a vindication of the Orange society in Ireland, he said—But it is said, more generally, that our meeting is merely political. Nothing can be more untrue. You are assembled to receive statements respecting a system, which, we offer to prove, is in opposition to the word of God. Is that, necessarily, a political purpose? If we are insincere in our professions, let the insincerity be shown—if we are single-minded in making them, is it not more reasonable to distrust the politicians whom they offend than those who by speaking truth have incurred their displeasure? Or, to propose the question in another light, if politicians imagine that there is something irreconcilable between their principles and our statements, is it not more rational that they should reconsider their principles than that we should withhold or disguise truths which the best interests of man, even those which are inseparable from faith in the word of God, demand to have made known? (Cheers and hisses.) That is not a question which one would have thought called for disapprobation—that it should have provoked it in Protestant, Bible-loving, Scotland, is indeed a marvel. (A few hisses.) Whoever you are who thus vent your displeasure at a sentiment which assigns to the word of God a higher honour and respect than is due to man's political intentions or interests, I beseech of you to remember what you do—beware, lest, in expressing disapprobation which you design for a speaker, you are not guilty of condemning the sentiment he has uttered—guilty of blaspheming, one might almost say, that blessed word which conveys to you the hope of glory, and provoking the just judgment of the mighty Lord whose Scripture you make light of. Our great desire is that those holy Scriptures should continue free to man—and because we see gathering in the distance, and now, indeed, not in the distance, almost in our neighbourhood, notices of an organization which would in time reimpose the seals upon that blessed book and heavy fetters upon human intellect—which would set up a false and rancorous theology as a substitute for superseded Scripture, therefore are we assembled to discover the dangers especially to be feared, and to consult what are the Christian means by which hostile influences may be counteracted. If men say that meetings such as these, or for these purposes, are political, is not the inevitable conclusion this, that the politics of this world, in the judgment of those who impugn our proceedings, are contrary to God's word? If not—

if their political views are in accordance with Scripture—why should they be impatient at hearing the supremacy and the freedom of Scripture plainly asserted.

Another objection has been made, that our meetings are designed to serve the cause of the church establishment in Ireland, and to cover and conserve what are called its abuses. We do not wish to effect any thing by devices which shun the light. We desire to have every circumstance affecting our church made known. And I would ask whether we who boldly call attention to these subjects, or those who would stifle discussion respecting them are more entitled to the praise of sincerity? I would not willingly shield one abuse in our church. My desire is that the church and establishment should be put into the best condition for discharging its arduous duties. And if I thought it essential to the accomplishment of such an object, that the church should not only be delivered from abuses but should part with its possessions, I would consent to cast all away as freely as the mariner lightens his vessel from burden and incumbrance when the fury of the tempest is upon her. (Applause mingled with hissing.) I perceive that we have here some friends to the abuses of the Irish Church, who would not join me in the endeavour to correct them. (Laughter.)

But it is also asked of us—why, if you have no political design do you at this time prosecute a mission which seems to have for its object the exhibiting the Church of Rome in a light which may render it odious? I answer the question—because we have evidence irrefragable that the Romish Church in Ireland has recently avowed and taught those principles of intolerance and perfidy which constituted the opprobrium of that church in what were thought the darkest ages of her history. We had no reason to believe that she had ever effectually renounced them. We were taught to think indeed that they had been silently set aside—or that the spirit of an enlightened age had changed them. But we have now ascertained that these principles, odious and evil in speculation, flagitious and abominable if proposed as principles of action, have been set forth, we may affirm, with authority, for the government of Romish ecclesiastics in Ireland. And therefore we obey what seems to us a plain call of duty, and endeavour to expose the pernicious system of instruction which has been revealed to us.

The Rev. Speaker here recapitulated the circumstances already narrated, connected with Mr. M'Ghee's discovery of the Theology of Dens, and the uses to which it was applied in the Church of Rome. He contrasted the carefulness with which Romanism concealed her principles of intolerance, while seeking privileges, with her bold avowals of them, when she had obtained by dissimulation the power at which she aimed—descanted on the oath given by Roman Catholics as a proof that they entertained no secret hostility to the Protestant Church—and illustrated the respect felt by representatives and constituents for this engagement, by the anti-tithe warfare in which, Dr. O'Sullivan contended, the oath was broken. He read various questions from the Directory of Romish priests, and showed their probable effects in the disturbances which followed their adoption. He gave a statement of the offers on the part of Mr. M'Ghee to be confronted by any advocate of the Roman Catholic bishops—of his proposal to submit to examination before a committee, of which the member of most influence was Mr. O'Connell—of the refusal to have him examined; and, Dr. O'Sullivan concluded this part of his subject by asking—would it have been thought right or good, to refuse these statements to the people of Great Britain, because a committee of their representatives did not think it fitting to entertain them? Is that to be the modern notion of reform—that if your representatives are unwilling to disturb their repose by hearing evidence on subjects they think disagreeable—you, their constituents, are to be incapacitated for receiving the evidence they have thought proper to reject, or the witnesses who would have given it are precluded from the right, at your invitation, to appear before you? Is this reform?

It was not the species of reform which Mr. M'Ghee desired, or to which he held himself amenable. He called a public meeting in London, and made before it the statement which the Parliamentary Committee would not receive from him. Before this meeting he had invited the Roman Catholic bishops to appear in person or by their advocates. To Mr. O'Connell he addressed a similar invitation. Neither that learned person, nor the bishops, nor an advocate accredited to represent them, appeared. The charges against the church were affirmed. They were repeated at other meetings which followed in rapid succession after the first exposure made of papal iniquity—and now it may almost be said that knowledge on this subject has been disseminated all over the country.

After testing the doctrines he censured, by their effects, as exhibited in the conduct of the Irish people, whose natural dispositions Doctor O'Sullivan warmly praised, and whose delinquencies he charged upon the circumstances in which they were placed, he proceeded thus—

“Here you have on the one side a being naturally of generous and amiable dispositions grievously perverted, rendered cruel, vindictive, false—and on the other hand, you are shown that the religious system in which this abused being has been brought up is, in its principles, so constituted as to debase and pervert all who have not some strong protection against its influences. Education, habits of society, a strong sense of personal honour and personal advantage, may have saved many from debasement—but what, humanly speaking, is to protect your humbler brethren in Ireland? It is indeed a fearful thing when the religion, to which you should look for the correction and reform of sinful natures, is a religion in which the worst form of humanity sees its own likeness. What is the nature of unchanged unconverted man? Is it not earthly, sensual, devilish? Is the conversion and cure of such a nature to be found in a church which arrogates to itself the divine attribute—infallibility; and employs this blasphemous title for the purpose of recommending the enormities of Professor Dens? What other result could follow under such instruction than that which we mournfully contemplate? You see a fine people perverted, and you have the explanation in their debasing religion. You desire to judge the principles of a religion, speculatively pernicious, by seeing their effects—and you behold the fatal effects in the character of an abused and corrupted people.”

Dr. O'Sullivan concluded his address by an exhortation to the assembly faithfully to discharge the duty for which they had become answerable.

The report of the meeting adds that when the Rev. Speaker had sat down

ROGER AYTON, Esq. moved a vote of thanks to the Reverend Mr O'Sullivan for his noble exertions in behalf of the cause of Protestantism, which was carried by acclamation.

The Rev. Mr. STONE concluded the meeting with an impressive prayer.

The Rev. DR. M'FARLAN proposed that the thanks of this assembly be given to our respected provost for his conduct in the chair, after which the meeting dismissed.

# GREAT PROTESTANT MEETING

HELD AT

PERTH,

ON TUESDAY, THE 14<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER, 1835.

---

THE next meeting was held at Perth on Tuesday, October 14. The following notice of the meeting, extracted from the *Perth Constitutional*, of October 16, 1835, will show the nature and character of the opposition which the speakers had to encounter.

It is scarcely possible to express, in terms of adequate reprobation, the malignant spirit which was exhibited in the meeting held on Tuesday last in the Middle Church of this city, to hear Mr. Gordon and Mr. O'Sullivan on the present workings and doctrines of the Church of Rome. The peaceful members of the Establishment were deeply anxious to be made acquainted with what these distinguished individuals had elsewhere communicated with attractive eloquence, and they congregated accordingly. But a determination to excite disturbance, and interrupt the meeting's harmony, was formed by certain known characters of no high estimation in the upper quarter of the city. Accordingly, they sent forth hissing whenever the speakers stated what they disliked. The hissing was drowned, indeed, by the enthusiastic plaudits of the friends of the Establishment. But this did not prevent them from recurring to their serpent manifestation whenever they felt themselves fretted by the speakers' exposures. These persons were a Committee of United Secession Voluntaries, some of whom had the business under consideration at their prayer meeting on the previous evening, and they were joined by certain like-minded radical infidels. The first of the body who ventured on speech was a NOTORIOUSLY PURE and *pious* Seceder from Bridgend, of the name of Allan, (the north Secession Meeting-house knows full well what the word PURE implies.) He said something to Mr. O'Sullivan respecting the Church of England. But, upon receiving a remark or two from Mr. O'Sullivan, he immediately shrunk back and disappeared, to the no small amusement of those who were beside him. The next interruption which the speaker met with was from a United Secession minister of the name of Marshall, from Coupar Angus, son-in-law to the Rev. David Young. Having vociferated for some time the word *sophistry! sophistry!* he got upon the seat, and insisted on address-



ing the Chairman. He was reminded by the Chairman, that by thus interrupting the speaker to become himself a speaker, he was violating the rules of decency and good order."

Notwithstanding, however, the attempts at interruption, the proceedings of the meeting were not, in any respect, injuriously obstructed. The addresses of the speakers were heard throughout and were perhaps more profitably heard because of the interruptions which from time to time drew attention to the topics on which the so called Voluntaries insisted. "Captain Gordon\* and Mr. O'Sullivan, the report adds, for hours held the audience enraptured with delight.

Of Captain Gordon's speech, the Editors very much regret they have been unable to procure any report. The following notes are all that they can offer of Dr. O'Sullivan's.

"However unwilling I should have been to see the interest of our meeting diminished by the introduction of a topic which might at first view seem alien from the principle of the great cause we would uphold, I am not sorry, that the attempts to interrupt or distract my gallant friend, have called forth from him those able and pertinent observations by which we have all been instructed, and by which most of us have been most highly delighted. As a minister in the church which he has eloquently defended, it seems my duty, to follow, for a few moments, in the path where he has with so good success preceded me.

"When it was the object of the party in opposition to the church to exaggerate the amount of its revenues, the principle used to be freely conceded, that the portion of endowment which is called tithe was not a burden on the farmer, who had an allowance for it in his rent, or on the landed proprietor, who had the allowance in a reduced rate of purchase, or in an enlarged grant—the complaint was merely that there were vexations in the uncertainty which prevailed as to the amount of tithe, and that the endowments of the church were excessive. Now that the vexations attendant on the collection of tithe have been removed, and the delusion prevailing as to the extent of church property has been dispelled—now that the charge for tithe is a certain very small impost on property—a small acreable charge; and that it has been established, as you may see in Sir Robert Peel's unanswered and unanswerable speech, that the church in Ireland, even for its present

---

\* "The manners of the two speakers are remarkably different, and almost equally effective. The Officer gives a plain, downright, clear, and forcible statement of facts which needs not the foreign aid of ornament to make it impressive. The Clergyman," &c. &c.—*Perth Constitutional*.

purposes might more justly complain of deficient, than be accused of excessive, endowments, the warfare is changed, and it is complained of as the hardship, that Roman Catholics should pay for the maintenance of a religion they reject.

“This is a matter to which it is fitting that you should direct your attention—not as if you could be at any loss for proofs of the iniquitous fallacy of the pretence, but that you should be ready to disabuse others.

“The late abortive attempt at legislation for the church consisted of two parts—one was an enactment that landlords should pay the tithe and should re-let their lands tithe free. Another was that a portion of Protestant revenue should be handed over for the purposes of what would be Popish education. The friends of the church in both Houses of Parliament agreed that the former part of the act should pass—the clergy of Ireland had submitted to relinquish one fourth of their income in order that the change should be made to the general joy, and only to their detriment. The effect would have been, so far as the Roman Catholics were concerned, that they should not only remain exonerated from tithe, but that the very name should for ever cease—that, so long as existing contracts provided, they should have a deduction of a fourth from what they had conditioned to pay on account of tithe, and, when new contracts were made, tithe should no longer have existence. The conditions were not accepted—the party adverse to the church required that not only must property be sacrificed, but also, that church property must be transferred to what would have been the use of the Romish priests—that, in a word, the Protestant proprietary of Ireland, to whom, originally, grants of property had been made for the purpose of maintaining the Protestant religion, must submit to a tax imposed on them, for, it might be said, the exclusive benefit of Roman Catholics. It is strange that those who pretend to think Roman Catholics unjustly charged with tithes, on the alleged ground that they do not worship in the church which it endows, should forget or overlook the fact, that the injustice would be far more flagrant and direct, which should extort from a Protestant Church, or a Protestant proprietary, funds to which one or the other had an indefeasible right, and dedicate these funds to purposes of Popish education. If it be wrong to require that the Roman Catholic tenant shall observe the terms of his voluntary contract, and pay tithe to a Protestant minister—it is doubly wrong to require that a Protes-

tant Church or landlord, without having incurred any obligation, voluntarily, so to do, contrary indeed to the spirit of the engagement by which the property of either is held, shall pay tribute to maintain a system of Roman Catholic—an unscriptural system—of education.”

Here the speaker was interrupted by a variety of questions and noises. When silence was restored, he addressed himself to the questions put to him, and the objections by which his arguments had been disputed. He proposed some illustrations to exemplify his position. Among others he imagined the case of a newly conquered or a newly discovered country, and asked whether an adjustment of property which burdened grants of land with liabilities to the maintenance of a religious institution might not be held equitable and permanent.

“The Sovereign, or the State, in this country, where as yet there is no private property, regards the establishing a permanent religious ministration as an object of primary importance. To the particular form of worship which he would have set forth, the sovereign requires compulsorily of no man that he shall signify his approval. Even those upon whom he has conferred grants of property, he leaves free. He wishes all to be members of the church he most approves—but he does not compel their assent to it. They are free to embrace it or to choose any other—but it is indispensable to their acceptance of the grant that they make the required acknowledgment. This they are to make, not in return for services offered by the church, but as the condition on which they accept and retain the possessions bestowed on them. In short, the proprietor of the country, we will suppose, has made us an offer of certain lands for which the rent we are to pay is to be handed, not to the lord of the soil, but to the church which he has established. It is quite clear we would have the right and the power to accept or refuse the offer. If, for example, the establishment were such as we accounted injurious to man’s best interests or derogatory to God’s honor, we should perhaps account it not alone a right but a duty, to reject a grant accompanied by conditions of which conscience disapproved; but it is a truth which needs no advocacy, that all who accepted the grant rendered themselves liable to the conditions; and that if at any period subsequent to the acceptance, they found the conditions onerous, there was no honest means of obtaining a release except that of relinquishing the advantages with which they had been declared inseparably connected. The recognised proprietor has given

over to others the dominion of the soil. He has assigned it, as it were, to two descriptions of persons each owing to the other certain duties, the faithful performance of which constitutes the title of possession, and from which you would say, speaking naturally, there can be no release, unless by relinquishment of the possession, to which, on the non-observance of the conditions, title ceases. You are not assembled to determine on any such matter as I have imagined, but you are here to judge in a matter not altogether dissimilar. The authority which is recognised as having sovereign dominion over the soil of Ireland, is found to have made grants to a number of individuals in whose successors proprietorship is now vested, and who have been by the same authority from which their title is derived, subjected to a certain encumbrance. They are privileged to exercise dominion over the soil according to recognised conditions, one of which is the payment of a tenth part of the produce to a class of individuals, whose title to receive it is the same in origin and in justice with that of those whose possessions are thus encumbered. The Sovereign of Great Britain, by right of conquest, or by forfeiture, became possessed of authority to grant the soil of Ireland. His grants bestowed a right to the tenth of the produce on the ministers of that church whose rights, by his coronation oath, every Sovereign of England especially pledges himself to protect; and you are to judge whether there is reason or justice in the allegations or claims which demand that now that right should be taken away. The popular ground on which this confiscation is claimed is that the members of one church should not be compelled to support the ministers of another. I put it to your judgment whether any man who reflects upon the case I have laid before you could propose or could accept a plea like this. If an individual profess that he cannot contribute to the maintenance of the church established by the Sovereign from whose grant his whole property is derived, with what show of justice can he retain the possessions upon which a payment to the church was laid as a perpetual encumbrance?

“ Make the case your own. Suppose you had bestowed property on an individual of whom you required that he should give up a certain proportion of the revenues you gave to purposes which you had declared. If the purposes were as he thought evil, ought he accept the grant—if they were not evil, ought he refuse to do justice—but evil or good—would you or would any man account otherwise than dishonest and unthankful the equivocator who should first accept your

bounty with expressions of acknowledgment and with assurances that he would gladly fulfil the conditions of the grant; and when he had obtained his desire, should then withhold the contributions he was bound to make, on the false and unworthy pretext that he had no interest in the purposes for which they were intended? No interest in the purposes for which they were intended! If an excuse of this character were to be admitted what would be the result? If one favored by Royal bounty with a large estate, and burdened with no obligations save that of bestowing a portion of its revenues on the church which supreme power had established, shall justify his withholding the contribution on the ground that he does not worship in that church, would it not be the natural, consistent, inference, that none should hold property in the state save members of the established religion? It is a weak and absurd fallacy that he who pays tithe, in a country where religious toleration prevails, pays for the service which the church renders. The benefits of the church establishment are freely offered to him. His payment of tithe, instead of provoking him to anger as a payment for some service which he will not receive, should rather remind him that he has had a grant of, in Ireland, more than twenty times what he pays, while he renders no service in return to those who have been made his debtors. The tithe which a man pays is an exponent of twenty times the amount which he receives. The disbursement and the receipt have the same authority and the same guarantee. It is only to confused minds and consciences that tithe impost can appear an unjust or unrequited burden. But there are some to whom any species of payment, for any purpose, will seem an offence, such as the prudent and compassionate gentleman who when he heard that a property tax was to be laid on, uttered a piteous ejaculation and implored God to "have mercy on the men who had money." May I regard this part of the case settled, that the landed proprietor has no just reason to complain of an encumbrance which is a condition of his possessions. I scarcely think it necessary to prove, that it cannot be objected to, either, on the part of the tenant; especially in Ireland, where it is commuted for a fixed rate. The tenant has an abatement in his *rent* more than commensurate to the amount of tithe composition; and indeed now, there are very few instances in which he is required to make a payment of tithe, the landlord compounding for it and including it in the rent, or rather enlarging the rent to what it would have been had not consideration for the additional payment circumscribed it within narrower limits.

“But although neither landlord or tenant should consider himself aggrieved, yet still, the church may and ought to be deprived of her endowments, because the state can resume what the state gave, and the voluntary system is that which is most desirable. The state may resume what it has given? May it? And is it only a question of expediency what species of property, whether Ecclesiastical or lay, it shall choose to reclaim? No. Lay property is not subject to the liability. On what principles? It is entailed; or else the present proprietor has the right to choose his successor. Does this make a distinction? Does the greater extent of privilege infer of necessity a more effectual security? If you make a covenant for a term of years with a landlord in fee, and observe all the conditions of your engagement, have you less security for your limited term than he for the more extended. Who, if this were so, would purchase the precarious title at an exorbitant price, or make his folly manifest to all men by buildings raised, or machinery constructed, at an immense outlay of capital. But the case is not so. The security of rights is not measured by their extent, and there is no maxim of law which does not guard as carefully the life interest of him who has no power to name a successor and from whom no successor springs, as it does the more extended interest and prolonged anticipations of him whose cares may be, as it were, projected into the settlement of property to be enjoyed by a yet unborn posterity. I pass away from this topic. I have often inquired and never heard a sound and valid reason why the state may rightfully resume church property while it has no right to invade a layman's possessions.

“But the voluntary church system is the better? Why the Established Church is a voluntary church system. Is it required by the Apostles of this new doctrine that the support of the church *must be* precarious—that no endowments shall be voluntarily bestowed by which her ministers shall be protected from dependance on those whom it is desirable that they admonish with all plainness of speech? Do they require that no man shall make a donation or a bequest, or do they insist on having a power to frustrate a donor's or a testator's will, and divert his offering from the purpose to which he had devoted it? If so, theirs is surely not a *voluntary* system; and if they would allow every individual to follow the free bent of his inclination and to endow, as seemed good to him, the church which he preferred, why will they now call for the rescinding of grants voluntarily made in former days, or why debar the Sovereign or the state

from the free exercise of a right which they confess belongs to every individual in the country? What are the endowments of the church but grants voluntarily made for its support, and with what show of reason could any men take upon them to say that they will not interfere to prevent or misapply voluntary bequests or donations, while they make manifest the uncertainty and insecurity of such endowments in their effort to take away those which should be accounted inviolable? Would any man who desired to be esteemed of sane mind call that a *voluntary system*, which should indeed give you permission to grant a portion of your property for any particular purpose, but which, so soon as the grant was made, should claim to itself the right of diverting your bounty, without your approbation, from the purpose to which you had devoted it, to some object which you had never intended to promote? If this be a voluntary system why should not the *arbitrary voluntarings* be vested in the Sovereign, as well as in any irresponsible or unaccredited individual; and why should those voluntarily bestowed endowments which the Sovereign has sworn he will protect, be invaded and severed from the institution to which they were originally destined? In a word, why should we not claim for the voluntary donors of former days, whether Sovereigns or subjects, the same consideration as, in order to render a voluntary system consistent, should be secured to all who, whether in present or in past times, are found to have exercised freely their right to dispose of property to such good uses as seemed to them most advisable."

The above was the substance of part of Dr. O'Sullivan's discourse, spoken in reply to various questions, and amidst many interruptions. In one instance he maintained a species of dialogue with a voluntary disputant, in which he asked—

"Was it criminal to purchase seats in a place of worship for poor persons who could not otherwise procure them? The answer was—No.

"Was it criminal to engage the services of a minister for the poor by appointing to him a salary?—No.

Was it criminal to bequeath a legacy of money for such a purpose?—No.

Or, for one who had full power over landed property, was it criminal to burden his property with a charge for the maintenance of worship? If not, why should not the state be permitted to grant and secure endowments?

[The speaker was interrupted by clamour and cries of sophistry, but he persevered, and repeated his statements in the form in which they appear in this report.]

In the course of his address, Dr. O'Sullivan expostulated against

the junction of Protestant voluntaries with their Roman Catholic allies. He exposed the tenets of the Church of Rome, as they had been made manifest by the recent discovery of the theology which guided the secret conferences of the priests; and he remarked on the coincidence between the movements of the voluntaries in Scotland and the aggression of Roman Catholics on the Church Establishment in Ireland; the system of aggression having, in both instances, originated at about the same point of time. To prove this, he appealed to reports of the proceedings of disturbers called *Hurbers* in Ireland, and the open announcements of the voluntary party in Scotland, both adverse to the church establishment, and threatening the destruction of its vested rights. Independently of this proof of connection, Dr. O'Sullivan alleged that the connection of Voluntaries with Romanists was notorious, and he asked on what plea could it be justified?

“The Church of Rome professes voluntarism. Is this, said Dr. O'Sullivan, the plea? The Church of Rome a voluntary church! Happy ambiguity of language—the Church of Rome voluntary! How is her title proved? Is it because the force by which she compels assent to her decrees is the force of disunion in families, and cruel dissension in states—the force of lawless violence and of superstitious terror? Is it because her agents are such as these, that we are to call the Church of Rome voluntary? But surely, such as she is now, such she was in that day when she was denounced by some who now court her alliance—such, I mean, except in the crimes by which in latter times she has been distinguished, and in the power which crime has procured her. Has it become a title of honour to her—has it procured favour for her—that she has shown herself willing and able to strike a heavy blow at the Church of England—willing to wound, and magnificently regardless of the *sworn* obligation to forbear? Is it for this that some who smote her in days less evil than those on which we have fallen, are now seen gathered under her banner?”

---

[The Editors have omitted those parts of Dr. O'Sullivan's speech which had direct reference to the Romish Theology. Of the conclusion they have found no report. It was an allusion to the character and the successes of John Knox, (the meeting being held in a church peculiarly memorable for the momentous occasion in which he preached there,) and an exhortation to remember the principle for which he had been blessed in contending.]



# GREAT PROTESTANT MEETING

HELD AT

## ABERDEEN,

On FRIDAY, OCTOBER 16th, 1885.

---

Capt. GORDON and Dr. SULLIVAN left Perth to hold a meeting at Aberdeen, on Friday, October 16th. The proceedings of the meeting were noticed in the following manner in the *Aberdeen Journal*.

On Friday last, a public meeting of those friendly to the doctrines and principles of the Reformation was held in the North Church, for the purpose of hearing the Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan and Captain J. E. Gordon give explanations regarding the present condition of the Roman Catholic religion in Ireland, and of the duty of Protestants with regard to it. Patrick Bannerman, Esq., advocate, was called to the chair. On the platform, besides Mr. O'Sullivan and Captain Gordon, we observed the Rev. Drs. Thompson and Black, the Rev. Messrs. Murray, Foote, Gordon, Gray, Bryce, Simpson, Allan, M'Kenzie, Thom, Corbet, Thornburn, Aitken, and Primrose, and Messrs. Thompson, (of Banchory,) Webster, Annand, (Belmont,) M'Combie, and Farquhar.

The meeting having been opened by prayer by the Rev. Dr. Thompson of St. Clements, the Chairman briefly addressed them on the subject which had called them together.

Captain GORDON, then came forward, and after some remarks on the responsibility incurred by those who undertook the task in which he had engaged, he referred to the advertisement calling the meeting, and said that, when such an advertisement on such a subject was necessary in Scotland, when it had become necessary to call the attention of the people of Scotland to the character of Popery, surely there

was a great falling off from the principles of their forefathers. Yes! to the scandal of their religion—to the shame of their country—to the dishonouring of God—it had been a question, what Popery is—what that system of spiritual despotism is, against which their forefathers had struggled, while laying the foundations of civil and religious liberty. The voice was still ringing in his ears—he had heard it proclaimed in a British Senate, by a Prime Minister, that there was no essential difference between the doctrines of Protestants and the doctrines of Popery. When such things were said, surely it was time to meet and endeavour to ascertain whether or not there was not still in the country a longing attachment to the doctrines of the Reformation? On the question of what Popery is, he would not volunteer his own opinion; he would expound the nature of Popery not according to Protestant judges, but according to the Church of Rome herself. He would ask those who heard him to compare the creed of Pope Pius IV., not with the Scriptures, but with the Confession of Faith, or with the doctrines of the Church of England, or with the doctrines of any Protestant Church, and then say whether or not there was any difference. The first characteristic of the Church of Rome was, that she divested the Son of God of his authority, in order to enthrone a human being in his place—she substituted a human priest in the room of Christ, the Mediator. He would read to them the definition of the character and powers of a priest from the Catechism of the Council of Trent, as that was the manual of Roman Catholic clergymen, and there was no appeal from its authority. Captain Gordon then read an extract, which described the priest as standing in the place of God. Thus, he continued, when the priest declared that a man was freed from his sins, he did so not merely in a declarative way, but as a judge deciding on his own authority, what was sin and what was not, and what sins should be forgiven and what should not. Did not this amply fulfil the character given in Scripture of one taking possession of the temple of God, and setting himself above God? The Roman Catholic Church having thus changed the priesthood, it became necessary for them to change the law also. They all knew that the Bible was the law of Christianity, that it was the Protestant rule of faith. Now, what did Roman Catholics think of the Bible? He would refer them to the creed of Pope Pius IV., remarking that there was no Roman Catholic who did not, through his priest, subscribe to that creed.

One article of that creed pledges the Roman Catholics to receive the Bible according to the interpretation of the Church, thus introducing a new rule of faith, distinct from the Bible, and opposed to the Bible. The Catholic thus pledges himself to receive what he never saw—he pledges himself to receive the Scriptures according to the interpretation of the Church; which interpretation, however, is nowhere to be found. Thus God himself is not permitted to speak till the Church of Rome has first spoken. The Roman Catholic is not permitted to form an opinion on one sentence of Scripture, till the Church has first put her interpretation on it. Now he would assert fearlessly that there was not to be found on the face of the globe any interpretation of the Scriptures by the Church of Rome. The Church of Rome having thus changed the priesthood and changed the law, proceeded to set up the authority of tradition, and to cast the Scriptures into concealment. There is no such thing as a New Testament in the vulgar tongue, in Italy, or in Spain, or in Portugal; and in no country under heaven where the authority of the Church of Rome is undisturbed, does she permit such a thing to be sold in any Bookseller's shop. When men forget what Popery is, they forget the time when men were burned for reading the Bible. Where, again, the Church of Rome cannot snatch away the word of God, she opposes tradition to it in order to make it of none effect; she mutilates it, or she adds to it what suits her purpose. Wherever the Church of Rome had the power, she extinguished the light of the Gospel—she could not do so in Scotland; but in Ireland, where Egyptian darkness brooded over the land, she exerted all her authority to take away the Bible from the people. He granted that the Church of Rome made a show of printing and circulating editions of the Bible; but at such a price as to render them altogether inaccessible to the poor Irish peasant. Capt. Gordon then related a number of circumstances illustrative of the baneful effects which Popery had had on poor unhappy Ireland; the manner in which the Irish Catholics spent the Sabbath, even those of them for whom Popery had done all that she could do. Need we be surprised when hearing of the outrages which were committed against the Protestants in Ireland by these men, or that combinations and conspiracies were made against Protestantism. But surely it was matter of surprise and sorrow that men calling themselves Protestants, and a Legislature calling itself Protestant, should co-operate in such

designs. Of the Church of Ireland he would say, as a Scotchman, and as one who had no interest in that church, and he would not shrink from the proof of what he said, that there was not in Christendom a branch of the Church of Christ more zealous in fulfilling their obligations to Christianity and to Protestantism than the Church of Ireland. When negligent, they were free from persecution, but now that they are standing up to discharge their duty, they have drawn down on themselves all the rage of their enemies—"this is the head and front of her offending." Dr. Doyle accounts for the origin of the tithe war from the circumstance that the ministers of the Irish Church were becoming too earnest in patronizing Bible Societies and Tract Societies. Then arose the war against the church—then bills for appropriating the church revenues to secular purposes, were brought into Parliament—then was the Irish Church exposed to persecution from every point of the compass. Ought it not to be a subject of concern to Protestants that men going out with their lives in their hands for the purpose of saving souls, should thus be persecuted? We heard much about liberty, but where is the liberty of the Protestant, when we hear of a clergyman having his brains knocked out on the roadside—when a clergyman is murdered in the midst of his own family—when even the humble Scripture-reader is waylaid and assassinated—when those who assert Protestant liberty are attacked in the public squares, and have their brains beat out—when under the Sabbath sun a man is murdered, and the priest, going up to his dead body, takes the book from his pocket and says, "Ah! the judgment of God is come upon him!" After referring to the Government resolution, Capt. Gordon asked if they were thus to set a bounty upon the murder of Protestants? for if there were now above fifty protestants in a parish, it would soon be seen that the number would not long continue above fifty. Capt. Gordon then concluded, by earnestly exhorting the meeting to come forward in behalf of their Protestant brethren.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN then addressed the meeting. He began by expressing his gratitude to the people of this city for the kind feeling they had manifested towards the Protestants of Ireland. He then referred to the declaration of the Synod of this place, on the subject of the Irish Church, and made a feeling allusion to the kindness which he had received from the Archbishop to whom the Synod's address had been forwarded. The distress in which the Irish Church

was at present plunged, had drawn on her the admiration even of her adversaries: her highest praises have been won from those who were prepared to cut her down. Those who knew her not in her time of prosperity, have, in her days of trouble and rebuke, ranged themselves amongst the most honourable and generous of her defenders. The question now to be asked was not—"Shall the sufferings of the Protestant church be terminated or prolonged?" but "Shall Protestantism or Popery become the established religion of Ireland?" Already Popery was partially recognised as such, in the national system of education in Ireland. It was said by some, that all that was wished for, in the measures proposed regarding the Irish Church, was a sound and judicious reform of that Establishment, and that the proposal of the legislature was intended to strengthen the Church. If this had been said by those whose predictions in times past had been fulfilled—by those whose promises had been kept—then he would say, believe *them*, and reject what *we* tell you. But if this is said by those whose predictions have been falsified by the event—whose promises have been broken—then listen to us, and reject what is stated by those who wish to pull down the Establishment. Mr. O'Sullivan then referred to the promises which were made by those who supported the Catholic claims. They said that, if their claims were granted, a strong objection to the Church Establishment would be taken away, and her merits would be viewed calmly, and without prejudice. These arguments prevailed, and Catholic emancipation was granted; but not one year had passed over since that measure was granted, without some new affront being offered to the Church,—and now a proposal of a most pernicious nature is brought forward, because the Church has failed of converting her enemies! He believed that the members of the Irish Church were anxious for a fair and useful reform of such abuses as might be found in her; But the measure of Government, if passed, would render such a reform impossible. He admitted that the revenues of the Irish Church were not at present well or wisely distributed; but it had been abundantly shown in the speech of Sir Robert Peel which had never been answered, that ~~these~~ revenues, so far from being redundant, are not commensurate to the wants of the Church. Mr. O'Sullivan then entered into an explanation of the circumstances which, about a hundred years ago, led to the union of parishes under one rector, in order to afford him a sufficient mainte-

nance, and explained the causes which had made the income of such united parishes come to be so valuable about the end of last century. He then showed that the bishops were labouring to break up these unions, and to give to every parish its own rector. From the method in which the Government plan would work, he showed that such a reformation as this would be impracticable. What was the time chosen for bringing forward this scheme? Not when complaints might be made of the inactivity of the clergy, but at a time when ministers of the Church of Ireland were extorting the praises even of her enemies. On this subject he would refer them to the speeches made in Parliament by men from Ireland, and England, and Scotland; for Ireland, he would refer them to the speeches of Lord Plunkett—for England, to the speeches of Lord Melbourne and Lord Brougham—and for Scotland, to the speeches of Lord Glenelg. The cause of the warfare against the Church of Ireland was, that the clergy had begun to signalise themselves by their zeal in making converts—by their efforts to emancipate the souls of men. The warfare carried on by the enemies of the Church has been double. In Ireland, it has been carried on with the assistance of the midnight incendiary, and the man of blood; and in the legislature of Great Britain, it has been carried on with the assistance of men who have broken the oaths by which they were pledged not to disturb the Church. It was easy to see the advantages which the Church of Rome would gain by suppressing the light of the holy Scriptures. The priests might then take away the humble minister of God, whose house was the depositary of the Bible of truth—to whom, late at night, and before light has broke in on the morning, men have come by stealth to obtain from him the word of God. He would now show them what was the religion that was to be put in the place of Protestantism. He then referred them to Dens's Theology, and showed that this work had been published in Ireland, under the sanction of the Catholic bishops. He mentioned the different challenges which had been given to the Catholic body by Mr. M'Ghee, to come forward and defend themselves from this charge. Mr. M'Ghee had challenged the bishops—he had challenged Mr. O'Connell—he had challenged Mr. Wood, secretary to Dr. Murray—he had challenged all these to come forward, but in every instance the challenge had been refused. Mr. O'Sullivan then showed that the work of Dens was used as a conference book by the Catholic clergy. He then gave

some instances of the questions proposed in Dens' book, in order to show the character of the work. He quoted the answers to the questions concerning the reading of the holy Scriptures. He then went on to show that the Church of Rome, though professing to be infallible, had never made use of her infallibility in rendering the Scriptures accessible to the people. The Catholic clergy called on the people not to read the Scriptures until the Church had interpreted them, and until this day the Church has given no interpretation, for which she would be held responsible, of the Scriptures. Mr. O'Sullivan then analysed the qualification under which, in the creed of Pope Pius IV., a Catholic says that he receives the Scriptures; and showed that, with this qualification, the proposition amounted to a rejection of the Scriptures altogether. He then proceeded to the doctrine of Persecution, as laid down in Dens' work. The people were to look on the priest as in the place of God, and to obey him implicitly. Considering these things, was it to be wondered at that men were struck down in the broad light of noon—that families were wrapped in sudden conflagration—that the law was set at defiance—and that, if any individual were hardy enough to point out the man of blood, that individual was marked out for vengeance, and his name stigmatised to his latest posterity. Mr. O'Sullivan attributed this state of things to the influence of the Roman Catholic Church; and asked if it was not a duty which every man owed to God and to his own conscience, to make the character of that Church more and more known to the nation. There were many in Ireland, he said, who in their hearts professed Protestantism, and who in the recesses of their houses kept the blessed word of God, who yet outwardly acknowledged the doctrines of the Church of Rome, lest, if they shook off the yoke, they should fall under the hand of the assassin. Let, then, the universal cry be raised from every part of the land, that no base and tyrannical Church shall prevent conscience from being free. Mr. O'Sullivan then made an eloquent appeal to the people of Scotland in behalf of the Irish Church. "You, men of Scotland, have had many honours conferred on you. You are honoured in being descended from men who in former years testified against Popery—you are descended from ancestors who were valiant for the faith. With this honour a great responsibility is connected: the old times will rise up in judgment against

you, if you are not worthy descendants of your forefathers—your indifference will be urged as an argument against the truth of what we say. It will be said, if this Church of Rome be so perfidious—such an enemy of God—such a tyrant over conscience, would Scotland allow it to continue—would the descendants of those men who of old stood up in support of conscience—would they continue supine, while so many were groaning under this despotism?" Suppose it were only now projected that Popery should be established in Ireland, would you not resist such an evil, and withstand the setting up of such idolatry?" When the persecuted Protestants were compelled to seek the shelter of the place of tombs, and found that they were slaughtered on the graves of their ancestors—when men who wished to retract the errors of Popery were assassinated in open day—what more could he say, to show that no age in history would be found more fruitful of the blood of martyrs than the present. Mr. O'Sullivan then again appealed to the sympathies of the people of Scotland for aid to the cause of the Irish Church, and concluded amidst the applause of the meeting.

The Rev. Mr. FOOTE, in moving the thanks of the meeting to Mr. O'Sullivan and Captain Gordon, after eulogizing the eloquent and 'spirit-stirring manner in which these gentlemen had addressed the meeting, begged, for his own part, and as bound in duty to himself, to allude to three points on which he would not wish to be misrepresented. Mr. Foote then stated, that in appearing on this platform, he did not wish to identify himself with any political party; but he must oppose himself to any measures against Protestantism, come from whom they may. The next point on which he wished to guard himself, was, that in appearing there he did not sacrifice his principles as a member of the Church of Scotland; and on this subject he referred to the interest which the Church of Scotland, in former times, took in the cause of the Irish Church. The third point on which he wished not to be misunderstood was, that in taking part in the business of this meeting they were not to be thought as desirous of retaining any abuses which might be found to exist in the Irish Church. Mr. Foote then alluded to some things in that church which required reformation, and among other things, to pluralities and non-residence. He then concluded by moving the cordial thanks of the meeting to Mr. O'Sullivan and Captain Gordon, for the information



which they had given to all assembled; and begged also at the same time to communicate to them the expression of the sympathy which the meeting felt towards the Church of Ireland.

Mr. THORBURN said he had great pleasure in seconding the motion. At that late hour of the meeting he thought it would be a work of supererogation, even if he were qualified to speak on the subject, to add much to what had been already so well said; but he must mention one or two points in addition to those that had been brought forward by Mr. Foote. They were here, he would say, neither as Tories, nor as Whigs, nor as Radicals, but as a new party in the state—a party, determined to support the interests of Protestantism; and they would hail with gratitude any measure which tended to promote the interests of the Protestant religion in the empire; and they would meet with hostility any measure which was calculated to shake the bulwarks of that religion which they believed to be fitted, by the will of God, to promote the best interests of mankind. Mr. Thorburn then adverted to the charge made against the Protestants of the present day, that they were acting in opposition to the cause of civil liberty. There was not one of them who was not liable to be met with this accusation, and on this point he wished to say a few words. It was said that the cause of civil liberty was as warmly advocated by the Church of Rome, at the present time, as ever it had been by Protestants; and a missionary had been sent over the country by the Catholics to teach the people the principles of civil liberty. In answer to all this, he would maintain that the Church of Rome had always been opposed to civil liberty, and had always exercised civil and ecclesiastical tyranny; and to prove this, he would bid them look to the stream of time, as it flowed on to the age of the reformation, and he would ask if it was not mingled with the purple colour of blood, shed by that church, which the Scriptures have described as drunk with the blood of the saints? He would defy any Roman Catholic to deny this. It was true that, at the time of the reformation, men took the Bible as their guide, who did not understand its spirit, and in whom something of Popery was still adhering—it was true that some Protestants acted as the Papists had done; but since the reformation had been established, wherever Protestantism has prevailed, there civil liberty, and peace, and order, and the rights of individuals, have been maintained. Can this be said of the Church of Rome? It can be said of Roman Catholics where they have been mingled with Protestants, as in England

and Scotland, and in Ireland where Protestantism was supreme; but can it be said of Popery in Italy, where, in the seventeenth century, the blood of Protestants was profusely shed? He would repeat the words of an immortal poet on this subject—words which fearfully applied to the present state of Ireland. (Mr. Thorburn here read the eloquent and thrilling sonnet of Milton—the xviii. in the common editions—on the massacre in Piedmont—

“Avenge, O Lord, thy slaughtered saints, whose bones, &c.”)

This was the language of our immortal poet towards the Church of Rome, in the seventeenth century; and from the details which they had heard that day, and from the history of Ireland, they knew that persecution was still part and parcel of Popery, and that persecution would not cease in Ireland, until the religion of Christ had gained the ascendancy; and that not till then could they expect that prosperity and good government, and the decencies of life and industry, would be known in that land. They had heard of a judgment being said to fall on a man who dared to read the word of God; but they had likewise heard of the judgment which befel him who lifted up his hand to number the people—and what judgment would now come on those who raised their hands on the people of God to number them? This was not the time for them to sit quietly under their own vine and their own fig-tree, when the people of God were held up as a spectacle of reproach on the earth. When the great enemy was overthrown, then they could settle their minor differences with the members of the Protestant body; but they were now engaged in too solemn a warfare, too stern a strife, to suffer them to contemplate these differences. Mr. Thorburn concluded by seconding, with deep gratitude, the motion made by Mr. Foote for a vote of thanks to the gentlemen who had addressed the meeting that day.

“May they go forth in the name of God, and may a spirit of dependance on his grace go along with them; and in all their controversies, and in all their labours, may they give the glory to God; and if they obtain the victory, may they feel that in His strength it has been obtained.”

The Rev. A. L. GORDON, after some remarks, moved a vote of thanks to the Chairman, which was unanimously carried; and the meeting broke up about four o'clock, having lasted about four hours.

The next meeting was held at Forres, on the evening of Saturday, October 17. Captain Gordon and Dr. O'Sullivan both addressed a crowded auditory. No interruption was offered, and the statements made, consisted, accordingly, of exposures of the doctrines of the Church of Rome, illustrated by evidence furnished by the condition and circumstances of those countries in which Romanism could be seen in action. It does not appear that the proceedings at the meeting were reported

---

The last meetings on this occasion in Scotland were held at Inverness, on Tuesday morning and Wednesday evening, October 20, and 21. After the last of these, Dr. O'Sullivan returned to London for the purpose of attending a meeting at Birmingham, at that time fixed, he believed, for November 1. Captain Gordon, after Dr. O'Sullivan's departure, addressed various crowded and attentive auditories in the neighbourhood of Inverness—defended the conduct of himself and his friends—by his speeches and in the press—and assisted in forming various Protestant Associations. The Editors have not procured reports of any of these proceedings—nor of the meetings at Inverness, at which some eminent divines in the Church of Scotland, and some lay gentlemen spoke with much eloquence and effect.

After having concluded his tour in Scotland, Dr. O'Sullivan thought it proper to notice a charge made against him by Dr. Murray. The following correspondence was the result. It is given, not in the order of the dates, but as it appeared in a pamphlet published at the time. His direct correspondence with Dr. Murray, Dr. O'Sullivan did not think himself at liberty, without permission, to make public; but, having taken measures to procure permission, found that he had been unnecessarily scrupulous, Dr. Murray it would seem having published it. The pamphlet, of which the Editors avail themselves, is entitled—

## CORRESPONDENCE

OF

THE REV. MORTIMER O'SULLIVAN WITH DR. MURRAY.

---

\* This letter, although it has been already published in the correspondence of Mr. M'Ghee with Dr. Murray, is here repeated for the convenience of immediate reference, the letters by which it is followed having arisen out of it.

### “ CALUMNIES AGAINST THE CATHOLICS.

“ TO THE EDITOR OF THE MORNING CHRONICLE. .

“ SIR,—In the *Worcester Journal* of the 10th instant, I read with unspeakable astonishment the following words, said to have been addressed to a public meeting by the Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan :—

“ ‘ In 1825 Dr. Murray was examined before a Parliamentary Committee, and he was asked whether the Church of Rome gave liberty to her members to read the Bible without notes? To which he answered—No. He was then asked whether the church had provided its members with a Bible with notes? To which he replied—No. So that, up to that year, the Church of Rome had not allowed her members to learn the word of God, either with or without interpretation.’

“ Now, this statement is not only untrue, but Mr. O'Sullivan knows that it is untrue. Mr. O'Sullivan was himself examined before the same committee to which he alludes; he had access to the evidence which I then gave; indeed he seems to speak from his own knowledge, for he pretends to quote my very words.

“ Now just take the trouble of comparing this statement with the evidence really given on the 17th of May, 1825, and printed by the authority of the House of Commons.

---

\* The notices and observations in the pamphlet are reprinted here.

“ After expressing my disapproval of the circulation of the Scriptures without some notes, for the reason which I then stated, the following questions were put, and replied to by the subjoined answers :—

“ ‘ Have any considerable number of editions of the Roman Catholic version of the Scriptures been published in Ireland under Roman Catholic authority?—Very many editions within the last twenty years.

“ ‘ Is the sale of the Scriptures among the Catholics of Ireland considerable?—It must be considerable, from the very fact that so many editions have been given of them. Booksellers undertake those editions upon a speculation of gain; and if they did not find it likely that they could get extensive circulation, they would not, of course, run the risk of loss, by incurring a very heavy expense in putting them forward.

“ ‘ Are you now engaged in supporting a stereotype edition of the Scriptures?—It is nearly complete.

“ ‘ What has been your object in publishing in a stereotype manner?—To give it a more extensive circulation.’

“ The following question was afterwards put with reference to the previous editions, printed in numbers, that they might be come at with less difficulty :

“ ‘ Do you believe that those editions of the Scriptures which have been so printed for the use of the poor, have been circulated with the knowledge and approbation of the Roman Catholic clergy in Ireland?—Most certainly with their knowledge and their approbation.’

“ Look now upon this picture and upon that, and mark the distortion which renders the one so utterly unlike the other. How hopeless the cause for which it is thought necessary to seek support from such unworthy means?

“ Of a somewhat kindred nature appears to be the trumped-up story about the studied secrecy in which the work of Dens was wrapped up from every Protestant eye, until, by some lucky accident, the Rev. Mr. M’Ghee was enabled to drag it into light. But here I am saved the trouble of refutation; for Mr. O’Sullivan refutes himself. A person who is not over nice about the truth of his assertions, ought, it is said, to have a long memory. But here the orator’s memory seems to have been peculiarly short; for after expatiating with due solemnity on the caution with which this desperate book was sealed up from Protestant inspection, out comes the astounding admission, from the Rev. Mr. O’Sullivan himself, ‘ That there were two booksellers in Dublin—one a Catholic, the other a Protestant—who furnished this book to their correspondents.’ Is not this a novel mode of keeping a book out of Protestant view, to actually put it for sale into the hands of a Protestant bookseller? How dull must he not have thought the intellect of his audience, if he really perceived the blunder he was committing, and yet believed that the clumsy imposture would escape detection?

“ But why was not this book sent forward to Parliament, or submitted to the Education Commissioners?—Simply, because it was not of that class of books that was required. Besides, it would have been quite a pity, had any busy-body volunteered to send forward this uncalled-for book; for then Mr. M’Ghee would have been robbed of the glory of making the grand discovery of a book hidden from the eyes of Protestants with such jealous care, and yet exhibited openly for sale in a Protestant bookseller’s shop! Enough of this absurdity.

“ As to the book itself, the doctrines so bitterly complained of are not doctrines of Catholic faith; and they never were held more generally among Catholics than they were among Protestants; but they are, thank God, falling every where into disrepute: and notwithstanding the pious efforts of Mr. O’Sullivan and Co. to revive them in the minds of their fellow-religionists, they are in the minds of the great body of Catholics a perfectly dead letter—wholly inoperative as to any practical result, and to be viewed still in the pages of angry polemics only with a feeling of regret that they had ever found an advocate. Mr. O’Sullivan, it is true, attempted to fasten these doctrines on the Catholic Church, as if to persecute, when we can, all who differ from us in religion, were considered by us a religious duty. The whole face of Christendom proves the contrary. I will not here review the threadbare arguments which he puts forward with as much pomp as if they had not been a thousand times before refuted; but if any of his hearers would have the goodness to glance at the chapter on persecution, contained in the late Dr. Milner’s ‘End of Religious Controversy,’ he would perceive at once how signally the reverend orator has failed in his attempt. If they wish farther to know with accuracy the doctrines which are practically taught to our people, let them not be led away by the rhapsodies of interested declaimers, but let them consult our catechisms. There they will perceive with what care the young mind is taught to consider every individual of the human race, of whatever creed or country, as the brother whom we are bound to love as we love ourselves. Would it not contribute much to our social comforts, if Mr. O’Sullivan and his saintly associates, instead of endeavouring to tear asunder the bonds of society, by the diffusion of discord, would practically listen to that divine admonition—‘Go thou and do likewise?’

“ Finally, I complain that, in the reported speech of Mr. O’Sullivan, the words of my letter to Lord Melbourne are misrepresented, for the purpose of advancing against me a charge of falsehood. This foul and calumnious charge I disclaim as wholly undeserving of any other notice, than that such a charge must appear, from the tenor of this letter, to have come with a peculiarly bad grace from the Rev. Mortimer O’Sullivan.

“ I have the honor to be, Sir, your obedient humble servant.

“ D. MURRAY.

“ Mountjoy-square, Dublin, Sept. 14.”

---

At the time the above letter was published, Mr. O’Sullivan was on his way through Scotland, whither he had been solicited to go, to attend various public meetings, which were held successively at Glasgow, Edinburgh, Paisley, Airdrie, Greenock, Perth, Aberdeen, and Inverness, with the same successful results as followed those of London, Hereford, and Worcester. Immediately on his return, which was not until the latter end of October, he addressed a letter to Dr.

Murray, (given hereafter, dated the 20th October,) which, in the first instance, was not made public; not at least until after the publication of the following, which appeared in the *Standard* of the 31st of October:—

“ TO THE PROTESTANTS OF GREAT BRITAIN.

“ No. I.

“ I would not have selected, voluntarily, so ambitious a superscription, but having been formally, and by name,\* arraigned before the Protestants of Great Britain, I feel that I cannot be charged with presumption in pleading at your tribunal. The cause, too, in which I address you is not personal; it concerns the most exalted interests, and has imposed on you the gravest responsibility.

“ A Roman Catholic archbishop, Dr. Murray, at various public meetings held within the last four months, has been accused of aiding in the dissemination of the most flagitious principles, and invited to appear, either personally, or by an authorized advocate, and exonerate himself from the charge. The invitation was not limited to an individual: it was in his official capacity Dr. Murray was accused—the character of the church in which he ministered was the real question at issue,—and, accordingly, all his brother bishops were included in the notice, that, personally, or by approved representatives, they should be heard in its vindication. This notice frequently repeated, and assurances accompanying it of an impartial hearing, were without effect. Eighteen meetings have been held in various parts of Great Britain during the last four months, at which the charges first advanced on June 20, in Exeter Hall, against the Church of Rome, were sustained, and no Roman Catholic advocate appeared in any instance, having authority to contradict them. Dr. Murray prefers an appeal to the public, through the medium of the daily press.

“ No man can question the right of an accused party to exercise, to the most ample extent, his privilege of selecting the form and the vehicle of his defence. Dr. Murray may have thought it incompatible with his dignity to appear where his church was arraigned, or where his own conduct, official and personal, was brought under consideration. He may even have accounted it derogatory to appoint an advocate who should answer in his behalf; and, in writing those angry apologies of which he has made the press his organ, may rather have yielded to the constraint of necessity imposed by adverse public opinion, than acted under a persuasion that such doctrines as those of the Church of Rome, and practices like those of her ministers, could wisely be submitted to the judgment of a Protestant nation. Hereafter I may offer some remarks on the reasons offered by Dr. Murray for shaping the course he has taken; for the present I willingly postpone them. He has appealed to the British people—this is enough. In the face of the British people must he and those whom, in the effort to vindicate himself, he has aspersed, defend themselves.

“ Dr. Murray has insinuated against me a charge of wilful misrepresentation. I have not been unaware of the duty which, in consequence, became

\* In Dr. Murray's address to the Protestants of Great Britain, in which he salutes them, “ Beloved fellow Christians.”

imposed upon me, nor have I been unnecessarily tardy in my endeavours to discharge it. Until now I was not at liberty to expose the slander in the manner in which it should most properly be stigmatized. Duties which allowed of no looking back to any personal consideration—toils which had the interests of a great cause for their end, prosecuted among a noble people, and which, I thank God, have been richly recompensed, altogether engaged me. The first moments of leisure indulged to me by more solemn cares, I have dedicated to the task of examining Dr. Murray's apologies for his church, and vindicating my name from his aspersions.

“ It is proper to premise, that the only topics on which I am charged with unfairness are merely matters *collateral to the question at issue*. The adoption of a theology containing most flagitious and abominable principles, as ‘affording the best and safest guidance’ for the clergy of the Church of Rome in Ireland, is not denied. The selection for clerical conferences of questions which, on the principles of that church, compel intolerant answers, is admitted. The doctrines which hold the Romish clergy free from allegiance to a Protestant state, are not authoritatively disowned or qualified. All, in short, which is substantive in the accusations recently advanced against the Church of Rome, remains, if not confessed, undisputed; but evidence given by Dr. Murray is not correctly reported in the *Worcester Journal*—to a decree of the Council of Trent the *Paisley Advertiser* has not done justice—and to my hypothetical offence of being concerned in these misrepresentations, Dr. Murray, magnanimously regardless of the strength of the case against him, has energetically addressed himself.

“ And here it may not be amiss to advert to one grave inconvenience which would have been avoided, had Dr. Murray met the accusers of his church in the assemblies to which he was invited. He would not have been led into gross errors as to the purport of their allegations. Had he condescended to hear their charges, or empowered some faithful friend to ascertain for him the substance of them, he must have learned that the matters on which he was expected to reply, were very widely different from those to which his attention seems to have been directed, and to which his denials are confined. Indeed, it is not altogether improbable that had he heard the charges as they were actually preferred against his church, he would not have found it convenient to hazard a contradiction even in the most elusive form with which the records of experimental casuistry could supply him. There were four great Protestant meetings held in England. Of the proceedings at three of these, authenticated reports have been published, and the truth of the momentous statements advanced and sustained in them remains uncontradicted—unchallenged. There was one meeting of the four which did not issue an authentic report, and it is in the unaccredited account of its proceedings Dr. Murray has found matter of expostulation and denial. It will soon be in the power of his arbitrators to frame a rational conjecture whether he would have uttered even this denial had he been present when the disputed allegations were made; and they can also judge whether his selection of the topics which he thinks it wisest to debate, to the exclusion of charges which it was of vital moment to him and his church to have repelled, does not powerfully corroborate those most grave and unambiguous accusations which he has suffered to remain uncontradicted.



"The charges which Dr. Murray has thought it prudent or necessary to advance against me are three: That I misrepresented evidence delivered by him before a Parliamentary Committee, and some expression in his letter to Lord Melbourne; that I mis-stated the facts with respect to a decree of the Council of Trent; and that having been at one period of my life a member of his church, I must have known that there was no truth in the allegations recently made to its discredit.

"It has been already proved,' he writes, 'on a former occasion, that at Worcester, if the report of the Rev. Mr. O'Sullivan's speech be correct, he openly perverted a Parliamentary document for the purpose of representing the evidence which I gave before a Committee of Parliament, as directly the reverse of what it really was. Let us now see how he deals with the acts of a general council. In the report of his speech at Paisley, as copied from the *Paisley Advertiser* of the 28th ult. into *Sanders's News-Letter* of the 2d inst. we find the following words:—'Before the conclusion of the fourteenth century, the Nicene Creed had been adopted; and in 1546, the Council of Trent set aside that creed.' This very creed was actually embodied in the decrees of the Council of Trent, on the 4th of February, 1546; and is set forth in the third session of the council, as a rule of Catholic faith. After this, what fact can be so public or so authentic as to be safe from perversion.'

"Your *if* is a notable peace-maker.' If the reports of the Rev. Mr. O'Sullivan's speeches at Paisley and Worcester be correct, what fact can be so public as to be safe from perversion? May I not answer by a question—if the reports of Mr. O'Sullivan's speeches at Worcester or at Paisley be not correct—if of his speeches at both these places there are *abstracts*, but not *reports*—what honest purpose could Dr. Murray serve by omitting authenticated reports of three speeches—ample reports of many; and finding, or professing to find, incorrectness in two notices, of which the utmost he can say is, that *if they are not ascribable to the reporter*, the speaker may be charged with them. That speaker is answerable for the authenticated reports of various speeches, and these Dr. Murray does not dare to impugn. Can his chance-medley adventure, uncertain whether it is to be enterprised against Mr. O'Sullivan, or against the *Worcester Journal*, serve any purpose so well as that of exhibiting the strength of that case which he shrinks from assailing, and of betraying the conscious and criminal terror of one who dares nothing for his church's vindication, or his own, unless he can call in aid the potent conjectural particle, to help him out of his difficulty.

"No such aid shall serve him. I deny that the passage quoted from the *Worcester Journal* is correct, as a *report* of my speech. I have not seen the paper, and do not know whether it professed to give more than an abstract. But, while I deny the correctness of the passage as a *report*, I affirm that, as the statement of a fact, it is substantially correct, and that it interprets Dr. Murray's parliamentary evidence in the sense in which a rational and honest man would necessarily understand it.

"The passage from the *Worcester Journal* is as follows:—"In 1825, Dr. Murray was examined before a Parliamentary Committee, and was asked whether the Church of Rome had given liberty to her members to read the Bible without notes? To which he answered, No. He was then asked whether the church had provided her members with notes?—to which he re-

plied, No. So that up to that year the Church of Rome had not allowed her members to learn the word of God either with or without interpretation." "This statement," Dr. Murray says, is not only untrue, but Mr. O'Sullivan "knows it to be untrue." He adds, "Just take the trouble of comparing this statement with the evidence really given, May 17, 1825, and printed by the authority of the House of Commons. After expressing my disapproval of the circulation of the Scriptures without some notes, for the reasons which I then stated, and declaring that the notes appended to the forthcoming edition of the Bible had my approbation, meaning to indicate thereby the nature of the authority which such notes require, namely, that of the Bishop in whose diocese they are circulated, as a guarantee that they are not heterodox or immoral, the following questions were put, and replied to by the subjoined answers:—Have any considerable number of editions of the Roman Catholic version of the Scriptures been published in Ireland, under the Roman Catholic authority?—Very many within the last twenty years, &c. &c.

"After having recited the questions and answers to a similar effect, which he held to be most suitable to his purpose, Dr. Murray proceeds:—"Now, look upon this picture and on that, and mark the distortion which renders the one so utterly unlike the other. How hopeless," he adds, "the cause for which it is thought necessary to seek support by such unworthy means!" I echo the exclamation. I ask also—Why did Dr. Murray propose to his readers to compare the statement in the *Worcester Journal* with the evidence really given on the 17th May, 1825; and suggest, instead of the evidence really given, his own "economical" version of it in the only part of which the censured statement could by possibility profess to be a representation? "After expressing my disapproval," &c. &c. Why not set this down as he expressed it before the Parliamentary Committee?—"and declaring that the notes appended to the forthcoming stereotype edition had my approbation."—Why not recite boldly the question which drew forth this declaration, and the answer which contained it!

"I shall place this evidence, as it was given, before our arbitrators, and leave it to their judgment whether the condemned statement in the *Worcester Journal* is not a natural inference, if not a faithful representation of it. But, inasmuch as matters of still graver concern than personal success are in question, it is necessary previously to bestow a brief remark on that subject which has called forth Dr. Murray's passionate remonstrances—the doctrine of the Church of Rome respecting the study of Holy Scripture.

"It appears according to the testimony of more than one Roman Catholic bishop, that various editions of the Bible have been printed and sold in this kingdom within the last twenty years. To some it may seem that such a fact proclaims the doctrine of their church far more plainly than decrees of councils, or formal professions of faith. This is a grave error. The practices of the Church of Rome indicate rather the circumstances to which she accommodates herself than the doctrines which she upholds and teaches. In countries where heresy prevails, it is her rule to allow larger indulgence in Scriptural study. But no concessions yielded to the necessity of place or season, can effect an alteration in her unchangeable doctrine. It is true that more than one edition of the Bible has been printed in this country, and that an edition

has of late years been stereotyped. Does this prove that all men are free to study even those editions which have been authoratively prepared, as it should seem, for their use? Doctor Murray has published an edition containing notes of which he approves. Is the Bible so prepared, a book which it is safe for all men to study? There is a form of approbation prefixed, which declares that the faithful may study, "*provided that they observe the required conditions.*" What are the conditions? Where are they detailed?"

"I have maintained, upon various occasions, and especially in that speech at Worcester, the report of which Dr. Murray condemns, that the conditions upon which a member of the Church of Rome may claim the privilege of reading the Bible cannot be complied with. The Council of Trent left some show of liberty; but the Creed of Pius IV., which Dr. Murray pronounces to be the creed of all the members of his Church, imposes restrictions which amount to absolute disqualification. The Council *permitted* the study of the Scriptures provided they were not interpreted *contrarywise* to the judgment of the church, or the unanimous consent of the fathers. Accordingly, where the church had not pronounced, and the fathers had not agreed, Scripture seemed free. The Creed inverts this order, and *prohibits* the study of Scripture unless according to the sense in which the church receives it, or to the unanimous consent of the Fathers. Accordingly, where the church has not pronounced, or the fathers have not agreed, the prohibition prevails, and Scripture is a sealed book. I have never heard the correctness of this conclusion disputed."

"Further, I have maintained that the Church of Rome, notwithstanding her boast of infallibility, has not exercised the gift with a view to settle the sense of Scripture; that in this country, as the evidence of her highest divines testified, there was not in existence, until the year 1825, a copy of the Bible containing notes of which they approved; and I have strongly condemned the deceitfulness of a church which prohibits the study of God's word, unless it be interpreted according to the sense in which she receives it, and by withholding the knowledge of what that sense is, renders the condition impossible, and the prohibition absolute. As to the publication of the Scriptures, I have distinguished between what the Church of Rome indulges or tolerates under adverse circumstances, and what, on principle, she enjoins; and I have regarded it as among the encouragements with which efforts to win souls from her thralldom have been favored, that in proportion to the sincerity, and prudence, and zeal, with which they were conducted, the indulgence granted with respect to the reading of Scripture has become more ample and unembarrassed."

"In all this, my statements frequently made, remain uncontradicted, even in that letter in which Dr. Murray aims at me a kind of hypothetical contradiction. The extreme caution with which he evades any thing like a distinct avowal of the doctrine his church maintains, must be apparent to all who can bear to read the document with attention. The statement *he proposes to contradict* is one which affirms that "*the Church of Rome*" had not "given liberty to her members to read the Bible without notes," and up to the year 1825 had not provided the notes, without which they could not read. What is the contradiction? That various editions of Scripture had been published

under Roman Catholic authority, and that booksellers would not have undertaken the publication of them, if they had not relied on effecting their sale. Surely in this there is no contradiction. Because Richard Coyne, publisher of the Complete Theology of Peter Dens, hazards a hundred or a thousand pounds in the publication of a Bible, it does not follow that the Church of Rome approves of his undertaking, or even privileges him to read the book he has printed. This would be rather an inconvenient defence for that church to take up. The matter to be ascertained is, not what booksellers or book-purchasers do, and priests tolerate, but *what the Church of Rome teaches*; and this is to be learned, not from the sales-book of a publisher, but from "sacred canons and general councils," from formularies of faith professed by all members of the Church of Rome, and professed with an oath by her priesthood."

"But could the statement in the *Worcester Journal* be contradicted? As a report of expressions used by me, if it purport to be such, it could and ought. As a statement of fact, could Roman Catholics with truth deny its correctness? It consists of two parts; one affirming that the Bible should not be read by the Roman Catholics without notes; the other that their church had not provided the notes which were required as the condition of their reading. Are these assertions false? Let Dr. Doyle answer."

"LORDS' COMMITTEE, MARCH 21, 1825."

"Have you in any instance allowed the circulation of the Bible among the laity without notes?—I do not know that we have.

"You think it necessary that notes should accompany the Bible for the purpose of explanation?—In our country, where religious controversy prevails to such an extent, I do think it necessary that short notes, explanatory of the texts on which our differences turn, should be prefixed to the Bible.

"You consider yourself pledged to all matters contained in these notes?—*No, not by any means.* On the contrary, there were notes affixed, I believe, to the Rheinish Testament, which were most objectionable; and, on being presented to us, we caused them to be expunged. *The notes carry in our editions of the Bible, no weight,* for we do not know the writers of many of them. If we find them clear enough in explanation of doctrine, we leave them there; but whenever we find any thing exceptionable, we put it out, as we have done in the cases I have referred to."

"But those published with the objectionable notes were published by authority of the bishops?—The translation was made at Douay and Rheims, *without our knowledge perhaps*; and when we found it in circulation and examined it, we found it to be correct, and then we approved of it, *which approbation refers to the text,* without the exceptionable notes, as stated in my last answer."

"In this testimony, I willingly overlook every thing except what immediately belongs to the case I am considering. It distinctly affirms the two statements in the *Worcester Journal*, that the Church of Rome does not allow the circulation of the Bible without notes—and that up to the 21st day of March, 1835, there was no copy of the Scriptures containing notes of which the Irish Roman Catholic bishops had approved. Dr. Murray should have

borne this in mind. If the Worcester report contained error, at least it erred with one whose memory he would not have treated with disrespect. And if Dr. Doyle erred when he gave that evidence on the policy of his church and his order respecting Scripture, from whom is truth to be obtained?

“Dr. Murray had an opportunity offered him of correcting the error into which his associate had been betrayed. Did he avail himself of it? Was his evidence such as to shame the fabricator of the *Worcester Journal*? Whatever may have been the merits of the case, has his testimony been, as he complains, foully misrepresented? Here it is—

“‘COMMONS’ COMMITTEE, MAY 17, 1825.

“‘Right Rev. Dr. Murray.

“‘Do you approve the circulation of the Scriptures, without notes, among the Roman Catholics? *I do not approve* of the circulation of the Scriptures without notes; I wish there should be some notes appended to them, as an indication that they are not to be interpreted according to private judgment, but according to the authority of the church.’

“Here it is plain the Right Reverend Divine agrees with his brother bishop, affirming one of the two statements contained in the *Worcester Journal*, and in the evidence of Dr. Doyle. A question followed, which put it to the test whether he dissented from the other. It was this—‘What are the particular notes, by what authority prepared, or where are they to be found, which, in your opinion, should accompany the Bible?’ This was a searching interrogatory. If there existed, on May 21, 1825, a copy of Scripture in the English tongue, to which the necessary comments had been appended, Dr. Murray was bound to name it. *He named no existing copy.* He said, ‘I have myself prepared an edition of the Bible, which is now ready to be issued, a stereotype edition, with such notes as I approve of.’ Thus is the direct testimony of Dr. Doyle corroborated by the tacit acknowledgment of Dr. Murray. The one declares that the notes in existing copies of Scripture are of no authority—that the bishops are not pledged to them—that even approbations granted had reference only to the text. The other bishop, when asked where approved notes can be found, and what they are, does not vouch a single existing copy of Scripture, but directs the committee to a volume yet to make its appearance.

“Had he named one copy in actual use, as containing the notes which were the subject of inquiry, it would not follow that by his selection of it he disowned all others; but when he named none—when he suggested to the committee that their inquiries must be suspended until his forthcoming volume had made its appearance, it cannot be denied that either he was dishonestly evading the question, or that he agreed with Dr. Doyle, who had stated, on his oath, that the bishops did not consider themselves pledged as approving the notes to any existing copies of the Scripture.

“I have had a correspondence with Dr. Murray on the subject of his letter, and may soon feel myself at liberty to publish it. For the present I have done with his first charge. I did not use the expressions reported in the *Worcester Journal*, nor do I believe they were designed to do more than convey the meaning of my argument. I believe the reporter was acting on his discretion, and wisely contracting the substance of a very long speech within manageable limits. But while I disclaim the report, I believe the statement to be, as regards the craft of the Church of Rome, and the evidence of Docto-

Murray, substantially correct. I believe it to affirm, with respect to that church, what her accredited advocates have not dared, and will not dare, deny; what Dr. Murray, even in his anger, has discretion enough not to dispute—that the law of the Church of Rome imposes severe restrictions on the reading of the Scriptures, and that Roman Catholics in these countries are indebted for the indulgence conceded to them more to the circumstances of the times than to the favourable disposition of their spiritual rulers.

“I shall soon return to my anxious toil again, and humbly pray that the subjects on which it must be occupied disturb not the soberness in which a severe duty should be discharged. Against the intemperance of the coarsest invective, or even the cold malice of suspicion, I think I am proof—but, to explore the mazes of most disingenuous artifice, and to expose the malignant principles and purposes which charitable precepts are profaned to cover, and so to govern the natural disgust that it impart not unchristian bitterness to the language, is, in the degree in which the exertion has recently been called for, a new trial. I pray for protection through it—and with all sincere desire that the truth may prevail, subscribe myself, Protestants of Great Britain, your friend and servant,

“MORTIMER O’SULLIVAN.

“October 30, 1835.”

---

A day or two afterwards, there appeared in the same paper the following letter and reply, to which allusion has been made above—

“October 20, 1835.

“MOST REVEREND SIR,

“In a letter bearing your signature, which appeared in the *Dublin Evening Mail* of Wednesday, the 14th instant, I find myself charged with having misrepresented your evidence before a parliamentary committee, and with having misstated a decree of the Council of Trent. I cannot offer any comments on reports which I have not seen, but think it becoming to give you an opportunity of knowing the purport of those assertions of mine to which your accusations seem to have reference.

With respect to your evidence before the parliamentary committee, I quoted two passages—one on the policy of the Church of Rome, respecting Holy Scripture, and one on the subject of the priest’s oath. The former I quoted (as well as evidence given by Doctor Doyle) in proof of my assertion that the laity were required to abstain from studying Scripture in the vulgar tongue, unless accompanied by notes of which the Church of Rome approved; and that, up to the year 1825, no such notes had appeared. On the other passage I made no comment. As to the decree of the Council of Trent, my statement was—that it had declared the Nicene to be the Creed of the Catholic Church, and that after the dispersion of the Council, the Creed of Pius IV. was promulgated as that of the Church of Rome. I forward to your address the *Standard* of Oct. 6.\*

---

\* Containing a report of Dr. O’Sullivan’s speech at the meeting held in Edinburgh on October 1st.

in which my arguments are more fully developed. And should you satisfy me that I have done you injustice, or misrepresented your church, I hold myself bound and ready to make the suitable acknowledgments.

" I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,  
" MORTIMER O'SULLIVAN."

" To the Most Rev. Dr. Murray.

" P.S.—An answer addressed for me, to No. 9, Upper Sackville-street, will reach me."

## REPLY.

" Mountjoy-square, Monday, October 26, 1835.

" REVEREND SIR,

" Your note of the 20th instant did not reach me until Saturday evening, the 24th. I avail myself of the first possible moment to say, in reply, that the quotations from your reported speeches introduced into my letters were accurately taken from public journals which were supposed to be favourable to your late mission. If your friends have misrepresented you, it is of them only that you have a right to complain. You admit, however, in your note, one statement which it is important to notice. With reference to two passages which you quoted in one of your speeches from my evidence before a parliamentary committee, you say—' The former I quoted in proof of my assertion, that the laity were required to abstain from studying Scripture in the vulgar tongue, unless accompanied by notes of which the Church of Rome approved, and that up to 1825 no such notes had appeared.'

" Now this statement is openly at variance with the fact. I said in my evidence, that the stereotype edition then coming out had notes of which I approved, indicating thereby the kind of authority necessary to give currency among Catholics to such notes; but I did not say (what would be quite contrary to the truth) that this was the first edition so approved of. I stated, in the course of the very same examination, what a person of ordinary candour would have considered exactly the reverse—namely, that there had been in Ireland several previous editions of the Scripture, and that those editions were circulated among the people "with the knowledge and approbation" of the Catholic clergy. I now leave you to reconcile your statement with what you must have known to be the truth.

" You are pleased to add, 'should you satisfy me that I have done you injustice or misrepresented your church, I hold myself bound and ready to make the suitable acknowledgments.'

" In reply to this, I have only to beg of you to look in upon your own conscience, and I have no doubt but it will, if honestly interrogated, save me that trouble. In the mean time I hold it to be quite unsuitable to have any future communication with you, until that interior monitor shall have prompted you to recall the slanders by which you have sought to blacken the character of your unoffending fellow-subjects.

" I remain, Rev. Sir, your humble servant,

✂ D. MURRAY."

" The Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan."

On the 2d of November, Mr. O'Sullivan addressed, through the medium of the *Standard*, the following Letter—

“ TO THE PROTESTANTS OF GREAT BRITAIN.

“ No. II.

“ A correspondence to which I referred in my former letter, and which I had taken measures to procure the right of publishing, has, I suppose by Dr. Murray's permission, appeared in print. A few remarks on its contents seem necessary.

“ The object of my communication to the right reverend divine was to inform him what were, in truth, those assertions of mine against which he had complained, and thus to give him an opportunity of sustaining his charges, or retracting them. From my letter, and from the paper by which it was accompanied, he could ascertain the precise nature of the statements of which he appeared to have seen indistinct and inadequate representations. The principal of these to which Dr. Murray's letters had adverted, were as follows.—

“ 1. The Church of Rome disapproved of the study of God's word in the vulgar tongue without notes, and up to the year 1825 no notes appended to any English copy had been authoritatively approved. In confirmation of this statement, I quoted the evidence of Dr. Murray and Dr. Doyle.

“ 2. *Roman Catholic priests, when beneficed, swear true obedience to the Pope, engage to receive all things delivered, declared, and defined by the sacred canons and general councils, and conclude the promise to maintain this faith, and to take care that it shall be taught and preached by all for whom they are concerned, in these solemn words:—This 'I promise, vow, and swear, so help me God, and these holy Gospels.'* Dr. Murray, before a parliamentary committee, directly affirmed that *the priests take no oath except the oath of allegiance.*

“ 3. Dr. Murray, when he assured Lord Melbourne that the publication of *Dens* was undertaken by a respectable bookseller, *entirely at his own risk*, was guilty of an unworthy concealment, in not informing the noble lord that *he had approved* the undertaking.

“ 4. The adoption of the Creed of Pius IV. was, as it were, the institution of a new religion, the Nicene having been declared, even by the Council of Trent, the creed of the *Catholic Church*, ‘the sure and *only* foundation against which Hell should not prevail!’ the Creed of Pius IV. having been accepted as that of the *Church of Rome.*

“ Of these statements, Dr. Murray receives the second, third, and fourth, without opposition or observation; of the first he has admitted half; to the remaining fragment he offers the semblance of an angry, yet unassured, denial.

“ Although the correspondence containing this hesitated negation has so recently appeared in the columns of the *Standard*, I shall venture here to transcribe the commentary on my first statement. ‘With reference,’ Dr. Murray writes, ‘to two passages which you quote in one of your speeches from my evidence before a parliamentary committee, you say, “The former I quoted in proof of my assertion that the laity were required to abstain from studying Scripture in the vulgar tongue, unless accompanied by notes of



which the Church of Rome approved, and that up to 1825, no such notes had appeared." 'Now this statement,' he goes on to write, 'is openly at variance with the fact.'

"In one respect Dr. Murray has in the preceding observation declared a truth. The statement which he quotes as mine is in an essential particular 'at variance with the fact,' inasmuch as it omits a most important clause. The passage which he professes to cite as mine is this—'The former I quoted, as well as evidence from Dr. Doyle, in proof of my assertion,' &c. &c. The importance of the words in Italics shall soon be made apparent. The omission of them justifies a different application of the expression, 'at variance with the fact,' from that which the right rev. divine has given it.

"'This statement is openly at variance with the fact. I said in my evidence that the stereotype edition then coming out had notes of which I approved, but *I did not say* (what would be quite contrary to the truth) that this was the first edition so approved of.' That Dr. Murray did not *say* this was the first, is true—it is also true that he did *not say* there was an edition with approved notes before it.

"'I stated in the course of the very same examination, what a person of ordinary candour would have considered exactly the reverse—namely, that there had been in Ireland several previous editions of the Scripture, and that those editions were circulated among the people, with the knowledge and approbation of the Catholic clergy. I now leave you to reconcile your statement with what you must have known to be the truth.'

"From this parting recommendation, it would appear that there is some discrepancy to be found between Dr. Murray's statement and mine, the one being, that up to the year 1825, no Bible possessed notes of which the Roman Catholic bishops approved; the other being, that Bibles were sold and circulated with their knowledge and approbation. I plead guilty to a dimness of vision, such as renders me incapable of discerning any contradiction here. Does Dr. Murray mean to say, that to allow the circulation of a book is to approve of all that it contains? Does he forget Dr. Doyle's oath, that Bibles had been circulated, although the notes were not approved of? Does he forget that Richard Coyne, 'with his knowledge and with his approbation,' published an edition of Dens—that priests with his knowledge bought it and studied it, &c. &c.? Does Dr. Murray confess that thus he has become responsible for the doctrines of the 'Complete Theology?' If not, what reason is there that he may not have given evidence to the effect he alleges, while yet Dr. Doyle may not have been guilty of perjury, or Mr. O'Sullivan of mistake, in affirming, that up to the year 1825, there was no copy of Scripture in the English tongue containing notes of which the Romish bishops in Ireland had approved?

"Time is unprofitably wasted in argument on a matter so plain as this. It never was denied that Roman Catholic bishops could authorise Bibles to be printed, whether with notes or without. It never was denied that they could indulge favoured individuals with the privilege of purchasing, and even reading, such copies of the Scripture. The matters denied were, that they had granted a general permission, or, consistently with their religious obligations, could grant a general permission to read the Scriptures without notes, and that they had authorised, before 1825, any English version of the Scriptures containing notes of which they approved. To say that Bibles were printed and circulated is not to affirm a contradiction to these denials.

" But Dr. Murray declares that the fact was at variance with my statement. He did not, he observes, *say*, when giving his parliamentary evidence, that there was not in existence, before 1825, a Bible to which approved notes had been appended. He declares further, that had he so said he should have spoken what was false. There *was*, then, in 1825, such a Bible as that which the parliamentary committees desired to see. Dr. Murray evaded the question, which should have had its proper answer in the production of the volume. Dr. Doyle, *with an oath*, denied its existence.

" Protestants of Great Britain,—Is this the conduct by which men accused of artifice and equivocation shall place themselves beyond suspicion? There was a Bible, containing approved notes, before 1825. Dr. Doyle, in that year, swore that none such existed. Dr. Murray, at a later period in the same year, when asked where approved notes could be found, answered, not by a direction to the existing work, but by promising a Bible which was yet to make its appearance. Why was the concealment of these approved comments guarded by an evasive answer and a false oath?

" Will Dr. Murray defend his silence on this subject as he does his reserve on the subject of Dens' Theology? When committees inquired what books communicated a knowledge of the Roman Catholic faith, Dens was not named, because, although he was the safest guide for the clergy, his works, for some untold and unimaginable reason, were not, so Dr. Murray declares, of the character which the inquiry contemplated. When it was asked, 'what are the notes, where are they to be found, and by what authority prepared?' which should accompany the Bible, did Dr. Murray think that such a question could have no reference to the copy which at the moment when he was examined contained them? It is a remarkable coincidence that the approved Commentary on Scripture, and the Complete Theology of Dens, were alike concealed from the knowledge of the parliamentary committees. Dens was the authorised guide of the priesthood—the Bible, with its notes, was, as it were, a Laity's Directory. Both were carefully concealed from Parliament. Why?

" If Dr. Murray would, even now, disclose the secreted Bible, perhaps the question could be answered. We are at no loss to understand why Dens was discountenanced or unacknowledged. Reasons no less cogent, may have justified Dr. Doyle's false oath, and Dr. Murray's evasion, respecting the Scriptural annotations.

" The Rhemish Testament, with notes which taught, as Mr. O'Connell said, that faith might safely be broken with heretics, and that it was lawful to murder men for their religion, was circulated with the approbation of the Romish prelates for more than a year, and continued to be the favoured copy of Scripture until the *British Critic* took upon itself to enact a Protestant Congregation of the Index, and awoke a storm of public indignation against which it was held unwise to contend. Was the approved copy, which Dr. Murray is not even now bold enough to name, and which, in 1825, he was careful to conceal, similar in spirit and character to that which the *British Critic* exposed, and from which, in obedience to the 'temper of the times,' approbation was withdrawn?

" If the approved Commentary resembled that appended to the Rhemish Testament, the concealment of it is intelligible. It was a profitable study

for the 'faithful,' but it would not abide the scrutiny of a heretical parliament. Therefore, although the people were to be instructed by it, the bishops would not acknowledge themselves responsible.

"I leave this case without further remark. However the matter be determined, my accuracy remains unimpeached. If Dr. Murray's reserve were honest, and Dr. Doyle's oath true, the statement in my speech founded upon them stands confirmed. If, on the other hand, that statement be contradicted, it is for Dr. Murray to reconcile the contradiction with his own silence, and with Dr. Doyle's sworn declaration. If there were not an approved commentary in 1825, that declaration was true, and Dr. Murray's present assertion is false. If Dr. Murray now speak the truth, he, in 1825, connived at and abetted falsehood; and he countenanced the circulation of a work for the instruction of the Roman Catholic people, which, at great sacrifices and by base arts, was concealed from the legislature of Great Britain.

"I have for the present but one observation to add. It appears that there was an edition of the Bible in 1825, which contained notes approved by the Romish bishops. Having been, in that year, solemnly denied, it becomes Dr. Murray, who now boldly avows its existence, to make known to the Protestants of Great Britain what it is. He answered half the question of the parliamentary committee in 1825. Let him now, by a supplemental reply, complete his answer. The Protestants to whom he has appealed have a right to know which of those editions of Scripture, published, as his evidence stated, within the twenty years preceding 1825, contained the approved notes. They have also a right to know why, in that year, Dr. Murray concealed and Dr. Doyle disowned them. Let the book and the explanation be submitted for their judgment.

"I remain, Protestants of Great Britain, with all good prayers,

"Your obedient servant,

"MORTIMER O'SULLIVAN."

This was succeeded, in the same paper, by another, on the 4th of November, as follows:—

"TO THE PROTESTANTS OF GREAT BRITAIN.

"No. III.

"I did not feel at liberty to observe on the arguments adduced by Dr. Murray, in his defence, until I had repelled his groundless insinuations against the correctness of my statements. I have done so, and shown upon his own evidence the injustice of his charges. Of the four accusations he had originally launched against me, he abandons all except a moiety of the first; and attaches himself to this poor fragment of a wrecked cause at vast sacrifices, loading with the charge of perjury the memory of a departed bishop, Dr. Doyle, convicting himself of criminal evasion, and incurring a suspicion of most disingenuous artifice in that remarkable omission,\* by which he altered

\* The omission of the words, "as well as the evidence of Dr. Doyle." (See preceding letter.)

the whole character and purport of a passage which he professed to quote as mine.

“ I have no doubt that this omission, if at all noticed by Dr. Murray’s retainers, will be ascribed to accident. They will, perhaps, say—‘ he could not have designed to conceal a passage which must be seen on reference to a published letter.’ But it is craft as old as the days of Attic rhetoricians—a craft familiar to Romish controversialists, to employ artifices which, passing undiscovered, shall serve their cause, while at the same time provision is made that a recoil of the detected fraud shall not cover them with dishonour. A Roman Catholic bishop in Ireland may enterprise boldly. If his stratagem succeed for a season all is well—if it fail, he can at least comfort himself with the assurance that the faithful pages which his subjects are likely to read shall not be sullied by an acknowledgment of his exposure.

“ But it is idle to dwell on a theme like this. It is enough to repeat, that the utter groundlessness of Dr. Murray’s charges has been made manifest. What is the nature of his reply to accusations strongly urged against him? He has appealed from the decision of public meetings in every part of Great Britain. His appeal is to British Protestants. What is the nature of his defence?

“ The accusation against him, or rather against his church, is, that the Roman Catholic bishops in Ireland declared the ‘ Complete Theology of Peter Dens’ to be the best and safest guide for their clergy in professional inquiries—that on three solemn occasions they suspiciously and culpably withheld the knowledge of this procedure from the legislature of the country—and that finally they made it a conference-book for the priesthood of their communion. The flagitious and abominable principles of this bad book are now sufficiently understood to render an enlarged exposition of its character unnecessary.

“ I dismiss many topics favourable to my views, and confine myself to what is of most pressing moment. The great point at issue is very simple—it is, are the doctrines taught in the ‘ Theology of Dens’ adopted by the Roman Catholic clergy in Ireland? This, it would seem, admits of a ready solution, and ought not to rest on any, the most unsuspecting, individual testimony. Questions as to the punishment of heretics are discussed in clerical conferences, and are professedly taken from that book which has been recommended to the priesthood as affording their best and safest guidance. The answers, as they are to be found in this commended guide, are of the most intolerant description. Are these the answers which the priests are bound to adopt? Dr. Murray says they are not. The passage in which he formally lays down the law by which inferences are governed, affords so much instruction on the subject, that I shall venture to quote it at length :—

“ With respect to the conferences, about which you inquire, I beg to say, that they are meetings held by our clergy at stated times in each year, for the purpose of discussing, for their mutual information, questions connected with their profession. In order to render these clerical meetings more useful, and to ensure the regular and gradual discussion of all the treatises of moral theology, the questions are proposed in the order in which they are usually found in theological works. The order adopted by Dens was found to be convenient; and therefore the questions to be discussed in this province were set down in the order in which they lie in his book; but when brought under consideration

they are discussed exclusively on their own merits, without any reference to that author; and no one is required, I do not say to adopt his opinion on any question, but even to know what that opinion is. The publisher, in commendation of his work, is pleased to call it the 'Conference Book for the Province of Leinster,' but it is so in no other sense than that which I have just stated. The questions which Dens treats are treated in our conferences, but not as he treats them. But why were questions regarding the punishment of heresy discussed at all? Because they form a part of a treatise on heresy, which is never omitted in a theological course, and which should, therefore, naturally come under consideration in its turn. Surely a clergyman ought to be ashamed not to know the state of a question which has so often agitated the christian world, or to be unacquainted with the arguments which would enable him to come to a just conclusion regarding it? Would it not be satisfactory to him to be able to prove to his own mind the justice of the oath which he had taken, and to which I have already alluded? And is there any thing so very alarming in his being allowed to discuss the question, even for that excellent purpose?"—*Letter to the Rev. Maurice James, dated Sept. 21.*

"I am satisfied to regard the question at issue, narrowed as it is by this explanation. I omit all reference to Dr. Murray's preceding statements, and do not insist on the contradictions and inconsistencies with which, it might be argued, they are chargeable. The matter of real consequence he has admitted—the suitable defence he has shown himself capable of understanding. He will understand also the fatal deficiency in his argument.

"Dens is a conference-book, so far as the adopting the order of its text, and discussing its questions; but it is intimated that it is only in the interrogative portion of his work that Dens is to be a guide. In his answers, to say that he is 'the safest guide,' means clearly, according to Roman forms of speech, that he is a guide 'whom it is safest not to follow.' The 'Theology' of Dens is the conference book, and questions are taken from it for the purpose of leading the minds of the clergy to conclusions of a diametrically opposite character to his answers—for the purpose of enabling them to prove to their consciences the justice of the oath in which they had disavowed the pernicious doctrine taught by Dens. It is upon this ground Dr. Murray defends the discussion in conference of those questions which had caused so much alarm.

"To this defence one thing is wanting; namely, a reference to that safer guide than Dens—'the safest,' by whom the clergy are directed to these charitable arguments. I undertake to say that had Dr. Murray produced such a witness to the tolerant character of his church, either at a public meeting, or in any of his various letters, the controversy would have been at an end. He is responsible for its continuance, if, having so valuable testimony at command, he abstain still from producing it.

"Bossuet's Exposition is not such a testimony. I do not know how Doctor Murray could justify himself for alluding to it. He entreats *Protestants of Great Britain* to read Bossuet. He recommends *his clergy in Ireland* to seek safe guidance in Dens. I will not dwell on this matter, or enumerate the many reasons why Bossuet should not have been cited. To one, however, I must advert. Bossuet does not, in *his exposition*, answer the questions respecting which the controversy has arisen. Elsewhere he has stated prin-

ciples which may be considered to answer them, and millions of abused, and persecuted, and betrayed, men rued the terrible reply. But the exposition—it never adverted to any of these questions, which to the astonishment and alarm of this our day, are matters of discussion for the Romish clergy in Ireland!

“Will Dr. Murray name the book of authority which gives to the startling questions of conference milder answers than those which are found in Dens? The bishops of the Church of Rome in Ireland three times asserted the authority of his pestilent volumes. Can any book of guidance be named which boasts a similar sanction, and is of a less intolerant character? Some such book, it should be natural to think, has been prepared. The questions relating to punishments for heresy, Dr. Murray says, are of necessity to furnish perpetual matter for discussion; answers must be, not what the private judgment of an individual approves, but what the Church of Rome teaches. Where are its authoritative instructions?

“I regard this question as of so much importance, that I conclude my letter with it. In what book of authority shall we find charitable answers to the questions from Dens? A Roman Catholic priest swears to admit Scripture as interpreted by his church, and, without any doubt, to receive her canons and general councils. IS THERE AN AUTHORIZED COMMENTARY ON SCRIPTURE, OR AN AUTHENTIC SUMMARY OF CANON LAW, OR ANY OTHER WORK TO WHICH A SUFFICIENT SANCTION HAS BEEN GIVEN, IN WHICH THE VIRULENT DOCTRINES TAUGHT IN DEN'S ARE CONTRADICTED? AND IS THE MILDER WORK A BOOK OF AUTHORITY IN THE CONFERENCES IN IRELAND? I SHALL PAUSE FOR A REPLY.

“MORTIMER O'SULLIVAN.”

“November 3, 1835.”

---

“TO THE EDITOR OF THE EVENING MAIL.

“Brighton, January 7.

“DEAR SIR,

“A letter bearing Dr. Murray's signature, and published in your journal of the 1st, insinuates some animadversions upon me, to which your editorial remarks have directed my attention. Although the animadversions are, as usual, of a personal nature, and, as usual, distinguished rather by vehemence than severity, and *although, from the peculiar circumstances in which he is placed towards me, the Most Rev. Divine is the last person in the kingdom who should volunteer to assail me with invective*, yet it may not be unsuitable to notice the topics of abuse he has chosen, and I beg your insertion of some brief observations upon them. It would seem more proper that they should be addressed to the *Evening Post*, in which, I believe, the letter of Doctor Murray first appeared; but the editor of that paper, in his rejection of a former communication from me, taught me to know that my dullness is of that kind which it is wisest to abuse at a distance. Your columns can endure occasional dullness, and I feel confident that, for its truth's sake, you will give toleration to mine.

“The passage to which I allude in Dr. Murray’s letter is to the following effect—‘Again, tithe is levied from the Roman Catholic inhabitants of the parish of Killyman, for the support of a Protestant rector. Now, suppose that this rector, with the money wrung from his Roman Catholic parishioners in his pocket, instead of endeavouring to repay them with religious instructions, &c. &c. should make the whole empire ring with denunciations against them, &c. &c. could we be surprised if some one of more than usually sensitive feelings should, in the ardour of his indignation, exclaim—‘Surely the system which fills the pockets of this rector with Roman Catholic money must be a nuisance.’

“This passage seems to affirm the principle that tithe is a payment for the services of a religious ministration; it contains also an acrimonious invective which, although of a personal nature; it may not be unbecoming to notice.

“The principle is erroneous. Tithes are not payment for religious services—they are the consideration for which the tithe-owner surrenders that portion of produce which is his, and by which the farmer becomes privileged to gather up the full harvest into his garners. The right of the tithe-owner is not dependent on the religious opinions of those who are his debtors; it may be independent of his own character or profession. He may be an endowed minister of religion, and derive no portion of his revenue from tithe; he may be entitled to ample tithe-income, and not be a clergyman or a Christian. What does the lay impropiator render in return for his tithe? Not religious counsel or ministration. No. He was entitled to a tenth of the produce; and he receives, instead, a money payment. The clergyman has a similar right—he has conceded a similar equivalent; and while it is the principle of a national religious establishment, that every man who will receive its instructions shall be taught ‘without money and without price,’ it is in the instance of the church in Ireland abundantly provided, that no man can, with any show of justice, complain of the burden of tithe, as if it were only an offering in acknowledgment of spiritual services.

“But Dr. Murray says the Roman Catholics of Killyman pay tithe, and insinuates that they are entitled to some return other than that which the land yields them. Have the landlords of these Roman Catholics enforced, for lands subject to tithe, the same rent which they would, or ought, to have demanded if the lands were tithe free? If they have, it is unjust and cruel to pour out on the unoffending clergy the anger and the invective which the oppressive landlord provokes. If they have not—if rent has been adjusted on a scale which leaves provision for the payment of tithe, the tenant has already, in the produce of the soil, his full equivalent; and it is not the part of a peace-maker or an upright man to represent it as a hardship, if he be called upon to fulfil the conditions of a voluntary and beneficial contract. I have offered this observation, not because the circumstances of that parish to which Dr. Murray alludes require it, but because it is right to notice the fact, that in no case can his argument bring conviction. In every instance where it is a grievance on the tenant to pay tithe, not the clergyman but the landlord is the offending party. In the parish of Killyman there is scarcely opportunity given for the shadow of complaint, so generally have the landed proprietors, who are all Protestants, become responsible for the tithe, so very limited is the number of Roman Catholics who continue chargeable.

“I am aware, however, that circumstances, even such as these, do not put enterprising opponents of the tithe system to silence, and would not, were they the circumstances of every parish in Ireland. I have heard it asserted, that even where the landlord *pays*, the tenant *suffers*, and that in order to lighten the burden of the occupier, the proprietor must be released from its obligation. The argument by which this proposition is supported, when plainly stated, is as follows—every landlord makes (not the value of his land, but) the pressure of his necessities the criterion by which he must have his rents adjusted, and it is proposed, as the most effectual mode of correcting the evils of such mal-administration, not to require that the tenant shall have justice, but to reward the proprietor's want of principle, by bestowing on him the tithe, and having thus improved his condition, to leave the occupier at his mercy. To render this new principle of distributive injustice effectual for any good, it should be made more comprehensive, and landlords should be released from all other debts as well as tithe, and from all other obligations as well as that to the clergyman.

“It is quite evident that the adoption of a voluntary system as a substitute for a national establishment, would not of necessity improve the tenants' condition. Extravagant and irreligious landlords would avail themselves of their immunity, and would withhold all assistance or contribution from the church—the pious and humane would feel themselves called upon to supply the new deficiencies; and thus in the same proportion as the selfish and irreligious had their powers enlarged, the benevolent would become embarrassed with additional burdens. In short, the adoption of a voluntary system would be unavailing as to any hope which sanguine tenants might entertain, unless there were adopted also two accompanying provisions of no little moment, one compelling landlords to bestow on the occupying tenant the benefits accruing to them in consequence of the abolition of tithe—the other a sumptuary edict prohibiting, unless where the consent of the tenantry had been obtained, all free-will offerings for religious uses. Whether these laws are consistent with the arbitrary voluntarism of modern times I need not inquire; it would be easy to show that without them the case of the tenant would not be bettered.

“But this argument, which calculates the rent of the occupier by the obligations of the landlord, has an aspect upon which it would be well to cast a moment's attention. If it be good for any thing, it can be retorted. If because the landlord pays tithe the tenant's burden is augmented, why shall it not be remembered that when the tenant pays priests' or liberators' dues, the landlord's revenue must suffer diminution? If a cry has been raised through Ireland, which demands that even Protestant landlords must not pay their debts to Protestant clergymen, under a pretence that, ultimately the occupier may feel the burden, how can the justice of a counter proclamation be disputed, that Roman Catholic tenants must, if their landlord be a Protestant, forego the enjoyment of contributing to the support of their church, because the landlord has a right to profit by their self-denial? If they desire to see Protestantism overthrown, he may desire the downfall of the Church of Rome. If they think their *labour* should not be rendered serviceable to a church which they abhor, he may claim a similar exemption in favour of his *lands*. In short, the natural result of the argument would be, that no Protestant proprietor should tolerate a Roman Catholic tenant.



"This, remember, is not the result of an argument approved by me—it follows by necessary consequence from reasonings, conducted in that spirit which has supplied Doctor Murray's declamation. Such reasonings, and the appropriate eloquence in which they are conducted, tend to break the connection which should subsist between landlord and tenant; they sow mutual discontent and distrust; they possess the occupier with a notion, that if any portion of his rent be applied to the maintenance of a religion which he does not profess, he is abused and wronged; they convey to the landlord a reasonable ground of apprehension, that his tenantry are taught, if subject to the influence of the Roman Catholic priesthood (and that a day may come when they shall carry their instructions into act,) that difference of religious belief releases them from all equitable obligation, and that any clamour and violence should be considered just and laudable, through which law may be warped into accommodation with the newly discovered equity. Against this pestilent sophistry I affirm the indisputable principle, that rent is to be adjusted by a reference to the value of the land and the burdens to which it is subject, and that in the nature and object of these burdens, the individual who has offered himself as a tenant should feel that he is wholly unconcerned.

"Dr. Murray has discovered a new ground of objection to the tithe system. The rector of Killyman has proclaimed grave charges against the Church of Rome. Are not the tithes which support such an accuser justly an object of execration? The argument may be expressed thus—'Mr. O'Sullivan arraigns the Papal Church in Ireland of unsound doctrine and loose morals; therefore, it is natural and right that members of the Church of Rome shall violate their contracts, and equivocate about their oaths, and that Romish ecclesiastics shall encourage them in the sanctimonious iniquity. There is one objection to the soundness of this reasoning—its dialectic soundness, I mean. I speak not of its moral character. Mr. O'Sullivan's exertions, whatever they have been, were the consequence not the cause, of the aggression he complains of. Long before he preferred his accusations, the conspiracy had been formed against his church, the oaths given as a security had been scorned, many charitable and pious ministers had been reduced to extreme want, many had been assaulted and driven from their homes—Houston, and Going, and Ferguson, and Whitty, had been murdered.'

"Dr. Murray complains of the application of tithes paid by Roman Catholics in Killyman. His complaint is not called for. I cannot state precisely the amount to which they are chargeable, or the amount which they pay; but of this I am confident, the rector of Killyman has granted reductions in their rent to Roman Catholic tenants, without solicitation, without necessity, equal to, at least, double the sums he expects to receive from Roman Catholics on account of tithe. He is not then likely to profit largely by their tithe contributions.

"It seems also matter of regret that a rector connected in such relations with the Roman Catholics of Killyman shall grieve them by his accusations against the Church of Rome. Dr. Murray may spare himself all concern on their account. It is a remarkable fact that Mr. O'Sullivan had a meeting with several of his Roman Catholic parishioners, at which he explained his grounds of complaint against their church, and at which, if words can be believed, he satisfied them that his conduct was such as every honest man must approve. It is a fact that when he had explained the qualification oath which

Roman Catholics had taken, and compared it with the conduct they had observed, a general cry of 'Perjury, downright perjury,' broke out from his audience. Dr. Murray may feel assured, that if he will take similar pains to instruct the people of Ireland in the nature of the obligations which Roman Catholics have incurred, and the manner in which they have observed them, they will readily understand the propriety of the course Mr. O'Sullivan has pursued, and will regard it more in sorrow than in anger.

"The Roman Catholics of Ireland have a ground of complaint. Their bishops are richly endowed with power and emolument. They are pledged to the defence of their church and the instruction of their people. Let Dr. Murray answer how have they acquitted themselves of the obligation. In a country where crime so abounds, where life is held so cheap—was the Complete Theology of Dens the best and safest guidance? When charges against their church, of perfidy and violence were ringing through the land, was the best defence they could offer, a sullen confession of guilt, and gross but fruitless vituperation of their accusers?

"What are these accusations with which the nation is ringing? What is the object of those efforts which the rector of Killyman is calumniated for having made? Are his accusations urged against the Irish people? Are his efforts designed to harm them? No, he can boldly defy the malice of his craftiest enemy—he can challenge the closest scrutiny into his life—into his writings, (however obscure the may have been)—he could fearlessly consent that his thoughts should become visible, and welcome just condemnation if in thought, act, or feeling, there could be detected towards Ireland or the people of Ireland, the presence of one sentiment which would misbecome a son or brother. To what, then, have his efforts been designed? To assist in rescuing his countrymen from a most foul and vitiating despotism, to expose, in the sight of a people too long regardless, the character of that conspiracy against man's hopes and interests, which has wrought wickedness, without check or inquiry, because it dared to communicate and conceal its abominable principles under the insulted name of religion. This he has endeavoured to do in the words of soberness and truth, and he has had the satisfaction to feel that his calumniators, and they are many and venturesome, have left every statement he has made unshaken, and cannot point or palliate the acrimony of their personal invectives, by quoting, from his accusations against an anti-social system, a single example of excessive, or even uncalled for, severity, either in sentiment or expression.

"The Roman Catholics of Ireland have ground of complaint. The heads of their church have been convicted of promoting the circulation of a vile book, and recommending its guidance as best and safest, under those circumstances precisely which have rendered it most pernicious. After various evasions, they have pleaded guilty to the indictment, but have not endeavoured by any act or declaration to stay or moderate the sentence which should follow their conviction. Dens, who teaches how the obligation of an oath ceases—how allegiance to a Protestant prince becomes annulled—Dens, who teaches that the man who loves the Word of God in its simplicity, and accepts the message it addresses to his reason and his heart, without waiting to ensure the impracticable condition of finding all the fathers unanimous as to its meaning—Dens, who teaches that the man who would be free—who, although he respects authority, and reverences piety and wisdom, feels that

he is answerable to God for his use of reason, and claims the *right*, because otherwise he cannot fulfil the *duty* of exercising his private judgment—Dens, who teaches that that man (although he might possess the graces and virtues of the murdered Irwine Whitty) is out of the pale of salvation as respects the world to come, and while he burdens earth, carries about with him a forfeit life, justly punishable by confiscation of goods, exile, imprisonment, infamy—DEATH; this Dens, notwithstanding the effectual exposure of his odious principles, notwithstanding those eloquent denunciations by which my valued friend, Robert M'Ghee, has been an instrument to awaken universal abhorrence and alarm—this Dens continues still 'to afford the best and safest guidance,' to be the substitute for oral instruction, for the authority of books, to the priests of the Church of Rome in Ireland. The lay members of that church have grounds of complaint—or, if they agree with their bishops that Dens is a safe and faithful guide—that the practices adopted by Dr. Murray and his associates, are appropriate and creditable modes of defence—they have no right to complain, if they are comprehended in the judgment unequivocally and universally pronounced, by Protestants to whom religion is dear, on the principles of Dr. Murray and Professor Dens.

" I am persuaded to hope better things of my countrymen, and confidently trust that the day is at hand when they will declare with authority, that Dens shall not furnish guidance to the consciences of the unlearned, and that the truth and honour of the educated shall have a better guardian than Dr. Murray.

" I am, &c. &c.

" MORTIMER O'SULLIVAN."

# CORRESPONDENCE

OF THE

REV. DR. O'SULLIVAN, WITH C. BODENHAM, ESQ.

---

The following correspondence, in which as well as in the former, the report of the Worcester Meeting is cited, appears not in its due order of time. The reason for its insertion, the reader will see on a perusal of it—

“TO THE EDITOR OF THE HEREFORD TIMES.

“Killyman Rectory, Moy, July 3, 1838.

“SIR—The following correspondence I send you, in a confident hope that, as it was occasioned by a report which appeared in the *Hereford Times* of April 28th, your sense of justice will influence you not to refuse it a place in your columns.

“I have the honor to be, Sir, your obedient servant,

“MORTIMER O'SULLIVAN.”

---

No. 1.

“TO C. BODENHAM, ESQ.

“Dublin, June 20, 1838.

“SIR—I have this moment, for the first time, learned that at a dinner to R. Biddulph, Esq., on Tuesday, April 24th, at which you presided as chairman, in speaking of ministers of the Church of England, who, at the instance of the Hereford Protestant Association, had attended public meetings in your neighbourhood, you made use of the following expressions.—

“Those itinerant preachers, who made their appearance here a short time ago, men who, on the subject of politics or religion, never by any chance tell the truth, except when they are at a loss for a lie.”

“The language is ascribed to you in a report which appeared in the *Hereford Times* of April 28; and, as one of the clergymen whom you are represented as having aspersed, I feel myself under the necessity of inquiring whether your expressions have been correctly reported; and, if it be the truth

that you advanced so grave a charge against absent individuals, I call upon you to name any instances, or instance, of falsehood, or error, or inaccuracy on my part, by which your accusation, as against me, can be substantiated or excused.

"I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

"MORTIMER O'SULLIVAN."

"Please to address Rev. M. O'Sullivan,  
"Killyman Rectory, Moy."

---

No. 2.

"Rotherwas, near Hereford, June 25.

"SIR—I have received a letter, apparently bearing your signature, unsealed, and dated Dublin, June 20, 1838, transmitted, I know not by whom, in an envelope with the Hereford post-mark, in which you beg to know if, at a public dinner recently given in Hereford, at which I presided as chairman, I made use of an expression which you quote as having been attributed to me in the columns of a public journal. The most correct account of the proceedings on that occasion has been published in a pamphlet, and my words, as there reported, were these:—

"'The enemies of the Protestant Church are they who sent for those itinerant preachers who made their appearance here a short time ago, who, on the subject of the Catholic religion, *never by any chance tell the truth, except when they are at a loss for a lie*, who have been gathering together what are called Protestant Associations, in which are to be found turncoat politicians, young humbug saints, and old palavering sinners, who went scattering about your streets the scintillations of their theological firebrands, to see if they could create a blaze, and who are for propping up the now tottering cause of religious intolerance, by inflicting on this city the eternal damnation of religious discord.'

"I am, Sir, your humble servant,

"CHARLES BODENHAM."

"To the Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan, &c.,  
"Killyman Rectory, Moy."

---

No. 3.

"TO C. BODENHAM, ESQ.

"Killyman Rectory, Moy, July 3.

"SIR—I have received your letter of June 25, in reply to mine of June 20, which, as I was ignorant of your address, I confided to a friend, who was so good as to have it transmitted to you.

"I felt authorised to propose to you two questions, to which I had a right to expect plain and explicit answers. You have answered one, by an express acknowledgment that the calumny of which I had reason to complain was justly ascribed to you. My second question (a 'call upon you to name any instances, or instance, of falsehood, or error, or inaccuracy on my part, by

which your accusation as against me could be substantiated or excused,") you have neglected to notice, and, as I cannot think the omission accidental, I accept your silence as a confession that your charge against me was groundless and inexcusable.

" I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

" MORTIMER O'SULLIVAN."

---

" TO THE EDITOR OF THE HEREFORD TIMES.

" Rotherwas, July 12.

" SIR—A correspondence having taken place between the Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan and myself, and that correspondence having now closed, I beg to request you to insert, in the *Times* of Saturday, the copies I herewith transmit to you.

" I am, Sir, your faithful servant,

" CHARLES BODENHAM."

[" Having received Mr. O'Sullivan's copies of the letters, Nos. 1, 2, and 3, for the purpose of publication, prior to the receipt of Mr. Bodenham's transcripts, we avoid a second insertion by here referring to them in the preceding advertisement.—*Editor H. T.*"]

---

No. 4.

" Rotherwas, Hereford, July 12, 1836.

SIR—I have received your second letter addressed to me, dated the 3d instant. Absence from home when it arrived has prevented my replying to it till this morning. You assert, that as in my former letter to you I did not comply with your request, and state the instances in which you had publicly misrepresented the doctrines of the Catholic religion, my silence on that point is an admission on my part that my charges against you were groundless. Your ingenuity in endeavouring to draw me into a controversial correspondence with you, I consider only as an emanation from that school, to the exertions of which the world is indebted for the far-famed circular of Pope Gregory, of which, if the general rumour speak correctly, you were one of the principal manufacturers. It is by no means my intention to take the trouble of either stating or enumerating your very many calumnious misrepresentations. The first reason is, that as your charges have been public, so also, as you well know, have already been their refutations.\* My second reason is, that when at 'The Great Protestant Meeting,' held at Worcester, Sept. 7, 1835, some person made an attempt to contradict the calumnies you were then uttering against the religious creed of your fellow-christians, you immediately exclaimed, amid the cheers of your company, that you would not hear him, asserting that 'it would be a waste of time—that no good could arise from such a controversy, for that no one, save the Pope, could be counted decisive authority in matters of this nature.' These were your words, as they stand recorded in the report of the proceedings published at the time by the journal, the eulogist of your

---

\* See, among other publications, "A full and authentic report of the Catholic Meeting which took place in the Town Hall, Birmingham, Nov. 23, 1835." Sold by Keating, London. Rockliff and Duckworth, Liverpool, &c. &c.

doctrines, the *Worcestershire Guardian*, of Sept. 12, 1835. Now, Sir, I do beg to assure you that I am not the Pope—I have neither horns at the top of my head, nor hoofs at the end of my legs, nor have I the additional appendage of a tail, all which decorations fanatics of your stamp would fain persuade the world are the distinctive marks of the Pope, and which were verily believed to be so by many, who have at last been induced by this and other scarcely less monstrous assertions of yourself and your co-operators, to take common sense into account, and to think for themselves. It can scarcely be necessary for me to add, that I shall decline all further correspondence with you, and am, Sir,

“ Your obedient servant,

“ CHARLES BODENHAM.”

“ To the Rev. Mortimer O’Sullivan,

“ Killyman Rectory, Moy.”

---

No. 5.

“ Killyman Rectory, Moy, July 14.

“ SIR—I received this morning your letter of the 12th. You persist in declining to specify anything in my conduct which could have rendered your accusation against me pardonable.

“ For your refusal, you assign two reasons; assuming in one that charges preferred by me against your church have been publicly refuted; and in the second, that I prevented an assembly which had heard my accusations from hearing the reply. The labour you must have expended, and the artifice to which you stooped, in fabricating the second of these reasons, may well justify a persuasion that you were not satisfied with the first; and that, had you found ‘in the refutation’ to which you refer, an argument or statement plausible enough to endure a scrutiny, and to serve a temporary purpose, you would not have been dissuaded by its incorrectness, or even its untruth, from endeavouring to profit by it.

“ Your first reason, then, for declining to comply with my demand (that you should name, not many, as you seem to insinuate, but *any* delinquency or inaccuracy on my part by which your conduct towards me could be excused,) I shall pass by, as wholly unworthy of notice. It intimates, merely, that others, besides you, have aspersed me—it establishes, perhaps, the fact, that you were only the retailer, not the author of the slanders you circulated; but it does not exonerate you from the blame even of authorship, because it shows you to be so distrustful of those sources of intelligence to which you direct me, that you dare not adduce proof from them of a single act of mine by which the guilt of your defamation could be palliated.

“ Your second reason is grounded professedly, not on the conduct of my adversaries, but on my own. You inform me that I prevented an assembly from hearing a reply to charges which I had preferred against your church, and that I alleged, as my defence for so arbitrary a procedure, the uselessness of discussing religious topics with any meaner adversary than the Pope. You then ‘beg to assure me’ that you are not the Pope. You volunteer an affirmation that you do not wear horns—you instruct me that you have neither hoofs nor a tail, and you leave me to draw the conclusion most (indeed I

might say alone) pertinent to the occasion, namely, that being unprovided with these discriminating appendages, and not being the Pope, you owe it neither to men or yourself to prove, that your invectives against me were not calumnies, which you knew to be false and groundless.

"The evidence upon which you would establish this new charge against me you profess to take from a report which appeared in the *Worcestershire Guardian*. I might, were I disposed to be critical, with reason object to it.

"The report does not profess to be full and authentic. You should have ascertained its accuracy before you consented to rest your case upon it. Again, even admitting its correctness, I might deny that it was applicable. I may have thought the Pope alone decisive authority on a question of Roman Catholic doctrine, and yet have held, that in questions respecting truth and falsehood, the highest authority on earth was the honour of an English gentleman. I might have thought you incapable of defending or explaining the doctrine of your church, and the more incompetent I held you to discharge such a duty, the better might I have thought you qualified to answer a plain question in a spirit of freedom and sincerity.

"But, Sir, I make no such objections. My duty is of a sterner description. I am bound not merely to expose the weakness of your reasoning, but to convict you of disingenuousness in your statements of fact. It is untrue that I objected to meeting an antagonist inferior to the Pope. It is untrue that (usurping the chairman's authority) I refused to hear a person who wished to address the Protestant meeting at Worcester. Further, Sir, it is untrue that the journal from which you pretend to quote ascribes any such conduct to me. How you have practised upon evidence to adapt it to your purpose, will be seen by comparing the parallel columns, which I subjoin—one containing a passage copied from a report in the *Worcestershire Guardian*, the other your version of it:—

"MR. BODENHAM'S VERSION OF A REPORT IN THE WORCESTERSHIRE GUARDIAN, SEPT. 12, 1835.

"When, at the 'Great Protestant Meeting,' held at Worcester, Sept. 7, 1835, some person made an attempt to contradict the calumnies you were then uttering against the religious creed of your fellow-Christians, YOU IMMEDIATELY EXCLAIMED, amid the cheers of your company, THAT YOU WOULD NOT HEAR HIM, asserting that 'it would be a waste of time—that no good could arise from such a controversy, for that no one, save the Pope, could be accounted decisive authority in matters of this nature.' THESE WERE YOUR WORDS, as they stand recorded in the report of the proceedings published at the time by the

"*Worcestershire Guardian*,  
"Sept. 12, 1835.

"A person in the crowd (Mr. Chapman, a cheesemonger in Worcester,) begged permission to say a few words in answer to the Reverend Gentleman.

"THE CHAIRMAN SAID HE COULD NOT GIVE ANY SUCH PERMISSION, in accordance with the rules laid down for carrying on the proceedings.

"MR. O SULLIVAN SAID HE SHOULD BE MOST HAPPY TO MEET ANY GENTLEMAN WHO APPEARED WITH AN AUTHORITY FROM THE CHURCH OF ROME, but he would not waste time by meeting those whom that church refused to accredit. No good could arise from such a controversy. Was it not acknowledged that no indivi-



journal, the eulogist of your doctrines, the *Worcestershire Guardian* of September 12, 1835.

dual, save one of the highest character, save the Pope, speaking from the chair of Peter, could be accounted decisive authority in matters of this nature? Was not this the doctrine of the Church of Rome? And should an individual who thought himself qualified to advocate the Church of Rome, solely because he was totally unacquainted with its doctrines, be accounted decisive authority?

"Here, Sir, is the report of the *Worcestershire Guardian*, affirming that, at a Protestant meeting, the chairman refused a hearing to an individual who had not complied with the rules by which the meeting was to be governed. Here is your false version of the report, ascribing the act of the chairman to me. Here is the report, affirming that I said I SHOULD BE MOST HAPPY TO MEET ANY GENTLEMAN WHO APPEARED WITH AN AUTHORITY FROM THE CHURCH OF ROME. Here is your false version, alleging that 'when some person attempted to speak, I IMMEDIATELY EXCLAIMED THAT I WOULD NOT HEAR HIM.' Here is the report condensing an argument, to the effect that Roman Catholics, who acknowledged the Pope alone to be decisive authority, have no right to expect that an individual not thought worthy to be accredited by their church shall be accepted, as decisive authority, at a Protestant meeting. Here is your false version of the report, describing the argument, as if it implied, that the Pope is the only Roman Catholic to whom a Protestant meeting should grant a hearing.

"Sir, you are an unfaithful witness—in every way unfaithful; unfaithful in your narrative, unfaithful in your citations, above all, unfaithful in your suppressions. I would not have paused to censure you for misrepresenting an argument—you may not have understood it; although you said, 'these are your words,' when you had recited what were not my words, I would not have visited with severity the offence of your false quotation, which even your eye must have taught you was most culpably inaccurate; but, Sir, you have wilfully suppressed an essential truth—you have wilfully asserted a direct and manifest falsehood—in the endeavour to screen yourself from my just demand, you have had recourse to a poor and most disreputable artifice, imputing to me an act which you know was not mine, and pretending to adduce, in support of your false charge, testimony by which you were contradicted, and which you have most dishonestly garbled to suit your purpose. Of all this, Sir, you stand convicted.

"You presume to say, that 'if general rumour speak correctly, I was a principal manufacturer of what you call 'the far-famed circular of Pope Gregory.' I had no concern with that document. All the circumstances connected with it are notorious. The frank and full avowals and explanations of Mr. Todd and Mr. M'Ghee are as public as the circular itself. Ignorance of them betrays in you an indisposition to inquire into evidence, and an aptitude and affinity for those rash rumours which the supporters of a bad cause find most serviceable.

" I should not have noticed this frivolous insinuation, but that, as I address you for the last time, I am unwilling to leave any falsehood in your letter unrefuted. I part from you in some disappointment, but with a feeling of thankfulness that my correspondence with you is ended. I engaged in it, because I was led to believe that you merited, as once you bore, the character of an English Gentleman. Experience had taught me, that there are individuals, nominally of your creed, who are sensible to generous instincts, and who retain pure principles, unsullied, in the midst of an 'evil and adulterous generation'—individuals who could forego the walks of honourable ambition, could surrender possessions and life at the command of their church, but who would not, to advance even her interests, abase themselves to any meanness or dishonesty. By some such, I thank God, Sir, I am known and understood. While I thought you were of them I would have taken pains to do myself justice in your sight. Henceforth, your opinions and your calumnies trouble me no more than the aspersions of those other unscrupulous and interested slanderers, with whom your morals and your taste have classed you.

" I am, Sir,

MORTIMER O'SULLIVAN."

" To C. Bodenham, Esq. Rotherwas, Hereford."

With this letter Dr. O'Sullivan thought the correspondence closed. Mr. Bodenham, however, after its appearance, addressed the following letter to the Editor of the *Hereford Times* :—

MR. MORTIMER O'SULLIVAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HEREFORD TIMES.

" SIR—I had not intended taking any further notice of Mr. O'Sullivan, but as he has ventured to charge me with falsifying the extract I introduced from the *Worcestershire Guardian* of September 12, 1835, when alluding to what he is reported to have said at the meeting at Worcester in that year, I herewith transmit to you that number of that journal, and have to request your permission that it may remain at your office, where it may be ascertained by any individual whether there be the least foundation for that assertion. For the satisfaction of such of your readers as may not like to take the trouble of calling, I here transcribe the quotation from that journal, and in a parallel column my version of that passage. It will at once be seen that my abbreviations from that report were wholly unimportant; they originated solely in the wish to make my letter shorter. In fact, it would be absurd to suppose that I should intentionally have altered a report appearing in a journal, which, being the advocate of his principles, could not but have been so easily accessible to my opponent, if not in his actual possession—

" *Worcestershire Guardian* September 12, 1835.

*Mr. Bodenham's Version.*

" Mr. O'Sullivan said he should be most happy to meet any gentleman who appeared with an authority from the Church of Rome, but he would not

" When some person made an attempt to contradict the calumnies you were uttering against the religious creed of your fellow Christians, you

waste time by meeting those whom that church refused to accredit. (Cheers.) *No good could arise from such a controversy.* (Cheers.) Was it not acknowledged that no individual save one of the highest character—save the Pope speaking from the chair of Peter—could be accounted decisive authority in matters of this nature.”

“Mr. Sullivan tells his readers—‘You have practised on evidence to adapt it to your purpose.’ He fails in his proof, but his letters and the original documents will show that he has himself omitted an essential part of that quotation, which I have put in Italics; though I do not, in this instance, accuse him as he accused me.

“I shall make no comment on the attack made on my character in his last sentence by this Minister of the Gospel of Charity, being quite sure that your readers and the public will agree with me that if one circumstance more than another has excited the regret of the judicious friends of the Protestant Church Establishment in this country, it is that the most prominent of her champions should be those restless fanatics who perambulate the kingdom, promoting discord instead of peace, and seeking, in vain, amid the records of the dead, for arguments against the religious liberty of the living. I exceedingly regret that I have been obliged, on this subject, so frequently to intrude my name upon the public.

“I am Sir, your obliged humble servant,

“CHARLES BODENHAM.”

“Rotherwas, July 23, 1836.”

Dr. O’Sullivan having altogether dismissed the thought of Mr. Bodenham’s speech and letters from his mind, and being very seriously occupied, was for some time unconscious of the imputation contained in the above letter. When, at length, he became aware of it, he referred to such reports of the correspondence as were in his possession, and saw, as the reader may see in the report submitted to him, that the charge against him seemed as unjust as it was insignificant, the words which Mr. Bodenham accused him of omitting, in his citation from the Worcester report, not having been omitted in his letter. Having examined several newspapers containing a report of the correspondence, and found all correct, he was disposed to conclude that the imputation against him was one of those rhetorical artifices which he had seen abundant reason to know that Romanism allows, and that some among the better educated of her votaries are not unwilling to practice. After some time, however, by examining

the reports as they appeared in the Hereford papers,\* he learned that he was in error, that the report in these papers was chargeable with the omission of which Mr. Bodenham complained. The interest in the controversy had at this time gone by, and Dr. O'Sullivan thought it a sufficient notice of the charge, on his part, to place in the hands of the secretary of the Protestant Association in Hereford, W. H. Bellamy, Esq., a copy of the *Standard*, of July 21, containing a correct copy of his letter.

To this hour Dr. O'Sullivan remains unable to explain or understand how the mistake could have occurred. His reply to Mr. Bodenham was dictated to amanuenses on whose fidelity he was justified in placing the most entire reliance. When the copies were completed, they were read and compared together. They were found to agree in every part. One copy was sent to the *Standard*, and one to each of the Hereford newspapers. In the *Standard* the letter appeared without the omission which was found in the Hereford papers, an omission which Mr. Bodenham does not condemn as a wilful offence, but which might justify doubts of Dr. O'Sullivan's accuracy. The Editors do not think it fitting or necessary to indulge in conjectures respecting this transaction, but they are persuaded that no candid reader will hold Dr. O'Sullivan responsible for an omission which is not found in the far greater number of the papers containing his letter, and which could not in the slightest degree have served his argument. It is scarcely necessary to observe, that the passage which Mr. Bodenham has cited from his former letter is not, what he is bold enough to call it, "a version" whether faithful or false, of the extract which he has placed by its side. The suppression of which, in this instance also, he has been guilty, the reader can learn by referring to the quotations in Dr. O'Sullivan's letter. The editors dismiss the subject without further remark, unwilling to be severe, where they feel that censure and even comment would be wasted.

---

\* Dr. O'Sullivan had received these papers immediately on their publication, but, having lent them to friends, did not for some time recover them.

# CORRESPONDENCE

OF

THE REV. ROBERT J. M'GHEE,

WITH

DR. MURRAY AND OTHERS,

FROM THE MEETING AT WORCESTER TO THAT AT LIVERPOOL.

---

As the foregoing correspondence required, in justice to the reader, to be presented in consecutive order, that the subject might be laid in one view before him; and the letters are given without reference to the dates in which they appeared, along with others, in the controversy,—so those which follow are necessarily placed in a similar order, as they intervened between the meetings of Hereford, on September 9th, and Liverpool, on October 20th.

In the same Paper, in which Dr. Murray's letter, p. 454, was published, there appeared also another from him, addressed to some gentleman at Worcester—it was as follows:—

“Mountjoy-square, Dublin, Sept. 12, 1835.

“SIR—In reply to your letter of the 8th inst. I beg to say that the itinerant sowers of discord to whom you allude, do well to carry their calumnies to a distance, where detection is not easy; here they could have no chance of success. They do not themselves believe, and they could not here get any one to believe, that I am an abettor of persecution. Doctrines of that description were attributed to me in London, on the ground that I directed the publication of the now celebrated Doctor Dens' Theology, which advocates the justice of punishing, by temporal penalties, the crime of heresy, not, however, by private authority, but according to law; a doctrine which, at the time he wrote, was unfortunately acted on in all the States of Christendom—Protestant England not excepted. I denied, however, among other things, that ‘I directed the publication’ of the work, and asserted that it was a mere speculation in trade of a bookseller, who undertook it at his own risk. I never said, as you seem to have heard, that I did not *permit it*; for I would think it unjustifiable to interfere with the fair speculation of a bookseller, on the

probable profits of a work which, taken as a whole, is a valuable compilation, though it may contain some objectionable opinions, which, however, in the present state of society, are practically harmless. Of this nature is his opinion regarding the punishment of heresy. This doctrine, as far as regards any practical effects resulting from it, is every where losing ground. The spirit of toleration is rapidly on the advance. The Catholic States of Poland and Hungary were among the foremost to lead the way. Poland, under Queen Mary, had previously set them the example. The States which embraced the Protestant Reformation, urged on by the first reformers, carried intolerance to a frightful extent; and the tenacity with which they clung to it so long, should make the professors of that religion exceedingly cautious in advancing charges of intolerance against the professors of any other. Whoever wishes to compare Protestant with Catholic intolerance, will be enabled to do so by reading the 49th letter in Dr. Milner's *End of Religious Controversy*, and the fourth of the same author's *Letters to a Prebendary*.

"But it is said that the work of Dens was dedicated to me; that the publisher says it was undertaken with my approbation, and that therefore, in my letter to Lord Melbourne, I must have told a falsehood, when I said that 'I did not direct the publication of it.' Surely there is no contradiction in these two statements. Allowing that what the publisher says in commendation of his work is true—allowing that I assented to his plan, surely it does not follow that it was undertaken at my instance, or that 'I directed the publication of it.' That was the original charge that was brought against me; and that is the charge which I denied, and do still deny.

"As to the abstraction of the dedication from some of the copies I know nothing whatever about it. In the copy which I possess it is very conspicuous. I cannot but feel obliged to the publisher for the compliment which he thus intended to pay me, but I do not on that account consider myself bound to adopt all the opinions of its author. There is no similar author that has any authority whatever for the support of his opinions, beyond what is derived from the arguments which he employs; and all the reasons that Dens could adduce in support of intolerant opinions, are utterly inoperative against the solemn oath taken by the Catholic clergy and laity of Ireland, as prescribed by the Act 33rd George III, chap. 21.

"I, A. B., do swear that I do abjure, condemn, and detest, as unchristian and impious, the principle, that it is lawful to murder, destroy, or in any wise injure any person whatsoever, for or under pretence of being a heretic."

"Among my calumniators some very sagacious persons endeavour to place my actions in contradiction with my declarations, by asserting that I was one of a meeting of bishops held in Dublin, in 1808, which meeting is said to have agreed that Dens's complete *Body of Theology* was the best book on the subject that could be republished."

"Whether or not such an episcopal declaration was made, I never heard, except through the publisher's advertisement; but it is at all events quite clear, that if it was, I at least could have no participation in it; for I was not then a bishop, but engaged in the duties of the more meritorious office of a working curate. Observe now the kind of proof by which it is sought to connect me with this meeting. In 1826, my name is found among the Irish

Bishops, disavowing certain intolerant and antisocial doctrines, and therefore it is assumed that I must have been eighteen years before among the supposed episcopal approvers of Dens' complete Body of Theology! Is it not wise in these calumniators, when they wish to circulate their impostures, to go to a distance from home?

"I have the honor to be, Sir, your obedient Servant,

" D. MURRAY."

In the *Worcester Guardian* of September 19th, the following letter appeared in reply to some efforts of Mr. M'Donnell, the Roman Catholic priest of Birmingham, to get rid of the charges fastened on Popery at the Worcester meeting:—

"THE REAL PRINCIPLES OF CATHOLICS"

PUT TO THE TEST.

"TO THE PROTESTANTS OF THE CITY OF WORCESTER."

"DEAR FRIENDS AND BRETHREN—A placard, which has been placed upon the walls of your city, has been forwarded to me, headed thus—'*The Real Principles of Catholics*,' and stating that these were to be explained on last Sunday, in the Roman Catholic Chapel, by Mr. M'Donnell, of Birmingham, and Mr. O'Carroll. This was intended, as I suppose, to counteract the effect produced by the statements recently made in London, and last week in your city, and to impress you with the idea that Popery had been grievously misrepresented.

"Now, having been engaged in the developments which have been laid before the nation of this 'mystery of iniquity,' and feeling a deep interest in the preservation of the principles and blessings of that Church which it has pleased God to establish in this empire, and in the protection of Protestants of all denominations from the delusions which are being daily practised on them by the emissaries of Rome, to blind them as to the real character of that awful and intolerant superstition—feeling also a deep interest in the eternal welfare of those who either have been brought up in the errors, or seduced by the sophistries of Popery, I consider it my duty to lay before you, my Protestant brethren, some facts developing the real principles of this '*Mother of harlots*,' and also to prove, as I trust to do with the help of God, to the Roman Catholics of Worcester, that the doctrines which the teachers of the Church of Rome acknowledge as their real doctrines, will no more stand the test of God's eternal word, than those doctrines which they so falsely abjure; that so they may be led, if it pleases God, to draw their attention to the truth, to 'turn from these vanities to serve the living God.'

"First, then, my Protestant brethren, my attention was arrested by the heading of the placard, because I recollected that I had in my possession a book entitled '*The Real Principles of Catholics*.' It is a duodecimo of 381 pages, written by Dr. Hornsfield, published in Ireland, in the year 1831. It is a sort of large catechism, professing to explain the doctrines of the Roman

Catholic Church, and most especially to do away the impressions which the writer stated were so injuriously entertained as to his genuine principles.

“He complains in his preface of the various cruel misrepresentations which, he says, were made of the Church of Rome; and for the purpose of counter-acting all these, he writes an introduction, in which he denies these charges by invoking imprecations on himself and his church, if they deserve them. I shall extract a few of them:—

“‘Cursed is he who contemns the word of God, or hides it from the people on design to keep them from the knowledge of their duty, and in ignorance and error. Answer, Amen.’

“‘Cursed is he who believes that the Pope can give to any one, upon any account whatsoever, dispensation to lie or swear falsely; or that it is lawful for any one, at the last hour, to protest himself innocent in case he be guilty. Answer, Amen.’

“‘Cursed is he who loves or promotes cruelty, that teaches people to be bloody-minded, and to lay aside the meekness of Jesus Christ. Answer, Amen.’

“‘Cursed is he who teaches it is lawful to do any wicked thing, though it be for the interest and good of our Mother Church, or that any evil action may be done that good may come from it. Answer, Amen.’

“‘Cursed are we if, among all these wicked principles or damnable doctrines commonly laid at our doors, any one of them be the faith of our Church. Answer, Amen.’

“‘Cursed are we if, in answering or saying Amen to any of these curses, we use any equivocation, mental reservation, or do not assent to them in the common and obvious sense of the words. Answer, Amen.’

“These are some of this writer’s imprecations—Then he asks—

“‘And can Papists then thus seriously and without check of conscience, say Amen to all these curses? Yes, they can and are ready to do it whenever and so often as it shall be requested of them.’

“He adds again—

“‘As for the king-killing doctrine or murder of princes and their subjects, excommunicated for heresy, it is an article of faith, and expressly declared in the General Council of Constance, in the year 1415, (Sess. 15) that such doctrine is damnable and heretical, being contrary to the known laws of God and Nature.’

“Again—‘It is an article of the Catholic faith to believe that no power on earth can license men to lie, forswear and perjure themselves—to massacre their neighbours, or destroy their native country on pretence of promoting the Catholic cause or religion,’ &c. &c.

“These, brethren, are the principles laid down as the real principles of Roman Catholics under these accumulated imprecations; and now I wish most particularly to call your attention to the authority under which this book was issued to the world in the year 1821—it is as follows—“*We approve highly of Dr. Hornihold’s Book, entitled ‘THE REAL PRINCIPLES OF CATHOLICS,’ &c. and we recommend it for perusal to the Roman Catholics of this Archdiocese.*’

✕ THOMAS TROY, D. D.

✕ DANIEL MURRAY, D. D.

M. H. HAMILL, D. D.

“‘Dublin Oct. 1821.



“ Now, brethren, this Thomas Troy was then the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin; this Daniel Murray was then his Coadjutor, now himself the Archbishop, and presiding over the Board of Irish Education—and just consider the facts.

“ While these men were thus approving this statement of their principles under these horrid imprecations—while in five years after, when Dr. Troy was dead, Dr. Murray's name was signed, with those of his brother Bishops, to their Pastoral Address to their clergy and people, dated 25th January, 1826, in which they say they ‘ declare on oath that they detest as unchristian and impious, the belief that it is lawful to murder or destroy any person or persons whatsoever, for or under the pretence of *their being heretics, and also the principle that no faith is to be kept with heretics*’—While they were thus publishing these professions and confirming them with these most horrible oaths and imprecations, what is now proved to be the fact?—proved beyond their power to answer, so that they dare not utter one word to meet the proofs? Why, that these very men had published, by their express united authority, as the secret standard and guide for their priests and themselves a book containing all the principles which they had thus so awfully abjured only thirteen years before. That this very Dr. Murray has republished this book only ten years after this,—that is three years ago—that he has selected, examined, approved, and authorized the selection and publication of a new volume, in addition to those before published, in which it is laid down as the duty of a Bishop to exterminate heretics from his Diocese, only that he is not to interfere with the Inquisitor; in which it is stated that the Inquisitor is to drag not only the heretic but even the man suspected of heresy, from the very sanctuary of the altar, to put him to death, and to give information to the Bishop; in which it is stated in the body of that infamous papal bull which he has sworn before the Committee of Parliament to be in force in Ireland, that if a man holds even this one fundamental principle of Protestantism, (not to mention many others) that ‘ *the reading of the Sacred Scriptures is for all,*’ this principle is heretical, damnable, &c. &c. and the Bishops are to punish him with the canonical punishments, and to deliver him over, if need be, to the secular arm. We have it proved by the unanswerable evidence of the documents themselves, that three years ago the very questions of confiscating our property, and compelling us to go over to Popery by the punishments of exile, imprisonment, and death, were actually discussed in their secret conferences of their Priests, and dictated by this very Dr. Murray, in conjunction with his Provincial Bishops through the whole Province of Leinster. These things are no conjecture—no vain imputation—but facts, unanswerable facts, which neither Priests, Bishops, nor Mr. O’Connell have dared to meet before the nation. And now, Protestant brethren, I ask you, do you see the Real Principles of Popery? Let them renounce, abjure, swear, curse, do what they please, I ask you what credit can any man of common sense and common honesty give to their professions or their oaths? If any Roman Catholic should feel, as I trust many may feel and justly feel indignant at the charge being laid against him, as if it were stated that he could not be believed on his oath, while he may be conscious of his own integrity and truth, I say to that man, I do not charge him with such crimes, because he happens un-

fortunately to be a member of such a corrupt communion—God forbid that every Roman Catholic were such a monster—but I charge it on his system—I charge it on his Church. I say if he does not hold these principles he is better than his Church—and I tell him, I not only charge it on his system, but on the whole body of the Irish Bishops. I say they are proved beyond all power of refutation—proved by their own documents, under their own hands, to be guilty of holding, and cherishing, and inculcating the principles which they have abjured; and I call on every honest Roman Catholic to examine the case, and either to disprove these facts to his own conscience, or else to come out of that Babylon, according to the Word of God, Rev. xviii. 4-5. 'Come out of her my people that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities.'

"And now I tell my Roman Catholic friends in a spirit I hope of Christian fidelity and charity, that the principles which the Church of Rome acknowledges are worse than the crimes that she abjures. The crimes which she abjures, and falsely abjures, are those by which she would bring destruction, temporal destruction, upon Protestants; but the principles which she teaches are the lying refuges which she substitutes and sells to the people for the salvation of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in which those who live and die really trusting in them, instead of in the Lord Jesus Christ, shall surely perish. Now, I do not think it right to make this statement, without giving to my Roman Catholic friends an opportunity of seeing it put to the test; and if it pleases God to spare me for a few days, I promise them that Mr. M'Donnell and Mr. O'Carroll, and all other Priests in England, shall have an opportunity, if they are able, of bringing their real principles, or whatever they chuse to acknowledge as such, to the standard of truth, and of trying the infallibility of their Church, by the test of God's eternal Word.

"Meantime, earnestly praying that you, my dear Protestant brethren, may be kept from the temporal and spiritual encroachments of Popery, and that our Roman Catholic countrymen, who ought to be dear to us all, may be delivered from her awful tyranny, till we are brought into the truth—the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

"I have the honor to subscribe myself,

"Your faithful and affectionate Friend and Servant,

"in the Gospel of Christ,

"R. J. M'GHEE."

"London, Sept. 16th, 1835."

In the *Hereford Times* of the same date, September 19th, the following letter to the Editor of that paper was printed:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HEREFORD TIMES.

"SIR,

"Having seen in your paper of the 19th instant, a Letter on THE HEREFORD PROTESTANT ASSOCIATION, 'from a Correspondent,' I think it may

be profitable to offer a few remarks on it. As far as it relates to the local circumstances of the City of Hereford—to observations on individuals—or on the efforts made by them to excite popular attention to the meeting—still more, as far as it relates to personal reflections on Mr. O'Sullivan or myself, it is too unimportant to call for animadversion—but there are a few points which are of sufficient consequence to demand notice. I shall merely observe, that the idea of the Duke of Cumberland's attendance originated, I believe, solely in the brain of the 'Correspondent.'

"In the first place, as to calling it an Orange Society, or Club, it is totally untrue. The facts which have been brought to light respecting the real principles of the Roman Catholic Church, are totally unconnected with any Orange Society, and indeed, speaking as they do for themselves, it is a mere effort to cast a reflection on them, and to affix a name which may appear to sever them from religion and connect them with politics, and thus to divert the public attention from the real state of the case.

"Secondly, this 'Correspondent' states, 'that to prevent all argument, discussion, or reply, no person was allowed to speak without the authority and sanction of the managing Committee.' Now, Sir, permit me to ask, who is there in Hereford that is competent to argue, discuss, or reply, on the facts of the case? I mean not to throw any imputation on the logical or oratorical powers, either of this 'Correspondent,' or of any gentleman in Hereford, by this question; but there are only two points in the subject that admit of discussion:—the first is the fact of the adoption of Dens's Theology by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy of Ireland, as the standard of guidance for their Priests. The second is the nature of that book. As to the second, no man can deny a plain printed book. As to the first, if a charge were brought in Hereford about a matter of fact against the Irish Roman Catholic Hierarchy, of which they had not heard, and which they had never had an opportunity to answer, I can well conceive that a spirit of British justice might dictate an indignant remonstrance on the part of this 'Correspondent;' but when a criminal himself pleads guilty, or when, having sufficient notice of his trial, again and again he chooses to suffer judgment to go by default, I believe it is not an impeachment on a Court of Justice that every man who may choose to undertake the cause, or to make a mock defence of the criminal, should not be permitted to present himself at the tribunal, to take up the time of the Court and interrupt the execution of the Law.

"The Roman Catholic Hierarchy of Ireland have been arraigned at the bar of Truth, of Public Opinion, of British Civil and Religious Liberty, for the secret adoption of the most detestable, anti-social, and anti-christian principles—principles which have marked the history of Popery throughout her guilty and persecuting career, in which her character is well developed, as described in the words of Inspiration, as 'the mother of Harlots and abominations of the earth—drunken with the blood of the Saints, and of the martyrs of Jesus: Rev. xvii. 5, 6.' The facts of the case have been established on evidence, as conclusive as ever yet was produced to establish any fact in a Court of Justice; every possible opportunity has been afforded to the persons accused—the Hierarchy of the Church of Rome, and to Mr. O'Connell—to come forward, if they were able, to meet the charge, either before a public meeting or a select tribunal, and they have uniformly declined,

from a consciousness of utter incompetence to do so. If, then, a body of gentlemen at Hereford, or Worcester, or any other place, think it important that these facts shall be made known universally to the people of their city and county, is it, therefore, fit or proper that the time of a public meeting should be taken up by admitting persons to prevent the people from hearing the truth, merely because they do not choose that any opportunity should be afforded to throw light on the abominations of the Church of Rome—when the men who are themselves arraigned have not a word to utter in their own vindication; and when such men as this 'Correspondent' cry out against their not being allowed to raise a disputation about principles, when they are utterly unable to impeach facts. When such men raise a cry about 'politics,' to divert the attention of the public from the superstitions and the guilt of the Church of Rome, it seems as if they feared their own political projects were rather in danger—that as they make common cause with Popery, in her attempts to persecute and subvert the established Church, they therefore apprehend, that any attack upon their ally may tend to bring disgrace or discomfiture upon themselves. The idea of 'extending acrimonious feeling towards the unoffending Catholics, and exciting one class of Christians to be as intolerant as possible towards another,' is a mere sophistical gloss upon the truth. Here are facts adduced, to prove that the principles of Popery that are cherished, disowned, published, acted on, and abjured, are principles of perjury, persecution, and murder; and if we dare to state these facts, and they do not dare to attempt to disprove them, let every honest man say whether this is exciting one class of Christians against another, and not rather exposing that iniquity which makes hatred and persecution a part of the religion of Christ. The most important part of this subject is that which refers to the Roman Catholics of Hereford. Your 'Correspondent' says, that 'the number of Roman Catholics in this city and county, bear no greater proportion than one in five hundred compared with the Protestants'—that 'the Catholics of Herefordshire include several of our most ancient and respectable families, and several individuals of acknowledged honour and talent, education and taste, and that they have all been distinguished by unobtrusive manners, by great moderation, and by exemplary conduct.' He therefore concludes that 'suspicion, and more than suspicion, must arise in any mind capable of judging, that religion in this, and many other cases, is but the stalking horse and the cloak of some very different design, and that politics (but ill concealed) formed the real object lurking at the bottom.'

"Now, Sir, I am very willing to take for granted all that your Correspondent states, as to the Roman Catholics of Hereford. I do not mean to call them into question, nor do I wish to inflict an unnecessary wound on their feelings. I am credibly informed that their numbers are on the increase, and I know that the ministers and emissaries (foreign and domestic) of the Pope, are making rapid progress not only in Hereford, but in all England, to blind the minds of men, and to delude them as to the character of Popery. But I beg to suggest to your Correspondent, that neither 'antiquity of family,' nor 'talent,' nor 'taste,' nor 'unobtrusive manners,' nor even 'exemplary conduct,' will make a sinner fit to stand in the presence of his God. I willingly take my stand among the Roman Catholics of Hereford, or any other Roman Catholics, as a poor sinner like themselves; and because I do so, and because

I feel for them, and with them, I therefore bear my testimony faithfully; and I trust, in sincere Christian kindness and charity to them, that the lying refuges of superstition which Popery sets before the sinner, can never save the soul that is so miserably blind as to rest on them. I cannot judge of individuals, unless as they may stand forth to confess their dependence on the system; but I am called on, as a Minister of Christ, to expose and to denounce the abominations of that system, and I do most earnestly submit to the Roman Catholics of Hereford these considerations:—

“ Can a system that inculcates treachery, perjury, persecution, and murder, be really the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ ?

“ Can men, who in their secret conclaves, cherish, and discuss, and inculcate these principles, and then, when they are dragged into light, deny them, and illustrate the iniquity of their system by the perjury with which they abjure the principles they have secretly inculcated—Can such men be Ministers of the Gospel of Christ, and not rather the Ministers of Antichrist ?

“ Can men, who pretend that the Word of the living God is not fit for his creatures to read, without the exposition of their Church to keep them from error, and who, when called on, are unable to give them that exposition—who pretend that the Church is the interpreter of the Scriptures, and then, when called on, are unable either to produce any interpretation of their Church, or to give an interpretation of their own—Can such men be true Ministers of the Word of God ? or can such a Church be the Church of God ?

“ Why should any free-born Englishman abandon his liberty of conscience—the blessings of the Word of God—the true religion which it has pleased God to establish in this country, for the spiritual slavery of the Italian tyrant—the Antichrist—the Pope of Rome ?

“ Bad as the principles of Popery are, as applied to the Protestants, they are ten thousand times worse as applied to the Roman Catholics—they might bring our temporal liberties into jeopardy, and our persons to the stake; but they bring the souls of those who bow to them into spiritual slavery, and drown them in destruction and perdition. And now I can assure the Roman Catholics of Hereford, that I bear this testimony not from a feeling of hostility to Roman Catholics, on the contrary I trust as a Christian, I should sincerely rejoice to render the least kindness to the poorest among them, I am sure if this is not my inclination I must be unchristian; but I call on them and exhort them in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, to come out from that guilty Babylon the Church of Rome, that they be not partakers of her curses and her plagues. I adjure them as they love their own souls and the souls of their children, to examine these principles in the light of God's Word.

“ To talk of their family being ancient, and their forefathers being of this religion, is absurd. A Turk might say his father had been a Mahometan. A Jew might say he and his father had always hated Jesus of Nazareth; but that is no excuse for either Jew or Turk, and I see not why it is, for a member of the Church of Rome. If he is found before the bar of God, turning from the salvation of the Lord Jesus Christ to the refuge of lies, which his Church sets before him, it will profit him nothing that his father had done so.

“ There is but one hope—one refuge for us all—that hope, that refuge,

the Lord Jesus Christ, as our beloved and adorable Redeemer, his precious blood is the fountain, the only fountain for our sins, and that blood of atonement cleanseth from all sin—to know this, to trust Him, to love Him, is to be a Christian, and to serve Him in your life and conversation, is to prove that you are so.

“The lying refuges of the Church of Rome shut out this hope from the sinner; her masses—penances—absolutions—indulgences—purgatories—false mediators—traditions—and all her hosts of superstitions and idolatries—and, above all, her anti-Christian doctrine of the merits of human works, turn away the soul from Christ, and leave it to the Priests to make merchandise of it as they do. I entreat the Roman Catholics of Hereford, to search the Word of God, and if they find Christ as the refuge, instead of their vain superstitions, then let them turn to Him as their hope and their strong tower. I most sincerely pray for the blessing of God, to accompany these considerations to them. I can assure them that the worst wish I feel for them, and for all my Roman Catholic fellow subjects is, that God may enlighten them and bless them with the hope of salvation in that same Gospel in which alone is the hope of my own soul. I shall hold myself bound to them, to stand before them and meet their Priests, if they choose to appear to expound the Scriptures, as I shall propose, if I am spared for some days, in the Worcester Newspaper, to the Priests there, and I can assure them it will give me much greater pleasure to stand forth before the Roman Catholics of Hereford, or any other place, in a spirit of Christian faithfulness, and regard, to expound to them the Gospel of Christ, than to stand in any assembly whether of Protestants or Roman Catholics, for the painful, but necessary purpose of exposing and denouncing the iniquity of the Irish Bishops, in adopting, and maintaining, and denying, and abjuring, the atrocious principles of Peter Dens.

“I have the honour to be, Sir,

“Your obedient Servant,

“R. J. M'GHEE,”

“Hereford, September, 19th.”

The reader, on referring back to page 222, will see the letter dated August 31st, addressed before the Hereford Meeting to Mr. Woods, the compiler of the Directories, and on September 21st, the following answer from that gentlemen was published in the *Hereford Times*:

“THE O'MULLIGAN MISSION.”

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HEREFORD TIMES.

“79, Marlborough-street, Dublin, Sept. 21st, 1835.

SIR—I need no apology to the good citizens of Hereford for obtruding myself on their notice; if a lengthened report of recent proceedings in their Town Hall speaks correctly, they are already made familiar with my name. On the contrary, I think that I owe them an explanation, for I was summoned  
Ca

to their city and demurred to the citation.—Indeed I felt that I should have long since stepped forward, but news from Hereford reaches Dublin tardily, and I awaited the appearance of a full report of the proceedings at the intended meeting, that while I apologized for my apparent neglect, I might at the same time (if necessary) add a word or two on the often-repeated arguments which I was aware would be adduced on that occasion. Another reason, too, kept me back; the conviction on the minds of all rational persons on this side of the Channel that the controversy was virtually at an end, and that more than enough had been said and written of Dens's Theology. A letter from a gentleman of much respectability in Herefordshire has fixed my wavering, and I am obliged to abandon the comparative retirement in which I live, and which I so much prize. Believing in my inmost soul that true religion is based on charity, and accustomed from my earliest years, as much as in me lay 'to have peace with all men,' it is not without difficulty I take up my pen on a controversial subject—nor do I do so now, for the purpose of 'rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing,' but from a conscientious conviction that I am bound to state the truth, in opposition to the gainsayers.

"A letter appeared in some of the Dublin newspapers addressed to me, and signed 'R. J. M'Ghee,' inviting me to appear on the 9th of the current month, at the Town Hall of Hereford. The first question I naturally asked myself was, who is this gentleman? And how is he authorized to invite me? Is he the mayor or one of the official authorities of the city? Is he the intended chairman, or the chairman to the proposed meeting? Is he, at least, the secretary to the committee of preparation? No—he tells me himself that he has received a 'pressing invitation.' If the citizens of Hereford wished to hear me for my cause, surely the same gentleman who invited Mr. M'Ghee could have written to me. The humblest individual who writes a civil letter to me, is sure to receive a civil reply; but, perhaps, Mr. M'Ghee was authorized to invite me—he does not state so, and I have too high an opinion of the good breeding and gentlemanly bearing of the Herefordians to suppose they would not have had more taste than to make my adversary the bearer of their will and pleasure to me. And did any man in his senses suppose that I would cast aside my solemn and serious duties, and betake myself to a strange city, to stand my trial before a partial Chairman, the professed calumniators of my religion, my accusers, in the midst of an assembly convened 'not for discussion,' but to pass previously-prepared resolutions condemnatory of my supposed principles, at the mere bidding of a man, whom I had never seen, to whom I had never written, and of whom I know nothing, save by public report? Did Mr. M'Ghee think me such a fool as to run over to Hereford to enact a part in his new Tragic Comedy? No; he was convinced, while inditing that letter that I could not, and would not, accept his challenge. For his offer to defray my expenses, I pray him to accept my thanks. I am always grateful for kindness proffered or bestowed. As these fifty guineas have, I presume, been already collected for my use, I take leave humbly to suggest, that they would be beneficially divided between the Mendicancy and Indigent Roomkeepers of this impoverished city, unless, perhaps, they might be found useful in purchasing 'a patent' for Mr. M'Ghee's newly-invented and most important discovery.

"The usual approbation of 1808, as at Exeter Hall, engaged the attention of the late meeting at Hereford; that approbation of which Doctor Murray, though a bishop in 1809, 'never heard except through the printer's advertisement'—that approbation in juxtaposition with which I am going to place a fact. Shortly after Mr. Coyne's first edition of *Dens* made its appearance, it was proposed by a member of the Board of Maynooth, that it should be made a class-book for the students. And what was the result of that motion? It was unanimously rejected. This fact can be proved by the present respected President of Maynooth College, and stands recorded in the minutes of the proceedings of the board. If the approbation were *general* and *unanimous* in September, 1808, is it not strange that four Archbishops and seven Bishops, who were members of the board, should reject the same work *unanimously* in February, 1809? But then, quoth Mr. M'Ghee, this book, which the Board of Maynooth rejected as improper for the use of students, is the very identical one selected by the Bishops of Leinster as 'the Conference-book' for the clergy. Prodigious objection! Four Bishops resolving to have the same subjects discussed in their respective dioceses at the same time, and agreeing to a certain order in which the questions are to be proposed, have therefore made the author, whose order they adopted, 'a Conference-book.' Did we meet for the first time to learn our business, we might well have a *class book*, though even in Maynooth we have frequently taken leave to differ from our author. But what is the case? A number of men, possessing, it is true, intellects of different orders—but all having passed through the ordeal of a collegiate course; all subjected to an examination for faculties; all obliged to know certain principles, and many of them acting on those principles for ten, twenty, nay, some for forty and fifty years—*assembled at conference.*

"Does any rational man suppose that they come to the discussion with *Dens's* Theology as a catechism in their hands? I do myself solemnly declare, that I never read a line of *Dens* until 1830, though some few years previously engaged in discharging the duties of the ministry, and attending at conferences; and further, that among the eight priests who serve in this church and parish, there is, and has been but *one copy* of that author. How sadly distressed must we not be to prepare our *lessons* on the eve of the day of conference! It is not to the questions, but to the answers and the conclusions drawn therefrom, that Mr. M'Ghee should call the attention of his hearers. In vain will he say, the answers are drawn from *Dens*. I deny it utterly. Does he set at naught our solemn oaths? So far back as 1818, I swore what I then believed, and now firmly maintain, that it is unchristian and impious to murder, destroy, or injure any person whatsoever, for or under pretence of being a heretic. My oath on a subject which I must and ought to know, is at least as good as Mr. M'Ghee's assertion, grounded as he admits it is, upon 'circumstantial evidence.' When he read the intolerant doctrines of *Dens* for his auditors, he ought to have added those of Luther, Calvin, John Knox, and a host of other worthies, and closed the said recitation with this truly Christian lesson, furnished (be not startled) by Pope Clement the Fourteenth—'the great misfortune in this case is, that some people confound religion with her ministers, and make her responsible for their faults. It never was religion, but false zeal pretending to her, that seized fire and sword to compel



heretics to abjure their errors, and Jews to become Christians. And what is more dreadful than to see good men fall victims to a zeal displeasing in the sight of God, and condemned by the church as equally hurtful to religion and the rights of society? The example of Jesus Christ, who during his residence on earth bore patiently with the Sadducees and Samaritans (the infidels and schismatics of those times,) obliges us to support our brethren of whatever communion they may be; to live peaceably with them, and not to torment them on account of any system of belief which they may have adopted. The power of the Church is purely spiritual. Our blessed Saviour himself, when he prayed for his executioners, taught us how his cause is to be avenged. Had the ministers of the Gospel been always careful to follow that divine model, the enemies of Christianity would not have been able to bring against it the unjust reproach of favoring persecution. The Catholic Church always disavowed those impetuous men who, stirred up by an indiscreet zeal, treat those who go astray with asperity; and its most holy bishops at all times solicited the pardon of the apostates, desiring only their conversion. Men, therefore, ought not to impute to the church those excesses, of which history has preserved the memory, and which are repugnant to the maxims of the Gospel.'

"Would to God that Mr. M'Ghee and his associates could imbibe somewhat of the spirit of charity and peace which glowed in the breast of this Pontiff; and that, instead of exciting religious rancour in the provincial towns of England, they would stay at home and devise means to ameliorate the condition of their poor countrymen! Not content with going over the old ground, Mr. M'Ghee exhumed another authority for his auditors at Hereford, in the person of the late excellent and venerable Dr. Lanigan. Though quietly reposing in his tomb since 1812, he judged that he

'Was more handy to call up in a hurry,  
Than Doctor M'Hale or Doctor Murray.'

If the good old bishop could instruct him from his grave, he would tell him that to quote an appropriate passage from an author, is not to bind one's-self to all the principles or doctrines that he advances, and that the act of an individual bishop cannot possibly be considered the act of the whole episcopal body. Before I close this letter, I may be allowed to advert to one other topic. A Rev. Mr. Tottenham is reported, in your journal of Sept. 12th, amongst other things, to have said that 'we worship the Virgin Mary, *who*, in several of our formularies and books of devotion, is expressly spoken of as the INTERCESSOR between GOD and Man.' Now, sir, will you allow me to place alongside of the statement, an instruction which I, a Catholic priest, gave to a Catholic congregation, on the last festival of the Virgin Mary, the 15th of August:—

'The Catholic Church teaches, that Christ Jesus, who gave himself a redemption for all, is the one and sole Mediator between God and man—that it is through him alone we have access to the Father—that there is no salvation in any other, and no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved, but by that of Jesus; she teaches that Mary, privileged though she be, is only a creature, infinitely below God, indebted to him for all the gifts of nature and grace she possessed in this life, and the eminent degree of glory to which she is exalted in

heaven, and that she is not to be honoured beyond the bounds of moderation and decency. The Catholic Church further teaches, that the honour to be paid to Mary is of a relative character, redounding effectually upon, and terminating wholly in God; and that if we honour and admire her eminent virtues, we only proclaim the infinite power and bounty of her divine Maker, and that we are but fulfilling that prophecy which the Holy Ghost uttered by her own lips, 'Henceforth all generations shall call me blessed, for he that is mighty hath done great things for me, *Holy is His name.*' To her, above all the children of men, was said by Heaven's deputed messenger, 'Thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and shalt bring forth a son and thou shalt call his name Jesus.' In the language of St. Matthew, she is 'Mary of whom was born Jesus, who is called the Christ,'—true source of her greatness—true source of the respect the Catholic Church pays her.

"Hundreds can testify as to the fact of my having delivered these sentiments and in these precise words, from the pulpit of the Metropolitan Church in this city, on the day above alluded to. The citizens of Hereford will surely find nothing in this doctrine derogatory to the honor due to God, or repugnant to the saving mediation of the Lord Jesus. I would finally entreat them to inquire our doctrine of ourselves, and not to take them on the word of itinerant or interested declaimers.

"For the length of this communication, accept my apology, and believe me to remain, your humble servant,

"P. WOODS."

On the 23d of September, the same gentleman addressed a letter to the Rev. Maurice James, Rector of Pembridge, who is mentioned in the preface:—

"TO THE REV. MAURICE JAMES, B. D., &c. &c.

"REVEREND SIR—To you, whose laudable exertions for the spread of good-will and charitable feelings among Christians of every denomination have brought down upon you the ire and denunciations of the gentlemen who recently exhibited at the Shire Hall, Hereford, I take leave to address the following brief observations:—

"It is notorious as the light of day, that none but the clergy of the district in which it is held are admitted to the Conference. Mr. M'Ghee himself designates them '*Secret Conferences.*' He has no opportunity of ascertaining by any possibility, what occurs at them; and yet, with the same lips which pronounces them '*secret,*' he tells the people of England—'The deeds of darkness which are reduced to horrid practice over the drunken debauch of the midnight assassin, are debated in principle in the sober morning religious Conferences of the Priests.' Is this what Englishmen call fair play?

"Again, the questions which are to be proposed at the Conferences are printed each year. They can be had by any body who chooses to purchase the Clerical Directory. But questions prove nothing. It is the answers which record our sentiments and doctrines. Hence the reverend orators

have laboured with uncommon efforts to prove that the answers, too, are taken from Dens. 'It is not out of questions, but out of answers that new questions arise—the answer is the intermediate term between the original and the suggested question.' Now it so chanced to happen that the Directory containing the questions for each year, must be published before the 1st of January. The Conferences in the country are held in the months of June, July, August, and September; those in the city in November, December, January, and February. What a spirit of divination must I not possess, to anticipate the answers which will be given in June or November following, and to ground subsequent questions upon them? Is this the reasoning Englishmen like? I should think not.

"I have the honor to remain,

"With much respect, your obedient servant,

"P. WOODS."

"Dublin, Sept. 23, 1835."

---

On the 30th September, the following letter was addressed to Dr. Murray, in the Dublin Evening Mail, by Mr. M'Ghee:—

"SIR,—Could I feel surprised at any finesse in equivocation from an individual, the principles of whose religion are embodied in Dens's Theology, I should express my unfeigned astonishment at two letters bearing your signature; the first dated September 12th, addressed to some gentleman in Worcester, whose name is not given in the public prints; the second addressed to the Editor of Berrow's *Worcester Journal*, and dated September the 14th. The general contents of these letters I shall reserve, if it please Divine Providence to spare me, for some future opportunity to answer, but I merely extract two passages from the first of them, for present consideration.

"You commence with this sentence:—

"Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 8th inst. I beg to say, that the itinerant sowers of discord to whom you allude, do well to carry their calumnies at a distance, where detection is not easy; here they could have no chance of success.'

"And you close with the following paragraph:—

"Among my calumniators some very sagacious persons endeavoured to place my actions in contradiction with my declarations, by asserting that I was one of a meeting of bishops, held in Dublin, in 1808, which meeting is said to have agreed, 'that Dens's Complete Body of Theology was the best book on the subject that could be republished.'

"Whether or not such an episcopal declaration was made I never heard, except through the publisher's advertisement; but it is, at all events, quite clear, that if it was, I, at least, could have had no participation in it, for I was not then a bishop, but engaged in the duties of the more meritorious office of a working curate. Observe, now, the kind of proof by which it is sought to connect me with this meeting. In 1826, my name is found among

the Irish bishops disavowing certain intolerant and antisocial doctrines; and, therefore it is assumed, that I must have been eighteen years before among the supposed episcopal approvers of Dens's Complete Body of Theology! Is it not wise in these calumniators, when they wish to circulate their impostures to go to a distance from home!

"Now, Sir, in the first place, you affect to say that a charge had been made against you, which you disprove by the matter of fact—namely, that you approved this book as a bishop in 1808, whereas you were not in that year a bishop; and having thus assumed this charge, and thus triumphantly refuted it, you ask, 'is it not wise in these calumniators, when they wish to circulate their impostures, to go to a distance from home!'

"Pray, who made this charge, Sir? So far from having advanced this charge against you, in my speech at Exeter Hall, on the 11th of July, as reported in the public journals, and in the pamphlets both of London and Dublin, my words were—

"'He (Dr. Murray) says, 'I did not direct the work of Dens to be published.' Mr. Coyne does not say he did—but he says that all the bishops directed it in 1808. Now, Dr. Murray was not a bishop in 1808—he was not a bishop till 1809, and therefore, he certainly could not have directed it to be published in that year."

"You affect to say that a charge has been brought against you as to a fact, which, on the contrary, it was declared you could not have committed, and you urge as a triumphant vindication the very reason which was given for not bringing this charge! Now, what a shallow, Jesuitical artifice is this!—an artifice which a person not intimately acquainted with the facts could not discover. What a melancholy illustration it affords how thoroughly you have profited, as a scholar, by the study of that theology which you have inculcated as a master!

"But, 'it is well for your calumniators to go to a distance, where detection is not easy.'" Now, how could you have the weakness to commit yourself by such a statement as this?

"Pray, Sir, who are they that have fled from investigation, and trembled at detection? If we went to a distance from home, had not you, Sir, an opportunity to follow us? Was not an advertisement published, a fortnight before our first meeting, stating expressly that it was "for the purpose of affording to the Roman Catholic Bishops in general, and to Dr. Murray, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, in particular, as specially implicated in the charge, an opportunity of meeting it in public in their own persons, or by any of their Clergy, or by any Roman Catholic layman duly delegated and authorised by them?" Why did you not come? Why did you not send? Who fled from detection, here, Sir?

"Did I not address a letter to you, dated June 29th, before our second meeting of July 11th, apprising you of the intended meeting, referring you to the documents and proofs produced at the former meeting, and inviting you to send any of your clergy, or to commission Mr. O'Connell or Mr. Shiel to come forward and meet those statements, which should be repeated at Exeter Hall, on the 11th of July? Did I not send this letter to your own house? was it not delivered to you by your servant? and did not your own servant inform my friend who took the letter, and called again, that there was no answer?"

“ Did I not publish a letter in the *Times*, dated July 17, after our second meeting, challenging Mr. O’Connell to debate, if he could, the evidence of the case before a select number of the House of Lords and Commons, equally chosen by lawyers appointed by him and us ?

“ Was this going to a distance, Sir ? Was Mr. O’Connell at a distance from Exeter Hall ? Who were the men that trembled at detection here ?

“ Again, Sir, when Mr. Woods, in that valuable letter to the Editor of the *Evening Post*, in which he so fully corroborated all the statements as to the facts against you, complained that we had gone to a distance—that we did not choose the Rotundo instead of Exeter Hall—did I not write a letter to the Editor of the *Evening Mail*, offering to meet Mr. Woods or any priests whom you chose to authorize, in the Rotundo, and to divide the tickets of admission with you for the benefit of my Roman Catholic friends and countrymen, who, I trust, will see, through this very means, the awful falsehood of that superstition which your church imposes on them for the Christian religion ? Was this going to a distance, Sir ? Who fled from detection here ? if detection of our impostures was so easy at home, why did you not avail yourself of this offer ?

“ Did I not in the same letter offer to give one hundred and fifty guineas to any three priests you chose to authorize, to come over to Exeter Hall, if you wished to counteract on the spot the statements made in London ?

“ Finally—Did I not offer Mr. Woods fifty guineas to bear his expenses, if he chose to come with any friend to attend the Hereford meeting ?

“ Now, you did not dare to notice one of these offers, and yet you sit down and write to a gentleman at Worcester that your calumniators go to a distance, when you know in your conscience that neither at a distance nor at home could you refute one of those facts which you call calumnies.

“ Now, Sir, as to being a calumniator : I trust I do not desire to merit the name. I have often written on the errors of the Church of Rome, and sometimes on the guilty exhibition of those errors in some of her members ; but I never wrote a line in which I did not give a full and ample opportunity to meet the charge, had it been possible to do so. Now, Sir, I answer your charge of calumny thus.

“ I assert these following propositions :—

“ 1st. Not that you approved of the publication of Dens’s Theology in 1808, with the bishops of the Church of Rome, as you were not then a bishop ; but that, while in your answers before the Parliamentary Committee in 1825, you gave Holden’s Analysis and Verron’s Rule of Faith, as the standards of your doctrine, you in that very year, and in the years 1826 and 1828, signed with your own name, and preserved for your own diocese, the Diocesan questions of conference for your clergy, taken from Dens’s Theology. This I prove from the comparison of the conference questions with Dens, and you can refute it by producing any other author, from whom you will say and prove you took the questions.

“ 2nd. That in the year 1831, you, in conjunction with your three provincial Bishops, adopted Dens as the conference-book for your province, though you said in your letter to Lord Melbourne, you ‘ did not make it a conference book.’ This I state on the evidence of Coyne, the evidence of Mr. Woods,

and the fact of the questions for your provincial conference corresponding with Dens, as published in your own Directory.

"3rd. I assert that you not only made it the conference-book, but that you prescribed the very treatise and page where the questions were to be commenced, beginning in the middle of the first volume; thereby by your own direction omitting the doctrines contained in the first half of that volume, which are on the fundamental principles of Christianity. This I state on the evidence of Mr. Woods, who declares that you yourself announced to him the very treatises which you were to discuss from Dens.

"4th. I assert, that in consequence of your making it a conference-book for your province in 1831, and the difficulty of procuring it, though three thousand copies had been printed in 1806, Coyne undertook, in 1832, a new edition, with your express sanction and approbation, as is proved by the words of the dedication, which you confess is conspicuous in your own copy; and which, therefore, most conclusively proves the fact, that you admitted and adopted it.

"5th. I assert that you sanctioned and approved an eighth volume to that edition, of which eighth volume you knew the contents, and approved of them, which are selections from canons and constitutions of your popes, as well as bulls, and which are selected, (as their own express references to the other seven volumes prove,) to corroborate the principles of your Church as laid down by Dens. This I state on the evidence both of Mr. Coyne and Mr. Woods, and the internal evidence of the eighth volume.

"6th. I assert that while, as stated in No. 3, you expressly omitted in 1831, the fundamental principles of the Christian faith from your questions of conference, as contained in the first volume of Dens, you as expressly retained the whole code of persecuting doctrines in your conferences for 1832, as contained in the beginning of the second volume of Dens, which you pretend, in your letter to Lord Melbourne, are obsolete.

"7th. I assert that in the eighth volume you have approved, as selections from the infallible authorities of your pope's bulls and decrees of intolerance, persecution and murder; that in the bull Unigenitus, which you proved yourself was in force in Ireland, you anathematise the very fundamental principles of our religion, and hold out, not only the condemnation of our principles, but the coercion, compulsion and persecution of our persons; you also lay it down as the duty of bishops to exterminate us from your dioceses. This I prove by the words of the eighth volume.

"Lastly, I say the persecuting doctrines of your Church which you pretend to abjure, so far from being obsolete, are embodied in canons, and decrees, and bulls, which you call infallible, which you boast can never be changed, and which you have sworn on your oath as a bishop, and pledged yourself in Pope Pius's creed, to maintain to the latest hour of your existence. If your oath of abjuration to Lord Melbourne is true, you are guilty of an act of perjury to your Church; and, if you do not violate your oath as a bishop to your Church, there is not a shadow of truth in your abjuration of these doctrines to Lord Melbourne.

"Now, Sir, these are eight plain, honest, intelligible propositions; you may call them calumnies—I assert they are truths. And now I challenge you before the whole nation, to appoint one, two, three, four, or five priests, to meet one, two, three, four, or five of us, who have spoken on this subject.

We will meet you in Ireland or England—the Rotundo or Exeter Hall, and go seriatim through these eight propositions, and disprove one and all if you can. If you choose to try, the press will convey the result to the nation. If you do not choose to do so, I will take your letter addressed to the gentleman at Worcester, and take this letter, if I am ever spared to go to another public meeting, and I will read them aloud, and show what you complain of as calumnies you are forced by your silence to acknowledge as truths, and that the charges which you profess to cry out against as being carried to at a distance, you dare not venture, when called upon, to meet in the midst of your own priests and people.

“And now, Sir, before I conclude, I call on you and charge you before that God who shall judge the quick and the dead—before whom you and I are both so soon to stand in judgment; I charge you, while He spares you, and while it is called to-day, to awaken to the study of His eternal Word, and to come out from that antichristian apostacy, which stands marked in that Word, for judgments and condemnation. How can you reconcile it to the belief of even a future state of retribution, to be secretly inculcating on others, and cherishing in your own heart, those vile principles which you are unable to defend, or even to acknowledge? Oh! Sir, repent and turn from those vanities and refuges of lies, to serve the living God. I wish to conclude in saying to you and to all my Roman Catholic friends, “my heart’s desire and prayer to God for you all is, that you may be saved;” and I testify against your guilt and your superstitions, with the earnest hope and prayer that God will ultimately bless the testimony, however weak in itself, to be an instrument “to open your eyes, to turn you from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that you may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them that are sanctified through faith which is in Jesus Christ.”

“I am, Sir, an enemy to perjury and persecution, and a faithful friend to the best interests of my dear Roman Catholic countrymen.

“R. J. M’GHEE.”

On the same date, September 30th, the following from Mr. James to the Editor of the *Hereford Journal*, contained also a letter from Dr. Murray to that gentleman.

“TO THE EDITOR OF THE HEREFORD TIMES.

“SIR,—In consequence of what occurred at the late Protestant Meeting (so called) at Hereford, I wrote to the Primate of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, Dr. Murray, as follows, viz:—

“MY LORD,—By this same post I forward to your Lordship a copy of the *Hereford Journal* of September 16th inst. containing the report of a Meeting brought together at Hereford, by Messrs. M’Ghee, O’Sullivan, &c., and also in its second page a letter from myself. Your Lordship will greatly oblige me by informing me, how it was that the authorized republication of *Dens* in 1808, and again in 1832, took place without the omission or any explanation of the passages objected to; and also what is the nature of the Confer-

ences in which the book is used, and to what use it is therein applied, and especially to what kind of comment or interpretation the passages in question are then subjected. I beg to direct your Lordship's attention also to the marked passages in the report, and to request such information as shall enable me to form a just judgment of the allegations contained in them.

"The interest which I feel, and the part which I am taking in the cause, will, I trust, excuse the freedom of my present step towards your Lordship ;

And I am, my Lord,

Your Lordship's very respectful humble servant,

MAURICE JAMES, B. D.

Pembridge Rectory, September 17th, 1835.

To which letter I received the following answer, viz :—

Mountjoy-square, Dublin, 21st September, 1835.

"REV. DEAR SIR,—I have been honoured with your Letter of the 17th inst. together with the Hereford Journal of the 16th, in which I read, with singular pleasure, the able and truly liberal paper which bears your name. Permit me, however, before I proceed further, to express my entire acquiescence in what you call the principles of Protestantism, namely, 'to refer all things, all actions, all tenets, all institutions, to the word of God.' We Catholics do so too. Our only difference, in this respect, is, that you confine that expression to the mere letter of the Scripture ; we consider part of the revealed Word of God to be unwritten (that is, not written in the Scripture), or at least not clearly contained in the written word, and to be known with certainty only through tradition, that is, the universal belief of the early Christians, as recorded in the writings of the Fathers, and other Monuments of Antiquity ; and proposed to us as such by the Catholic Church. In this class of revealed truths we rank the efficacy of Infant Baptism. But there is no part of our belief that we trace to any other source than the revelation of God. After this digression, which I trust you will pardon, I pass to the subject which procured for me the favour of your Letter.

"The chief part of the information which you require, with regard to what is called the authorized publication of Dens, will be found in the public Journal which I have the honour to forward to you by this Mail. [The Dublin Morning Register containing two letters of Dr. Murray's, which have also appeared in the Worcester Journal.]—'But why was the work allowed to go to press without the omission of the objectionable passages, or at least the note?' I am not convinced that, because we dissent from the opinions of an author, it would be therefore quite fair to mutilate his book, by omitting a treatise which, in one shape or other, forms part of every similar Work purporting to be a course of Theology. There is no similar Work which does not contain a vast number of debateable opinions, which rest entirely on the arguments which support them. Now judge how utterly superfluous would have been a note in the present instance. This Work, you are aware, was not written for the ignorant. It was written in Latin, beyond of course the reach of that class of persons, and designed solely for the use of professional men. Now those men had disavowed on oath the only opinion that could lead to any practical mischief. Of what advantage, then, would it have been to



load the page with a note? No student could be placed on the roll of Maynooth College without taking the oath alluded to in one of the Letters which you will find in the Dublin Morning Register. This surely was the strongest comment that could be made on the text of Dens. [The oath is in these terms: I, A. B., do swear that I do abjure, condemn, and detest, as unchristian and impious, the principle that it is lawful to murder, destroy, or in any wise injure any person whatsoever, for or under pretence of being a heretic.]

“ With respect to the Conferences about which you inquire, I beg to say that they are Meetings held by our Clergy at stated times each year, for the purpose of discussing, for their mutual information, questions connected with their profession. In order to render these clerical meetings more useful, and to insure the regular and gradual discussion of all the Treatises of Moral Theology, the questions are proposed in the order in which they are usually found in Theological Works. The order adopted by Dens was found to be convenient; and therefore the questions to be discussed in this Province were set down in the order in which they lie in his book; but when brought under consideration they are discussed exclusively on their own merits, without any reference to that author; and no one is required, I don't say to adopt his opinion upon any question, but even to know what his opinion is. The Publisher, in commendation of his work, is pleased to call it the Conference Book for the province of Leinster, but it is so in no other sense than that which I have just stated. The questions which he (Dens) treats are treated in our Conferences, but not as he treats them. But why were questions regarding the punishment of heresy discussed at all? Because they form a part of the Treatise on Heresy, which is never omitted in a Theological course, and which should therefore naturally come under consideration in its turn. Surely a clergyman ought to be ashamed not to know the state of a question which has so often agitated the Christian world, or to be unacquainted with the arguments which would enable him to come to a just conclusion regarding it. Would it not be satisfactory to him to be able to prove to his own mind the justice of the oath which he had taken, and to which I have already alluded? And is there any thing so very alarming in his being allowed to discuss the question even for that excellent purpose? I do think that the absurd clamour which is raised on this subject in England, will awaken a useful spirit of inquiry, and will ultimately tend to the disadvantage of the Church, which it is sought to defend by such dishonest means.

As to the resolution to which you have called my attention, I can only express my deep concern, that the individuals who have lent their countenance inconsiderately to it, many of whom I have no doubt are estimable men, have allowed themselves to be seduced, by the basest imposture, into the adoption of a most unjustifiable and disgraceful slander. I have the honour to be, with much respect, reverend dear Sir, your obliged and faithful Servant,

† D. MURRAY.

“ I will only add, that I am entirely satisfied with the explanation given in the above Letter, and in my conscience acquit the writer individually, and the Catholics in general, of entertaining, at this day, the persecuting and homicidal doctrines and dispositions attributed to them; which doctrines (the

spirit of them at least) and dispositions belong, I believe, much more to their accusers, and are really exemplified in their actions,

I am, Sir, your very obedient Servant,

“ MAURICE JAMES.

“ September 29th, 1835.”

---

On the 3rd of October, the Editor of the Hereford Times having received a reply to Mr. Woods's letter of September 21st, addressed to him from Mr. M'Ghee, republished Mr. Woods's letter (*see page 496,*) with Mr. M'Ghee's reply, which was as follows :—

“ TO THE EDITOR OF THE HEREFORD TIMES.

SIR,—Having seen a letter addressed to you by the Rev. Patrick Woods, I feel called upon to notice it.

“ The reverend author apologises to the citizens of Hereford, for not attending at their public meeting, by stating, that he had been invited by me, in a letter published in the Dublin Papers, to attend, but that he did not know ‘who I was;’ that I was not either ‘Mayor’ or ‘one of the constituted authorities;’ the intended Chairman or Secretary to the meeting,’ or ‘even to the Committee of Preparation;’ that I merely told him ‘I had myself received a pressing invitation;’ that I ‘was not authorized to invite him,’ and he has ‘too high an opinion of the good breeding and gentlemanly bearing of the Herefordians, to suppose they would not have had more taste than to make his adversary the bearer of their will;’ and he asks, ‘would any man in his senses suppose that he would cast aside his solemn and serious duties and betake himself to a strange city;’ &c. &c., or did I ‘think him such a fool as to run over to Hereford to enact a part in my new *tragi-comedy?*’ &c. &c.

“ Now, Sir, it is true I could not presume to invite Mr. Woods to come to Hereford in any official character in that city, not having the honour of being connected with it.

“ It is also true that I was not authorized by any gentleman in Hereford to invite him, so that no reflection is cast either on ‘the good breeding or gentlemanly bearing of the Herefordians.’ The case was simply this, that I had endeavoured to meet the very express wishes of that reverend gentleman himself; and, I must say, I am at a loss to account for what I must call the unreasonableness of his complaint.

“ Pray, Sir, consider the case.

“ On the 20th of June, and on the 11th of July, we had two public meetings in Exeter Hall; the bishops and clergy of the Roman Catholic Church had full notice of the time, place, and subject; Mr. Woods made several complaints of want of fairness and propriety on our part: One was, that we had gone to London to Exeter Hall, instead of selecting Dublin and the Rotunda. I offered to meet the Rev. Gentleman in Dublin, at the Rotunda; and he did not honour my communication with a reply. Another complaint was, the partiality of a

Protestant audience. I offered to give him half the tickets for Roman Catholics; this, too, he has not deigned to notice. Again, he complained that we had not told him of a fund from which to pay his expenses. I offered him one hundred and fifty guineas for himself and two of his brethren to come again to Exeter Hall; this, too, he passed over in most perfect silence. When the meeting was announced for Hereford, it appeared to me but agreeable to the gentleman's wishes to offer to bear his expenses there if he wished to come; so I told him I would give him fifty guineas for this purpose; now, the reverend theologian inquires 'who the gentleman is,' and says I am neither Mayor of Hereford, or any official authority; so that really, Sir, I know not what to do. I can only offer, through you, my best apology to Mr. Woods, for my utter inability to anticipate or meet his wishes; but, if he will do me the honour to inform me in what mode it may suit his convenience to come forward and elucidate the subject, I shall be exceedingly happy to contribute my humble assistance. Meantime, since I cannot have the pleasure of meeting him upon the platform, it is but justice to the cause of truth to remedy this, by encountering him through the medium of the press.

I really pity Mr. Woods; there seems such a vein of anxiety to vindicate himself, and his bishop and brethren, running through his letters, which issues in an unaccountable fatality, of sinking them deeper and deeper in the mire. His success seems so entirely in the inverse ratio of his intentions, that I believe there never was a system of defence so powerfully conclusive in support of an accusation.

We have wanted some more facts to throw additional light, both on the resolution of the bishops in 1808, adopting Dens as the best guidance for the priests, and also on the means by which they have endeavoured to keep it out of public view.

"Mr. Woods, in this letter, has supplied us with both. For what appears? That, in 1809, the very year after Coyne printed 3000 copies of Dens's Theology, by the united order of the Irish bishops, some one, either more daring or more foolish than the rest, proposed that it should be adopted as a class-book of Maynooth. The honest man naturally enough supposed, that if it was the best guide for the Priests, it could not be bad for the students, and accordingly proposed his motion; so that we have this fact on Mr. Woods's authority, that it actually appears on the minutes of the College of Maynooth, that, in 1809, when 3000 copies had been ordered to be printed by the Bishops, it was proposed as a class-book for the College. Now, what was the result? Mr. Woods tells us that every one of the Prelates, namely, four Archbishops and seven Bishops, who were members of the Board, *unanimously rejected it*. The very book which these men had ordered unanimously, six months before, to be printed as the best guide for the Priests, they unanimously forbid to be brought forward as the class-book of Maynooth. The conclusion Mr. Woods would request us to draw from this is, that the Bishops could not have ordered the book to be printed in 1808, when they rejected it as a class-book for Maynooth in 1809. First, I should advise Mr. Woods to be cautious in his attempt to insinuate any thing against the veracity of Mr. Coyne. Let him take care how he compels 'worthy and respectable' Richard Coyne to substantiate his assertion as to the resolution of the Bishops. Secondly, his fact, granting it to be true, proves

nothing but this, that his bishops were conscious of the iniquity with which they adopted Dens as the guide for their clergy, by the unanimity of cunning with which they kept it out of sight in their College. The class-book of Maynooth could not have been hid from the public eye. Does he imagine that such a fact can patch up a covering for his Bishops, that they kept Dens for the secrecy of the conclave, and Bailly and Delahogue for the publicity of the College? Does he forget that Dr. Murray gave Holden and Verron in, as his standards, on his oath before the Parliament, the very year when he took his own Diocesan conferences from Dens? Does he trump it up as a vindication of them, that they would not allow Dens to supersede Bailly, when it must have been detected in the College, when he told us himself in his own last letter, that the four provincial Bishops, Dr. Murray at their head, superseded both Antoine and Bailly by Dens, where they did not fear detection in the conference?

"As to Mr. Woods's personal declaration, that he never read a line of Dens till 1830, I can only say, if it be true, he could not have been a member of Dr. Murray's diocese in 1825, 1826, and 1828.

"I thank him for his mild quotation from Pope Clement. I could find him fifty smooth lies in Peter Dens.

"I now come to a part of that gentleman's letter which affords a too true, and a too miserable exhibition of the deceit and iniquity of the Church of Rome. There is no doctrine she will not deny; no principle she will not abjure; no act of idolatry or superstition she will not fritter into nothing, when it suits her purpose to blind and to deceive.

"Mr. Woods has been nettled by the faithful testimony of Mr. Tottenham, which he bore against the idolatry of his Church, in the worship of the *Virgin Mary*; and what does he do? He begs to lay alongside of Mr. Tottenham's statement a very neat and pretty specimen of his own doctrine, which he tells us he actually delivered in what he is pleased to call the pulpit of the Metropolitan Church of this city, on the 15th of August last. It is so exceedingly pretty, that it is a pity not to put it into type again. It is as follows:—

"The Catholic Church teaches that Christ Jesus, who gave himself a redemption for all, is the one and sole Mediator of God and men; that it is through Him alone we have access to the Father; that there is no salvation in any other; and no name under Heaven given to men, whereby we must be saved, but that of Jesus: she teaches that Mary, privileged though she be, is only a creature, infinitely below God, indebted to Him for all the gifts of nature and grace she possessed in this life, and the eminent degree of glory to which she is exalted in heaven, and that she is not to be honoured beyond the bounds of moderation and decency."

"The Catholic Church further teaches, that the honour to be paid to Mary is of a relative character, redounding effectually upon, and terminating wholly in, God; and that if we honour and admire her eminent virtues, we only proclaim the infinite power and bounty of her Divine Maker; and that we are but fulfilling that prophecy which the Holy Ghost uttered by her own lips, 'Henceforth all generations shall call me blessed; for He that is mighty hath done great things for me—Holy is His name.' To her, above all the children of men, was said by Heaven's deputed messenger, Thou shalt con-

ceive in thy womb and shalt bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus. In the language of St. Matthew, She is Mary of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ—true source of all her greatness—true source of the respect the Catholic Church pays her.'

"Now, Sir, permit me to place alongside of this statement of Mr. Woods another exhibition, not of what the Church of Rome is said to teach, but a practical specimen of her doctrine:—

"'Now that all these events may come to pass happily and successfully, let us lift up our hands and eyes to the most Holy Virgin Mary, who *alone has destroyed all heresies*, and is our greatest confidence, even the *whole foundation of our hope*. May she, by her patronage, in this trying situation of the Lord's flock, *implore a prosperous result of our efforts, designs, and actions*. Let us ask these in *humble prayers of Peter the Prince of the Apostles, and of his Co-Apostle Paul*, that you may all stand as a rampart to prevent the laying of any other foundation than that which is laid.'

"Now, Sir, I have only to say, that, while Mr. Woods was delivering his pretty statement in his pulpit, his Pope, and every one of his Bishops, were circulating this document, which is actually a part of the Pope's encyclical letter, translated, circulated, and enforced, by the authority of every Popish Bishop in Ireland, the year 1832; and I believe it will readily be granted that Mr. Woods is fully as honest and successful in his vindication of his Bishops from the iniquity of Peter Dens, as in the defence of his Church from the charge of her horrible idolatry of the Virgin Mary.

"I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant,

R. J. M'GHEE."

---

As Mr. Woods evidently implied in his letter, that he would have come to Hereford had he been properly invited by persons who were authorised to invite him, the Committee of the Protestant Association were resolved that he should be left without excuse, and accordingly they drew up the following resolutions, which were duly forwarded to Mr. Woods:—

"At a Meeting of the Committee of the Protestant Association of the City and County of Hereford, held at the Committee Room, Hereford, on Monday, the 5th day of October, 1835, Sir Edwyn Francis Scudamore Stanhope, V. P., Bart. in the Chair.

"Resolved—That having seen a letter to the Editor of the *Hereford Times*, signed 'P. Woods,' and being informed that this gentleman is the Roman Catholic Priest who compiles, under Dr. Murray, the Directory, and the Conferences of the Roman Catholic Priesthood of the Province of Leinster, and perceiving that he is the same person to whom a letter was addressed by the Rev. Robert J. M'Ghee, inviting him to come to the late meeting held in this city, we feel it due to that gentleman, to the cause of truth, and to all our Protestant and Roman Catholic friends and neighbours, to give publicity to our opinions and wishes on this subject.

"*Resolved*—That it appears to us conclusively established by the Gentlemen who have spoken, both at Exeter Hall and in this city, that *Dens's Theology* has been adopted by the Roman Catholic Bishops of Ireland as the guide for their priests, and by Dr. Murray, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, and the Bishops of the province of Leinster, as the Conference Book for their clergy, and that the questions actually proved to have been discussed in the private conferences of the Roman Catholic Priests of that province, are those of intolerance and persecution, assuming the right over the persons, properties, liberties, and lives of heretics, which are not only at variance with all the professions made, even on oath, by those Bishops, and generally by Roman Catholics, but are utterly intolerable in any free country, and irreconcilable to the nature of the Christian religion.

"*Resolved*—That it appears to us, from the nature of the statements made in our Shire Hall, that every fair opportunity has been afforded to the Roman Catholic Hierarchy of meeting and disproving the charges made against their principles, but that they have not ventured to do so, and that it is, in our judgment, the duty of Protestants of all denominations, and of all those who really value the blessings of civil and religious liberty, to use all their endeavours to bring forward the truth clearly on this subject before the nation.

"*Resolved*—That it appears to us that Mr. Woods having declined, as he states, to come over to this city on the occasion of the late meeting, because he was not invited by the Chairman or Secretary of our Association, and also because he did not choose to appear before a partial chairman and a partial meeting, we feel it right to obviate the objections of this gentleman, and to use our best efforts to throw every light upon this important subject.

"*Resolved*—That if Dr. Murray chooses to appoint Mr. Woods, either alone or with any other Roman Catholic Priests, to come to Hereford on any day he may please to name, giving us a fortnight's notice, so as to enable us to make proper arrangements, or if Mr. Woods chooses to do so on his own responsibility, we will apply to the Rev. Gentlemen who have spoken on this subject, to come here again to restate the arguments they have already advanced, and to afford Mr. Woods and his friends an opportunity of meeting them. That we will request Charles Thomas Bodenham, Esq. our respected Roman Catholic neighbour, or any other respectable Roman Catholic gentleman resident in this county, to take the chair, in conjunction with our Protestant Chairman, and that we will place at his disposal half the tickets for the meeting to insure an impartial auditory for all parties, and that we shall gladly defray all the expenses incurred by the gentlemen on both sides.

"*Resolved*—That the Secretary be directed to enclose a written copy of these Resolutions to Mr. Woods, according to his address as given in his letter (79, Marlborough-street, Dublin), and that they be also inserted in the *Hereford Journal*, the *Hereford Times*, the *Worcester Guardian*, and in the *Times*, the *Morning Chronicle*, the *Standard*, and the *Dublin Evening Mail*."

The following is the reply of Mr. Patrick Woods to the invitation :

“79, Marlborough-street, Dublin, Oct. 7, 1835.

“SIR—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your favour of the 5th inst. which has just come to hand. Accept my thanks for the obliging terms in which it is couched. Most happy would I be, according to the extent of my humble ability, to afford every information in my power, to the good citizens of Hereford on the principles and doctrines of Catholicity. It has, however, pleased providence that I should move in another sphere. I am placed in a large and populous parish by the will of my ecclesiastical superior, and to the spiritual wants of the people of this parish I am bound to minister ‘in season and out of season.’ My first excuse, then, for non-compliance with the expressed wish of the Hereford Protestant Association is, that ‘well-regulated charity begins at home.’

“In the second place, *Cui bono* to re-open a discussion which has already scattered the seeds of disunion and rancour throughout the land; has afflicted the lovers of peace—has disgusted the sensible and thinking portion of the community?

“Had your Committee adopted their present mode of proceeding on a former occasion, doubtless the resolution which was then adopted, and which was grounded on an *ex-parte* statement, would not have had the sanction of the meeting. Since that period, abundant evidence has been offered to the people of Hereford to prove that we utterly disclaim the doctrines and principles attributed to us. Witness Dr. Murray’s letters to a gentleman in Worcester, to the *Worcester Journal*, and to the Rev. Maurice James. This latter gentleman has distinctly stated in the *Hereford Times* of Saturday last, that ‘he is *entirely satisfied*’ with Dr. Murray’s explanation, and that ‘in his conscience he acquits the writer individually, and the Roman Catholics in general, of entertaining at this day the persecuting and homicidal doctrines and dispositions attributed to them.’ We have been charged with holding intolerant doctrines—we have long since abjured these doctrines with our solemn oaths; justice and honour alike demanded that the obnoxious resolution, grounded as it was upon false assumption, should have been at once rescinded. This is the fair play I would expect from Englishmen.

“A little reflection would have taught your Committee the absolute impropriety of asking me to meet men who accused my bishop of perjury, (the attempt Dr. Murray has made at the expense of his oath); men who, to my own solemn declaration adjoined (if it be true)—men who, to my exposition of the doctrines of my church, replied, ‘there is no doctrine which she (the Church of Rome) will not deny, no principle she will not abjure—no act of idolatry she will not fritter into nothing, when it suits her purpose to blind and to deceive.’ If the people of England will take the pains to read all that has been said and written on the subject of Dens’s Theology, they will readily see at which side of the question charity is placed, and charity and truth generally go hand in hand together.

“I remain, Sir, your very obedient servant,

“P. WOODS.

“Mr. W. Yapp, &c. &c. Secretary to the Protestant Association.

“P. S.—I have not thought it necessary to speak to Dr. Murray, or to any other ecclesiastic, on the subject of this communication.”

The next publication was a letter from Dr. Murray to the Protestants of Great Britain, published in all the Romish papers:—

“**BELoved FELLOW CHRISTIANS,**—My humble name has been *traduced before you*; and, what I feel more acutely, the divine religion which I profess has been held up to your view, in colours *so truly odious*, that if they were a faithful representation of it, *the disgusting picture* would justly merit your execration. You are lovers of justice; you are slow to decide on partial statements; I rely, therefore, with confidence on your patient attention, while I dissipate the illusion which has been practised on you.

“A Protestant clergyman, of the name of M'Ghee, *little known here except through the numerous efforts he has made to rise out of obscurity by the intemperance of his bigotry*, was able to induce some individuals of his profession to join in a citation, through the public papers, to me and the other Roman Catholic Bishops of Ireland to proceed to London, and there answer, before a public meeting, certain undefined charges which would be brought against us. What those charges were, he did not yet condescend to explain. Now, pause for a moment to consider the nature of this proceeding. Were I, or any number of Catholic Clergymen, to summon the Bishop of London, or any of his right reverend brethren, to suspend his pastoral duties, and come over to Dublin, or Cork, or Galway, or at least to send some duly authorized person to appear in his name, to answer before a public meeting of Catholics, some charge that would be there exhibited against him, would you not stare at the matchless effrontery which could have suggested such a proposal? Would you not rather believe, that the man who could venture to announce it must be labouring under some strange mental aberration? For Mr. M'Ghee, however, unfortunately for his own character, such an excuse cannot, *at least as yet*, be offered. He does not, it is true, appear, if we are to judge from such of his productions as have met the public eye, to be gifted with any high power of understanding; but he had enough of *that low cunning*, which belongs to narrow minds, to perceive that such a summons, from such a quarter, and to such a place, would not be in any manner, either personally or by deputy, attended to, and that he would be therefore enabled to advance such statements as would suit his purpose, without the risk of contradiction. But, to make assurance doubly sure, it was arranged that no one should be allowed to open his lips for the purpose of controverting those statements, without a written authority from the accused parties to plead in their defence—an authority which he well knew that no bishop would stoop to grant. *Thus, a Catholic, who might be induced through curiosity to be present at the farcical exhibition which was thus in preparation, might be doomed to bear his clergy and his religion traduced*, and himself perhaps, as a member of that religion, represented to all around him as an object of suspicion, if not of detestation—and if, while his soul burned with indignation at the slanderous charge, he would presume to stand up, and repel it with scorn, he was to be denounced as a disturber, and threatened with forcible expulsion. This, surely, is not the usual course of British justice.

“Well, the important day arrived, when the mighty disclosure was to be made; the workings of Popery were to be revealed; the hidden things of darkness were to be brought to light; the dangers which hung over the



Protestant religion were to be put forth in full relief; the public expectation was wound up to its highest pitch; in short, the mountain was in labour, and lo! the *ridiculus mas* that made its appearance, was the hitherto concealed work of Peter Dens—a work of Popish intolerance, which was exhibited to the wondering audience, as a grand discovery just then providentially brought to light; a work, however, which one of his associates acknowledged was publicly for sale in a Protestant bookseller's shop, and which could in fact have been procured by any one, at any time for many years before, with as much ease as any of those numerous Protestant books, which are equally or more intolerant, and which are still daily published without scruple, although their intolerance has not, like that of Dens, been disavowed on oath.

“ This, then, was the grand discovery, which collected in Exeter Hall whatever could be found of the deepest shade of bigotry, to witness the overthrow of Popery, and denounce his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects of Ireland, as unfit, on account of the horrid principles with which they are imbued, to enjoy any of the privileges of social life. To establish satisfactorily this conclusion, this book was held up as the standard of Catholic doctrine, and it was asserted that the doctrine which it contains goes to the frightful length of encouraging the assassination of Protestants. I am not surprised that, at this awful announcement, a thrill of horror pervaded the meeting; but we shall soon see with how little real cause.

“ That the book of Dens is, in no sense of the word, a standard of Catholic belief, has been already proved so fully to the public, that any further argument on the subject would be wholly superfluous. Indeed that author himself never for a moment contemplated such a distinction for his book. Whenever he discusses questions which are not of faith (and the greater part of his work is composed of such questions), he generally refers to the conflicting opinions of Catholic writers on the subject, and then assigns his reasons for inclining to the one side rather than the other. Those reasons which may seem to him to be cogent, may, and often do, appear to others to have no weight whatever. Of this description is his opinion with regard to the punishment of heresy, which the Catholics of Ireland have many years ago disavowed. His opinion, therefore, in this respect, is so far from being a standard of our belief, that it is directly the reverse of what is taught and believed amongst the Catholics of Ireland.

“ But here I have a heavy charge to bring against our accusers, and I bring it *with unaffected pain*. After attempting most unjustifiably to bind us to all the opinions of Dens, they have wilfully misstated the opinions of that author himself; and attributed to him, without a shadow of truth, a doctrine from which his soul would revolt with horror—a doctrine so detestable as to lead to the assassination of those who differ from us in religious belief. Now, this is pure, unmix'd fabrication. Search his volumes from beginning to end, and you will nowhere find a single trace of this abominable doctrine. He advocates, it is true, in common with many other writers, Protestant and Catholic, the justice of penal laws against the public expression of heretical opinions. But he has not written one line to countenance the atrocious opinion, that it would be lawful for any individual either to murder or in any manner to injure another, under the pretence that he professes a different creed. Yet, this is the false ground on which a tour of defamation commences; men

assuming to be ministers of the Gospel of peace, think it fitting to their vocation to become missionaries of discord; they go about, not like the blessed Saviour "doing good," but scattering the seeds of hatred and uncharitableness in their track; they summon us, whom they have falsely accused, to follow them from town to town, and stand up as culprits before a public meeting, wherever enough of bigots could be collected to ensure our condemnation; our absence is taken as proof of admitted guilt; torrents of abuse are poured out with the most disgusting petulance on what is described by the gentle epithet of "the abominations of Popery;" and a whole class of men, the Catholic priesthood of Ireland, men holding an honourable station in society, and looked up to by millions with reverence, are denounced with the most unscrupulous disregard of truth and decency, as a band of deceivers, with their oath of peace upon their lips, while they inculcate in secret to their deluded hearers the most "antichristian principles, perjury, persecution, and murder." (See various reported speeches on the subject, but particularly a letter of Mr. M'Ghee, inserted in the Hereford Journal of the 30th ult.) When a shrewd man has an object to gain by the circulation of calumny he will at least endeavour to fashion it so as to give it the appearance of truth. But here the usual caution of the calumniator is laid aside, and the very semblance of probability is considered unimportant. In fact, the accusation is not only false, but it could not possibly be true. For surely the private teaching of such abominable doctrines, for years, to six millions of people, without this work of infamy being discovered, until the book of *Dens* was almost miraculously found out, is an absurdity which can hardly be surpassed by that of asserting with one breath (as it has been asserted) that this same book was a hidden book, kept for the use of "the sacred conclave," and with the next that there were more than three thousand copies of it in circulation, any number of which a Protestant bookseller could supply.

"This pitiful stratagem may delude for a moment the ignorant and the bigotted; but it will produce to the calumniators no lasting fruit, and must ultimately tend to their own degradation and shame.

While I pity, from my inmost soul, the fanaticism which could have suggested such a desperate course, I shall not be surprised if some one will ask are there not some features of resemblance between this and what the Apostle Jude has described? "These speak evil of those things which they know not. Woe unto them! they have gone in the way of Cain," (by their wretched attack upon their neighbours' character,) "and ran greedily after the error of Balaam," (by deceiving the people,) "for reward . . . clouds they are without water, carried about of winds, trees whose fruit withereth . . . raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame, wandering stars to whom is reserved" (I tremble to write what follows; oh, God! avert the awful consummation) "to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever." (Epistle of St. Jude, 10th and following verses.)

"As for Mr. M'Ghee, perhaps some palliating excuse can be offered for him. He may have imbibed those erroneous notions of our religion which are but too often instilled in the nursery; and he may not have had, in his riper years, sufficient strength of mind or extent of knowledge to get rid of those senseless prejudices about the horrors of popery, in which he had allowed himself, almost unconsciously, to grow up. But for his *Fidus Achates*, the

Rev. Mr. O'Sullivan, the same excuse cannot be admitted. It cannot be said of him that he "speaketh evil of the things which he knoweth not." He was *trained up*, by his own admission, in the bosom of the Catholic Church. He knows that he was never taught in that Church the doctrines which are now attributed to it. If he was—where and by whom? Let him come forward and denounce the wretched being to execration and scorn. But no; he will not—he cannot do it. He has, in this respect, done all that he could. He has not ventured to assert that he ever heard such doctrine in the Catholic Church, while he was a member of it; but he has gone to rummage *old musty records*, and attempted to prove, from a perversion of their meaning, that persecution must be a tenet of the Catholic Church. This is a poor resource for one who could at once have borne testimony against us, if he had imbibed similar doctrines from his early teachers—doctrines which they could have had no interest in concealing from him, at a time when they could not possibly foresee the *unfortunate* course which he was afterwards to pursue.

"I will not follow him through those musty records, the meaning of which (as it has been already proved a thousand times) he perverts; but I will content myself with one argument so plain as to be intelligible to all.

"We Catholics believe that our Church is infallible—that is, we believe that the Spirit of God, which, according to the promise of its Divine Founder, is to abide with it for ever, will protect it from teaching, as a revealed truth, that which is not so. Otherwise that other promise, that He would be with it all days even to the consummation of the world, would fail, and the gates of hell, contrary to his express assurance, would prevail against it. Resting on these promises, calculated to lead the ignorant as well as the learned to the knowledge of Jesus, and of the truths which he has taught, every Catholic embraces with undoubting certainty, as a revealed truth, that which this unerring authority proposed to him as such. But, on the other hand, the man who would prefer his own private and erring judgment to the decision of the entire Church, sustained as it is by those consoling promises, and would reject as untrue that which he declares to have been revealed, would deny its infallibility and protest against its doctrine, or, in other words, he would by the very fact become a Protestant. Now, I deny that persecution, on account of religious opinions, forms any part of the Christian dispensation. If, therefore, the doctrine which I thus deny be a tenet of the Catholic Church, I by this denial separate myself from its communion, and to all intents and purposes become a Protestant. He who denies one article of faith, proposed as such by the Catholic Church, tears up the foundation on which the whole system rests, pronounces it to have fallen from the privilege of inerrability, and to have ceased to be "the pillar and ground of truth." Yet I glory in the name of Catholic; as such I am recognised; and to the centre of Catholic unity, the everlasting Chair of Peter established in Rome, I am conscientiously and indissolubly united. Persecution, therefore, is not a tenet of the Catholic Church. Nay more; if it were, the whole hierarchy of Ireland would have long since renounced its title to the name of Catholic. For on the 25th of January, 1826, thirty Catholic Bishops, including three coadjutors (that is all the Catholic Bishops of Ireland), published a declaration containing the following words:—'The Catholics of Ireland not only do not believe, but they declare upon oath that they detest as unchristian and

impious, the belief that it is lawful to murder or destroy any person or persons whatsoever, for or under pretence of their being heretics; and also the principle, that no faith is to be kept with heretics." Yet those bishops were Catholic, eminently Catholic, and it was their glory never to have swerved from "the faith once delivered to the saints," nor to have "greedily run after the error of Balaam for reward." It is absurd, then, to talk of persecution as a tenet of the Catholic Church.

Observe now, I pray you, how the Catholic clergy of Ireland endeavour to impress upon their flocks the spirit of those declarations. In the Catechism sanctioned by the four Catholic archbishops of Ireland, and which is in general use through the country, the following questions and answers are found:—

"Q.—To how many Commandments may the ten Commandments of God be reduced?

"A.—To these two principal Commandments, which are the two great precepts of charity, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbour as thyself. This do and thou shalt live."—Luke x.

"Q.—And who is thy neighbour?—Luke x. ver. 29.

"A.—Mankind of every description, and without any exception of persons, even those who injure us, or differ from us in religion.

"Q.—How am I to love my neighbour as myself?

"A.—'As you would,' says Christ, 'that men should do to you, do you also to them in like manner.'—Luke vi. ver. 31.

"Q.—What particular duties are required of me by that rule?

"A.—Never to injure your neighbour in word or deed, in his person, property, or character; to wish well to him and to pray for him, and always to assist him as far as you are able, in his spiritual or corporal necessities.

"Q.—Am I also obliged to love my enemies?

"A.—Most certainly. 'Love your enemies,' says Christ, 'do good to them that hate you, bless them that curse you, and pray for them that persecute and calumniate you.'—Luke vi. Matt. v.

"Allow me now, beloved fellow Christians, to appeal to your candour and to ask, does this doctrine seem to breathe, or is it in any manner reconcilable with, the spirit of religious persecution? Judge for yourselves—weigh this statement well, and decide, whether the charge of intolerance and uncharitableness will be found to rest more fairly on us or on our accusers.

"Still further: There are in Ireland at present about twelve hundred schools under the care of the commissioners of national education, and the number of them is increasing every day. Now, in every one of those schools the following lesson is required to be hung up and taught, with the full approbation of the Catholic clergy:—

"Christians should endeavour, as the Apostle Paul commands them, to live peaceably with all men (Rom. xii. 18)—even with those of a different religious persuasion.

"Our Saviour Christ commanded his disciples to love one another. He taught them to love even their enemies, to bless those that cursed them.

and to pray for those who persecuted them. He himself prayed for his murderers.

“Many men hold erroneous doctrines, but we ought not to hate or persecute them. We ought to seek for the truth, and to hold fast what we are convinced is the truth; but not to treat harshly those who are in error. Jesus Christ did not intend his religion to be forced on men by violent means. He would not allow his disciples to fight for him, &c. &c.”

“These, then, are the doctrines of benevolence and brotherly love which the Catholic clergy recommend, and practically inculcate. When impressions such as these are deeply fixed in the young mind, throughout every part of the country, how hopeless would be the attempt ever afterwards to remove them, even if it were possible to suppose that this clergy were mad or wicked enough to desire it!

“The charge, therefore, against us, that we hold persecuting doctrines, or act upon them, is clearly untrue; and it is now for our adversaries to prove, that in casting those unjust imputations upon us, they have not been guilty of deliberate slander.

“I now retire from this painful controversy, and I do so with the conviction that it has inflicted on the authors of it a more grievous and a more permanent injury than it has upon us. It was arranged in the decrees of Providence that Haman *should perish on the gibbet which he had prepared for Mordecai*, (Esther vii.) and the same Divine Providence seems to have ordained, that the snare by which our accusers hoped to ensure the ruin of our character should prove fatal to themselves.

“Before I finish, permit me to advert to one instance more of the unfairness which has throughout this controversy characterized their proceedings.

“It has been already proved on a former occasion, that at Worcester, if the report of the Rev. Mr. O’Sullivan’s speech be correct, he openly perverted a parliamentary document, for the purpose of representing the evidence which I gave before a committee of parliament, as directly the reverse of what it really was. Let us now see how he deals with the acts of a general council. In the report of his speech at Paisley, as copied from the *Paisley Advertiser* of the 26th ultimo, into *Saunders’s News Letter* of the 2nd inst. we find the following words:—‘Before the conclusion of the fourteenth century, the Nicene Creed had been adopted, and in 1546 the Council of Trent set aside that creed.’ Now, this very creed,—such as it was, adopted and amplified by the first General Council of Constantinople in the year 381, with the addition regarding the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and Son, agreed to between the Latin and Greek Churches in the Council of Florence, 839,—this very creed was actually embodied in the decrees of the Council of Trent, on the 4th of February, 1546, and is set forth in the third session of that Council as a rule of Catholic faith. After this, what fact can be so public or so authentic as to be safe from perversion? Nay, more, Mr. O’Sullivan has himself often heard this very creed recited in our Mass; and he knows that, down to the moment when he withdrew himself from our communion, it formed an important part of our Church service on every Sunday throughout the year.

“Generous Britons! You whose honourable reverence for truth forms

such a prominent feature in your character, will you any longer allow your confidence to be thus abused? Will you not at length open your eyes to the expediency of examining, by the exercise of your own judgment, the imputations cast upon us and upon our Church, rather than receive them, without inquiry, as true, upon testimony which you must now perceive is of the most questionable character? In the doctrine of millions there can be nothing secret. Take the trouble of making yourselves acquainted, through authentic sources, with the real differences of doctrine between you and us. You will find them in a little book, which I pray you to read over. It is a short exposition of the Catholic Faith, by *Bessuet*. You will find it in any Catholic bookseller's shop. It will place before you in a few short pages the articles of belief in which we disagree. Examine them one by one, in the presence of that God who is to judge us all, and, always keeping in mind the admonition of St. Paul, that 'sects' are among those evils which exclude from the kingdom of God, consider how far these differences justified your forefathers in separating from the parent stock, and how far they are sufficient to justify you in continuing still that fatal separation. Examine these things calmly but anxiously; the inquiry is the most important that can engage the mind of man. If your inquiry confirm you in your present course, I will grieve; but it is not for me to condemn. 'Who am I, to judge another's servant? To his own Lord he standeth or falleth.' With that Lord of justice we must all account; but, awaiting his righteous judgment, let us endeavour to fulfil that great precept of charity, in the obligation of which we all agree. Let us, as our blessed Saviour commands, have love one for another: let us, as his Apostle teaches, love not in word or in tongue, but in deed and in truth; and let us in the spirit of this precept endeavour to give glory to God, not by the intemperance of our zeal, but by the sincerity of our efforts to promote peace among men.

"Beloved fellow Christians! that grace and peace be multiplied unto you, through the knowledge of God, and Christ Jesus our Lord (2 Pet. 1. 2.) is the fervent wish and prayer of

"Your obedient servant,

"D. MURRAY."

Mountjoy-square, Dublin,  
October 12, 1835.

The first notice taken of this epistle of Dr. Murray's, was in the following letter to the Roman Catholics of Ireland by Mr. M'Ghee, and published in the Evening Mail, October 19th:—

#### ROMAN CATHOLIC DECEPTION.

"TO THE ROMAN CATHOLICS OF IRELAND.

"Dear Roman Catholic Friends and Countrymen,—A perfect consciousness that, in every act with which my humble name has been associated, I have felt, as I trust I shall ever feel, sincere and earnest anxiety for your best interests, gives me confidence in addressing you. I care not with what abuse I may be assailed in the public press, or in what an odious attitude I may be presented to you. I am fully convinced that you will at length be enabled,

through Divine mercy, to discern whether the man who will bear a faithful and decided testimony against the errors of the Church of Rome, at the expense of your displeasure, or the man who will flatter and encourage you in them, is more your sincere and honest friend. I can truly say I should rejoice to render a service, if in my power, temporal or spiritual, to the poorest among you; and you cannot but know that it is a painful office to wound the feelings of men, as they must be more or less wounded if we bear a testimony against the errors in their religion. While, I trust, I do not desire to inflict an unnecessary wound on your feelings, I do desire, my dear countrymen, to lead you, at any expense, to investigate truth. If I have unnecessarily insulted or distressed any among you, I regret any step I may have taken or any expression I may have uttered beyond the necessity of illustrating truth; but I confess I have not yet seen that I have done so; and I do not write to you to apologise, or to modify or retract any thing that I have said or written; on the contrary, the more I examine, the more I consider, the more do I see the imperative necessity of giving the fullest publicity to the truth of the whole subject which has so lately engrossed your attention. Depend on it, my countrymen, your interests are far more deeply concerned in the principles of Dens's Theology than those of the Protestants. The worst persecutions that the enemies of God's word can raise against the truth are of no consequence when compared with the deep delusions they impose upon the souls of those whom they mislead by error. Better to be fastened to the stake by a persecuting tyrant, than to be cast into eternal death by a false teacher. The former can, at the worst, but inflict injuries upon your bodies, but the latter can destroy your immortal souls; and if ever there was a system on earth calculated to destroy the soul of man, that system is the system of superstition inculcated by the Church of Rome. I solemnly declare I do not feel more disgusted by the abominable principles which are proved by the very confessions in your priests' directories to be taken from 'Dens's Theology,' than I do by the hollow mockery of affected liberalism and charity with which those very men, who are unable to disprove one of the facts alleged against them, attempt to evade and deny the principles which those facts unanswerably prove them to maintain.

"I trust, if I am spared, you shall soon see more of the evils which Dens's Theology entails on you; but I just call your attention now to one single point of Dr. Murray's letter to the Protestants of Great Britain—the greater part of it is to be considered in reference to Protestants, but I invite you, as plain honest men to consider one point.

"First, look at the very words of his address to the Protestants of Great Britain—'Beloved fellow Christians.' Now I take those three words—and I ask you solemnly, in the presence of God, as men who shall give account to Him who is the Searcher of hearts—do you believe Dr. Murray honestly means what he says in these words? Do you believe, from what you have ever seen, heard, and learned of your priests and bishops, that any man among them, who is a true and honest servant of the Church of Rome, can call the men who protest against the errors of that church 'beloved,' or 'fellow Christians,' in sincerity and truth? Just consider the facts—look at the very words of Dr. Murray's own letter. He says—'We, Catholics, believe that our church is infallible; that is, we believe that the Spirit of God, whi

according to the promise of its Divine Founder, is to abide with it for ever, will protect it from teaching as a revealed truth that which is not so.'

"That is clearly the doctrine of your church. Well, what does he say again?

"The man who would prefer his own private judgment to the decision of the entire church, sustained as it is by these consoling promises, and would reject as untrue that which it declares to have been revealed, would deny its infallibility, and protest against its doctrines, or, in other words, he would, by the very act, become a Protestant.' Again—'He who denies one article of faith proposed as such by the Catholic Church tears up the foundation on which the whole system rests, pronounces it to have fallen from the privilege of inerrability, and to have ceased to be the pillar and ground of truth.'

"Now, my dear countrymen, there are no men on the earth more quick in their perception of truth and reason, when you apply your understandings than yourselves, and I do intreat of you to look at these two passages which Dr. Murray uses to make out an argument of his own, which shall be considered on a proper occasion.

"First—He defines a true Catholic as one who rests on the infallibility of the church. He then defines a Protestant as a man who "denies the infallibility"—who 'tears up the foundation on which the whole system rests,' pronounces the church 'to have fallen from the privilege of inerrability,' and to have 'ceased to be the pillar and the ground of truth.'

"Now, just look at his address, and compare it with these definitions in his own letter.

"He calls the man who protests against the church a '*beloved fellow Christian*' with the man who abides by the church! He calls a man who denies the infallibility of the church a '*beloved fellow Christian*' with the man who rests on that infallibility!

"He calls a man who 'tears up the very foundations on which the whole system rests'—who pronounces the church to have 'ceased to be the pillar and ground of the truth,' a '*beloved fellow Christian*' with the man who builds upon the rock of Peter, and declares that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

Now, my Roman Catholic Friends, I ask you before God, as men who shall answer at his bar, do you believe, in your conscience, that a man can really hold the definition of a Catholic which Doctor Murray has justly given, and really hold the definition of a Protestant which he has justly given, and which he certainly believes, and yet be sincere in calling the Protestants of the empire '*beloved fellow Christians*'?—be sincere in calling men Christians who tear up the foundations of what he calls the Church of Christ!—be sincere in calling them '*fellow Christians*,' yea, '*beloved fellow Christians*,' with the true members of that church which they deny to be the pillar and ground of the truth?

"Do you not know that the admission of the name Christian, applied to us, is a virtual surrender of the Church of Rome?

"I assert that the man who uses such language, and holds the principles of the Church of Rome, is belying with his lips the sentiments and feelings of his heart; and I think the man more respectable and more honest, who really professes the principles of Peter Dens, than the man who tries to evade the



imputation of those principles by professions which he knows cannot possibly be true.

“ This is one of the worst abominations of your church, that she dares to usurp a heaven-descended authority, which gives her a right and power of denouncing all who refuse to bow to her domination, and which makes the persecuting principles of Dens a necessary part of her very existence. The man that calls a Protestant a ‘*fellow Christian*’ is either a thorough deceiver, or he does not actually hold the principles of the Church of Rome. I trust there are many of you reading your Bibles, and gradually beginning to see your way out of the corruptions of that awful superstition, and who are beginning to recognise your Protestant brethren as Christians. Look, my dear countrymen, steadily at truth, pray to God to enable you to do so. If your church is true, if her principles are sound, the more she is put into the fire of examination, the purer the gold will appear.

“ But, if any thing can be calculated to open your eyes, surely it ought to be to see the men who pretend to be the ministers of the infallible Church of Christ totally unable to disprove, yet not daring to confess, their adoption of the actual principles that constitute an integral part of their religion; receding in public from the opinions, which you know in their hearts they maintain—utterly unable to escape from facts, and betrayed into such miserable inconsistencies and contradictions, in their weak sophistical attempt to evade or reconcile their principles either with themselves, or with even the decent proprieties, not of Christianity alone, but even of the social existence of man.

“ May God Almighty send his blessing upon you, my dear Roman Catholic countrymen—may he open your eyes and hearts, and turn you from these vanities to serve the living God! May you be brought to honour his truth, and thus emancipated from the slavery of these errors; and may you so see the salvation of the gospel of Christ, that instead of protesting against your errors, we may be enabled to acknowledge the truth of your principles, and that we may mutually embrace each other, as true Christian servants of our heavenly Master, and children of our heavenly Father. Amen. My countrymen.

“ Believe me a faithful and sincere foe to the errors that enslave you, because I am a faithful, and, I hope, affectionate friend to your souls.

“ R. J. M'GHEE.”

A writer, signing himself Anti-Gallio, having entered into the lists to defend Popery, elicited the following letter to the Editor of the Evening Mail, which appeared, October 21st, 1835—

“ TO THE EDITOR OF THE EVENING MAIL.

“ SIR—Dr. Murray's letter to the Protestants of Great Britain supplies abundant subject for proof of all that has been stated by us as to the Church of Rome—it shall be fully examined, if Providence permit, in due time. In the mean while there are one or two points and persons that deserve some notice.

" I have read Anti-Gallico—First, I beg to inform him that I think a man coming to fight in armour with unarmed men is not entitled to be admitted into the lists. If he says he comes not as a combatant, but a mediator—then if he be an honest one let him avow himself, as well as his object—a good man has no reason to be ashamed of a good cause, if his intentions be really what he would wish us to believe.

" Secondly—When he compares the writ '*de heretico comburendo*;' with the persecuting laws of Popish canons—that is, when he compares the statutes which Popery introduced into the laws of England, and which Protestant governments (however they were in any instances criminal enough to act on them for any time) have long since blotted out of those laws—when he compares these with those persecuting dogmas that remain in the Popish canons, bulls and constitutions, not only unrepealed, but unrepealable till Popery renounces infallibility—and not only so, but which every Popish bishop is sworn to maintain to the latest hour of his existence; when he tries to identify these two, he is either ignorant of the subject on which he writes, or he is dishonestly endeavouring to confound fact with falsehood, and joining with Popery to blind the public mind, and to turn it from the points in question.

" Thirdly—When he pretends to excuse Popery for not renouncing these persecuting doctrines—when he actually informs us that she cannot renounce them, and yet invites us to a sort of sighing match with the Church of Rome—'*Let the writ of Elizabeth and the bulls of the Pope be equally deplored*.'—that is, let us sit down and deplore laws which are long since repealed, and let Popery deplore laws which she has not repealed, and will not repeal, and cannot repeal, but swears to observe—and prints, and propagates—When this gentleman proposes such a species of penitential diet, I only beg to recommend him to get Moore to adapt it to one of the Irish Melodies, and subjoin it as a postscript to the second edition of '*The Fudges*.'

" Lastly—When he pretends to palliate the principles of Peter Dens's Theology, and tells us that 'the objectionable pages are few in number, and in all likelihood escaped their attention,' in the teeth of the reiterated proofs that they were discussed in their conference as the actual laws of their church, the 'penalties decreed' the '*pœnæ late*' against heretics, and selected and published in the 8th volume, as approved by Dr. Murray; and when he attempts to identify these canons of Popery with some sentence he has picked out of some tract published by the Established Church Society, I can only say that nature evidently intended the man for a Jesuit, and if he is a member of the Church of England, the Church of Rome has been cheated of a favoured and faithful votary.

" When he talks of a book against persecution mutually composed and mutually circulated by Dr. Murray, Mr. Woods, Mr. O'Sullivan and me, 'without touching on any of the points of difference between the two churches, and thus proving that we 'are anxious to promote on all sides what in theory we acknowledged to be the spirit of Christ's religion,' though I believe he never contemplated the likelihood of his proposal being adopted, yet it is due to the cause of truth to notice it.

\* A poem in defence of the Romish bishops published after the Meetings in Exeter Hall, in 1836, by Thomas Moore, Esq.

"First, then, I tell him there is already a book in print that forbids persecution—a book in which no difference between any two churches are touched on, but those which are against, not man's opinion, but God's authority—a book which it is not left to man's discretion either to neglect, to mutilate, or to pervert, but which God's creatures are commanded to read, or hear—that book is the Bible. I have not, for my part, so far adopted the anti-Christian principle of the Board of Education, as to admit that a man may either, for himself or others, abandon that which God has given for his instruction, and adopt either any part which the folly of his wisdom may deem fit as a substitute for the whole, or some other book or books which he may hold in common with Popery or infidelity.—Perhaps Anti-Gallio understands this.

"Secondly—I do not acknowledge that 'the spirit of Christ's religion' can dwell, or be promoted," or produce its fruits, in a system of the spirit of Antichrist. I must ask, in the language of Scripture, 'what communion hath light with darkness? or what concord hath Christ with Belial?' Believing, as I do, that Popery is at least one system, if not the chief system, of anti-Christ, set forth in the Word of God, I cannot in Christian sincerity, and love to the souls of my countrymen who have been born under its horrid yoke, mock both my own conscience and God's truth, and their everlasting interests, by pretending to say I am doing a Christian act in dispersing books or opinions among them as savouring of true religion, or promoting true religion, which do not touch on the falsehoods of their religion—my duty is to call on them to repent, and to believe the Gospel. A system of unchristian apathy, or ignorance, or jesuistry, or perhaps political expediency, may prompt men to some such scheme, but Christian charity and Christian fidelity, and God's authority, denounce such trifling with the salvation of man; and it is very little matter whether a man chuse to assume the character of a Gallio or an anti-Gallio, when his principles will not stand the test of his Creator's word. I shall not notice the writer again, nor permit him to lead me away from the one point in question with the Church of Rome. I recommend him to read a little more of his Bible and a little more of Popery, before he writes again on the subject; he seems to require considerable information both as to the error contained in the one, and the truth contained in the other.

"I must say a few words as to Mr. Woods. He quotes a passage from a letter of mine, as furnishing one of his varied apologies for not acceding to the proposal of the Hereford Committee.

If his Bishop had been accused of perjury in the wrong, and that he could prove the fact, it would seem to me an important reason for acceding to their request—his refusal, on such a plea, wears more the semblance of a conscious incapacity to exculpate, than a confident power to defend him.

"He asks, can he meet men, who, 'to his exposition of the doctrine of his church,' replied, 'there is no doctrine she (the Church of Rome) will not deny—no principle she will not abjure—no act of idolatry she will fritter into nothing, when it suits her purpose to blind and to deceive.'"

"Now those were my words; and the more I consider them the more deliberately I assert them. Mr. Woods's individual personal character as a man, I desire not to touch on; he really seems to be amiable; his honest insertion of the name of Dens between the brackets, as the book which the

clergy were to find the answers for the conferences, and his honest confession of all the matters of fact connected with the case, prove that any taint in the simplicity of his character is to be charitably ascribed to the iniquity of that system, in which he is so unhappily involved, and from which I sincerely trust he will, with his brethren, be yet emancipated. But when he throws himself into the middle of the doctrines of his church, he is turned into a jesuit by constraint, he must adopt subtleties for the defence of a system where all truth and honest argument must fail. Now take the very point in question:—Mr. Tottenham brought forward the idolatry of the Church of Rome in worshipping the Virgin Mary. Mr. Woods, in vindication, does not go to the 'Rosary of the Virgin,' or the 'Devotion of the Sacred Heart,' or some of those documents which he found were tender ground; but he, with much jesuitical *naivete*, if I may be allowed the expression, quotes a passage from a sermon of his own, which was evidently a sermon intended to guard against this very charge. Now, to quote the fallible authority of an individual as the infallible doctrine of the church, was not quite the standard. Well—but what is the rule of worship which Mr. Woods lays down in this sermon, which he tells us so many hundred people actually heard. He says—the church 'teaches that Mary, privileged though she be, is only a creature infinitely below God, indebted to him for all the gifts of nature and grace she possessed in this life, and the eminent degree of glory to which she is exalted in heaven; and that she is not to be honoured beyond the bounds of moderation and decency.'

"'Privileged though she be!' What are her privileges? 'The eminent degree of glory to which she is exalted in heaven!' What is the degree? 'Not to be honoured beyond the bounds of moderation and decency.' What are these bounds? He gives in the smoothest manner as the doctrine of his church what he actually preached himself, and when we ask what he preached?—he preached what the grossest idolater of the Virgin Mary would admit—what neither his Pope nor one of his bishops would deny, though the Pope wrote, and his bishops all adopted, translated, and circulated, four years ago, that '*she alone has destroyed all heresies, and that she is 'the sole foundation of their hope!*' Now do the Pope and bishops exceed 'the bounds of moderation and decency,' or not? If this be not an act of idolatry I should be glad to know what is?—and if Mr. Woods has not endeavoured to fritter this idolatry into nothing, and to deny it at the very same time that he leaves an open for the commission of it all, then I can only say I am unable to read the plain language of the Pope's encyclical letter, or the plain 'moderation and decency' of Mr. Woods's sermon—I remain, Sir, your very obedient servant,

" R. J. M'GHEE."

---

The following document is published to show the various artifices and falsehoods to which Popery resorted, to bring, if possible, discredit and contempt on the persons whom they could not meet, and the statements which they could not disprove—it appeared in the *Strewsbury Chronicle* of October 23—

## "FOR THE SHREWSBURY CHRONICLE.

"We whose names are hereunto subscribed, having seen in the *Shrewsbury Chronicle* of October the 2nd, the following statement of a fact said to have occurred at the meeting of the Church Missionary Society, on the Tuesday preceding, at which, as well as at the private meeting subsequent, we were present:—

"'Into this company assembled, to aid the dissemination of Christianity among the Heathen, the Rev. Mr. M'Ghee intruded himself, offering to prove that various sects of Christians were ready to exterminate each other for false doctrine and heresy. Mr. M'Ghee is the associate of Murtough O'Sullivan, a renegade Irish Catholic, in an incendiary mission to England avowedly to provoke ill-blood between man and man, and to render the gospel of peace a firebrand to destroy all peace and religious tranquillity. Greatly to the honour of the assembled Churchmen of Shropshire, they refused hearing political diatribes; and he remained dumb till the business of the meeting was closed: when he gathered several persons around him, in a private room, to whom he expounded the identity of Peter Dens and Dr. Murray. But the audience were impatient, and left the room.'

"We consider it due to Mr. M'Ghee, and to truth, to say that there is not even the shadow of foundation for the charge of intruding himself on the proceedings of the Missionary Society, which this statement seems to prefer against that gentleman. Mr. M'Ghee was indeed present, but did not attempt to address the meeting, although earnestly requested by two of those whose names are subjoined either to move or second a resolution on behalf of the Missionary Society. There was not, consequently, the least refusal, *on the part of the meeting*, to hear him. It is true that Mr. M'Ghee did, in a private room, afterwards, when the meeting was dissolved, state the facts as to the Theology of Dens to some gentlemen who were anxious for information on that subject; but it is so far from being true 'that the audience were impatient, and left the room,' that he was requested to return to Shrewsbury when he conveniently could, in order that a more numerous auditory might be assembled to hear these important facts, and to consider whether an Association should not be formed in Shropshire, for the protection of our religion from the encroachments of the Church of Rome.

"THOMAS WHITMORE, Apley Park, Chairman of the Missionary Meeting, and also of the private Meeting.

"CHARLES RICHARD CAMERON, Incumbent of Wombidge.

"GEORGE L. YATE, Vicar of Wrockwardine.

"JOHN NUNN, Curate of Stockton.

"HUMPHREY SANDFORD, Minister of Bioton.

"W. R. STOKES, Shrewsbury.

"JAMES COLLEY, Curate of Montford.

"HENRY BAGNALL, Curate of Wellington.

"HUGH HAMILTON, Curate of Smethcote.

"ROBERT W. KYLE, Curate of Wrockwardine Wood."

The next document in the controversy, is the report of the first Meeting at Liverpool, to form a Protestant Association.

AUTHENTIC REPORT  
OF  
THE GREAT PROTESTANT MEETING,  
HELD AT  
THE AMPHITHEATRE, LIVERPOOL,  
ON  
*Thursday, the 29th of October, 1835,*

FOR THE PURPOSE OF COMMUNICATING IMPORTANT DOCUMENTS,  
AND OF FORMING A PROTESTANT ASSOCIATION.

[*Printed from Report.*]

*Treasurer.*—CHARLES S. PARKER, Esq.

**Committee.**

Mr. T. O. Cooper,  
Thos. A. Dale,  
Joshua Edwards,  
George Gibson,  
H. Gordon,  
T. B. Horsfall,  
E. Harrison,  
John Howard,  
Samuel Holme,  
Richard Harbord,  
William Jones,  
Edward Jones,

Mr. James Jackson,  
W. T. Keightley,  
James Laughton,  
George Langtry,  
Henry Menzies,  
Thomas Porter,  
R. W. Preston,  
James Robertson,  
John Smith,  
R. H. Sherlock,  
William Worrall,  
Robert Williams,

AND ALL CLERGYMEN, BEING MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

*Secretaries.*—MR. THOMAS FORSYTH, MR. MOSES EDWARDS.

At a PUBLIC MEETING, held at the Amphitheatre, Liverpool,  
on the 29th October, 1835.

WILLIAM HULTON, Esq. of Hulton Park, in the Chair.

Moved by the Rev. ROBERT J. M'GHEE, seconded by the Rev.  
RICHARD POPE.

*Resolved.*—That it has been established to the satisfaction of this Meeting, that *Dens's Theology* was adopted in the year 1806, by the Irish Roman Catholic Bishops, as the best book on the subject that could be republished, and as containing the most secure guidance for the priests, and subsequently made the Conference Book by Dr. Murray, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, and by the bishops of the province of Leinster for their clergy, since the year 1831, and that this book contains the tyrannical and anti-christian doctrines of intolerance, cruelty, and persecution, which have distinguished the Church of Rome in former days. That it appears to this Meeting, that

every fair opportunity has been afforded to the Roman Catholic Hierarchy, to meet these facts both in England and Ireland, which they have appeared incompetent to do—that the attempts which are made to deny and abjure their principles, while they cannot disprove the facts, seem to this Meeting only to illustrate and aggravate the iniquity of the Church of Rome. That it therefore appears to this Meeting, that it is the imperative duty of Protestants of all denominations, who value the salvation of their fellow-creatures, to use all means to make these facts known to their Roman Catholic neighbours—to warn them against the iniquity of such a system; that it is imperative on all Christian ministers to warn them from it—and that it is the duty of all men, who value the rights and privileges of conscience—of true religion and civil liberty—to endeavour to oppose and counteract the encroachments of Papal darkness and Papal tyranny in the United Kingdom.

Moved by the Rev. Dr. RALPH, seconded by the Rev. ROBERT P. BUDDICOM.

*Resolved*,—‘That an Association be now formed of the friends of the Established Churches of Christ, for the diffusion of Protestant information, and the maintenance of Protestant principles. And that the following Gentlemen be requested to act as Treasurer and Secretaries, and adopt the necessary measures to form a Committee; and that all Clergymen who are members of the Association shall be members of the Committee.’

CHARLES S. PARKER, Esq. *Treasurer.*

THOMAS FORSYTH, Esq. } *Secretaries.*  
MOSES EDWARDS, Esq. }

(Signed)

WILLIAM HULTON, *Chairman.*

It was afterwards moved by the Rev. R. P. BUDDICOM, seconded by DUNCAN GIBB, Esq.

That the cordial thanks of this Meeting be given to William Hulton, Esq. for his able and impartial conduct in the chair.

---

## REPORT.

At eleven o'clock, William Hulton, Esq. of Hulton Park, entered the house from the stage door, accompanied by the Rev. Messrs. M'Ghee and Pope, and a number of other friends. The appearance of these gentlemen occasioned a loud and general cheering from

the assembly. When this public manifestation of respect had subsided, C. S. Parker, Esq. moved that Mr. Hulton be requested to take the chair; this proposition being seconded by the Rev. Dr. Ralph, Mr. Hulton took the chair, and proceeded to address the meeting to the following effect:—

Ladies and Gentlemen,—Though called by the motion which has been moved, seconded, and has received your sanction, to take this chair, I could not satisfy my conscience to enter on the important duties of the day, nor would you, I feel satisfied, approve of any attempt of mine to execute them, except we first ask of Almighty God the influences of his Spirit to calm the troubles which agitate our minds, and to enable us to go through the business of this day in a spirit of peace and love. I call on the Rev. Mr. Buddicom to offer up a prayer.

Mr. BUDDICOM then stepped forward to the front of the orchestra, and offered an appropriate and impressive prayer.

The CHAIRMAN then again rose, and spoke nearly as follows:—

Ladies and Gentlemen—My Christian friends—those who know me best are perfectly aware of the deep humility with which I have entered on the duties of this day. I look around me and see many who ought to have preceded me in taking this chair: and my own insignificance in this great town, assures me that I ought not to have been placed in this very prominent situation; but, when duty calls, all minor considerations must at once give way; still I cannot help looking back to a similar meeting last year, when I had the honor of addressing you. I remember that this chair was then filled by extraordinary station and talent, of which I, unfortunately, can in no respect boast. I am aware also, that by men on whose judgment we place very great reliance, objections may be raised to the mode of our proceedings. But, if a man will leave every good work undone till no objection can be raised against it, many a good work will be left undone for ever. Now let me most anxiously implore you, my approving friends, to lay aside, as far as it is possible, every feeling of party politics, and of party prejudice. And let me assure you—if within these walls there are any that oppose—let me assure you that we meet you in the spirit of christian charity, for the cause of those whom we think to be deluded, and that no hostile provocation actuates any part of our conduct. Gentlemen, the inhabitants of the south of Ireland



are suffering cruel persecution, and the causes remain to be proved this day, if possible, by a reverend gentleman specially competent to lay before you such information. What the Church of Rome was, I have the opportunity of explaining to you in a mode which may be new to many of my hearers. I happen to hold in my hands two indulgences of two popes, authentic documents delivered to one of my ancestors, for the salvation of his soul and of mine, if I had not become a heretic. One was given by Pope Eugenius IV., and the other by Pope Boniface IX., granting an indulgence to my ancestors, and extending it to me and my successors, if they remained catholics. Are these the documents that we are to present at the bar of judgment? (Cheers.)—the passports to heaven? Is this a document you would exchange for the cleansing blood of the ever-living Redeemer of man? (Loud and continued cheering.) If the response of your hearts be that they are not, may we hope that, assembling here under the blessing of Almighty God, such a spirit may be raised in the town, that each poor Irishman may now be able to say, ignorant though I may be, this I know, that “whereas once I was blind now I see.” Gentlemen, I beg to call on the Rev. Robert M'Ghee to propose the first resolution.

The Rev. R. J. M'GHEE then rose, amidst loud cheering, and spoke as follows:—

Mr. Chairman,—Though I have the honour to address this vast and respectable meeting at the request of some of the most respectable and respected individuals who compose it, yet, if I were to appear before you on such contemptible considerations, and with such paltry and insignificant objects as the public journals have so liberally ascribed to me—if I were to stand here as a tool of a political party, actuated by political motives; to promote some political end, I should stand here with feelings very different indeed from those with which I present myself before you this day. For when I consider the importance of the subject on which I am called to address this meeting—when I consider the persons, the interests, the principles, the feelings, the prejudices, the passions which are involved in it, I should sink under the weight of the responsibility which lies on me, were I to stand on the sandy foundation of the paltry considerations of mere temporal concerns. But, sir, I stand here on very different grounds. Unconnected all my life with any political party—without communication, without concert, without conference, without authority, without

accountability to any party, or any man of any party in the nation—desirous, indeed, not to give unnecessary offence, but not solicitous in the discharge of my solemn duty to please any man in all your empire from the cottage to the throne.—I stand here, sir, on the authority of this holy Word, (holding a Bible in his hand,) the Word of the eternal God—acknowledging, indeed, my accountability for my conduct and my expressions to the laws of my country, and to the laws, I hope, not only of civilized, but of Christian society, but for my principles, for my motives, acknowledging no accountability to any one on earth—to none; but to the God of heaven. I do not, then, descend sir, into the arena of your political controversies, but I invite all your politicians, and all your statesmen, to come and ascend upon the ground on which I stand. For it is ground upon which the poorest, the meanest, the humblest individual, like myself, may stand with confidence and firmness, and it is ground on which, if the statesman or the monarch does not plant his foot, he has no foundation to rest on for time or eternity. The man who takes his stand on the principles of eternal truth, stands on an elevation superior to the patronage of the statesman, and above the power of the throne. If the whole world were arrayed against him, he stands on a rock—the world stands on a quicksand. He can smile amidst its scorn; he shall stand unmoved amidst its ruins. What effect, or whether any effect may be produced upon the political interests of England or Ireland, by the truths which it is my duty to lay before this meeting, it is not for me to calculate. This I know, that one effect ought to be produced by them—they ought to lead all men who are in error to consider, before it be too late, whether the errors of which they are ashamed in time, can stand, as your chairman has so forcibly illustrated, when we come to appear at the bar of eternity. I am sure they ought to produce this effect—that all men should know the value of true religion—the value of a religion which is founded on the Word of the living and eternal God, and that they should rally around and maintain the truth. I speak not as a politician, but as a minister of Christ, when I say, Woe, woe, woe be to the guilty nation that desires to exclude the Word of God from its councils—that will compromise, for any political consideration or any principles of man, the sacred word and authority of his Creator. Woe, I say, woe, woe to the guilty nation to which it is a matter of indifference whether the sound and faithful Word and worship of the living God be maintained, or supplanted by ignorance and superstition in any quarter of the empire.

Before I enter on the subject, let me say to my Roman Catholic friends, if I have the pleasure of addressing any here, that I can appeal to Him who searcheth the heart, that I stand not arrayed with any party against them, but, to the best of my judgment, I stand here, as I desire to stand everywhere, as their honest and faithful friend. They must expect from me fidelity; speaking in the sight of God, I must be faithful to my duty; for, "if I sought to please men, I should not be the servant of Christ." But, in the discharge of that duty, if I should use any expressions which may wound their feelings, I regret the painful necessity; and, if I should wound them by any unnecessary expressions, I trust that they will believe it is owing to the weakness of human nature, in speaking hastily on such a subject, and not to any intention of wounding the humblest, or the most insignificant amongst them.

It was not my intention to have entered into the subject of the evidence of this book—*Dens's Theology*—as having been set up as the standard of faith by the Roman Catholic bishops and priests of Ireland. It was my intention to have entered into the consideration of the principles contained in it; for I have been obliged so frequently to appear before the public and to go through the details of evidence on the subject, that those who have read that evidence are more than satiated with its repetition. But, so long as men come forward as they have done, on high authority, to deny, while they cannot disprove, the facts which have been so frequently detailed—so long as I am permitted to speak, I shall feel it my duty to reiterate those proofs and to go through the facts and evidence on this subject, till there shall not be a man in England who is able to read, that can doubt the facts as they have been laid before the nation. Now, one word, before I begin, to the editors of the public papers. An editor has a moral and literary, as well as a political character to maintain; he is, of course, perfectly free to choose what sphere he pleases to move in, as a politician, but he is not at liberty to move in what sphere he pleases as a moralist. He may make what comments on the principles, the conduct, and authorities of men he likes, but I do say he has no right to deny facts that he cannot disprove, and to endeavour to mislead the public mind as to their existence. Now, I have seen throughout all the papers, paragraph after paragraph, headed, calling this "*a humbug*," a "*mere imposture*," &c. Now, I stand here this day, in stern defiance of all the press in England.—(Immense cheering followed this

announcement, and cries of "Hear.") I defy the capability of any editor in England to go *seriatim*, step by step, through the proofs that I shall lay before this meeting this day, and deny the facts which these proofs shall establish. I can assure them that, so far as I am concerned, the press, the censure of the press, or of the world, is a matter of perfect indifference to me. To the man that desires to act conscientiously upon a sense of his duty and accountability to his God, it is a small matter for him to be judged by his fellow worms. Without further preface, I shall now call your attention to the circumstances and proofs which are to be laid before you.

This is the book—*Dens's Theology*—(holding out the volumes in his hand)—of which you have heard so much. Now, observe, there are two series of facts connected with this book. The first series of facts refers to the first edition of this work, which was published twenty-seven years ago, in the year 1808. The second series of facts refers to the second edition of this book, which was published three years ago, in the year 1832. Now, I shall begin with the series of proofs connected with the first edition; and I would request your calm, patient, diligent attention to all the facts and circumstances which I shall lay before you.

The first notice that we have in print of *Dens's Theology* is found in an advertisement of the Roman Catholic bookseller, Mr. Coyne, in his catalogue, which is bound up with the *Priests' Directory*, for the year 1832. There are three facts stated by the bookseller, in the advertisement in this catalogue, connected with the first edition of this book, published in the year 1808. It commences—"In the press, and will be published in March, 1832, by R. Coyne, DENS' COMPLETE BODY OF THEOLOGY."

"At a meeting of the Roman Catholic priests of Ireland, assembled in Dublin on the 14th day of September, 1808, they unanimously agreed that *Dens's Complete Body of Theology* was the best book on the subject that could be republished, as containing the most secure guidance for such ecclesiastics as may, by reason of the circumstances of this country, be deprived of the opportunity of referring to public libraries or consulting those who may be placed in authority over them; in consequence, an edition of this work was ordered to be printed by the present publisher, to the number of three thousand copies."

Now, this bookseller states this fact, that, on a certain day, namely, the 14th September, 1808, all the Irish Roman Catholic bishops and archbishops met together—he states, on that day, so assembled, they passed a certain resolution, which I have read, respecting *Dens's Theo-*

logy—he states that, in consequence of this resolution, they gave him an order to print three thousand copies, which he accordingly did. Now, this is a statement of facts that occurred twenty-seven years ago, given by the bookseller who has always published for the Roman Catholic bishops of Ireland, at least during that time, and I believe for some years before, and who is also the bookseller to the College of Maynooth. And I will say of Mr. Coyne, that he is a man of the most unblemished reputation, and as upright a man, as far as I have heard, as any in the city of Dublin. Now, this evidence—this statement of facts—has never been impeached by any authority. The editor of the *Freeman's Journal* and the *Weekly Register* has denied it; but neither Dr. Murray nor any one of the Roman Catholic bishops of Ireland have ever ventured to stand forward and say that it is not the fact.

Dr. Murray has stated that he never heard of the resolution till he saw it in the advertisement, though he was himself made a bishop the year after the resolution was passed. This is very extraordinary, if it be true; for we shall see on another occasion that this very edition was ordered as the conference book for his own diocese and province. If he did not know that it was so adopted before he was a bishop, then it is only a proof of the double adoption of the *Theology of Dens*, for it was first set up as a standard by all the bishops in 1808; and Dr. Murray, on this principle, without any knowledge of their approbation, adopted it a second time on his own independent authority, as the best book for his conferences, in 1825. So far we have direct proof. Now we all know in the evidence which is to be produced for the establishment of any fact—we know that collateral evidence is sometimes a testimony as strong as direct evidence. Now I shall call your attention to some collateral evidences on this subject, to establish the fact stated by Mr. Coyne in his advertisement.

The first to which I shall direct your attention is found in the *History of the Roman Catholic Association*, published by Mr. Wyse, a member of parliament—a gentleman with whose talents you are, no doubt, acquainted. In the appendix, No. VII., of this history, we find as follows:—“At a meeting of the Roman Catholic prelates, assembled in Dublin, on the 25th of February, 1810, the following resolutions had been unanimously adopted:—

“1st.—That it is the undoubted and exclusive right of Roman Catholic

bishops to discuss all matters appertaining to the doctrines and discipline of the Roman Catholic Church.

"2nd.—That we do hereby confirm and declare our unaltered adherence to the resolutions unanimously entered into at our last general meeting, on the 14th September, 1808."

Now you observe these resolutions of September, 1808, were never in print. But this establishes the fact that the bishops *did* meet on the very day mentioned by Mr. Coyne; and they do here declare that they confirm these resolutions. This is merely a fact to establish the proof that they met on the day named.

Again, in two months after this, namely, in November, 1808, there was a remarkable circumstance occurred at Kilkenny, which, as I detailed it at the Hereford Meeting, I shall not now repeat at length. But Dr. Lanigan, the then Romish Bishop of Ossory, violated a promise which he had made to some of his own people, a committee of Roman Catholic gentlemen in Kilkenny, of whom Major Bryan was the head; and Major Bryan was so offended at the violation of this promise that he published the fact in the papers of the day. The bishop replied to the charge, and justified the violation of his promise; and he justified this violation by five reasons, which appeared to Major Bryan so exceedingly jesuitical, that he stated, in another letter which he published, that it was unnecessary to make any comment on them. Now, in referring to the reasons which Dr. Lanigan gives for violating his promise, we find that they are the very reasons given in *Dens's Theology* for the violation of a promise, and literally translated from Dens. So that we have here a bishop violating a promise, and justifying that violation from the standard of theology, which at the time was not known—but which now appears to have been adopted two months before as the standard of the Roman Catholic priesthood by all the bishops of Ireland.

The next collateral proof to which I shall refer you, is this. Mr. Woods, the compiler of the *Priests' Directory*, wrote a letter to the editor of a Hereford paper, purporting to excuse himself for not having come to the Hereford Meeting. In this letter he states a very remarkable fact concerning *Dens's Theology*. He says,

"Shortly after Mr. Coyne's first edition of Dens made its appearance, it was proposed by a member of the Board of Maynooth, that it should be made a class book for the students; and what was the result of this motion? It was unanimously rejected. This fact can be proved by the present respected president at Maynooth College, and stands recorded in the minutes of the

proceedings of the board. If the approbation were general and unanimous in September, 1808, is it not strange that four archbishops and seven bishops, who were members of that board, should reject this same work unanimously in February, 1809."

Now observe: Mr. Woods, in the first place, makes a mistake respecting the dates, which is very important. Here he says, "shortly after Mr. Coyne's first edition of *Dens* made its appearance, it was proposed by a member of the Board of Maynooth, that it should be made a class-book for the students;" and he tells us this proposal was unanimously rejected in February, 1809. Now, I believe all booksellers will bear me out in my assertion, when I say that a Latin book, in seven volumes, of which 3000 copies were ordered in Sept., 1808, could not well be published in Feb., 1809. And what appears from this? That this book, which was at that time unprinted, was from such high authority so well known, that one of the members of the Board of Maynooth—some honest simpleton or other—proposed that it should be adopted as a class-book for that college. But the archbishops and bishops unanimously rejected that motion. It was an admirable book for the secret direction of the priests, but a dangerous book for public inspection as a class-book to the College of Maynooth. Therefore, so far from establishing that the bishops did not approve of it in 1808, it rather appears from this fact that the book must have been most highly approved of by them, and perfectly known to be so, or it never could have been proposed by any member of the Board, that it should be adopted to supersede Delahogue and Bailly, which were, and continue to be, the class-books of that College; and as to their rejecting it, what does that prove, when we see now the efforts that they make to evade, deny, and get rid of it, when it is irrefragably established to have been adopted as the conference book for the whole province of Leinster?

Now *Dens* went to sleep for a long time. We hear nothing of *Dens*, and we can trace nothing of *Dens*, for seventeen years after this. But in seventeen years after this, namely, in the year 1825, we find *Dens's Theology* adopted by Dr. Murray as the conference book for the diocesan conferences of Dublin. Here are the questions of conference for the diocese of Dublin in the years 1825, 26, and 28, and we find this command at the end of each of these conferences:—

"The aforesaid questions"—(I am translating from the Latin)—"and in their order, shall be discussed in the conferences of the city of Dublin, in the

alternate months, from the month of May, 1825, to March, 1836, inclusive; signed D. Murray, A. D., &c."

These questions of conference—which are printed, that they may be in possession of many individuals—have been authenticated by the very directories sent over by Dr. Murray and his priests to Mr. O'Connell, and lodged by him in evidence before the Orange Committee, in London, and they are taken exactly from *Dens's Theology*, not, indeed, in regular successive order, as those since 1831, but taken up and down from different treatises. I have myself authenticated them, and have stated these facts to Dr. Murray, in a published letter, and in speeches, and they have never been denied, so that in seventeen years after Coyne makes this statement concerning *Dens's Theology*, we have this book made the conference book for the clergy of the diocese of Dublin; in the same year, be it remembered, that Dr. Murray gave in his evidence to the houses of parliament that Verron and Holden were the standards of the Roman Catholic Church, while he was himself adopting in his diocesan conferences the standard of *Dens's Theology*. Now I say this is a collateral proof that Coyne received the order to publish the books, and did publish the books in 1808; for Dr. Murray must have known these books existed, and were in possession of all the clergy in his diocese, or he could not have made that book a book of questions for the conference of his diocese.

Again, another proof, another collateral evidence of the truth of Coyne's statement occurs in this, that afterwards, viz., five years after, Dr. Murray and the three bishops of the province of Leinster made it a conference book for the whole province, in 1831; therefore, I say, it must have existed in the province, it must have been circulated through the province in the possession of the clergy, and the bishops must have known it to be so, or they could not have made it a conference book for that year. Now these are so many collateral proofs of the truth of Mr. Coyne's statement which cannot be denied.

Now consider some more points, consider that all these proofs, direct and collateral, are from the very best friends—the very best supporters of the Roman Catholic Church. Consider Mr. Coyne's direct assertion of the fact that three thousand copies were commanded to be printed—that is, copies for all the ecclesiastics in Ireland—for the number is calculated to be three thousand. Now, we know very well, every bookseller knows—that if an experiment was to be made



on the sale of a book, that two hundred and fifty, or five hundred at most, were enough; seven hundred and fifty, or a thousand copies, would be too much to make an experiment on the public taste for even theologians. But here was a command to print three thousand copies, so that this could have been no experiment; the sale must have been secured by command of the bishops, or it is impossible Mr. Coyne could ever have expended such a sum as he was obliged to expend in the publication of that book.

Now again observe, that this collateral evidence is wholly unintentional. Mr. Wyse never thought of corroborating, by his appendix, the statement of Mr. Coyne as to the assembling of the bishops on this very day. The bishops never imagined, by this reference to their resolutions of the 14th September, 1808, in their resolutions of the 25th February, 1810, that they were corroborating the statement of Mr. Coyne as to *Dens's Theology*. Dr. Lanigan never thought that his reasons for the violation of a promise would be traced to the very book that he and his brother bishops had adopted as a standard two months before. Mr. Woods never intended, by his quotation from the minutes of Maynooth, to prove the very opposite of what he intended to establish, and to throw light on the fact that he had endeavoured to disprove. Dr. Murray never dreamt, when he was appointing *Dens's Theology* for the conference book of his diocese in 1825, that he was proving, and that his questions would be brought to light to prove, that this book was set up by his brother bishops seventeen years before as the standard for all the clergy. Mr. Woods, when he was writing the heading of the provincial conferences in 1831, never thought that he was proving the same truth and establishing, by additional evidence, the statement of Coyne. For, observe, these are the conference questions for 1831, before the second edition of *Dens* was published, given on the strength of the edition which had been already published in obedience to the commands of all the bishops in 1808. Now I say, when Mr. Woods wrote that heading in the year 1831, and published these questions of conference, he very little thought that they would be brought out before the nation in 1835. Dr. Murray and the three provincial bishops, when they made *Dens* the conference book for their province, had very little idea the day would come when the whole questions of conference should be produced against them. Now all this evidence, coming unintentionally

from the most devoted friends of the Roman Catholic Church, corroborates the statement of Mr. Coyne beyond the possibility of doubt.

Again, consider, not only the persons from whom this evidence comes, but consider the persons before whom this book comes, in which this evidence is contained. It is now necessary to explain the nature of this book—the *Directory* of the Roman Catholic priests. It is a book in which are their offices, which they are obliged to read every day in the year—that is, portions of the Breviary and of the Scriptures are marked here for them. And be it observed, they are marked in cypher, so that no one can understand their meaning except a priest, and until the *Directories* were brought out this year, they were probably never in the hands of any one but a Roman Catholic priest, because no one could understand them. To this *Directory* Mr. Coyne's catalogue is annexed. Now consider before whom this book comes. It comes before every Roman Catholic bishop and priest in Ireland, for they are obliged to have this book in their hands, (for they must recite their offices, under the penalty of mortal sin) before the first of January, and to have it in their hands every day until the thirty-first of December; so that this book came before all the hierarchy and priesthood of Ireland. Now consider that this same advertisement is repeated in 1833, 34 and 35; and these facts, so stated, their bishops have never denied, nor have they been denied by any one else from the time they were brought out until now. Does not this establish the truth of Coyne's statement as to *Dens's Theology*.

Now there are two other statements on the subject which I shall not much insist on, because they cannot be considered as coming from persons friendly to them. All these came from friends, and there can be no question on their part as to their truth. But, in addition to this evidence, Mr. Nolan, a Roman Catholic priest, who has left the Church of Rome and become a member of the Church of England, states that this book, though not used as a class book, was in the College of Maynooth. -Mr. Croly says, in a postscript to his second pamphlet.

“The *Theology* of Peter Dens, which is now before the world, is a standard work of Irish Roman Catholic orthodoxy, and of Roman Catholic orthodoxy universally. It was published in Ireland and on the Continent in the customary way, *permissu superiorum*, with the full sanction and approbation of episcopal authority. No exception was ever taken to it in whole or in part. It was printed in Ireland expressly for the use of the Irish Catholic priests, to

be their guide in casuistry and speculation. In the library of Dr. Murphy's seminary, in Cork, there were fifty or sixty copies of it for the use of the seminary and the diocesan clergy. It should be remarked here, that Dens is not singular in his doctrine respecting heretics. Every Roman Catholic theologian, who has written on the same subject, coincides with Dens. This matter shall be handled in my next publication."

Here is the evidence of Mr. Croly. Be it remembered that he is a priest in Cork, though, I believe, suspended for the honesty of some of his statements. He states this fact—that fifty or sixty copies of this book were in the bishop's library. Now, these are the unanswerable facts, direct and collateral, that prove Mr. Coyne's statement respecting Dens in 1808.

We now pass to the next edition of Dens, which was published in 1832; and I would entreat your attention to the direct and collateral evidence to be adduced on this subject. We have, also, here, in the same advertisement, a direct statement of the bookseller, "that the work is now very rare and scarcely to be met with." This is in the year 1832. Though he had published three thousand copies in 1808—

"The work is very rare and scarcely to be met with, and, inasmuch as his grace Dr. Murray, Dr. Doyle, Dr. Keating, and Dr. Kinsella have made it the conference book for the clergy of the province of Leinster, the publisher, as well to obviate the difficulty experienced by them in procuring the work, as also to advance the cause of religion and morality in the other parts of the Irish Church, is induced to reprint a limited number of copies."—"An additional volume, which is now, for the first time, annexed to the present edition, contains encyclical letters of the sovereign pontiffs, &c., bearing on the subjects contained in the work, as also the constitutions of Benedict XIV., in which he has defined questions formerly controverted among divines, and wherein he has decided subjects principally regarding moral theology. \* \* The supplementary matter above referred to, has been added with the sanction and approbation of his grace the Most Rev. Dr. Murray."

Now, observe, he states that these four bishops had made it the conference book of the clergy of the whole province. He states that these bishops and the clergy found a difficulty in procuring the work, and in order to obviate this difficulty he says that he publishes a second edition, and in order to advance the cause of religion and morality in the other parts of Ireland. And I firmly believe that Mr. Coyne made that statement in the honest integrity of his heart; that he did believe that that book, which had been so eulogised and ordered by his bishops, must be a book calculated to advance the cause of religion and morality; and for this cause he printed a limited number of copies, but that number (I have it from Mr. Coyne's own lips,) was three thousand.

Again, he makes another statement. In 1808 there were only seven volumes of the book printed ; in 1832, there were eight volumes printed. Now mark what he states : " an additional volume is now, for the first time, published," and that volume contains the constitutions of Benedict XIV., in which he has " defined questions formerly controverted among divines ;" he says that it also " contains the whole of the epitome of the canonical and moral doctrine of Benedict XIV., carefully selected from his bulls and constitutions." Then he says, " the supplementary volume referred to, viz., this eighth volume, has received the sanction of his grace the Most Rev. Dr. Murray." This is Mr. Coyne's statement.

Now consider what collateral proofs we have to establish this direct statement of the bookseller ; we have first the book in which the statement is made. This is, as I stated before, the *Priests' Directory*. Now, do you believe it possible that a man could state to a body of clergy in a whole province, that their bishops had made a certain book—a conference book for them, if he had not done so ? Would it be possible for a man living in the metropolis under the very sanction of the archbishop of the province, where the clergy were coming every day into his shop—would it be possible that he would make a statement to them that they were to take their conferences from a certain book if it was not so ? I say the advertisement of the fact by the bookseller—and the advertisement alone—would be conclusive proof to a man of common sense. But consider the manner in which it is stated:—he adds, in the advertisement of 1832.—"*Clergymen* who may feel disposed to possess the work, are requested to send their names to the publisher, or to the following booksellers." He then gives a list of booksellers. Observe now to whom it was addressed ; "*Clergymen*," and these clergymen were directed to the booksellers in seventeen cities and towns of every province in Ireland, Ulster, Munster, Connaught, and Leinster.

Now we go to authenticate the fact of his statement from the internal evidence of the book itself. He says that the eighth volume for the first time is now annexed to the first edition " bearing on the subjects contained in the work." Remark, that the eighth volume " bears on the subjects contained in the work." I open the eighth volume. I find in this eighth volume ninety-three references, which I have carefully counted over ; ninety-three references of the diffe-

rent constitutions, bulls, and letters of the pope. (When the pope speaks *ex cathedra* his decisions are of infallible authority in the Church of Rome.) I find ninety-three references to all the preceding volumes of Peter Dens's Theology. This proves this fact that the work has been carefully studied by the most able Roman Catholic divines, and that the infallible authorities of the Roman Catholic pontiffs have been collected and condensed in this volume for the purpose of giving not only authenticity, but *infallible* authenticity, to the doctrines contained in Dens. Then, again, I open the volumes of Peter Dens, and find in the title-page of every single one of the preceding volumes, this advertisement :—*Theologia moralis et dogmatica reverendi et eruditissimi Domini Petri Dens, Editio nova et absolutissima.*—Mark, “most absolute”—most authoritative—why? The reason is given because established by the infallible authority contained in the eighth volume—*absolutissima*—*Quippe cui nunc primum accedunt Epitome ex operibus Benedicti XIV. necnon et variae summorum Pontificum præsertim vero ejusdem Pontificis Constitutiones Literæ Encyclicæ.*

The book is headed in the title-page of every one of the volumes as “most absolute” and “most conclusive,” because now, for the first time, are added to it the extracts from the works of Benedict XIV., and also of various popes. These infallible records give it infallible authority, and be it remembered, that this eighth volume is declared by Coyne to be added under the sanction and approbation of Dr. Murray; and be it also remembered, that Mr. Woods, Dr. Murray's own secretary, has not only acknowledged, but asserted the same fact.

We now come to other and direct evidence calculated to establish beyond all doubt the truth of Coyne's statement. Here is the dedication to Dr. Murray, of which you have heard so much, and which is not to be found in all the copies :—“*Reverendissimo, in Deo Patri, ac Domino, D. Danieli Murray. \* \* \* Hanc Secundam, Editionem Theologiæ P. Dens Ejus cum approbatione susceptam,*” &c. &c. Dr. Murray has stated in one of his letters that the dedication “stands very conspicuous in his own copy;” and is it to be supposed that the doctor would allow that dedication to stand in his own copy, declaring that the thing was under his own approbation, if it were not so?—Now we have an addition to this, if we wanted any more infallible

proofs. We have infallible proofs enough here of the five *Directories* of 1831, of 32, 33, 34, 35; here they are. In these five *Directories* we have the questions of conference regularly marked out, beginning in the first volume of Peter Dens, page 144, and regularly continued in regular successive order, chapter after chapter, page after page, through the first volume, second volume, and to the middle of the third volume of *Peter Dens's Theology*, which these gentlemen have had for their conferences all these years. We have the successive pages of *Dens's Theology*, and the heading of the chapters corresponding to the questions, so that there cannot be the slightest shadow of doubt to any man who can read Latin. He reads the questions, and he reads the chapters in Dens, which are answers to these questions. Now I just simply propose this one question; I propose it to the auditory—I propose it to the gentlemen of the press of whom I have spoken: if this be no evidence of a fact, I should be glad to know what is? I should be glad if any gentleman of literary distinction—any of the editors of the English press—I should be glad if they could produce any proof of one fact in history; or in the present day, more clear, more conclusive, more utterly unanswerable, than this? As to the miserable pretence that, though the questions were taken from Peter Dens, the answers were not, I shall beg leave to ask any child in this assembly, if there be any here, if they ever got questions from Gough which they were obliged to answer from Voster? I would ask any senior wranglers, if such there be here, if they were ever asked questions from *Newton's Principia*, which they were to answer from La Place? If any gentleman can point out any such course of instructive questions in theology, in science, in any department of literature, that are to be given from one book, and to be answered from another book, why then we shall say there is certainly another absurdity in the world equal to this one on which they try to rest their defence.

Now, the next point I would submit to the meeting is this, that, in the last place, in the way of proof, every fair opportunity that could be afforded, has been afforded to those persons who consider their principles impugned by those statements, of coming forward to meet them. The advertisement of the first meeting, which was signed by twenty of the Irish clergy, of whom I myself was the most insignificant, signed by the Dean of S. Patrick's, the Dean of Clogher, the Dean of Ardagh, and a great many other clergymen—I say that advertise-

ment was exhibited for the special purpose of giving notice to the Roman Catholic Bishops in general, and Dr. Murray, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, in particular, that they might avail themselves of the opportunity of attending that meeting. Now, a number of opportunities have been since afforded to them; but, as Dr. Murray, in one of his letters addressed to some gentleman in Worcester, stated that his calumniators, as he was pleased to call us, went to a distance, I felt it my duty to write a letter to Dr. Murray, in which I recapitulated the opportunities he had had of meeting the facts and contradicting them if he could, and I felt it my duty to give him another opportunity. You will not, I hope, consider it a piece of improper egotism if I submit this letter, as containing a condensed view of those opportunities, to your consideration. Indeed, I have pledged myself to do so. As I am suffering at present, as I generally do suffer, under a weakness of the throat, I trust I need not offer any apology to this meeting, if they will permit me to request my rev. brother, Mr. M'Neile, to read the letter.

The Rev. H. M'NEILE then came forward, amidst loud cheering, and said—Sir I very gladly respond to the call of my rev. friend. I am willing to give any assistance in my power, by reading some of the documentary evidence that he wishes to lay before the meeting. (Cheers.) Before, however, I read the letter put into my hands, I hope I may be permitted to occupy a few minutes of your valuable time in stating my reasons for cordially taking a part in the proceedings of the day. Should this, however, be attended with any inconvenient interruption to my friend's statements, I would gladly postpone it, or waive the privilege altogether. (Mr. M'Ghee having begged the rev. gentleman to proceed, he continued—In the presence of the living God, and before the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing in his kingdom, and surrounded by this vast concourse of my fellow-countrymen, I disclaim, from my soul, all participation in the motives which have been attributed to us in holding the present and similar meetings. (Cheers.) I disclaim all intention of making such occasions subservient to the upholding and perpetuating of abuses in the Established Church. I hate abuses which are proved to be such. I protest against them, and labour for their removal as cordially and as honestly as any reformer in England. (Cheers.) But I also hate measures, by whomsoever introduced,

which, without aiming at any reform of any abuse, go at one fell swoop to do away with the principle of an Established Church altogether. I will not allow myself to enlarge upon this topic, as I have an unfeigned desire to be very brief. My reasons, then, for most gladly co-operating in the proceedings connected with the meeting were—first, because I believe my fellow-countrymen require information upon the subject before us; secondly, because I believe they are desirous of receiving that information; and, thirdly, because I know there is valuable information to be given. We have valuable historical information to communicate upon one subject, concerning which there exists a wide-spread deception. It is reiterated with the utmost confidence, and gloried in with the highest triumph on one side, and it is heedlessly and habitually assented to without examination on the other, that the Roman catholic perversion of Christianity was the primitive religion, the only religion in Europe, for the first fifteen centuries of the Christian era. Nothing can be more opposed to the facts of the case than this fallacious and mischievous statement. (Hear, hear.) Historical proofs abound, clear and conclusive, of the existence, in the south of Europe, and in our own favoured island, of primitive scriptural Christianity, many centuries before the peculiarities of the papacy, as it was now exhibited, were ever heard of. (Cheers) Christianity was known in Britain, well known, and British bishops were in attendance at the councils of the Christian church centuries before the bishop of Rome attempted to usurp supremacy over his brother bishops, or lay claim to that infallibility in dispensing with the obligations of the law of God which identifies him with “the man of sin.” But it is asked, why not keep quiet, and allow protestants and Roman catholics to go on together in peace—to live together, and to die together? This leads to another, and the only additional reason which I shall now assign for taking part in proceedings like the present: We cannot, without treachery the most barbarous to the souls of our fellow-men, live in hollow peace with a system which erects itself in hostility against the perfection of the law of our God, and against the perfection of the Gospel of our Saviour. (Hear.) The law of God is perfect. Sin, any sin, is the transgression of the law. The wages of sin, of any sin, is death. If a man, saith the apostle James, keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. (Hear.)



Here, then, in the light of the perfection of the law of our God, there is no pretext for the disastrous figment of the differences between mortal and venial sins, without which differences the idol temple of the soul-destroying delusion of popish confession, and absolution and penance, crumbles to dust. (Loud Cheers.) The gospel of our Saviour is as perfect as the law of our God. In that gospel, full, full as well as free, forgiveness of sin—of all sin by the blood of Jesus—is proclaimed to every one that believeth: “there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus.” Here, again, in the light of the perfection of the gospel of our Redeemer, there is nothing left for purgatory to accomplish; and without a purgatory held out in mingled hope and fear, the blasphemous altar, the popish mass, with all the lying wonders of transubstantiation, crumble into dust. (Cheers.) Thus we show the Roman catholic system in direct hostility against the law and the gospel; and how, then, can we wonder that the Bible, which contains both law and gospel, should be a suspected, and, when practicable without exposure, a prohibited book? (Hear.) Have we, then, any choice? Are we not bound to protest against such a system? I shall now proceed to read my reverend friend’s letter to Dr. Murray, dated September 24th, 1835:—

TO DR. MURRAY, ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP  
OF DUBLIN.

“Sir,—Could I feel surprised at any *finesse* in equivocation from an individual, the principles of whose religion are embodied in *Dens’s Theology*, I should express my unfeigned astonishment at two letters bearing your signature; the first dated September 12th, addressed to some gentleman in Worcester whose name is not given in the public prints; the second, addressed to the editor of *Barrow’s Worcester Journal*, and dated September the 14th. The general contents of these letters I shall also reserve, if it please Divine Providence to spare me, for some future opportunity to answer; but I merely extract two passages from the first of them for present consideration.

“You commence with this sentence:—

“‘Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 8th instant, I beg to say that the itinerant sowers of discord to whom you allude do well to carry their calumnies to a distance where detection is not easy; here they could have no chance of success.’

“And you close with the following paragraph:—

“‘Among my calumniators some very sagacious persons endeavoured to place my actions in contradiction with my declarations, by asserting that I

was one of a meeting of bishops, held in Dublin, in 1808, which meeting is said to have agreed that '*Dens's Complete Body of Theology* was the best book on the subject that could be republished.'

"Whether or not such an episcopal declaration was made I never heard, except through the publisher's advertisement; but it is, at all events, quite clear, that if it was, I, at least, could have had no participation in it, for I was not then a bishop, but engaged in the duties of the more meritorious office of a working curate. Observe, now, the kind of proof by which it is sought to connect me with this meeting. In 1826 my name is found among the Irish bishops disavowing certain intolerant and anti-social doctrines; and, therefore, it is assumed, that I must have been eighteen years before among the supposed episcopal approvers of *Dens's Complete Body of Theology*! Is it not wise in these calumniators, when they wish to circulate their impostures, to go to a distance from home?"

"Now, Sir, in the first place, you affect to say that a charge has been made against you, which you disprove by the matter of fact—namely, that you approved this book as a bishop, in 1808, whereas you were not in that year a bishop, and having thus assumed this charge, and thus triumphantly refuted it, you ask, 'is it not wise in these calumniators, when they wish to circulate their impostures, to go to a distance from home?'

"Pray, who made this charge, Sir? So far from having advanced this charge against you, in my speech at Exeter-hall, on the 11th of July, as reported in the public Journals, and in the pamphlets both of London and Dublin, my words were—

"He (Dr. Murray) says, 'I did not direct the work of *Dens* to be published;' Mr. Coyne does not say he did—but he says that all the bishops had directed it in 1808. Now, Dr. Murray was not a bishop in 1808—he was not a bishop till 1809, and, therefore, he certainly could not have directed it to be published in that year."

"You affect to say that a charge has been brought against you as to a fact which, on the contrary, it was declared you could not have committed, and you urge as a triumphant vindication the very reason which was given for not bringing this charge! Now, what a shallow, jesuitical artifice is this?—an artifice which a person not intimately acquainted with the facts could not discover. What a melancholy illustration it affords how thoroughly you have profited, as a scholar, by the study of that theology which you have inculcated as a master.

"But 'it is well for your calumniators to go to a distance where detection is not easy.' Now, how could you have the weakness to commit yourself by such a statement as this?

Pray, Sir, who are they that have fled from investigation, and trembled at detection? If we went to a distance from home, had not you, Sir, an opportunity to follow us? Was not an advertisement published, a fortnight before our first meeting, stating expressly that it was 'for the purpose of affording to the Roman Catholic bishops in general, and to Dr. Murray, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, in particular, as specially implicated in the charge, an opportunity of meeting it in public in their own persons, or by any of their clergy, or by any Roman Catholic layman duly delegated and authorized by

them?" Why did you not come? Why did you not send? Who fled from detection here, Sir.

"Did I not address a letter to you, dated June 29th, before our second meeting of July 11th, apprising you of the intended meeting, referring you to the documents and proofs produced at the former meeting, and inviting you to send any of your clergy, or to commission Mr. O'Connell, or Mr. Sheil, to come forward and meet those statements, which should be repeated at Exeter-hall on the 11th of July? Did I not send this letter to your own house? Was it not delivered to you by your own servant? And did not your servant inform my friend who took the letter, and called again, that there was no answer?"

"Did I not publish a letter in the *Times*, dated July 17th, after our second meeting, challenging Mr. O'Connell to debate, if he could, the evidence of the case before a select number of the House of Lords and Commons, equally chosen by lawyers appointed by him and by us?"

"Was this going to a distance, Sir? Was Mr. O'Connell at a distance from Exeter-hall? Who were the men that trembled at detection here?"

"Again, Sir, when Mr. Woods, in that valuable letter to the editor of the *Evening Post*, in which he so fully corroborated all the statements as to the facts against you, complained that we had gone to a distance—that we did not choose the Rotundo instead of Exeter-hall—did I not write a letter to the editor of the *Evening Mail*, offering to meet Mr. Woods or any priests whom you choose to authorize, in the Rotundo, and to divide the tickets of admission with you for the benefit of my Roman Catholic friends and countrymen, who I trust will see, through this very means, the awful falsehood of that superstition which your church imposes on them for the Christian religion? Was this going to a distance, Sir? Who fled from detection here? If detection of our impostures was so easy at home, why did you not avail yourself of this offer?"

"Did I not in the same letter offer to give one hundred and fifty guineas to any three priests you chose to authorize, to come over to Exeter-hall, if you wished to counteract on the spot the statements made in London?"

"Finally—Did I not offer Mr. Woods fifty guineas to bear his expenses, if he chose to come with any friend to attend the Hereford meeting?"

"Now, you did not dare to notice one of these offers, and yet you sit down and write to a gentleman at Worcester that your calumniators go to a distance, when we know in your own conscience that neither at a distance nor at home could you refute one of those facts which you call calumnies.

"Now, Sir, as to being a calumniator; I trust I do not desire to merit the name. I have often written on the errors of the Church of Rome, and sometimes on the guilty exhibition of those errors in some of her members; but I never wrote a line in which I did not give a full and ample opportunity to meet the charge, had it been possible to do so. Now, Sir, I answer your charge of calumny thus:

"I assert these following propositions:—

"1st—Not that you approved of the publication of *Dens's Theology* in 1808, with the bishops of the Church of Rome, as you were not then a bishop, but that while in your answers before the parliamentary committee, in 1825, you

gave *Holden's Analysis and Verron's Rule of Faith* as the standards of your doctrine; you, in that very year, and in the years 1826 and 1828, signed with your own name, and prescribed for your own diocese, the diocesan questions of conference for your clergy, taken from *Dens's Theology*. This I prove from the comparison of the conference questions with *Dens*, and you can refute it by producing any other author from whom you will say and prove you took the questions.

"2nd.—That, in the year 1831, you, in conjunction with your three provincial bishops, adopted *Dens's* as the conference book for your province, though you say in your letter to Lord Melbourne you "did not make it a conference book." This I state on the evidence of Coyne, the evidence of Mr. Woods, and the fact of the questions for your provincial conferences corresponding with *Dens* as published in your own Directory.

"3rd.—I assert that you not only made it the conference book, but that you prescribed the very treatise and page where the questions were to be commenced, beginning in the middle of the first volume; thereby by your own direction omitting the doctrines contained in the first half of that volume, which are on the fundamental principles of Christianity. This I state on the evidence of Mr. Woods, who declares that you yourself announced to him the very treatises which you were to discuss from *Dens*.

"4th.—I assert that, in consequence of you making it a conference book for your province in 1831, and the difficulty of procuring it, though three thousand copies had been printed in 1806, Coyne undertook, in 1832, a new edition with your express sanction and approbation, as is proved by the words of the dedication, which you confess is conspicuous in your own copy, and which, therefore, most conclusively proves the fact that you admitted and adopted it.

"5th.—I assert that you sanctioned and approved an eighth volume to that edition, of which eighth volume you knew the contents, and approved of them, which are the selections from canons and constitutions of your popes, as well as bulls, and which are selected, as their own express references to the other seven volumes prove, to corroborate the principles of your church as laid down by *Dens*. This I state on the evidence both of Mr. Coyne and Mr. Woods, and the internal evidence of the eighth volume.

"6th.—I assert, that while, as stated in No. 3, you expressly omitted in 1831 the fundamental principles of the Christian faith from your questions of conference, as contained in the first volume of *Dens*, you as expressly retained the whole code of persecuting doctrines in your conferences for 1832, as contained in the beginning of the second volume of *Dens*, which you pretend, in your letter to Lord Melbourne, are obsolete.

"7th.—I assert, that in the eighth volume you have approved as selections from the infallible authorities of your popes, bulls and decrees of intolerance, persecution, and murder; that in the bull *Unigenitus*, which you proved yourself was in force in Ireland, you anathematise the very fundamental principles of our religion, and hold out not only the condemnation of our principles, but the coercion, compulsion, and persecution of our persons; you also lay it down as the duty of bishops to exterminate us from your diocese. This I prove by the words of the eighth volume.

"Lastly.—I say the persecuting doctrines of your church, which you

pretend to abjure, so far from being obsolete, are embodied in canons, and decrees, and bulls, which you call infallible, which you boast can never be changed, and which you have sworn on your oath as a bishop, and are pledged in Pope Pius's creed, to maintain to the latest hour of your existence. If your oath of abjuration to Lord Melbourne is true, you are guilty of an act of perjury to your church, and if you do not violate your oath as a bishop to your church, there is not a shadow of truth in your abjuration of these doctrines to Lord Melbourne.

"Now, Sir, these are eight plain, honest, intelligible propositions; you may call them calumnies—I assert they are truths—and now I challenge you before the whole nation to appoint one, two, three, four, or five priests, to meet one, two, three, four, or five of us who have spoken on this subject. We will meet you in Ireland or England—the Rotundo or Exeter-hall, and go seriatim through these propositions, and disprove one or all if you can. If you choose to try, the press will convey the result to the nation. If you do not choose to do so, I will take your letter addressed to the gentleman at Worcester, and take this letter if I am ever spared to go to another public meeting, and I will read them aloud, and show that what you complain of as calumnies you are forced by your silence to acknowledge as truths, and that the charges which you profess to cry out against as being carried to a distance, you dare not venture, when called upon, to meet in the midst of your own priests and people.

"And now, Sir, before I conclude I call on you, and charge you before that God, who shall judge the quick and the dead—before whom you and I are both so soon to stand in judgment—I charge you while He spares you, and while it is called to-day, to awaken to the study of His eternal word, and to come out from that anti-christian apostasy, which stands marked in that word for judgment and condemnation. How can you reconcile it to the belief of even a future state of retribution, to be secretly inculcating on others, and cherishing in your own heart, those vile principles which you are unable to defend or even to acknowledge? O! Sir, repent and turn from those vanities and refuges of lies, to serve the living God. I wish to conclude in saying to you, and to all my Roman Catholic friends, my heart's desire and prayer to God for you all is, that you may be saved; and I testify against your guilt and your superstitions, with the earnest hope and prayer that God will ultimately bless the testimony, however weak in itself, to be an instrument 'to open your eyes, to turn you from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that you may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them that are sanctified, through faith which is in Christ Jesus.'

"I am, Sir, an enemy to perjury and persecution, and a faithful friend to the best interests of my dear Roman Catholic countrymen.

"R. J. M'GHEE."

"Sept. 24, 1835."

Mr. M'NEILE having concluded the letter, proceeded to say—Sir, we owe our reverend brother (Mr. M'Ghee) a debt of sincere gratitude for making these exposures, because the present policy of the Roman catholic hierarchy is denial in England of what they are at the same

time inculcating in Ireland. From the light of the Protestant community in Great Britain they would fain hide the hideous monsters which they exhibit in gigantic dimensions before the terrified and enslaved superstition of their deluded followers in Ireland. But it will not do. It lives in your recollection, that when Bishops Latimer and Ridley were led out to the stake at Oxford,—when the iron chains were girded about their middles, and fastened in the ground by a staple,—when the kindled faggot was brought and laid down at Dr. Ridley's feet,—Latimer addressed his brother martyr in these words “Be of good comfort, Master Ridley, and play the man; we shall light such a candle by God's grace this day in England, as, I trust, shall never be put out.” (Loud Cheers.) The confidence of this suffering servant of God was prophetic—there was, indeed, a period when appearances were against it. It seemed as if supposed security and consequent supineness on one hand, and artful and anti-christian liberalism on the other, had conspired to put an extinguisher upon the candle of scriptural protestantism. But that period has passed away; the generosity of a nation which knew the blessings of civil liberty, and knew not the evil genius of popery, conferred upon the Roman catholics such privileges as have led to aggression, provoking such a recoil as bids fair to rouse England from her lethargy, to snuff our candle, and while some persons were boasting that the no popery cry is dying away, ill-dissembling their fears that it may again come to life; behold, it is alive and shines, and brightens, and will go forth on the increased intelligence and education of a great protestant people, no longer as a candle, but as that brilliant gaslight in this amphitheatre, beaming across the length and breadth of our land; and the voice which goes forth from the prodigious assembly of this day, saying, “no popery,” shall be responded to from city after city, and town after town, each and all answering, “no popery.” The rev. gentleman concluded amid loud cheers.

MR. M'GHEE then resumed, and was received with continued cheering.—I trust it does appear from the letter which my reverend brother has read, that it has been my desire to act honestly by Dr. Murray, and not to send forth any calumnies against him which I was not, to the best of my judgment, ready to establish in his presence. I can truly and conscientiously say that I have not, in any statement I have made, ever perverted or exaggerated one single fact that has

come to my knowledge ; but I have endeavoured, in the plainest simplicity of truth, to state to others what plainly struck my own mind ; and when we speak of the cry of "no popery," I can truly say—what I would say to the whole nation—what I would say to any individual Roman catholic—: My friend, I say, "no popery," not to injure, but to serve you—I would say no popery to your conscience—I would say no popery to you, as I would say no trial, no pain, no sorrow, no death to you—from which the hand of a friend and brother could rescue you in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. That is the only no popery cry that I desire to raise to my Roman catholic friends—a cry of fidelity and a cry of christian love. For there is no ground on which men can stand before God in exposing the errors of any religion but the ground on which the apostles stood—that is, fidelity to their God and love to their fellow-men. And if we are called protestants, the only legitimate reason for the name is, that we protest against the errors, but that we love the men.

Now, to this letter Dr. Murray has made a reply in a letter which I suppose, you have all read, for it has been universally published in every paper on every side. That letter is addressed to the Protestants of Great Britain, and it becomes my duty to offer a few remarks on some of its passages which bear on the subject.

It commences—

"Beloved fellow christians—my humble name has been traduced before you ; and, what I feel more acutely, the divine religion which I profess has been held up to your view in colours so truly odious, that if they were a faithful representation of it, the disgusting picture would justly merit your execration. You are lovers of justice, you are slow to decide upon partial statements ; I rely, therefore, with confidence, upon your patient attention, while I dissipate the illusion which has been practised upon you."

This is a most important admission from Dr. Murray. He states that if the representation made to you of his religion were true, the disgusting picture would justly merit your execration. Now, let me ask, whence have the colours been derived in which this picture has been drawn ? What is the attitude in which it has been placed so as to merit the execrations of the public ? The colours have been derived from that source which all the Irish bishops have declared to be the best for their priests to take their instructions from, and from which Dr. Murray and his provincial bishops have drawn the conferences for their respective dioceses. Let it be remembered, that the

hardest expressions that have been used of popery—the expressions which Dr. Murray admits as showing it to be execrable, if they be true—are those which have been read out before the public from his own book of conferences, *Dens's Theology*.

Dr. Murray does not venture to answer the charges contained in my letter, but he replies by several epithets, that are not very complimentary to myself; he says I am obscure, intemperate, bigoted, without the reach of understanding, narrow-minded, cunning, only not deranged, and guilty of falsehood. I should be extremely sorry to justify practically the doctor's imputation, by any attempt to vindicate myself from these charges, any farther than they relate to the point in question. I dare say they may in many parts be well founded. One who knows me far better than Dr. Murray, has given this description of me, that my "heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked."—This I can say and feel is true, and when we are really acquainted with the evils of our own hearts, we shall not be very solicitous to vindicate ourselves from such imputations. But, besides, I should be exceedingly sorry, as far as I am personally concerned, to deprive the doctor of any benefit to be derived from this line of argument; and surely it ought to strike him, that the contemptibility of an accuser facilitates the task of refutation; and if a charge coming from such a poor contemptible creature is not to be met and answered, how overwhelming must be the accusation—how tremendous must be its truth!—and if it is so formidable in such puny hands as mine, what would it be in the hands of a man who possessed all the qualities in which I am so lamentably deficient?

Alluding to our invitation to the bishops to come to our meeting in London, he says—

"Now pause and consider the nature of this proceeding. Were I or any number of catholic clergymen to summon the Bishop of London or any of his right rev. brethren to suspend his pastoral duties, and to come over to Dublin, or to Cork, or to Galway, or at least to send some duly authorized person to appear in his name to answer before a public meeting of catholics some charge that would be there exhibited against him, would you not stare at the matchless effrontery which could have suggested such a proposal? Would you not rather believe that the man who could venture to announce it must be labouring under some strange mental aberration?"

Now, I will answer Dr. Murray's question: he does not put a case exactly parallel, but I will give him one that is so. Let me suppose that the Archbishop of Dublin, instead of sitting down with Dr.



Murray, as I regret to say he does, to the great dishonour of the Protestant church, to mutilate the Word of the holy God, and to set up the principle that that Sacred Word is not to be the standard for the education of the country; I say this, that Dr. Murray may know, and that all men may know, that I contend against false principles, not against men; for, whether a man be a Protestant Archbishop or a Roman Catholic Archbishop, who presumes to maintain that the Word of the living God is not to be held up as the authoritative standard of man's instruction from the cradle to the grave, I will lift my feeble voice against that principle. I say, then, if the Archbishop of Dublin were to run from the extreme of compromise to that of persecution—if he were to propose to his clergy, in secret conferences, principles by which he would establish that they were to compel Roman Catholics by corporal punishment to become Protestants, to confiscate their property, to drive them into prison or exile, and to put them to death whenever it was expedient for them to carry their principles into execution; if the Roman Catholic clergy could discover this, and could procure books and documents which proved the fact, and were to call on the Archbishop of Dublin to stand forward in London or any where, and vindicate himself from such a charge—if he were guilty, and unable to do so, he would deserve to be stripped of his mitre for his crime, and if he could vindicate himself and refused to do so, he would deserve to be stripped of it for his pusillanimity in not wiping off such a stain from himself and his religion.

The Doctor's charge of cunning is based on a singular foundation. He says of me—

“ He had enough of that low cunning which belongs to narrow minds to perceive that such a summons, from such a quarter, and to such a place, would not be in any manner either personally or by deputy attended to, and that he would, therefore, be enabled to advance such statements as would suit his purpose without the risk of contradiction. But, to make assurance doubly sure, it was arranged that no one should be allowed to open his lips for the purpose of controverting those statements without a written authority from the accused parties to plead in their defence; an authority which he well knew no bishop would stoop to grant.”

Here, I must remark, Dr. Murray makes a mistake. It is not the fact that no person was allowed to open his lips without authority from the bishops, for an exception was made, the most favourable that could be, to Roman Catholics—Mr. O'Connell was specially invited by a letter in the public prints, to come to Exeter-hall and apply all

his legal ability to disprove, if he was able, the charges advanced against his bishops, but Mr. O'Connell did not venture to make the attempt; he called us "mountebanks," indeed, in the House of Commons, but did not dare to meet us on the platform. Now, then, to what does Dr. Murray's charge of cunning on this ground amount? A man makes a public charge—selects the most public place in the empire—invites the accused party to answer if he pleases—calls on the most able champion of his cause to come forward if he can in his defence, and this is all sheer cunning!—why? I knew "the bishops would not stoop" to vindicate themselves; that is, I was so cunning I calculated on the dignity of Dr. Murray!!! and the diffidence of Mr. O'Connell!!! How far my sagacity was conspicuous in calculating on the diffidence of Mr. O'Connell I am sure it is unnecessary to point out to this meeting; but it may not be so self-evident in my calculation on the dignity of Dr. Murray. Let us see how far I might have been justified in my calculation. Dr. Murray could not stoop to vindicate himself either in person or by deputy in Exeter-hall, but he stooped to write to Lord Melbourne, to say he had not made this a conference book, while his own secretary proved him to have done so.—He stooped to abjure to him, by quoting his oath, the principles which he was sworn to maintain to the latest hour of his existence.—He stooped to write to some unknown gentleman in Worcester, complaining that his calumniators went to a distance, but he would not stoop to meet them at home.—He stooped to write to the editor of *Barrow's Worcester Journal*.—He stooped to write to Mr. James, of Hereford.—He has stooped, in reply to the distinct and specific charges, which you have heard in my letter, to write this address to the Protestants of the empire, and to apply vituperative language to Mr. O'Sullivan and to me, without answering or even venturing to notice one single charge from beginning to end of it all! Now, really, I did not presume to calculate on the extent of Dr. Murray's humility; but, had I ventured to do so, I could never have anticipated such a total prostration of all episcopal dignity, and such a remarkable stretch of episcopal condescension.

But, though the Doctor does not answer these charges, he breaks up some new ground for himself; he gives a description of the first meeting at Exeter-hall. He says:—

"Well, the important day arrived when the mighty disclosure was to be

made, the workings of popery were to be revealed, the hidden things of darkness were to be brought to light; the dangers which hung over the Protestant religion were to be put in full relief; the public expectation was wound up to the highest pitch; in short, the mountain was in labour, and, lo! the *ridiculus mus* that made its appearance was the hitherto concealed work of Peter Dens—a work of Popish intolerance which was exhibited to the wondering audience as a grand discovery just then providentially brought to light.”

Really, this is a singular description for Dr. Murray. What! Peter Dens a *ridiculus mus*!!! The guide of the Roman Catholic priests of Ireland, set up by all their bishops a *ridiculus mus*!!! The author of the questions of conference for all the province of Leinster for five years a *ridiculus mus*!!! Dear, what a formidable animal it must be!!! Dr. Murray and all the priests were afraid to go near it!!! Mr. O'Connell dare not venture to Exeter-hall, where it was to be exhibited. Then, what a curious animal, too!!! London was not content without having it exhibited a second time—Worcester insisted on seeing it—Hereford called for it—Glasgow demanded it—Edinburgh must get a sight of it—Birmingham is crying out for it—and, though last, not least, Liverpool must be favoured with a view. Here it is, ladies and gentlemen, (holding up Dens; this was received with great cheers.) You have heard of a simile “as quiet as a mouse,” and I can assure you Peter Dens was never heard to squeak for twenty-seven years in Ireland, though he was running through every corner of the land. But, then, when he did come out of his hole, and was brought to England, to-be-sure, what a noise he did make! It was not as if the mountain brought forth the mouse, but as if the mouse brought forth the mountain; and here I think the Doctor made a mistake in his simile. But, if he must have a mountain in it, I should rather say it was not to be found in the parturition of the mountain of Æsop, but in the perforation of the mountain of Æolus, where the poet represents the storms rushing out when the spear had perforated its side.

“Venti velut agmine facto—

[Here the Rev. speaker, who was speaking rather rapidly, stopped short, and said to Mr. M'Neile, who was next him, “What is the next?” the effect produced on the auditory was quite electric, when Mr. M'Neile bowed in reply, and they were all, for a few moments,

couvulsed with laughter, in which the speaker joined, but immediately he recollected the passage, and, when he could be heard, proceeded,]

*Qua data porta ruunt, et terras turbine perfiant.  
Una Eurusque Notusque ruunt, creberque procellis  
Africus, et vastos volvunt ad littora fluctus."*

Pardon me, my friends, for a momentary digression from the deep solemnity of my subject. I can truly say that my heart feels anything but levity on the occasion, and that I feel it much less adapted to excite laughter than tears. Dr. Murray's description suggested these passing observations. I supposed he wished to put off with a figure in rhetoric what he felt he could not meet with reasoning, and, perhaps, he thought that

*Ridiculum acri  
Fortius et melius magnas plerumque secat res.*

The charge of falsehood which Dr. Murray brings against us involves some points connected with the subject, which it is necessary to notice: he says,

"But here I have a heavy charge to bring against our accusers, and I bring it with unaffected pain. After attempting, most unjustifiably, to bind us to all the opinions of Dens, they have wilfully mistated the opinions of that author himself, and attributed to him, without a shadow of truth, a doctrine from which his soul would revolt with horror; a doctrine so detestable as to lead to the assassination of those who differ from us in religious opinions. Now, this is pure, unmixed fabrication. Search his books from beginning to end, and you will no where find a trace of this abominable doctrine. He advocates, it is true, together with many other writers, both Protestant and Catholic, the justice of penal laws against the public expression of heretical opinions; but he has not written one line to countenance the atrocious opinion, that it would be lawful for any individual either to murder, or, in any manner to injure another, under the pretence that he professes a different creed. Yet, this is the false ground on which a tour of defamation commences."

Now, in reply to this, I answer that I never said, nor, I believe, did any one who spoke on the subject, ever say that Dens laid down the principle that individuals were to assassinate those who differed from them in religion. Any such report or statement must be misrepresentation or misconception. But I did say, and repeat, that he states it, and proves it to be a principle of the church of Rome, to murder by her authority, when she can, those who refuse to submit to her; and I say that principle is as abhorrent from the Christian faith as individual assassination. I care not whether the principle is

carried into effect by the bullet of an assassin against his victim, or by the church in a wholesale massacre of St. Bartholomew; or of 1641.

Dr. Murray again says—

“That the book of Dens is, in no sense of the word, a standard of Catholic belief, has been already proved so fully, that any argument on the subject would be superfluous. Indeed, that author himself never contemplated such a distinction for his book. Whenever he discusses questions which are not of faith, (and the greater part of his work consists of such questions,) he generally refers to the conflicting opinions of Catholic writers, and then assigns his reasons for inclining to the one side rather than the other. Those reasons which may seem to him to be cogent, may, and often do, appear to others, to have no weight whatever. Of this description is his opinion with regard to the punishments of the crime of heresy, which the Catholics of Ireland have for many years disavowed. His opinion, therefore, in this respect, is so far from being a standard of our belief, that it is directly the reverse of what is taught and believed amongst the Catholics of Ireland.”

Now, it is most important to mark the principle which Dr. Murray professes here to establish. The question is, whether the doctrines of the punishments of heresy are, as Dr. Murray here asserts, mere casuistical opinions, or whether they are established on the authority of laws which Dr. Murray has sworn to observe. Now, I flatly deny Dr. Murray's assertion respecting Dens. I assert that his principles on this subject are not casuistical, but that they are established on laws which Dr. Murray has sworn to obey as infallible; and now let us bring this to the proof. Here is one of Dr. Murray's questions of his conference for 1832:—

Q.—“Are unbelievers to be compelled to join themselves to the bosom of the faithful?”

Now, what is the answer to this question in Dens, and on what authority is it established?

Answer to the question—

“Baptized infidels, as heretics and apostates are wont to be, also baptized schismatics, can be compelled even by corporal punishments, to return to the catholic faith, and the unity of the church. The reason is, that they, by baptism, are made subjects of the church, and so the church has jurisdiction over them, and the power of compelling them by the appointed means to obedience, and to fulfil the obligations contracted in their baptism. This is also true in the case of those who have been baptized in their infancy, or who, compelled through fear or any necessity, have received baptism.”

Here is the principle—now what is the authority? Mark it—

“As the council of Trent teaches, sess. 7. can. 14., and the council of Toledo, 4th can. 55.”—*Dens*, vol. ii. page 80.

Now, I have here the council of Trent, and I refer, in the council of Trent, which I hold in my hand, to the canons on this subject.

Fourth canon (on baptism)—“If any man shall say that the baptism which is given even by heretics in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, with the intention of doing what the church does, is not true baptism—let him be damned.”

Again, eighth canon—“If any one shall say that baptized persons are free from all the precepta of the holy church, which are either written or handed down, so that they are not bound to observe them, unless they choose to submit of their own accord, let him be damned.”

Fourteenth canon—“If any one shall say that little children of this kind having been baptized, are to be asked, when they grow up, whether they choose to ratify what their godfathers and godmothers promised in their name when they were baptized, and when they answer that they do not choose it, that they are to be left to their own will, nor to be compelled, meantime, by any punishment to a Christian life, unless to be debarred from receiving the Eucharist and other sacraments till they repent, let him damned.”

This last Dens quotes.

We have now here those infallible canons, referred to by Dens as the authority for this persecution. Let us now see how Dr. Murray is bound to the observance of these canons. For this purpose I turn over the pages of this council, till I come to the creed of Pope Pius IV. Dr. Murray and Dr. Doyle were examined as to the standard of their faith before the Houses of Parliament, and they both gave in the creed of Pope Pius IV., and it is the universal summary of the faith of all Roman Catholics. We find in this creed the following words:—

“All other things delivered, defined, and declared in the sacred canons, and the general councils, and especially by the holy council of Trent, I indubitably receive and profess; and, at the same time, all things contrary, and all heresies whatsoever condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the church, I also condemn, reject, and anathematise.”

We have now here the principles of Dens for compelling us, by corporal punishments, to return to the faith, established on the authority of these infallible canons—we have Dr. Murray bound by an oath in the very creed which he has himself delivered as the standard of his faith, to observe those canons—to anathematise whatever the church anathematizes, and yet he gravely tells the Protestants of the empire, who, he expects, are entirely ignorant of these facts, that Dens's doctrines on the persecution of heretics are mere casuistical opinions, and that he himself abjures them altogether!

Let us take another question from Dr. Murray's conferences—

“What are the penalties decreed against heretics?”

And when we read in Dens that they are “infamous *ipso jure*, and to be deprived of Christian burial—that their temporal goods are to be confiscated—that they are to be punished with other punishments, namely, exile, imprisonment, and death—are these casuistical opinions of Dens? We find them corroborated by the Scripture, Deuteronomy, chap. xvii. 12th verse, in which it is appointed that “He who is unwilling to obey the priest shall be put to death;” which passage is noted in the *Douay Bible*, “that surely God has not done less for the church guides of the New Testament than he did for those of the old.” We find these penalties against heretics ratified also by the decree of the council of Constance, which also Dr. Murray has sworn to obey as infallible, and yet he gravely tells the public that Dens’s opinion on the subject is merely casuistical, and that he himself abjures the principle of persecuting heretics.

Let us now turn to other documents, which he will not presume to call casuistical, and whose authority he will not venture to deny. In his examination before the Commons, he declared that the bull “Unigenitus” was in force in Ireland. This bull he has published in that eighth volume, which, as we have so often seen, is under his “sanction and approbation.” This bull denounces one hundred and one propositions of Quesnel, many of which are the fundamental principles of the Protestant faith, of which I may mention one, namely, “the reading of the scripture is for all.” In this bull we find the following sentences:—

“Commanding all the faithful in Christ, of both sexes, that they should not presume to think, teach, or preach of these said propositions contrary to the things contained in this our said constitution; that whosoever shall teach, defend, or publish them, or any of them, jointly or severally, or shall presume to dispute, or to treat of them even in diputation, publicly or privately, unless, perchance, by impugning them, he shall be subject to the ecclesiastical censures and other punishments decreed by the law *ipso facto* against those perpetrating similar offences.”

Again, in the very next page, we have the following passage:—

“We command, moreover, the venerable brothers, the patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops, and other ordinaries of places, also the inquisitors of heretical pravity, that they should, by all means, coerce and compel all contradictors and rebels whatsoever by censures, by the aforementioned punishments, and other remedies of the law and fact, invoking also, if need be, the aid of the secular arm.”

Is this bull “Unigenitus” a casuistical opinion?—or is it not a standard of the faith to which Dr. Murray has sworn obedience?

Yet he tells the Protestants of the empire that he abjures the doctrines of persecuting heretics, and quotes his oath in confirmation of his assertion.

Again, under the very head of "heretics," in these constitutions, so carefully selected from the infallible decrees of the popes, the following is the duty of the bishops, as prescribed by Dr. Murray in this eighth volume.

"The bishop is bound even in places where the office of the holy inquisition flourishes, to take sedulous care that he should purge the diocese entrusted to him from heretics; and, if he should find any, he ought to punish them with canonical punishments. Nevertheless, he ought to take care that he should not hinder the inquisitors of the faith from the discharge of their duty."

Mark here, that the office of the bishop, laid down in these careful and infallible selections, is to purge his diocese from men, and not from principles—*ab hereticis*—from heretics. We read these things with our eyes, and hear them with our ears, yet Dr. Murray pretends to abjure them as the principles of his church, in a letter addressed to the Protestants of Great Britain.

But there is another point to which Dr. Murray invites our attention, as a security for the tolerant principles of his church; he addresses us as follows, in one of his catechisms:—

"Observe, now, I pray you, how the Catholic clergy of Ireland endeavour to impress upon their flocks the spirit of those declarations. In the catechism sanctioned by the four archbishops of Ireland, and which is in general use through the country, the following questions and answers are found:—

Q.—To how many may the commandments of God be reduced?

A. To these two principal commandments, which are the two great precepts of charity—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart and with thy whole soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbour as thyself. This do and thou shalt live."—(Luke x.)

Q.—And who is thy neighbour?—(Luke x. 29.)

A.—Mankind of every description, and without any exception of persons: even those who injure us, or differ from us in religion.

Q.—How am I to love my neighbour as myself?

A.—As you would (says Christ,) that men should do to you, do you also to them in like manner.—(Luke vi. 31.)

Q.—What particular duties are required of me by that rule?

A.—Never to injure my neighbour in word or deed—in his person, property, or character; to wish well to him and to pray for him, and always to assist him as far as you are able in his spiritual and corporal necessities.

Q.—Am I also obliged to love my enemies?

A.—Most certainly. "Love your enemies," says Christ "do good to them



that hate you ; bless them that curse you ; and pray for them that despitefully use you."—(Luke vi., Mat. v.)

" Allow me, now, my beloved fellow-christians, to appeal to your candour, and to ask, does this doctrine seem to breathe, or is it in any way reconcilable with, the spirit of religious persecution ? Judge for yourselves ; weigh this statement well, and decide whether the spirit of intolerance or uncharitableness will be found to rest more fairly on us or on our accusers."

Let me now second Doctor Murray's request, and intreat you to judge for yourselves. He has given you some quotations from one of his catechisms ; let me call your attention to another part of the same catechism.

*Butler's Catechism, p. 29 and 30.—Lesson x., on the true Church.*

Q.—What do you mean by the true church ?

A.—The congregation of all the faithful, who, being baptized, profess the same doctrine, partake of the same sacraments, and are governed by their lawful pastors under one visible head on earth.

Q.—How do you call the true church ?

A.—The holy catholic church, Ap. Cr.

Q.—Is there any other true church besides the holy catholic church ?

A.—No. As there is but one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, there is but one true church.

Q.—Are all obliged to be of the true church ?

A.—Yes : no one can be saved out of it.

*Again, page 51.*

Q.—Do the precepts of the church oblige under pain of mortal sin ?

A.—Yes. " He that will not hear the church," says Christ, " let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican."

Here, now, the children are taught that heretics cannot be saved ; that every one who does not belong to the Church of Rome is to be treated as a heathen and a publican. Again, there is a small catechism for children, entitled

" The grounds of the Catholic Doctrine, contained in the Professions of Faith, published by Pope Pius IV., and now in use for the reception of Converts into the church, by way of question and answer : the twentieth edition, stereotyped. Dublin, printed by Richard Coyne, 4, Capel-street, 1829." In page 7 we find as follows :—

" Now, true faith, in order to please God and save our souls, must be entire : that is to say, we must believe, without exception, all such articles as are revealed by God, and are proposed by his church to be believed ; and he that voluntarily and obstinately disbelieveth any one of these articles, is do less void of true saving faith than he that disbelieves them all. As St. James tells us with regard to practical duties, chap. ii. v. 10, ' Whoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.' Hence St. Paul, Gal. v. 20, reckons heresies, that is, false religions, amongst those works of

the flesh, of which he pronounces 'that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.' And God himself (Isaiah lx. v. 12) tells his church, 'The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish.'

Here is destruction proclaimed against all who will not serve the Church of Rome.

Again, page 53, speaking of Protestants, he says—

"We are convinced that they are schismatics, by separating themselves from the communion of the church of Christ; and heretics, by dissenting from her doctrines in many substantial articles; and, consequently, that they have no part in the church of Christ, no lawful mission, no succession from the apostles, no authority at all to preach the word of God, or administer the sacraments; in fine, no share in the promise of Christ's heavenly kingdom, excepting the case of invincible ignorance, from which the Scripture in so many places excludes schismatics and heretics".

These principles are impressed on Roman Catholic children.

Again. In the christian doctrine of Dr. Doyle, prescribed by him to be used in the diocese of Kildare and Leighlin, printed by Richard Coyne, in the year 1828, we find the following passages:—first, in his dedication "to the members of the society of the christian doctrine." Speaking of the way to teach children, he says—

"Impress upon their hearts a love of Christ, and of his holy spouse the church: let them know and fear the malice and danger of those heresies which have rebelled against both, that they may avoid all communication with them."

Here the children are taught to count us heretics and rebels, because we refuse to submit to the Church of Rome. And in the body of the catechism, page 25, we find how these principles are to be impressed upon the children:—

Q.—What think you then, of such as accuse the church of errors, of faith, and of Idolatry?

A.—Truly, I think them to be heretics or infidels, for our Lord saith, "He that will not hear the church let him be unto thee as an heathen and a publican."—St. Matt. viii. v. 17.

Q.—Is not the church, at least, too severe in its censures and excommunications against sectaries?

A.—No; she is very reasonable and charitable in them; for vicious, passionate, and self-interested men, are sometimes brought to reason for fear of punishment; so a father corrects his child, and if it continues obstinate and wicked, disinherits it.

Here this very man, Dr. Doyle, whose catechism is one of the most popular in Ireland, impresses on the minds of children the right and duty of the church to punish us; and when we inquire where are these punishments to be found? The answer is—ask Peter Dens.

The Doctor now turns to another mode of appeal.—

“ Generous Britons!—you whose honourable reverence for truth forms such a prominent feature in your character, will you any longer allow your confidence to be thus abused? Will you not at length open your eyes to the expediency of examining, by the exercise of your own judgment, the imputations cast upon us and our church, rather than receive them, without inquiry, as true, upon testimony which you must now see to be one of the most questionable character? In the doctrine of millions there can be nothing secret. Take the trouble of making yourselves acquainted, through authentic sources, with the real differences of doctrine between us and you. You will find them in a little book, which I pray you to read over—it is a short explanation of the catholic faith by Bossuet. You will find it in any catholic bookseller’s shop. It will place before you, in a few short pages, the articles of faith in which we disagree.”

The Doctor here turns your attention to a tract of Bossuet. It is a smooth and oily tract, and the Doctor wishes you to suppose that there was nothing deeper in that varnished jesuit than he would wish you to believe in any other of those who professed the theology of Peter Dens. But Bossuet was a friend of Peter Dens as well as Dr. Murray; and there is a remarkable fact connected with him, to be found in the sixth volume of this work. There is a certain class of crimes of such a dark complexion, that they are not within the ordinary reach of popish absolution; they are called *Reserved Cases*; the priest cannot forgive them; the bishop cannot forgive them; they must be reserved for the absolution of the pope himself. Observe what a tremendous power this gives the priesthood over the conscience of their unhappy victims, and how they must tremble at the commission of those crimes which can only be pardoned by the pope. It is necessary that the priests should have these crimes in their recollection, that when a sinner comes to the confessional, they may be sure that his crime lies within the reach of their jurisdiction. Accordingly, Bossuet has composed three Hexameter Latin verses, to serve as a *memoria technica* for the priests on this occasion. Foremost on the list of criminals he has placed the heretic, and we find in Peter Dens the verses which he has composed—

“ Hæreticus, raptor, Sodomita, incestus, adulter,  
Incendens, perimens, cum percussore parentum,  
Sortilegus, sic Simon, Apostata, denique complex.”

Now, what is the difference between Peter Dens and Bossuet? Bossuet puts persecution into poetry, while Dens and Dr. Murray are content with it in prose.

But how does Dr. Murray address the Protestants of the united empire? He calls you "Beloved fellow Christians." Now mark what is the admission here! Why, that you may be Protestants, that is, you may not only deny the articles of the faith of the Church of Rome, but you may absolutely protest against her, and yet you are "Beloved fellow Christians!" The catechism he quotes, tells the children that out of the Church of Rome there is no salvation for his soul; that if a man is not a member of that church he cannot be a Christian, and yet he comes to address the Protestants of the empire as—"Beloved fellow Christians!" But it is a pity, when the Doctor calls us "beloved fellow Christians," that he circulates a book with principles so different; for here, in this very book, the second volume of Peter Dens, page 112, he tells us,

"Lutherans and Calvinists appoint as the judge of controversies the sacred Scriptures alone, or interpreted by the private judgment of every one; but the heretics of England say that this judgment is to be referred to the secular power."

The "heretics of England!"—Here we are! assembled, and in one fell swoop condemned as the "heretics of England." Dr. Murray sets this book up as the standard for his priesthood, and then he calls us "beloved fellow-christians!" But this is not all. We have not to go so far as Peter Dens, for what are the very words of his own letter when he refers you to Bossuet. He says, "Examine these, always keeping in mind the saying of St. Paul, 'that sects are among those evils which exclude from the kingdom of God.'" Mark!—he desires you always to keep in mind that your very existence as a sect shuts you out from the kingdom of God. He applies this principle to the sects divided from the church of Rome; he brings no charge of articles of faith rejected or crimes committed, but because you are separated from the Church of Rome. He desires you to keep in mind that you are excluded from the kingdom of God, and that in the very letter where he calls you—"beloved fellow Christians!" He says:—

"Consider how far these differences justified your forefathers in separating from the parent stock, and how far they are sufficient to justify you in continuing still that fatal separation."

Mark! it is a fatal separation, while he yet addresses you as—"beloved fellow Christians." Notwithstanding, you must perish if you do not submit to the church of Rome.

The last effort which Dr. Murray makes to blind the Protestants of the empire on this important subject is derived, I regret to say, from another appeal to the oaths of the bishops. He quotes the oath which the Roman Catholic Bishops signed and published in 1826, in which we find the following passage :—

“ The Catholics of Ireland not only do not believe, but they declare upon oath that they detest as unchristian and impious the belief that it is lawful to murder or destroy any person or persons whatsoever, for or under the pretence of their being heretics, as also the principle that no faith is to be kept with heretics.”

Now, when this is brought before us on such a solemn occasion, it is necessary for us to investigate the credit that is to be attached to it; this oath was signed by all the bishops of Ireland, by those four individuals who have made *Dens's Theology* the standard of conference for their diocese. Let me now call your attention to some part of the doctrines of oaths as contained in this standard of their faith.

In the fourth volume, page 214, we find a list of the various modes in which the obligation of a promissory oath ceases. They are as follow :—

“ First, by rendering it null and void ;—secondly, by dispensation and relaxation ;—thirdly by commutation ;—fourthly, by a change or withdrawing of the matter ;—fifthly, the total end completely ceasing ;—sixthly, by reason of the condition not being fulfilled ;—seventhly, the principal obligation ceasing, an oath purely accessory ceases ;—eighthly, by non-acceptation, and forgiving, or remission ;—ninthly, if the oath begins to verge to a more unfavourable issue, (*in deteriorem exitum*,) or to the prejudice of the public good, or even of any particular individual ;—finally, the obligation of an oath ceases when it is directly obstructive of a greater good.”

Now, since one of these numerous modes of annihilating the obligation of an oath is dispensation, we must inquire who has the right of dispensing. In the next page, page 215, the question is asked :—

“ With whom is lodged the power of dispensing with an oath ?” Chiefly in the Pope, but not without a reasonable cause, for he dispenses in another's right. It is also lodged by ordinary right in the bishops, not in the priests, for this dispensation requires the power of the highest jurisdiction.”

We now consider the mode of dispensing with an oath, and in page 216 we find the following objection urged against dispensation :—

“ Obj. The obligation of an oath is of natural and divine right, therefore it cannot cease by dispensation, commutation, or making null and void.”

A.—“ We deny the consequence, because, by dispensation, &c., it is brought to pass that that which fell under the oath does not fall under the oath by withdrawing, prohibiting, &c., and so there is nothing done contrary to oath. Besides, there is this condition implied in every oath,—“ *saving the authority of my superior,*” (*salvo jure superioris.*)

Additional light is thrown on this subject by referring to a dispensation in another case vol. ii. page 272, in which we perceive by what high authority this power of dispensation is given to the church. It is declared as follows :—

“ Dispensation is not granted in the obligation of a vow or an oath, the vow or the oath remaining ; but the vow or the oath is *taken away or relaxed by the superiors of the church in the place of God, and thus the obligation arising from thence spontaneously ceases by the removal of the matter.*—(General expressions of disgust here pervaded the meeting.)

Having seen the power of dispensation, it now remains but to inquire what is the just *cause* of granting it. We find in vol. ii. page 350—

“ What is understood by a just cause or sufficient reason for dispensing ?”

“ Answer.—Any necessity, utility, or piety, reasonably moving to dispense.”

“ What ought to be that necessity, utility, or piety, sufficient to cause a dispensation ?”

“ Answer.—Its quantity cannot be determined ; but it is to be morally considered, the circumstances of the law, persons, time, &c., being considered.”

We have now but one step more to proceed ; and I solemnly declare I think it is a step that brings us up to the very *acme* of human iniquity ; and that is, that the same person who has power to grant a dispensation to others, has also power to grant the same to himself. We find in vol. ii. p. 347, the following statement :—

“ *He who can dispense in his own law, or in another man's law, with his subjects, can also in the same laws grant a dispensation to himself, because he is a part of the same community, and of no inferior condition to his subjects.*”—(Expressions of disgust and horror followed this quotation.)

Now mark the awful iniquity of this system as applied to an oath. A man in the condition of a creature appeals to his God as a witness of his truth, and then, on the occasion of what he may please to call “ any utility, or piety or just cause,” he steps out of the condition of the creature, and puts himself in the place of the Creator, and grants to himself, as the Creator, the dispensation of the oath which he took as a creature.—(Great expressions of disgust, and immense cheering) I repeat, that I consider this as the very *acme* of human iniquity on the subject, and I hope that Dr. Murray will never dare to quote a Roman Catholic bishop's oath to the Protestants of the empire again.

And now, why do we bring these things forward? I hope in God—and the first thing I hope for—and, as I stand in the presence of God, the greatest blessing my soul desires from it is, that my dear Roman Catholic countrymen—my poor misguided friends and countrymen, may have their eyes opened to see that system of iniquity brought to the light. A system that dare not stand the blaze of day, can never stand before that God who “sets our misdeeds before Him, and our secret sins in the light of His countenance.” And I trust in God that they will be led to see that the men who pretend to infallible authority, and infallible power, but dare not stand forward to justify their assumption—that they cannot be teachers of the pure gospel of Christ. And I trust the teachers and people may be led to consider of these things before it be too late to turn to the refuge which God has set before us. This is my heart’s desire and prayer to God for them, and it is the first desire of my soul in bringing these things forward. It is not to excite enmity against them, but to excite (and it is that which, if you be christians, it will excite) in your hearts genuine feelings of compassion for them. “For who maketh thee to differ from another, and what hast thou that thou didst not receive?” If we are not bowed down under these superstitions, if we are not maintaining the doctrines of Dens. “By the grace of God we are what we are.” And may that grace be given to our poor Roman Catholic friends and neighbours! May we learn to abhor that liberalism which makes light of these things. May we, if we have any title to the name of Christians, stand up and maintain the cause of our God wherever we are.

I do trust that this is the last time that any of us shall ever be obliged to go through this evidence again. I trust that there is not an editor of one newspaper will presume to deny that which I say I defy his talents to disprove. I trust, since Dr. Murray has voluntarily given up the cause, that it will be acknowledged to be, as it really is, totally indefensible; for I will say this, that every part of this letter, for instance, that Dr. Murray has just written, has only been calculated to plunge them deeper and deeper into the charge, and every page appears to me to mark the finger of God in it, for every part only supplies you with additional materials to find out more and more of their errors. For example: Dr. Murray has denied that he made this book a conference book—his own secretary proves it. He com-

plains of a want of justice—and he refuses every opportunity to vindicate himself. He says he cannot stoop to public discussion—but he has stooped to write column on column of sophistry in the newspapers. He complains that his calumniators go to a distance—but he will not venture to meet them at home. He will not venture to argue—but he condescends to vituperate. He confesses, in this very letter, the church to be infallible—but he calls, also, in this very letter, her very canons “musty records !” The “musty records” of an infallible church !” He refers us to his catechisms to prove the inculcation of charity—we find these catechisms almost as bad as Peter Dens. He refers us to Bossuet—Bossuet rises in judgment to condemn him. He refers us to his oath—this brings to light his dispensations. He says he will retire from the controversy—to what refuge can he flee? It is in vain ; there is no refuge whatever where popery can escape the light. Driven from all the depths of jesuistry and falsehood in which she has been accustomed to plunge from the pursuit of truth—reduced, by every ebb and flow of arguments and proofs to shallower and shallower sophistries and subterfuges in her hopeless efforts to escape—she lies at length exposed to public view like a monster of the deep, deserted by the tide, left high and dry, gasping and floundering on the bleak and open shore.—(Immense cheering and clapping of hands, which was thrice repeated.)

My friends, I can only say that all those who know the human heart, know, that any poor, wretched sinner, like one of us, who stands before the public, in any cause in which such applauses as you have bestowed may be given to him, stands forward only in a scene of trial and temptation—ready to ascribe something to his vain self, and to forget that he is, as he is, “poor and wretched, and miserable, and blind and naked.” I can truly say that when I look within and view what I am, as a sinner, that the applauses of the world could not raise me out of the dust in my own estimation, knowing what I am before God ; and I would intreat, my friends, not your applause, but your earnest prayers. And I do intreat your prayers, not only for myself, but for Dr. Murray—for all Roman Catholics. When they say we wish to come forward to excite a spirit of enmity and anger against them—to enact laws against them, and persecutions against them—I deny the assertion, and in the midst of England, and if I were in the midst of her parliament I would say, there is no law will ever do for



Ireland but the law of the living God. No sword, I say, for Ireland, but the "sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God." And if we had been as faithful to our Roman Catholic countrymen as we ought to have been, as faithful ministers of the living God, in testifying with all fidelity of their errors and of the gospel, these errors that are destroying their souls—instead of being, as we are, a wretched, miserable, divided nation, we should have been bound together in one bond of Christian love, as one family—not contending against errors with each other, but "with one heart and one mind, striving together for the faith of the gospel."—(Great cheering, which continued some time.) I have the honour to move this resolution, and I trust in God, that according to the feeble efforts which I have endeavoured to make in laying the case before you, that it is a resolution which will pass unanimously.

*Resolved.—That it has been established to the satisfaction of this meeting, that Dens's Theology was adopted in the year 1806, by the Irish Roman Catholic bishops, as the best book on the subject that could be republished, and as containing the most secure guidance for the priests, and subsequently made the conference book by Dr. Murray, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, and by the bishops of the province of Leinster for their clergy, since the year 1831, and that this book contains the tyrannical and anti-christian doctrines of intolerance, cruelty, and persecution, which have distinguished the Church of Rome in former days. That it appears to this meeting, that every fair opportunity has been afforded to the Roman Catholic hierarchy to meet these facts both in England and Ireland, which they have appeared incompetent to do—that the attempts which are made to deny and abjure their principles, while they cannot disprove the facts, seem to this meeting only to illustrate and aggravate the iniquity of the Church of Rome. That, it therefore appears to this meeting, that it is the imperative duty of Protestants of all denominations, who value the salvation of their fellow-creatures, to use all means to make these facts known to their Roman Catholic neighbours—to warn them against the iniquity of such a system; that it is imperative on all Christian Ministers to warn them from it—and, that it is the duty of all men, who value the rights and privileges of conscience—of true religion and civil liberty—to endeavour to oppose and counteract the encroachments of papal darkness and papal tyranny in the united kingdom.*

(The reading of the resolution was received with tremendous cheering.

The Rev. RICHARD POPE was hailed with great cheering.—Mr. Chairman—Ladies and Gentlemen—when I consider the length of time during which we have been assembled in this meeting, and that most powerful, most conclusive, and, I shall add, affecting statement which has been submitted to the judgment and the common sense of this large assembly, I confess that I feel some difficulty in presenting

myself before you. With respect to my own individual self, did I merely make my appearance on this platform without giving utterance to a single sentiment, a strong denial would be given to the rumour circulated in the sister country, that I was either studying at the college of Maynooth, or that I had gone to Rome with a view of becoming a Roman Catholic priest. Having made these remarks with respect to myself, I shall dismiss the subject.

It is, at all times, painful to stand forward as an accuser of any portion of our fellow-men. If we reflect upon the nature of the world in which we dwell, and have made even a small progress in the science of self-knowledge, we shall be slow in bringing any charges against private individuals; but, when those who have laid themselves open to accusations of a most fearful nature—accusations based on the most incontrovertible evidence—happen to be a body of men, and that body ecclesiastic, presiding over the moral and spiritual destinies of a large portion of our fellow-subjects, that silence which in a case of individual delinquency, might be commendable, becomes criminal apathy. It may be laid down as a moral truism, that the ministers of any religion exercise great influence, either for good or evil, over the population to whom they minister. The Irish priests are familiarized with the habits, the prejudices, and the peculiarities of character belonging to the people over whom they watch. Through the medium of auricular confession they enjoy access to their thoughts and feelings. In the public, and even private ministrations of religion, they assume the character of intercessors between the Deity and their flocks; and by the absolutions which they grant, and by the supposed miracle of transubstantiation which they are believed to perform, they are raised in popular estimation above the level of humanity—a delusion which, I need scarcely say, they are neither anxious to dissipate, nor slow to improve.

Again, the studies of the ecclesiastic must, necessarily, have a considerable influence in moulding the powers of his own mind in shaping and modifying the instructions which he imparts to his people; and are likely, in a greater or less degree, to show themselves embodied in the practical doings of his congregation. Let the clergy be savingly and strongly imbued with the knowledge of that volume which is “able to make them wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus;” they will be “workmen that need not be

ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth"—they will be "men of God, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

Again, let the studies of the ecclesiastic be of a vain and frivolous character, the natural levity of his own character will be augmented, his ministrations will prove meagre and inefficient, and "the hungry flock will look up" in vain for "the sincere milk of the word that they may grow thereby."—(Cheers.)

Further, should a system of theology be recommended to an ecclesiastic, by an authority which he is in the habit of reverencing—should that system of theology contain principles most anti-christian and anti-social; and should those principles have emanated from a tribunal, whose decrees and definitions he has sworn undoubtedly to profess and receive—then, I say, that we are justified in concluding that some of those anti-christian principles will find their way into his public ministrations, and the seeds thus sown will spring up into an abundant harvest. "Men do not gather grapes of thorns, nor figs of thistles. Whatsoever a minister soweth, that shall he also reap. Now, if your common sense admit the truth of the positions I have laid down; if it be the fact that the studies of an ecclesiastic, exercises a powerful influence on his own mind—if it be true that those studies will tell upon his people, should a discovery have been made that for years a volume of professed divinity has been a standard of theology with the Irish priests, inculcating principles inimical to the full prerogatives of the civil power, and setting up an ecclesiastical usurpation over the consciences, the rights, the liberties, and the lives of men, are we not furnished with a solution, at least in part, for the moral debasement of Ireland, and for the wretchedness which that debasement has generated."—(Cheers.)

Little need be added to the weight of evidence on this subject, which has been presented to your consideration. Permit me to say a few words. Mr. M'Ghee has directed your attention to a resolution of the Romish bishops, passed the 14th September, 1808. My friend and others have been called upon to produce that resolution. The demand is most absurd. Is Mr. M'Ghee the keeper of the minutes of the private meetings of the Romish bishops in Ireland? Bear in mind, the resolution was published in Mr. Coyne's Catalogue, in 1832, and was before the eye of Dr. Murray and the Romish bishops between three and four years, and yet its truth was never denied,

until the church of Rome, in Ireland, was charged with adopting the work of Dens as a standard of theology. I beg, in the next place, to call your attention to the subject of the conferences. Dr. Murray has denied that he made *Dens's Theology* a book of conference. That denial has been disproved by the gentleman who preceded me. But in what person has Dr. Murray made the denial? He denies, it is true, for himself, but where are the denials of the other bishops, Dr. Keating, Dr. Kinsella, and Dr. Nolan (the successor of Dr. Doyle,) who, together with Dr. Murray, made Dens a book of conference for their respective dioceses? Mr. Woods has informed us, through the medium of the *Freeman's Journal*, that *Dens's Theology* was selected (as it presented, unlike other treatises, a complete system) because the questions followed in consecutive order. I would ask what was Mr. Coyne's practical opinion in the matter? Did he publish the questions of Dens alone? The questions might have been comprised in a small compass. No: he published the whole work, contained in several volumes—he published the answers, as well as the questions, contained in Dens. Here allow me to notice a statement in the *Freeman's Journal*, dated 27th of June last, and published by authority—

“The first year no mention was made of the author, whose order was followed in the *Directory*. The clergy were thus put to inconvenience, being obliged to rummage through several volumes for the questions.”

I repeat, “for the questions.” Why should the clergy have been obliged to rummage through several volumes for the questions? The questions they had already in their possession announced in the *directories*. The “several volumes,” then, were searched for answers to the questions which they previously possessed. Dens was a substitute for the “several volumes;” therefore, Dens was to be searched, not for the questions, for the priests knew them, but for answers to the questions given beforehand in the *Directories*.—(Cries of hear, hear, and cheers.)

Mr. Woods, the chaplain and secretary to Dr. Murray, informs us, in his first letter, that one reason why he “honestly (mark the expression, “honestly”) gave in crotchets, at the head of the questions, the name of the author from whose work he had taken them by ‘command,’ was ‘to obviate this difficulty.’” Now, I ask, how could the ignorance of the priests, as to the work from which the questions

were taken, have occasioned a difficulty, if the answers given in the same book from which the questions were taken were not considered as worthy of some consideration?—(Hear, hear.) And how could this difficulty be obviated by Mr. Woods, when he “honestly stated the name of the author from whom the questions were taken, if the answers in *Dens* had no reference to the questions for conference?” (Hear, hear.) Another reason why Mr. Woods made known the name of the author, whose work supplied the questions was, “to avoid being taunted with having set down for discussion matter which might be considered useless, light, or trifling.” The volumes of *Dens*, then, it seemed, possess some little authority; for the fact of the questions for conference being found in his pages (and the answers, we suppose, as well,) would prove that the subjects for conference were neither “useless, light, nor trifling.”—(Hear, hear.) I did intend to refer to some other documentary evidence, but my reverend friend has anticipated me. Mr. M'Ghee quoted the Rev. Mr. Croly's testimony. It is the postscript to the second pamphlet, addressed to the lower orders of the Roman Catholics in Ireland. My friend also referred to Mr. Nolan's letter. As I happen to possess it, allow me to read the paragraph which relates to *Dens's Theology*. The letter is addressed to the Rev. Mr. Maguire:—

“You assert that your religion rests as much upon the authority of Peter *Dens* as on the authority of Johanna Southcote. Pray, when, and under what influence did you write this dreadful fabrication? Was it in your hours of solitary reflection, or did you imagine that your assertions would pass unheeded? Pray, Sir, let me ask you, is not *Dens's Theology* one of the reference books of Maynooth College, where you and I have studied, though not as contemporaries? Is not that book left in the public library for the perusal of all the students? Again, have you ever heard of its prohibition? Have you not often made its contents your answers for class? And with all these questions, which must be answered in the affirmative, will you still assert ‘that your religion no more rests upon the authority of Peter *Dens*, than upon the authority of Johanna Southcote.—(Hear, hear, and cheers.)

“There are four things remarkable with regard to *Dens's Theology*. First, that, though it be not a class-book in Maynooth College, still it is there as a book of reference. Second, that it has been publicly exposed in the library, and that its perusal has never been prohibited. Thirdly, that many students in Maynooth had copies of it in my time for their own use, and were never prevented from reading it; and, fourthly, that, when I officiated as a Roman Catholic clergyman, many of the priests' conferences in Ireland were regulated by questions and answers from *Dens's Theology*. To these circumstances may be added the fact that *Dens's* opinions are as much respected in

Maynooth, as *Blackstone's Commentaries* in the Protestant Universities of England."

You will perceive that the statement made by Mr. Nolan is not irreconcilable with Mr. Woods's communication on the subject. Mr. Woods acquaints his readers that in 1800 *Dens's Theology* was unanimously rejected, when proposed as a class-book for Maynooth. Mr. Nolan informs that the students were not prevented from examining the contents of *Dens's Theology*, and that it was used by many inmates of that establishment. *Dens* might have been made use of by the students, though not admitted as a class-book. In the latter character it might have been subjected to the examination of the visitors; and consequently, as you have already heard, might have come before the public—a circumstance which might have been attended with awkward results. Indeed, singular secrecy was observed in the manner in which *Dens's Theology* was circulated. It is usual, when new publications are edited, that the fact should be announced in the newspapers of the day. Mr. Coyne is a shrewd, sensible man. If, as Dr. Murray asserts, the republication of *Dens* was undertaken by Mr. Coyne, "as a speculation in trade," it is striking that, knowing as he must have done, that not a few Protestant gentlemen would have been glad to possess the work, he did not announce in the journals its republication! In short, I shall not attempt to insult your understandings by further endeavouring to strengthen the body of incontrovertible evidence which has been submitted to you; but shall proceed to lay before you some passages in the work of *Dens* itself.

Before, however, I do so, allow me to say that I entertain little doubt but that the volumes under consideration will be found to throw light upon the past, present, and future doings of Rome's faithful children. The Bishop of Exeter, in his place in the House of Lords, stated, in a speech made on the 16th of July last, reported by the public press, that—

"He would read a short extract from a most authentic book, the Roman Catechism, sent forth by the authority of the council of Trent, and which the Roman Catholic prelates, when examined before the committee of parliament in 1825, admitted to be a decisive authority, from which no Roman Catholic could appeal. 'First, the faithful must be taught how great the nobility and excellency of this sacrament is; for, seeing the bishops are, as it were, the interpreters and ambassadors of God, who, in God's name, teach men the divine law, and the rules, and personate God himself on earth, they are

worthily called, not only angels, but gods also, because they hold the power and name of the immortal God amongst us.”

“ These were the words of a most authoritative work, declared to be so by Dr. Murray, and all the Roman Catholic prelates, and they were not mere words, but they were acted on every day. For a proof of this he would refer their lordships to a matter of public notoriety. In an inquiry which was carried on in another place, a Roman Catholic clergyman declared (and his honest avowal was honorable to him,) that, “ In the confessional, he was, as it were, God.”

Does this Theology of Dens sustain, I would ask, the avowal of the Romish priest? I turn to vol. 6, p. 218, in which the following question is proposed—

“ What is the seal of sacramental confession ?”

The answer to which query is—

“ It is the obligation or debt of concealing those things which are known from sacramental confession.”

In page 219 the following questions and answers occur—

“ Can a case be stated in which it is lawful to break the sacramental seal ?”

“ It cannot be stated—although the life or safety of a man, or even the ruin of the state, should depend upon it; nor can the supreme pontiff dispense with it; so that, on that account, this secret of the seal is more binding than the obligation of an oath, a vow, a natural secret, &c., and that by the positive will of God.”

“ What, therefore, ought a confessor to answer, being interrogated concerning truth, which he has known through sacramental confession alone ?”

R.—“ He ought to answer that he does not know it, and, if necessary, confirm the same by an oath !”—(Expressions of great disgust succeeded this quotation.)

Obj.—“ It is in no case lawful to tell a falsehood; but the confessor would tell a falsehood because he knows the truth; therefore, &c.”

R.—“ I deny the minor, ‘ that is, that the confessor would lie, because such confessor is interrogated as a man, and replies as a man; but now he does not know that truth as a man, though he knows it as God, says St. Thomas, q. 11, art. 1, ad. 3. And that sense is naturally inherent in the reply, for when he is interrogated or replies, out of confession, (*extra confessionem*) he is considered as a man.’ ”

“ What, if it be directly inquired of the confessor whether he knows a particular thing by sacramental confession ?”

R.—“ In this case he ought to answer nothing; so think Steyart and Sylvius; but the interrogation is to be rejected as impious; or he can say absolutely, not in relation to the question, I know nothing, because the word *I*, restricts to knowledge acquired by him as a man, (*humanam scientiam*). In like manner, if a confessor be cited in judgment, that he may give a reason for

having refused absolution, he ought to make a protestation that, in this matter, he does not acknowledge a superior but God.—*Antoine, t. 4, de Pœn, cap. 4, q. 6, p. 606.*”

From this passage it is obvious, that a most extensive conspiracy against the state may be on the eve of breaking out; the knowledge of the conspiracy, while in embryo, may reach the ears of the confessor; yet, should he be acquainted with it only through the confessional, he is most strictly bound to withhold it from the civil authorities of the country!—(Hear, hear.) You will also observe, that the knowledge of the priest is twofold, human and divine. “Human,” knowledge acquired out of the confessional; “divine,” that acquired within it! We cannot enter the prison-house of the confessional; but allow me to touch briefly on the fearful obscenity developed in the pages of *Dens*. The instructions therein supplied to the confessor, treat of subjects, as the index informs us, which I shall not name. I shall ask two questions: How can husbands allow their wives to enter the confession box?—(A general feeling of disgust here appeared to pervade the meeting.) How can a loving father permit his blooming and adult daughter to be subjected to the ordeal of confession? I can only account for the fact by recollecting the early period of life (ten years of age) at which children of both sexes attend the confessional. Their minds thus become gradually familiarised with subjects, the mention of which would instantly excite feelings of abhorrence in the genuine professor of protestantism.—(Hear, hear.)

It is a truth which cannot be denied, that the lower orders of Romanists in Ireland possess but little respect for the laws of the British empire, or their administrators. Does *Dens* throw any light upon this matter?

In 3rd vol. p. 40, we read, “The acts of a judge are invalid, on account the defect of lawful authority; but this defect occurs in a twofold manner, namely, absolutely and relatively; absolutely, when he has never had jurisdiction, or has fallen from it: for example, if the judge be an excommunicated person not tolerated; relatively, when the persons or causes to be tried are not subject to his jurisdiction.

In the preceding passage we are told, that there is an absolute defect of lawful authority in the acts of an excommunicated judge.—This is tantamount to saying that the acts of Protestant judges are invalid. For all heretics (Protestants) are *ipso facto* excommunicated. Such being the doctrine taught in a standard of theology used by the Romish ecclesiastics in Ireland, can submission to the laws on the



part of the people, administered as they are universally by heretic judges, be reasonably expected?—(Loud cheers.)

Dens adds :—

“ Observe, however, that the acts of a judge having the *titulus coloratus*, (the coloured title,) with the common error of the people, are valid.”

Dens refers to number 106, *Sacr. Pœn.*, which occurs in the 6th volume, p. 146-7. We are there furnished with explanations of the *titulus coloratus*, and of the common error of the people.

“ What is understood by the *titulus coloratus*?

“ R.—The institution or delegation of an office with cure, apparently acquired according to the laws. In the second place, the commission of delegated jurisdiction conferred by one having ordinary jurisdiction, although invalidly on account of some unknown defect, is supposed to be comprehended under the *titulus coloratus*. It is said to be an error common, or of the community, by which a priest is supposed to hold an office with cure or jurisdiction.”

I shall here remark, that our judicial functionaries may possess the “*titulus coloratus*,” but it is questionable whether their authority is supported by the common error of the people. In Ireland, the papal ecclesiastics have lately attempted to raise themselves above the civil power. The case I allude to is this :—The Rev. Mr. Prendergast, in consequence of the state of disorder to which the gaol of the county of Waterford was reduced, was dismissed from his chaplaincy to the gaol by the grand jury of the county ; and the priest of the parish in which the gaol is situated, appointed in his room. This exercise of legitimate authority, on the part of the grand jury, gave umbrage to Doctor Abraham, the titular bishop of the diocess. That prelate accordingly addressed a letter to the foreman of the county grand jury, on which there were several members of the church of Rome, highly respectable gentlemen ; and which letter I shall now, with your permission read.—(Cheers.)

“ Clonmel, July, 28, 1835.

“ Sir—I never was more astonished than on receiving a document, purporting to be a decree of the county of Waterford, passed at the late assizes—a decree as slovenly in its verbiage, as it was arrogant in its conception. This conduct might well become the mild meridian of Elizabeth’s reign, but certainly ill-accords with the vaunted liberality of modern jurists. What ! a box of laymen to usurp the patronage of a Catholic bishop ! I can scarcely believe it. But, to guard against the possibility of any infringement on my rights, I now tell you, as foreman of that said grand jury, that no other priest but the Rev. Mr. Prendergast shall dare officiate as chaplain of the county gaol, and this you may publish from the highest to the lowest places. What right had the

grand jury to dispose of my subjects in the fulness of their wisdom, and this without any appeal to the proper authority! The world shall see, by the result of this very affair, not only the usurping propensity of that said jury, but also its impotence in ecclesiastical affairs. I mean nothing *personal* in this address, but really I can with difficulty restrain my feelings on this subject, and in such times as these.

" I am, Sir,

" Your obedient servant,

" W. ABRAHAM."

(The reading of this letter was received with loud cheers.) This letter you will doubtless say was worthy, from the mild spirit which it breathes, of proceeding from the pen of an episcopal dignitary.

A circumstance of a like character occurred some years since in the city of Dublin. The grand jury in Easter term, 1814, appointed the Rev. Mr. Duffy, a Roman Catholic priest, of unimpeached character, and who had for some time previously attended gratuitously, to be chaplain of Newgate. When Dr. Troy, the Roman Catholic bishop, heard of this, he appointed another in Mr. Duffy's place. The grand jury deemed it proper to appeal to the Court of King's Bench against this proceeding of the bishop, when their appointment was confirmed. Having, however, been threatened with excommunication if he presumed to act in his situation, Mr. Duffy did not do so, although there was no other impediment to prevent him. The consequence was, that in 1815, the grand jury again complained to the court, and the result was, that, in consequence of Mr. Duffy's non-performance of his duties, he was dismissed by the city grand jury.—(Hear.) What does Dens say on the subjection of ecclesiastics to the laws of their country? In 2d volume, p. 290, we read as follows:—

" There are two points to be considered in every law; one, that the law is a rule of morals, that it points out, directs, and obliges, and these things relate to the directive force of the law; another, that the law imposes or inflicts punishments, and so far terrifies and compels, which regards the coercive force of the law."

In p. 292 Dens continues:—

" Are clerks subject to human laws?"

(Rather a strange question, one should suppose.)

" I. R.—It is beyond controversy that clerks are subject to ecclesiastical laws which concern themselves—as well with regard to their coercive as to their directive power.

" Therefore, it is here particularly inquired, whether, and how far they are subject to civil laws ?

" 2. Clerks are bound by the civil laws, which are not opposed to the clerical state or to ecclesiastical immunity, as to their directive power; thus they are bound to observe the value of money, not to export grain out of the country, if so doing be prohibited—to walk in the evening with a light, if such be commanded by the civil law to the whole community.

" However," continues Dens, " because, according to the 10th chapter *Ecclesia*, lib. 1, Decret. tit. 2, a layman has no jurisdiction over the persons of clerks; hence Suarez and more canonists teach that clerks are only indirectly bound by those laws, as was observed in the preceding number, concerning a legislator; so far forth to wit, as in a like case a part ought to conform itself to the whole community, and because the canons enjoin that clerks should observe laws of this nature.

" 3. But if the civil laws are opposed to the immunity of clerks, or if they relate to a matter in which clerks are exempt from secular power, clerks are bound by such laws neither as to their directive nor coercive force. The reason is, that clerks in such matters are in nowise subject to the secular power; thus, a clerk is not bound to keep watches to military services," &c.

Dens then refers, on the subject of ecclesiastical immunity, to Tract. " de Religion," number 196, et subsequentibus, 4th vol. p. 239.

No. 196 is headed " Concerning ecclesiastical immunity." It proceeds thus :—

" What is ecclesiastical immunity ?

" 1. R.—It is the privilege or exemption of ecclesiastical persons, things, and places, from the power of laymen.

" 2. Hence, ecclesiastical immunity is divided into " personal, real, and local;" concerning local immunity we treat below, No. 198.

" What privilege does personal immunity comprise ?

" 3. It contains the privilege of the canon—" *Si quis suadente diabolo*. Caus. 26, q. 4."

For an explanation of the privilege of the canon upon turning to 6th volume. p. 315, we read—

No. 227. The chapter is headed, " Concerning striking a clerk."

" Another case reserved for the chief pontiff by Innocent III., in council. Lateran, c. 15, is read in the decree of Gratian. Caus. 17, q. 4. Can. 29.

" If any one at the instigation of the devil should incur the guilt of this sacrilege, that he should lay violent hands upon a clerk or a monk, let him be subject to the chain of anathema; and let no bishop presume to absolve him (except the peril of death be imminent, &c.)—(Hear, hear.)

" This is called the privilege of the canon."

Turning back to 4th vol. p. 239, we read of personal immunity.

" 2. It comprises the privilege of court, by which, for example, a clerk is exempted from secular jurisdiction, power, and judge; but in a "feudal" (*feudali qu. copyhold*) and real action, in the present day, he is compelled to answer in presence of a secular judge.

" 3. It comprises exemption from personal burdens ; for example, of boarding soldiers, of keeping watches, &c.

" 4. Real immunity is that by which the farms, lands, or houses, &c. of ecclesiastics, are exempted from burdens or taxes, imposed by laymen ; for example, from the payment of the twentieth penny, &c.

" 5. Both these immunities, sedulously observed with due piety in former times, in the present day are almost extinguished ; for eighty years since, ecclesiastical lands were exempt from payment of the twentieth penny and of the royal taxes ; but, even at this present time, with respect to the clergy of the metropolitan church of Malines, immunity, in some degree, (aliquo,) is still observed."

What Dens adds is well worth consideration—

" But, perhaps, the more on that account, that the clerk vindicates for himself that due immunity from a burdensome title," (titulo.)

There is one subject to which I beg to call your particular attention. In the second conference for the year 1832, the conference in which the questions relating to the persecution of heretics occur, the question is found : " Is the reading of sacred scripture necessary and commanded to all." This question occurs in Dens's 2d vol., p. 101. The first answer there given to the question is—that the reading of the sacred scriptures is " neither necessary nor commanded to all, is evident from the practice and doctrine of the universal church : wherefore, in the bull ' Unigenitus,' the proposition 79, concerning this matter, is condemned : ' It is useful and necessary, in all times, and places, for all descriptions of persons, both to study and know the spirit, piety, and mysteries of sacred scripture :' to this add proposition 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, and 85, condemned with same bull." I shall not occupy your time by reading the other propositions condemned. Now, the bull " Unigenitus" is contained in the 8th vol., published, as Mr. Wood states, with Dr. Murray's sanction, and further was declared by Dr. Murray, in his examination before a committee of the House of Commons, to have been received in Ireland. The church of Rome would tell you that she does not prohibit the free circulation of the scriptures ; but in Dens we are distinctly informed that the church of Rome does not allow the reading of the scriptures to all. Can, I would ask, a system which is opposed to the perusal of the scriptures by all, have emanated from that God who created the human mind ? (Loud cheers.) Common sense tells you, that no fellow creature is authorized to come between you and revelation, and, that man is entitled to read the sacred records—Can

such a system have proceeded from the God of the Bible?—Cheers.) Deity says, addressing the inhabitants of the earth, “Seek ye out of the book of the law of the Lord and read.”—Search the scriptures, for they are they which testify of me.”—Hear, hear.)

Another question, immediately following in the conference already noticed, is—

“Is the reading of sacred scripture lawful for all? Dens answers—“In the first place, the church does not prohibit by any decree, not even, indeed, to laymen, the reading of sacred scripture, in the Hebrew, Greek, or Latin tongue!!! However, by the law of nature, it is to be abstained from, if that reading should be liable to perversion through defect of fitness, or disposition of mind, as was the case with those of whom St. Peter treats in his second epistle, chapter 3, v. 16, ‘which the unlearned and the unstable wrest to their own destruction.’”

As this is a passage often quoted by opponents to the indiscriminate circulation of the scriptures, allow me to make some remarks upon it. So far is the passage from upholding the position which it is so frequently brought forward to maintain, that I claim it as supporting the right of all to peruse the scriptures. Look at the passage. The word translated “unlearned,” is a compound adjective of the word rendered disciple—undisciplined, untaught in scripture truth, appears a fair rendering. The word translated “wrest” is to torture, to put to the rack, to wrest from the natural meaning; and implies an ingenuity of mind, which the unlearned, in the general acceptation of the word, do not possess. Accordingly, we find that the fathers of the great heresies which have prevailed were not ignorant but learned persons. So that, if perversion of the scriptures supplied a just reason why they should be withheld from any—they should be withdrawn from the learned, for such have made a bad use of them.—(Cheers.) To use an illustration—“The profligate pervert their health to their own destruction.” To pervert health they must have possessed it. Certain persons, of whom Peter speaks, misused the scriptures. To have misused them they must have had access to them. (Hear, hear.) Does Peter direct that such should be prevented from reading the scriptures? By no means. The address of the 2d epistle is to “all that have obtained like precious faith with us.” He founds, indeed, a caution upon the statement which he had made. “Beware lest ye also be led away from your own steadfastness” (in reference to the unstable) “by the error of the wicked. But grow in grace and in

the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,"—(hear,)—(in reference to the unlearned.)

Dens continues :—

" In the second place, the church does not absolutely prohibit to laymen, or to men of any rank, the reading of sacred scripture in the vulgar tongue ; but she does not ALLOW (1) it, except with great cautions."

Dens quotes as authority for the position which he has laid down, the 4th rule of the index ; and remarks upon it—

" Observe that, according to said rule, the power of granting permission to read sacred scripture in the vulgar tongue is lodged with the bishop or inquisitor, not with the parish priests or the confessors, except this power has been granted to themselves ;"—(hear, hear ;)

So that the parish priests and confessors are not authorized to grant to their respective subjects permission to read the Bible, unless they themselves have previously received license to read the Bible.

As the authority of the rules of the index is sometimes doubted, permit me to call your attention to some proofs, that they are of standing force in the church of Rome. In the year 1564, the year in which the standard creed of the church of Rome was put forward by the authority of the popedom, Pius IV. published a bull, bearing date 24th of March, 1564, expressly to confirm the rules and index. The heading of the bull is, " Bull of our most holy lord Pius IV., by divine providence, Pope. Approbation of the index of prohibited books, together with the rules established by the fathers deputed from the Council of Trent, and the prohibition of possessing and reading said books."—Pope Leo XII., in his encyclical letter, dated 3d May, 1824, speaks of the rules as " the rules of our congregation of the index," and exhorts the faithful " strictly (*adamussim*) to adhere to them." The Rhemists, in the preface to their New Testament, speak of this fourth rule as authority, and lament that due respect in the present day is not paid to it—I beg to add a single fact. I have myself seen the index and rules printed at Rome, under papal authority, bearing so recent a date as that of the year 1819. It is entitled " the index of Prohibited Books, by order of our Most Holy Lord Pius VII., Supreme Pontiff. Rome, 1819. From the Apostolical Printing-office, with the privilege of the Chief Pontiff.—(Hear. Prefixed are the "*decem regulæ* ;" and in the appendix are subjoined the several indices from the year 1819 to 1828, by Pius VII. and Leo

XII. If the church of Rome, therefore, possessed ascendancy in these countries, it is evident she would lay an interdict upon the free use of the Bible.—(Cheers.)

These meetings, under the divine blessing, will be productive of much good. They will tend to remove delusions under which some statesmen, and temporal philanthropists, labour, with respect to the true nature of the religion of Rome. They will place before the christian man the genuine character of the theology which is dispensed to members of the papal communion in Ireland, and excite his commiseration on behalf of the spiritual interests of the sister island. They will demonstrate, to the orthodox dissenter, the real features of that system, with which, for the attainment of particular objects, he has been led to form a most anomalous coalition.—(Loud cheers.) And here I would remind him of the observation of a truly able writer—"The aid which we receive in argument from parties between whom and ourselves there is the most entire discordance on first principles, may well be suspected, if not wholly rejected;" and I tell him that, let the objects which he contemplates be but accomplished, and the monster whom he now embraces will crush the unsuspecting victim to destruction.—(Loud and continued cheering.) The diffusion, too, of the knowledge of Rome's genuine faith, will check its encroaching advances in England. Believe me, the religion against which we protest is a most watchful foe, eager to usurp domination over the human race; and if we would continue to enjoy the blessings which are now possessed by us, we must sedulously guard against the encroachments of the Roman power. I shall conclude in the language of Wordsworth:—

———"The sacred book,  
In dusty sequestration wrapt too long,  
Assumed the accents of our native tongue;  
And he who guides the plough or wields the crook,  
With understanding spirit now may look  
Upon its records, listen to its song,  
And sift its laws."

May we duly estimate and turn to practical account the privileges which we possess. Mr. Pope concluded by seconding the resolution proposed by Mr. M'Ghee, and sat down amidst the long-continued applause of the whole meeting. The resolution passed with thunders of acclamation.

Dr. RALPH said he begged leave to propose a resolution, arising out of the statements which they had just heard; and, as they must be much exhausted, he would do so in as few words as he could find.—These statements had gone to prove two things—first, that the *Theology* of Dens was a standard work of the Romish Church; and, secondly, that its principles were of a most immoral, anti-social, and anti-christian tendency. He felt persuaded that, on no mind was there left a doubt of the truth of these facts, from the evidence of the gentlemen who had preceded him. But it was desirable they should commit themselves to some practical object, while their impressions were so overpowering. In a few minutes they would breathe a different atmosphere, so much did men, in general society, merge their religion in their politics. The design of the resolution, therefore, he had to propose was, the formation of a society for the exhibition and defence of Protestant principles.—(Enthusiastic and long-continued applause.) On the applause ceasing, he said,—Before he proposed the resolution, he could not help expressing his delight at the manner in which the announcement had been received; but he hoped they would show the value of their present—he was not surprised to find—strongly-excited feelings, by using every exertion in their respective spheres to diffuse Protestant principles.—(Renewed cheering.) The resolution is to the following effect:—

*Resolved.—That an association be now formed of the friends of the Established Churches of Christ, for the diffusion of Protestant information and the maintenance of Protestant principles. And that the following gentlemen\* be requested to act as Treasurer and Secretaries, and adopt the necessary measures to form a Committee; and that all clergymen who are members of the Association shall be members of the Committee.*

The Rev. R. P. BUDDICOM spoke as follows:—At this late hour of the meeting, and after your attention has been so long and so intensely occupied, I feel the necessity of great brevity in seconding the motion proposed by the Rev. Dr. Ralph. I have very sincere pleasure in doing so; and, after the unanswerable appeals made to your reason, judgment, and zeal for divine truth, I can have no doubt that you will cordially adopt the resolution. Allow me, however, earnestly to impress upon your minds, not merely the necessity of passing the motion, but of endeavouring to carry it into effect, collectively and individually. This duty will involve both effort and sacrifice. The

\* See page 528.



genius of popery is so subtle, and its promoters so active, that all our diligence and devotedness will be certainly required. It was wisely observed by Bishop Barrington, and lately quoted by the Rev. T. H. Horne, in his excellent *Protestant Memorial*, "*That, if the Reformation was worth establishing, it is worth maintaining;*" and I should be sorry for the head and heart of that individual, who, having heard the arguments of these gentlemen, on whose words we have hung with so much delight, should not go forth from this place determined, in the might of God, to uphold the principles of the Reformation. The statements already made have irrefragably proved Romanism to be a system essentially at war with all the simplicities of religion, and all the relations of social life. If, therefore, the honour of the Saviour, the sanctities of private obligation, the demands of public duty, the allegiance which we owe to the state, the throne, and the altar, be dear to our hearts, we shall endeavour to diffuse such principles of pure and undefiled religion as may tend, through the divine blessing, to ward off the danger with which all are threatened.

It has been already well said, that, where men differ from each other upon the most solemn, momentous, and fundamental principles of faith, the duty of outward union, for any object, is more than questionable. This remark has been forcibly applied to the mournful combination now made between many who own the truth as it is in Jesus, and those who deny the all-important doctrines of his godhead and atonement; between those who profess to hold dear the religious principles of the Reformation, and the members of the Church of Rome, against the established Protestantism of this land. I would beg leave to tell my dissenting brethren, many of whom are, probably, present, that they have committed a tremendous mistake in this most unnatural alliance with popery, for any purpose under heaven, and not least, for the downfall of the national churches. If their purpose could be fully answered, the only result for which they could reasonably hope would be Polypheme's favour—to be the last devoured. It has been already hinted, that, if the dissenters could overthrow the churches established in these realms, the Romanists would do the rest. And what advantage could dissent possibly obtain by the alteration? The established church is at this hour a bulwark between our dissenting brethren and the great enemy of all Protestantism, in whatever community of professing Christians it may be found. Were that bulwark

immediately removed, by the unhallowed agency employed against it, the actors would soon find themselves crushed and writhing, in hopeless agony, beneath a weight which, if upheld, might have protected them, but which they would draw down upon themselves for their destruction. Their repentance would surely come, but it would come too late. And, while they would probably be struggling with each other much more sternly than at present, the common enemy would devour all at his leisure. Permit me in conclusion, to beseech you not to carry hence any feelings other than those of tenderness and pity for those whom Rome has entangled in her snare, and deluded in her mystery of iniquity, to their soul's infinite peril. I intreat you, as the first act, upon reaching your homes, to pour out your hearts in thankfulness to God for your own privileges in the clear knowledge of divine truth ; earnestly to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints ; and fervently to implore your Heavenly Father, that our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects may be translated from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son, and numbered among saints for glory everlasting.

Mr. BUDDICOME concluded by stating that he had only to propose a resolution which he was sure would pass with acclamation, it was a vote of thanks to WILLIAM HUTTON, Esq. their Chairman, who had so ably and impartially presided over the proceedings of the day.— (Loud and repeated acclamations responded to this proposition.)

Mr. HUTTON briefly returned thanks.

The Doxology was then given out by Mr. BUDDICOM, and sung as it seemed by all the voices in the Amphitheatre, in a most solemn and impressive manner, and the meeting separated.

The next proceeding in the controversy was the Protestant Meeting at Birmingham.

# GREAT PROTESTANT MEETING

HELD IN THE TOWN-HALL,

## BIRMINGHAM,

ON

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 18th, 1835.

---

PURSUANT to advertisement, convening a meeting of the friends of the Protestant Religion and the Constitution in Church and State, an assembly unprecedented for numbers and respectability took place at the Town Hall, Birmingham, on Wednesday the 18th of November, 1835. Among the persons upon the platform and in the organ gallery were—

Lord Viscount Lorton.

The Honourables E. Stewart and Charles Harris.

Colonels Thorn and Pitman, and Major Willows.

The Venerable Archdeacons Spooner and Hodson.

The Revs. E. A. Bagot, Ley Brooks, S. Wilberforce, G. Ryder, G. Inge, J. Hargreaves, J. Hargreaves, jun., D. W. Walton, R. Greenside, G. Salmon, E. L. Clarke, Ed. Bagnall, J. Mendham, R. R. Mendham, H. Harding, T. G. H. Lucock, W. R. Bedford, T. B. King, C. T. Elers, T. Blyth, Geo. Barrs, W. Hillsley, F. Thompson,—Vaughan, J. T. Cartwright, E. H. Wainwright, D. Davies, F. G. Dineley, H. Gwyther, W. K. Marshall, J. Todd, T. Harrison, T. Price, A. H. Price, J. Leak, E. Kempson, J. Gorle, W. Marshall, J. W. Sanders, E. Meredith, G. Sproston, J. Short, — Richards, G. Woodhouse, W. M. Isaac, W. K. Ison, W. Lewis, J. Hudson, — Freemantle,

G. W. White, J. Hawkeswood, W. Palmer, D. Walton, H. Pountney, W. Gordon, G. Wharton, G. Salmon, H. Hamilton, W. L. Mills, J. Clayton, —Gascoyne.

The Revs. Dr. Jeune, T. Mosely, J. Garbett, W. Marsh, S. F. Morgan, T. G. Breay, J. Allport, E. Dales, M. W. Foye, C. Arnold, T. Nunns, R. Kennedy, S. Gedge, S. Crane, G. Ranking, E. Palmer, H. Chavasse, T. G. Simcox, G. O. Fenwicke, J. W. Downes, G. Lowe.

The Rev. Messrs. Rigg, Squance, Slater, Wallace, Richards, and other Dissenting Ministers.

The Revs. Dr. Brown, T. M. M'Donnell, Abbott, Gascoigne, Perchall, and other Roman Catholic Priests.

Dr. Evans, Dr. Huey, Dr. Eccles, Dr. Hamett, Dr. Kingstone, Dr. Roberts, &c.

James Taylor, Esq., Richard Spooner, Esq., E. L. Williams, Esq., Edward Winnington, Esq., W. P. Inge, Esq., John Peel, Esq., John Gough, Esq., Messrs. R. Tooth, G. Salmon, J. Craddock, J. Lea, L. O'Brien, D. O'Brien, E. Jones, J. Taylor, J. Proud, J. Webster, jun., J. Boulton, J. Craddock, J. Dawes, James Russell, — Gregory, — Kearsley, H. Simcox, E. Lloyd, J. Halford, — Hammersley, H. Hodgson, W. Hodgson, J. Oldham, W. H. Rickets, W. Robinson, P. Williams, G. Silvester, C. Hopkins, L. Badger, J. O. York, H. Radford, — Basano, J. C. Harper, J. Bennett, R. Greene, G. Hodggets, W. C. Alston, J. Simcox, Charles Tindall, J. W. Unett, T. Knott, J. Y. Bedford, W. Chance, R. Harris, J. Smallwood, W. Anderton, W. Haughton, J. Walker, T. Richards, J. M. Knott, R. Hasluck, D. Ledsam, G. Barker, H. Rotton, J. Rawlins, G. Whateley, S. Rawlins, Ed. Heeley, J. B. Hebbert, T. Gutteridge, T. Hanson, jun., E. Wilson, W. Richards, G. Whateley, D. Ledsam, H. Pountney, J. Moore, &c. &c.

In the Ladies' Gallery were noticed Lady Emily Harding, Mrs. Archdeacon Hodson and family, Mrs. R. Spooner and family; the Misses Whateley, Mrs. Mosely, Mrs. James Taylor, Miss Downing, Mrs. Garbett, the Misses Marsh, Misses Barker, Mrs. Kingstone, Mrs. Gedge, Mrs. Benyon and family, the Misses Tindal, Mrs. Braham, Miss Inkersley, Mrs. Fenwicke, Mrs. F. Harding, Mrs. Finch, Miss Hanell, Mrs. Clarke and family, Mrs. and the Misses Russell, Mrs. Tooth, Miss Woods, the Misses Allport, the Misses Halford, Mrs. Proud, Mrs. Hillier, Mrs. Pershore, Miss Anderton, Mrs. Lad, Mrs. Col. Pitman, Mrs. Harris, Mrs. T. Richards, Mrs. Ingleby, Mrs. Eccles, Miss Barker, Miss Thurlow, Miss Hume, Mrs. Adderley, the Misses Petit, Miss De Brabander, Misses Squance, Mrs. and Miss Unett, Miss Thomason, Mrs. Ledsam, together with the wives and families of almost all the clergymen and gentlemen above-named.

On the motion of W. P. INGE, Esq. seconded by JOHN SIMCOX, Esq. RICHARD SPOONER, Esq. was called to the Chair, amidst the loudest cheers, who immediately proceeded to address the meeting as follows:—Ladies and gentlemen,—My first duty is to read to you the advertisement convening the meeting which I have now the honour to address.—(The advertisement was then read by Mr. SPOONER.)

Before I proceed to state to you particularly the objects we have in view, or to detail to you the rules and regulations which have been laid down for the guidance of the meeting, I feel satisfied you will agree with me in thinking that, on an occasion so deeply interesting to the well-being of our fellow-christians, we cannot do better than to commence the business of the day with prayer to the Almighty, that we may be blessed with the influence of his holy spirit, and rightly conducted to a successful termination of our labours. I, therefore, beg leave to call on the Rev. Mr. Marsh to open this meeting with prayer.

The Rev. WILLIAM MARSH then offered up a suitable and impressive prayer, in which the vast assembly joined.

The CHAIRMAN—I will now proceed to read to you the rules and regulations which the Committee have agreed upon for the conduct of this Meeting.

1. Admission by ticket only.

2. As the Meeting is not convened for *discussion*, no persons but those deputed by the Committee will be allowed to address the Meeting.

3. Every person using the privilege of a ticket is considered pledged to adhere to the rules of this Meeting, and to submit to the Chair.

These are the rules by which we are to be guided; and in taking the high and honourable situation which your kindness has imposed upon me, I confess I feel that I must draw largely on your indulgence, but it shall be my earnest desire to fulfil the duties of the situation in which I have been placed in a manner that may meet with your approbation, and be consistent with your wishes. If there be any one here who shall in any way infringe the rules and regulations I have just read, I do hope and trust that I shall receive such support from you as will enable me to discharge my duty faithfully and efficiently. I would here beg to mention that upon the present occasion this Hall is, strictly speaking, a private room. It has been granted, by those who have the legal power to grant it, for the use of certain gentlemen who have called this meeting together, and who have invited our two reverend friends, the Rev. Mr. M'Ghee and the Rev. Mr. O'Sullivan, to come here and make statements on a subject in which we are all deeply interested, and which, I am quite sure, the more it is investigated the more will it be conducive to the advancement of true religion and the best interests of society. I am satisfied that, after this remark, every gentleman who has accepted a ticket will feel that he

is bound, not by mere courtesy, but by the strictest rules of honour, not in any way to interfere with the proceedings of the Meeting to which he has received an invitation.—I will now shortly advert to the object of our assembling. I would first observe that I am sure, both here and elsewhere, our object has been much misunderstood. We have been charged with having political views. I renounce, on the part of myself,—and on the part of my friends around me who have called this Meeting together—I renounce, in the most clear and most emphatic manner, that we have any political views, or any party views, or party feelings whatsoever. (Loud cheers.) We have likewise been accused of traducing our neighbours and friends. I equally disclaim that; our simple, plain, and intelligible object is this—to place before this great and respectable meeting of English Protestants, what are the tenets of the Roman Catholic Clergy, as now avowed by the hierarchy of that Church, in opposition to those which we hold to be the truth as it is in Jesus. That is the plain and simple object of the meeting; and if I am asked why at this moment do we think it necessary to bring this subject before the consideration of the public, I should say there are various reasons for so doing; and the most prominent, I confess that which operates the most strongly on my mind, is, the late attempt,—in my opinion, an exceedingly unjustifiable attempt to say the least of it, to apply the revenues of the Irish Protestant Clergy to other than strictly Protestant ecclesiastical purposes. Another reason which operates strongly on my mind, I refer to, I own with great pain, but on these occasions we must speak our minds honestly and openly, without fear, favour, or affection. I refer to that, which, to speak in the mildest terms, I must call a most extraordinary interpretation of a clear and intelligible oath; and when I look around me and endeavour to find upon what principles Members of Parliament, who have taken their oaths not to interfere with property as by law established, have formed the majority which has interfered in this unjustifiable manner,—I say, when I look for the reasons and principles which could induce them to act thus, I find them entirely explained in the doctrines laid down in a book which has been lately promulgated under high Roman Catholic authority, as the book which ought to be the guide of their conduct on all occasions. When I find it plainly and distinctly laid down in that book that the end justifies the means, be they what they may, or in

other words, we owe more to the Pope than we do to Almighty God I am not surprised at what has happened. I will not venture further on this part of the subject. I should only very imperfectly lay before you such statements as will be introduced to your notice by the Rev. gentlemen I have first alluded to. But if I am asked what good can arise from discussions like the present, I answer that I believe one most important object will be attained. I feel a strong confidence in the power—in the force of truth. These discussions lead to the elucidation of truth: and feeling, as a Protestant, that the Protestant religion is founded upon truth, I hail every opportunity that we have afforded us to investigate the truth; being thoroughly convinced that we may with confidence rely on the result. There is another benefit that I am sanguine enough to anticipate we shall also receive from these discussions. For very many years of my life I have been in close intimacy with several most respectable and highly talented individuals belonging to the Roman Catholic church, and having had an opportunity of seeing them in their private character exemplarily fulfilling all the duties of social life—knowing them to be honest, upright, and honourable in their dealings—I am perfectly sure they must be in ignorance of these doctrines being now claimed as part and parcel of the doctrines of the Roman Catholics by their highest authority; I believe they imagine these doctrines to have been for many years totally exploded from their creed. I think it will be advantageous to show them that, at least, they are not so far exploded, but that they are maintained by their hierarchy at the present day, and that, the book in which they are found is investigated by them in all their concerns of life. Their answer when this shall be told to them will be, “I am sure these are not the doctrines that we profess and practise;” and therefore, in that respect also, will there be much benefit resulting from meetings like the present.—I will detain you no longer, except to thank you for the attention you have honoured me with. I feel highly gratified at being placed in the position to which your kindness has elevated me, and my greatest satisfaction will be so to conduct myself as to merit your approbation.—Mr. Spooner resumed his seat amidst considerable cheering.

The Rev. Mr. M'GHEE was then introduced to the notice of the meeting by the Chairman, and was received with the warmest acclamations. The Rev. gentleman spoke as follows:—Mr. Chairman,—The great

publicity which has been given to that subject on which I am to have the honour of addressing this meeting to day, precludes the necessity of any lengthened prefatory observations to introduce it. I can truly take up the sentiments which you have expressed from the chair when I say, that in standing forth on this and on all occasions of the kind I can call my God to witness, as his minister, that I am not prompted by feelings of hostility, but by those of the deepest, most earnest, most faithful Christian anxiety for the best interests of my Roman Catholic fellow-subjects; and I would call upon this meeting to recollect that the subject which is to be brought before their attention this day, is a subject the most important that can engage the attention of man. The day is at hand when the Judge of Heaven and Earth, shall read the heavens, and come down to judge the earth; when an assembled world shall stand before his throne; and when all the interests and all the concerns of this little passing perishing scene shall appear to be, as they really are, but like the small dust on the balance compared with that one subject which engages our attention this day. My heart's desire and prayer to God, for my Roman Catholic fellow-subjects is this—that they may know that hope, that only hope to which, as a sinner, I look myself, the salvation that is in Christ Jesus our Lord; and it is because these books (producing them) are against that salvation; it is because these principles subvert that salvation; it is because, in my judgment, comparing them with the word of the eternal God, I cannot call them Christianity, but Anti-Christianity, that I stand up here. It is for that reason I desire to bear my testimony humbly, but I trust faithfully, as I hope I ever shall while God spares my life, against those evils which destroy the souls of those who rest upon them, and which turn them not from darkness to light, but from light to darkness. I shall now endeavour to lay before you a statement of the facts which it has pleased God to bring to light concerning the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church; and I can only say this, that from the moment they were discovered by us to be the real tenets of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy of Ireland, without any delay, without any looking to any consideration whatever, of opinions, of interests, of parties, or anything connected with parties, they were simply and honestly brought forward before the nation.

As I was deputed by many of my reverend brethren, very unworthily indeed, to lay details of the evidence before the public in Exeter



Hall, I can truly and conscientiously say that I neither did then, or since pervert, misrepresent, aggravate, or extenuate any single fact that came within my knowledge, but I endeavoured to lay them simply and plainly before the public, and every effort that has been made from every quarter to counteract this statement has only served, I trust, under the direction of Divine Providence, to substantiate and confirm the faithfulness of it. I shall not consider it trespassing upon you to recapitulate the evidence of this case. If you have seen the statements that have already been published, you will consider it very important to see the documents on which those statements have been founded, that you may the more clearly understand them; and if you have not seen those statements, I trust you will see and read them; and I hope you will recollect, that you are not reading statements about fables or theories, but statements concerning facts and documents, which you have not only heard with your ears, but have seen with your eyes.

The Rev. Gentleman then produced certain books and documents, observing, this is the book of which you have heard so much—DENS'S THEOLOGY. These are the books, on the evidence of which this is established, as being the standard of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy of Ireland. These books are called the Priests' Directories, which it is necessary you should see and understand. (The Reverend gentleman held up the different volumes for the observation of the audience.)

The Roman Catholic priests are obliged to repeat certain exercises every day, which they call offices, which they must repeat under the penalty of mortal sin. The offices are extracted from different works—the Breviary chiefly, the Missal, portions of the Gospel, and perhaps other things that I do not know of; but the subject matter of the offices is published every year, for every day in the year, in the book which is called their Directory. It is the directory for their offices, and they must keep this book in their hands from the first of January to the last of December. Here is the book (holding it up.) This book, although printed, may be called strictly a private or secret book, for this reason, that it is written in characters which no person but a Roman Catholic priest understands. Therefore the book, although printed, and although it might be lying upon the counter of the Roman Catholic bookseller, no person who took it up would think of buying, for this simple reason, that he would not understand it. In this

directory are included (at least in these Irish Directories) the questions of private conferences for the Roman Catholic clergy, which they hold four times a-year, sometimes oftener; but for the last five years they have held them four times a-year, assembled together with the bishop of their diocese at their head. These questions, then, are the subject matter of this conference; and annexed to these directories is another small book, namely, the catalogue of Mr. Coyne, the Roman Catholic bookseller in Dublin. It is in this catalogue that the advertisement of Dens's Theology appears. I hope now you understand the nature of the Directory.

I shall now briefly lay before you a recapitulation of the evidence as to the publication and adoption of these books. There were two editions of this book published; the first in 1808, in seven volumes, and the second in 1832, in eight volumes; and it is in the Directory of 1832 that we find the advertisement, containing a statement of the first publication in 1808, and the re-publication in 1832. The bookseller says—

“Just published, Dens's Complete Body of Theology, in eight volumes.

“At a meeting of the Roman Catholic Prelates of Ireland, assembled in Dublin, the 14th day of September, 1808, they unanimously agreed that *Dens's Complete Body of Theology* was the best book on the subject that could be re-published, as containing the most secure guidance for such Ecclesiastics as may, by reason of the peculiar circumstances of this country, be deprived of the opportunity of referring to public libraries, or consulting those who may be placed in authority over them. In consequence an edition of the work was ordered to be printed by the present publisher to the number of 3,000 copies.”

Now, confine your attention, in the first place, to the edition of 1808—keep that in your recollection; there were seven volumes printed in that year; you have heard the advertisement stating this fact by the bookseller, which appears to be inserted in the Directory of 1832, in order that all the Roman Catholic priests of Ireland now living might know the great authority which this book possessed in their church, namely, that it had been ordered by all their bishops in the year 1808.

Now, observe, there are four facts stated by the bookseller in this advertisement. He states, *first*, that the Roman Catholic Bishops of Ireland assembled on a certain day, the 14th of September, 1808.

*Secondly*.—That that day they selected this book as the best book that could be re-published. Now mark, it was to be the most secure

guide for the Ecclesiastics in the absence of libraries,—which would contain all the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. It was to be their guidance in the absence of their bishops,—so that if they could not refer to the authority of their superiors on any particular occasion, they might find their superiors' opinion and authority written in that book.

The *third* fact was this, that in consequence of their unanimous approbation, they ordered this man to publish 3,000 copies—that is, a copy for every Roman Catholic priest in Ireland.

The next fact is, that he did publish these 3,000 copies. Now you have here four facts stated by the living witness himself—the man who states he received that order twenty-seven years ago, and the man who declares he executed that order; and recollect that there is hardly a single bishop on the Roman Catholic Bench in Ireland at this day who does not know, and the great body of their priests must know, that these facts are true, that they did receive at that time the book which was ordered to be published by their bishops.

Now this is the statement of the bookseller respecting the edition of 1808. I will now call your attention to some collateral evidences that establish this fact, and corroborate the testimony of this bookseller.

In the very year 1808, two months after this order was issued by the bishops, one of the Roman Catholic bishops of Ireland violated a promise which he made to a body of Roman Catholic gentlemen—a committee of Roman Catholics, in the county of Kilkenny. This called forth their indignation, and one of them, a most respectable gentleman, possessing one of the largest fortunes in that county (Major Bryan,) published a statement in the paper, mentioning that the bishop had violated his promise. The bishop wrote a letter in self-justification, and he justified the violation of his promise by five reasons, which reasons are translated from Dens's Theology.

In the year 1809, the year after, in February, it appears from the authority of Mr. Woods, the gentleman who compiles the Directory, that it is to be found in the minutes of the books of the College of Maynooth, that this book was proposed in February 1809, to supersede the present class-books, Delahogue and Bayly, and that it was rejected.

Again, in the year 1810, the Roman Catholic bishops met, and Mr. Wyse, in his history of the Roman Catholic Association, has published a set of resolutions passed by them, declaring that they confirmed all the resolutions that they had passed on the 14th September, 1808; thereby clearly establishing Coyne's statement that they had met on that day.

In the year 1822, a Roman Catholic priest published a book, in which he stated that Dens's Theology was adopted by the bishops as a Conference-book in the diocese of Ossory, and that the doctrine of persecution of heretics was founded upon the authority of that book. This is the book; it only came into my hand yesterday; but I shall have occasion to refer to it just now, upon a more important point.

In the year 1825, Doctor Murray took his own questions of his Diocesan Conferences from Dens's Theology; and, be it remembered, that that was the year in which he gave in on his oath before the committee of Parliament Holden's Analysis and Verron's Rule of Faith—books which are not to be bought, and have not been published in Ireland—he gave in those books as his standard, and not the book that had been ordered to be published by the bishops, and that he, in that very year, took that book, Dens, as the Conference-book for his own diocese.

In the year 1826, Doctor Murray again took his questions of Diocesan Conference from Dens's Theology. In 1828, he also took the questions of his Diocesan Conference from that book; and in the year 1831, he and the three bishops of the province of Leinster agreed together to set up Dens's Theology as the standard of conference for all the province of Leinster.

Again, Mr. Nolan, a Roman Catholic priest, who has lately conformed to the Established Church, in answer to two letters from Mr. Woods and Mr. Maguire, states, that Dens's Theology was in their time a reference-book in the library of Maynooth. And Mr. Croly, a gentleman who has not conformed from the Roman Catholic church, but who is still a priest, though, I believe, under suspension for a bold and honest statement of facts, this Mr. Croly declares in a postscript to a pamphlet he has published, that this book was the standard published by the permission of his superiors throughout all Ireland, and that no exception was ever taken to any part of it; and that these

doctrines concerning heretics are not only to be found in Dens, but that they are doctrines admitted and acknowledged by all Roman Catholics.

Now, you have here four facts stated by direct evidence from the Roman Catholic bookseller; you have here ten indirect collateral evidences, or facts, every one proving and establishing the direct testimony of the bookseller upon the subject. Mr. Wyse proves the fact, that the bishops assembled on the day that Coyne states them to have assembled. Mr. Woods, by stating that Dens's Theology was proposed to the Board of Maynooth to supersede the present class-books, shows the high estimation, the high authority in which that book must have been held at that day. The fact of its being proposed shows its authority, and the fact of its rejection only proves their consciousness of its iniquity; and that they did not choose that that book should be made the subject of public investigation, as it must have been if it had been made a class-book of the College of Maynooth. The bishop who translated the modes of violating a promise from Dens, gave the best possible proof that he recommended that book as the guide for his clergy, because he proves he adopted it for his own.

An individual: Who was he?

The Rev. Mr. M'GHEE: Bishop Lanigan.

Dr. Murray in taking the questions of his conference in the years 1825, 1826, and 1828, from that book, shows not only the authority in which the book was held, but he shows that the book must have been published, as Coyne states, and that it must have been in the possession of the clergy of his diocese; for he could not have proposed to them questions out of a book if he did not know that they had the book to answer the questions. And while it is clear that he adopted that book as the Conference-book for his diocese, he shows that he was conscious of the iniquity of that book; for either he gave the true standard in his answers to the House of Commons, or he did not. If he gave in the true standard of his faith in answer to the House of Commons, why did he adopt the false, or the more imperfect standard for his own diocese? And if he adopted the true, and the best standard for his own diocese, what was the reason he gave in a false standard to the House of Commons?

I have omitted another fact, namely, that Mr. Croly states that the book was possessed by the present Roman Catholic Bishop of Cork,

Doctor Murphy I believe, that it was possessed by him, and that he had fifty or sixty copies of it in his library, for the use of his seminary, and for the use of the clergy of his diocese. This is a matter of fact; the bishop of whom he states it is alive, and it has never been denied. Now, I say the four provincial bishops; namely, Doctor Murray, Doctor Keating, Doctor Doyle, and Doctor Kinsella, in adopting Dens as the standard conference-book for their provinces, proved not only the authority and estimation in which they held the book, but thus proved the statement of Mr. Coyne, that the book must have been published, as he says he did publish it, for they never could appoint as a standard book for their clergy to answer from a book which they did not believe, or know that their clergy possessed. Therefore, up to the year 1831—mark, here are a tissue of facts, from the year 1808 up to 1831, all bearing upon the edition of 1808, for recollect, all these refer to the edition of 1808, the edition of 1832 not having been yet published.

Now, you have seen this book traced as a Conference-book of the Diocese of Dublin, to the year 1828. Let us now go back to that year. I would for a moment observe on another circumstance: a Mr. O'Daunt, an Irish Roman Catholic gentleman, has written a letter in the Irish papers, suggesting, as an objection to the adoption of Dens's Theology, this fact: he says—

“The priests who have conformed from the Roman Catholic church, if Dens was adopted, should have mentioned it.”

I saw in one of the Dublin papers, last week, an answer to this quoting, from a publication written by a Roman Catholic priest in the year 1822, his evidence upon the subject; now, I call your attention to the statement made by this gentleman, he is a Mr. Morissy, parish priest of Oning and Templeorum, in the diocese of Ossory, in the county of Kilkenny, and Roman Catholic chaplain to his Majesty's Prison in Dublin. The title of the work is “The Second Part of a Development of the cruel and dangerous Inquisitorial System of the Court of Rome in Ireland.” Having stated that there was a system of instruction for the priesthood against heretics, and that the doctrines of persecuting heretics had been held in the conference of the diocese of Ossory, he says—

“A respectable divine called Dens wrote the course of Theology; this author is highly recommended by our bishops and superiors to parish priests,

and all those who have the care of souls, and government of the people ; this same author was re-printed in Dublin by a Roman Catholic bookseller, a few years ago, and distributed among the Roman Catholic clergymen throughout Ireland ; in his treatise on Faith, he explains and inculcates what punishments are, and should be inflicted on heretics."—Page 224.

Now, here we have written in 1822, before any human being in Ireland ever heard of Dens except the Roman Catholic bishops and priests ; we have here this statement written by this priest, declaring that the same questions which were discussed in 1832, through all the province of Leinster, were discussed in this secret conference of the diocese of Ossory, before 1822, and that Dens's rules for the punishment of heretics, were the rules then adopted by the bishop and clergy of that diocese.

Now as I shall read some of the documents out of Dens himself, I will not anticipate them, for Mr. Morissy quotes a translation of some of the passages of Dens ; but there is a passage here to which I call your marked attention, I never saw it till last night, and I confess it has thrown a very solemn and a very awful light upon the facts which I shall lay before you. One of the punishments stated in Dens is, that those who are heretics among priests are to be deprived of their benefices and dignities. He states,

"In consequence of this Ecclesiastical law, I was deprived of my benefice and dignity, and thank God, shortly after the Catholic Emancipation will be granted, we shall treat the Ministers of the Church of England after the same manner, and turn the Protestants out of the public offices, and make room for our own clergy and laity, &c."—*Morissy's Second Development*, page 245.

Now mark, this is a prophecy of a Roman Catholic priest, exposing these facts in the year 1822 ; now I will refer to Dens as a matter of law. In the 4th vol. page 272, he mentions (among the modes of acquiring and losing benefices,) that by manifest and public heresy, and by many other crimes, Church benefices are lost.

In the year 1830, a new view presents itself to us—the Roman Catholics had then acquired that political power which they had so long sought for ; now before 1830, and since that year their questions of conference are taken from Dens or some other author. But in the questions for that year I find no ostensible reference made to any accredited author, neither to Dens, nor to Bayley, nor Delahogue, nor any other—the questions of conference of the priests, for 1830,

appear to be miscellaneous questions, arising in some respects from the new state and circumstances in which the church was placed, and which, in connection with this statement of Mr. Morissy, throws, in my mind, a most solemn and awful light on the then and future proceedings of the Church of Rome. For, mark in the second conference, the very first question proposed in the year 1830 is this, "*Who are they who are justly to be called beneficed men in Ireland?*" Mr. Morissy declares that heretics are deprived of their benefices. He declares in 1822, that when Catholic Emancipation was granted, they would turn the Ministers of the Church of England out of their livings; and the question proposed in private conference the year after emancipation is granted is this—"Who are they who can justly be called beneficed men in Ireland?"

There is also another point that is rather remarkable in the year 1830. I do not know whether you recollect to have seen a letter written by Dr. M'Hale, the present Roman Catholic Archbishop of Tuam, to the Bishop of Exeter; but I will read you a passage from that letter:—

"Keep then as long as the growing intelligence of the times will permit you to keep them, your titles and your palaces—for as we require neither one nor the other, we have here no permanent city; and as for titles, leaving the vain ambition of such baubles to your Lordship and the Gentiles—we shall be content with the more Christian office of ministering to the spiritual wants of those over whom WE WERE APPOINTED."

Now there is something connected with these same baubles and titles which is worth notice. In the year 1829, and for the preceding years, the Roman Catholic Bishops were content with the titles of our Archbishops and Bishops; the title of *Lord* does not belong to the spiritual office, we all know, but to that office which the Bishop holds as a spiritual peer of the realm; but their title of office is Right Reverend, or Most Reverend—now the Roman Catholic Hierarchy were contented with these titles up to the year 1829; but in the year 1830, they adopted in their private books the title of Princes of the Blood. Titles to which no Archbishop of the Protestant Church ever aspired; their titles are these—"Most Illustrious and Most Reverend." Here they are—here is the printing—here are the words—(turning the face of the book to the audience)—there is nothing like documents; here is the title before you. "By the order of the Most Reverend the Archbishop of Dublin." Here it



is in 1830, "By the order of the Most Illustrious and Most Reverend the Archbishop." These baubles of titles, to be sure, are worth nothing !

In the year 1830 there were other questions in their conference not less important. One was this—

"What are the obligations of the Judges? 'what of those who, in our country, are called Jurors?'

"Are there any cases in which both the one and the other are strictly held to restitution?"

Connect the question as to benefices, with the fact prophesied so clearly by Mr. Morissy, that heretics were to be denounced and deprived of their benefices, and with this fact, that heretical Judges have no authority, according to the doctrines of Dens, and you will see, perhaps, something of the meaning of the question—"Are there any cases given in which Judges or Jurors are strictly bound to make restitution?" and connect that with another document which I regret I have not here, but which is one of the most awful I ever saw. It is a note found in the quarto edition of the Bible published by Mr. Coyne, under the command of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, in the year 1816. It is a note on some part of the Gospel, (Matt. xvii. 24.) in which it speaks of Judas having been guilty of innocent blood; and the note declares that he did betray innocent blood. Then the note adds, I am not aware of the exact words, but I pledge myself to the accuracy of the meaning, the note adds—

"So are all officers, especially all Judges and Jurors, who execute the laws of Heretic Princes against Catholic men; for it is nothing to them that they execute the laws of other men, because they are guilty in executing those laws which are in themselves unjust."

If there is any mistake or misrepresentation about my quotation of the note, I will send it to one of the editors of your journals, if it please God to spare me to return to Ireland. We now come to the second edition of this work, namely, that published in 1832. Now you have here a statement of Coyne respecting that edition—it is a continuation of what I read before :

"This work is now very rare, and scarcely to be met with; and inasmuch as his Grace Dr. Murray, Dr. Doyle, Dr. Keating, and Dr. Kinsella have made it the conference book for the clergy of the province of Leinster, the publisher, as well to obviate the difficulty experienced by them in procuring the work, as also to advance the cause of religion and morality in the other parts of the Irish Church, is induced to re-print a limited number of copies."

Here you have a direct statement of Coyne. He says that the four bishops united to make this a conference book for their province, and that, in consequence of this, he printed a new edition, and he gives, as a reason for this, that they found great difficulty in procuring the work. Now this is a practical answer to the objection which has been so frequently made, against the facts stated with respect to Dens; namely, that the questions, merely, were taken in the order of Dens, but that the answers were not taken from Dens at all. This has been very ably answered in several ways and on several occasions, but this is a plain and practical answer to their objection, for if the clergy only wanted the questions, one copy of the book was enough; Doctor Murray and the other bishops had copies, they took the questions from the book—they printed the questions in their Directory—every Irish Roman Catholic Priest had the questions in his Directory; why therefore, did they want the work when they had the questions?—What was the reason that Coyne expended three thousand pounds in printing this edition of the work, unless they wanted to find the answers out of the book?

I beg now to call your attention to the eighth volume which has been added to this edition, the like of which you never saw before.—This is a book of infallibility, as I shall show you by and by.—Now Coyne says that he has printed, for the first time, an eighth volume, bearing on the subjects contained in the work, and then he tells you it contains the constitutions, *Encyclical Letters*, and Bulls of Pope Benedict XIV., and of other Popes; and the reason why I say that it is infallible is this, that when the pope defines anything in faith and morals, speaking *ex cathedra*, the pope in that is held infallible by all the Roman Catholic Church. [Here some person laughed as if in denial of this assertion.] As I perceive that this statement is received with a smile, which, if I understand, implies some doubt of its veracity, it is necessary for me to corroborate it; that which I have stated as a fact, every Roman Catholic that knows the principles of his church, knows to be true. Here is a question in the first volume of Dens, page 4.

“What conclusion is deduced from the authority of the pope?”

“Answer.—We answer by distinguishing.—If the pope declares anything as a private doctor, it is of no greater authority than if it was of any other individual doctor. But if he declares anything *ex cathedra* relating to faith or morals, a certain and infallible argument is deduced from such a definition.”

Again, if you wish it, I will refer to the second volume, page 93, as to the rules of faith.

“ There are five rules of faith, two are inanimate, and the other three animate ; in other words living or dead ; (*inanimate* and *animate*.) The inanimate rules of faith contain the truths of the Catholic faith, like a deposit, and they are Sacred Scripture and divine tradition. The living rule of faith is that which declares to us those things which God hath revealed, so that it sufficiently proposes them as to be believed by divine faith, and it is three-fold, viz. The Church, a general Council, and the pope defining *ex cathedra*.”

Coyne states, that it is for the first time he publishes this eighth volume, containing these bulls and constitutions of the Pope which are thus proved infallible, and that it is under the express sanction and authority of Dr. Murray.

Now, to corroborate Coyne's statement, we have, in the first place, the dedication of the book itself. Here is a copy, in which the dedication is found, declaring that this second edition of *Dens* is undertaken with his approbation, and is by the publisher dedicated and inscribed to the Most Rev. Father in God, Dr. Murray. We have also to corroborate this statement an advertisement in this book, addressed to all the Roman Catholic clergymen of Ireland. Remember now, that this is a book, which was to come into the hands of every one of them, and they were to have it in their hands every day in the year. “ Clergymen who may feel disposed to possess the work are requested to send their names to the publisher or following booksellers. [Here are the names of booksellers in seventeen cities and towns in the four provinces of Ireland.]

We have also to corroborate Coyne's statement, the heading of the Conference published in the Directory for the year 1801, the first words of which, I do not know whether they are exactly worth reading, relate to those baubles of titles !

“ In obedience to the orders of the most illustrious and most Reverend the Archbishop and Bishops of the province of Leinster, we shall discuss the treatises (from the author Mr. *Dens*) about human acts in two Conferences ; about sins in one Conference, and about conscience, also, in one Conference, in the year 1831.

Now, we have Mr. Wood's (Doctor Murray's secretary) own declaration, published in one of the newspapers, that Dr. Murray was the person who came to him and announced with his own lips, according to that very heading of the conference, that they were to take the subject of discussion from *Dens*.

I have now a body of proofs to produce, which you must allow me to condense, otherwise I should have to submit to you 574 proofs, for we have 574 questions, taken in consecutive order, going from the middle of the first volume, quite through the second, and into the third volume of Dens.

Now, if these be not proofs and facts, as firm as the foundation of the earth, that this book is the Conference-book for the clergymen of the province of Leinster, and the standard of the Roman Catholic church in Ireland for twenty-seven years past, I should be glad to know what proof any person could adduce of any fact in the world.

Although this subject has been nearly exhausted, and you may have read, at least many of you may have read, not only these statements which I have made, but also the quotations from Dens himself; yet it is important that you should not only hear those facts, and read them in the pamphlets, but that you should hear them read from the documents themselves; so that you can not only say I heard these facts, but you can also say I heard them from the book that is in the possession of all the priests in Ireland, in which these questions were proposed by the order of their bishops, and I heard the answers read from that book which was set up as the standard of their theology. Now, I shall only read to you two or three. The first I shall read is the second Conference for the year 1832.

“ Are *unbelievers* to be compelled to join themselves to the bosom of the church.

Now, the answer to that question in Dens is, that infidels and pagans cannot be compelled to join themselves to the bosom of the church, because the Gospel was not propagated, and is not to be propagated among pagans by force of arms, but by moral persuasion, preaching, &c.

But the answer is very different when it comes to those who are subject to the authority of the church of Rome. In their case the answer to that question is—

“ Baptized unbelievers, such as *heretics*, apostates, also baptized schismatics, can be compelled even by corporal punishments to return to the catholic faith, and the unity of the church. The reason is, that they, by baptism, are made subjects of the church, and therefore the church has jurisdiction over them, and the power of compelling them, by the appointed means, to obedience, and to fulfil the obligations contracted in their baptism—this is also true of those who have been baptized in their infancy, or who, compelled by fear or any necessity, have received baptism as the council of Trent teaches, Sess. 7. can. 14.

Now, remember, one of the excuses for not taking the answer from Dens is, that the opinions of Dens are merely the opinions of an individual. But it is far otherwise. Dens has collected the authoritative opinions of the church—Dens has collected the infallible principles and definitions of the church—and Dens's doctrine is drawn from that authority, and corroborated by that authority. He corroborates this by quoting one of the canons of the Council of Trent, which I will read to you :—

“ If any one shall say that *baptism*, which is given *even by heretics* in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, with the intention of doing what the church does, is *not true baptism*, LET HIM BE DAMNED.”

Now, observe, *that canon brings in all Protestants of every denomination in this empire*. Whatever contempt the church of Rome may throw upon our order, or upon our other ordinances, the church of Rome maintains the validity of our baptism ; and why ? because it brings us within the arm of her jurisdiction.

Now, mark the eighth canon, but do not forget at the same time, *that all Protestants are here included*.

“ If any one shall say that those who have been baptized are free from all the commands of the holy church, which have been either written or handed down by tradition, so that they are not obliged to observe them, unless they choose to submit to them of their own accord, let him be damned.”

The words are “ ANATHEMA SIT,” and anathema is defined in the Rhemish Bible to be “ a thing accursed, and devoted to utter destruction.” Here is another canon—the fourteenth :—

“ If any one shall say that baptized little children, when they are grown up, are to be asked whether they choose to ratify the things which their godfathers and godmothers promised in their name, when they were baptized, and if they answer that they are not willing—that they are to be left to their own free will, and not to be compelled to a Christian life by any other punishment, unless that they are to be deprived of the reception of the Eucharist and the other sacraments—let him be damned.”

This is the authority to which Dens refers, for compelling us to return to the faith ; and I say that every time Doctor Murray repeats his creed, he swears to observe those canons, and that they shall be observed by all under his authority to the last hour of his existence. There is an objection to this anticipated in Dens, thus :—

“ But nobody believes unless he is willing, and the will cannot be compelled, therefore no one can be compelled to the faith.

Now this is a very rational objection, but what is the answer ?

" We answer by denying the consequence—

that is, we deny that a man is not to be compelled to the faith,— for he is not compelled to believe against his will, (*ut nolens credat.*) but that from being unwilling he should be made willing.

He is to be put upon the rack, I suppose, or he is to be led to the stake, or suffer any penalty that the church pleases to inflict upon him: or perhaps he is to be starved into a profession of the faith, which is the practice in some parts of Ireland at this moment. But there is another objection—

" But no one can be compelled to baptism, therefore no one can be compelled to the faith."

Answer.—" We answer with St. Thomas.—As to vow is a matter of the will, but to perform of necessity, so to receive the faith is the part of the will, but to hold it when received is of necessity, and thus heretics can be compelled to hold the faith."

Now mark, I pray you, what follows—

" Meantime it is not always *expedient* that the church should always use this right, as will appear from what follows."

It certainly was not *expedient* until the year 1829. But it is growing more and more *expedient* every day. There is another question in this conference, and a most important one, for it leads to the consideration how many churches are to be shut up in all Ireland. The question is—

" Is it lawful to tolerate the worship of unbelievers?"

The answer in Dens is, that—

" The worship of Jews may be tolerated with a certain degree of moderation, but Pagans and *Heretics* are not to be tolerated, because they are so bad that from them no utility can be devised to the good of the church."

Then an objection is anticipated thus—

" The apostle to the Romans says, " let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind," therefore liberty of religion is to be left to every man."

*This is the great principle of Protestant liberty of conscience—* this is the great principle of toleration—this is that principle which secures to man that liberty which is the birth-right of a rational and immortal being, and makes him an accountable being, not to his fellow-creature, but to his God. But what says the Church of Rome to this principle? What is the toleration she admits? She denies that every man is to have liberty of conscience, she says—

" We answer by denying the consequence, for the apostle is not treating of the rites of religion, but of the observance or non-observance of the

difference of days and meats, according to the laws of Moses, both of which might be well done at that time."

Then another objection is anticipated, thus—

"The dilemma of Gamaliel, Acts, c. v.—When he speaks of those things which the apostles were doing, he says, "refrain from these men and let them alone, for if this counsel or this work be of man it will come to nought, but if it be of God ye cannot overthrow it." "

Now what does the Church of Rome reply to this?

Answer.—"1st. This is a dilemma, not of the sacred Scriptures, but of Gamaliel, who wished by this apparent argument to rescue the apostles whom he favoured from present danger; but, 2nd. Granting that the argument of Gamaliel does stand, there is this difference, that the cause of the unbelievers is not doubtful to the judges of the church, as was the cause of the apostles to the Jews, but it appears that it is certainly false and condemned, whence it is not to be tried or proved, but extirpated, unless (mark!)—unless some reasons may supervene which might induce us to grant it toleration."

So much for the toleration of our worship!!!

I now come to another question in these conferences, which is the last I shall read, it is as follows:—

"What are the penalties decreed against those infected with the stain of heresy?"

Now I have remarked on this before, but you know we cannot make new speeches in detailing old facts, and it is on facts you are called to prove your judgment and decision—now if this be, as Dr. Murray pretends, a casuistical question, why did he not propose it in a casuistical form? In the chapter in Dens, the heading of it is

*"De pœnis criminis hæresis. On the punishment of the crime of heresy."*

Now why did not Dr. Murray ask what does Dens say of the punishments of the crime of heresy? Why does he not ask what were the principles entertained on this subject in the days of our fathers? If these be, as he pretends to thank God is the case in his letter to Lord Melbourne, the by-gone doctrines of former days, why does he not propose his question thus in the secret conferences of his clergy? How does he propose the question? "What are the penalties decreed (*pœnæ latæ*) against those infected with the stain of heresy?" "*Decreed!*" Who has decreed them? On what authority? Are they not decreed on the authority of the canons of the Church of Rome which he declares to be infallible, and which he has sworn to obey? What are then these penalties? What is the answer of Dens on this point? He says—

"Notorious heretics are infamous, *ipso jure*, and are to be deprived of the right of Christian burial."

"Their temporal goods are *ipso jure* confiscated, but before the execution of this, a sentence declaratory of their crime is to proceed from the Ecclesiastical Judge; for the cognizance of heresy belongs to the Ecclesiastical Court."

Now, I assert that this takes all the Protestant property in Ireland out of the hands of the civil authorities, and gives it into the hands of the court of Rome; for whenever that church has it in her power to pronounce a man a heretic, she has it in her power to confiscate his goods. It is then added—

"Finally, they are also justly affected with other corporal punishments, as with exile, imprisonment, &c.

Then the question is asked—

"*Are heretics justly punished with death?*"

"St. Thomas answers, YES! For as forgers of money or other disturbers of the state are justly punished with death, so also are heretics, who are forgers of the faith, and as experience testifies grievously disturb the state—this is confirmed from this, that God in the Old Testament ordered the false prophets to be slain; and Deut. 17, it is decreed, 'if any is proud and unwilling to obey the priest, LET HIM BE PUT TO DEATH.'"

You will observe, that this passage is fortified by a note from the Douay Bible; not only in the edition of 1816, but also, with a small alteration in the stereotype editions of 1825, and in that of 1827, the only editions permitted into the hands of the Roman Catholics of Ireland. The passage to be met with in the note of the Bible to which I have alluded, is to this effect—

"Here we see what authority God was pleased to give the church guides of the Old Testament, and surely he has not done less for the church guides of the New Testament."

But there is another authority higher still than this—he adds—

"The same is proved by the condemnation of the 14th Article of John Huss, in the council of Constance.

This Council has been ever held up to us, as exhibiting one of the most awful instances of tyranny and cruelty that the page of history presents; this man was taken by the authority of the council of Constance, although at that very moment he had the Emperor's safe conduct in his pocket, yet in defiance of that protection—yea, with that very Emperor's consent, he was dragged and put to death by that council; but this is the infallible authority which these bishops have



sworn to obey, which is held up in their standard theology of Ireland for putting heretics to death.

Now, I say, when you have heard these things, note them down that you have heard them read to you out of the actual books themselves; that you have not only heard them with your ears, but seen them with your eyes; make a memorandum of them—hand them down to your children, and to your children's children, *that in the 19th century men who professed to be teachers of religion, held it lawful to put their fellow-creatures to death, for exercising liberty of conscience.* This is not said to excite in your minds those evil passions and feelings against your Roman Catholic brethren, which, as Christians, you ought to reprobate, but tell these things to your Roman Catholic friends and neighbours; speak to them—address them with honest fidelity, and in plain and simple language, and ask them, as men who profess to be called Christians, if these be their principles? If they renounce and abhor them, then call on them to come out of that Babylon, that they be not partakers of her sins, nor visited with the plagues that await her iniquities. Call on them to turn from that destruction which has been denounced against the Mother of Harlots and abominations of the earth; that is “drunk with the blood of the saints.” Remember that the authority in which these questions have been proposed is the almanac of the priests of Ireland, and is in their hand every day in the year. An almanac, in which are calculated, not the rising and falling of the tides around our shores, but the rise of papal tyranny, and the fall of Protestant freedom—Not the eclipses of the sun, nor the emergence and occultations of the planetary satellites, but the eclipse of the Sun of righteousness—the setting of the light of truth upon the gloomy shores of Ireland, and the emergence of the satellites of guilt and ignorance, and superstition, in the night of papal darkness and papal apostacy. (This sentiment was hailed by the meeting with loud and repeated acclamations.)

I am now obliged to notice some of the objections that have been attempted to be raised against our statements; and it is a matter of thankfulness to God that every effort that has been made, every attempt in every quarter to invalidate one particle of the statements we have made, has only ended in their increased establishment and confirmation. I am aware that there was any passage in Dr. Murray's letter to the Protestants of Ireland, that I did not answer in

my address to the meeting at Liverpool. But since that period I have seen a much more complete answer to some particular parts of the letter of Dr. Murray. Dr. Murray entreats the Protestants of Ireland, and the empire at large, not to take the sentiments of the Roman Catholic clergy from such witnesses as we are—not to take them from such a writer as Dens—but he selects his own authority, and he refers especially to Bossuet. Now, a writer in the *Dublin Evening Mail* (I do not know who he is,) has quoted a passage from a celebrated oration of Bossuet, complimenting Louis XIV. on the revocation of the Edict of Nantz. Now, I will read to you the sentiments of Bossuet on this occasion; and remember that Dr. Murray flies from Dens to Bossuet, and that he entreats you to follow him. Now do so—do, I beg of you, take Dr. Murray's advice, and go to Bossuet for a true picture of the principles of popery—take it from his compliment to Louis on this occasion:—

“Touched by so many miracles, let us pour out our hearts upon the piety of Louis—let us raise our acclamations to heaven, and say to this new Constantine, this new Theodosius, this new Marcian, this new Charlemagne, what the six hundred and thirty fathers said formerly in the council of Calcedon, “You have established the faith—you have exterminated the heretics—this is the grand achievement of your reign—its peculiar characteristic, by your means heresy is no more. God alone could have worked this miracle. King of heaven preserve the king of the earth! This is the prayer of the churches this is the prayer of the bishops.

Now, what is the difference between Dens and Bossuet? Dens enforces the command, Louis executes it, and Bossuet praises him to the skies for the achievement. But there is another authority still higher than Bossuet, the *Encyclical* Letter of the Pope of Rome sent over to Ireland, translated by the Roman Catholic bishops for the benefit of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, in the year 1832. There it is said—

“From this infectious source of indifferentism and latitudinarianism, flows an absurd and mistaken notion, or rather a delirious raving.”

What is this “delirious raving?”

“That liberty of conscience must be granted and insured to all.”

The pope declares it to be a “delirious raving” that liberty of conscience should be granted to all persons! He proceeds—

“For this pernicious error, the way has been prepared by that uncontrolled and inordinate liberty of opinion which, unfortunately both for church and state, is spreading far and near, and by which some have had the impudence to say that religion itself would be advantaged.”

Now, observe, when you have the Roman Catholic bishops and priests debating in their private conferences on the infallible authority of the council of Trent, that liberty of conscience is not to be allowed to man, you have in the same year—mark, in the self-same year, 1832, the Pope of Rome sending forth his Encyclical Letter containing these sentiments, and the bishops translating it, and diffusing it throughout the country.

Dr. Murray then begs to retire from the controversy. I cannot let him go yet; I promised I should keep his letter to the unknown gentleman at Worcester for another opportunity, and I must now offer a remark or two on it. He says—

“ I denied, however, among other things, that I directed the publication of the work, and asserted that it was a mere speculation in trade of a bookseller, who undertook it at his own risk. I never said, as you seem to have heard, that I did not *permit* it, for I should think it very unjustifiable to interfere with the fair speculation of a bookseller upon the probable profits of a work which, taken as a whole, is a valuable compilation, although it may contain some objectionable opinions, which, however, in the present state of society, are practically harmless. Of this nature is his opinion respecting the punishments of heresy.

“ *Practically harmless!*” If the clergy of Ireland were here they could tell you how practically harmless they are.

Probably some reference to what is a mere question of trade, may be a little relief to the tediousness of this detail, and I will read to you a letter that was sent to some of the first booksellers in London. The name of Dens was not mentioned, and I firmly believe, as you will see from their answer, that they had not the slightest notion of what work was referred to in the proposition made to them.

“ 1st. Suppose I were to ask you to print for me a Latin work on theology, written by a foreign divine, and highly approved of and recommended by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and all the bishops, as an admirable work for the clergy of England, the work to consist of seven volumes 12mo. averaging from 400 to 420 pages a volume, what number of copies would you advise me to risk in an edition, under such patronage?

2nd. Suppose I fix the price at £1 15s. or £2 a set, what sum must I advance to bear you wholly harmless, and take the whole risk of profit or loss on myself? Or, in other words, what proportion must the outlay, to clear all expenses, bear to the selling price of the work.”

I will now read you the answers, but I am sure you will not wish to give the names, as the communication was strictly private.

“ Sir—In reply to your letter, we beg to say that we could not conscientiously advise you to print any *Latin* work, even with the high patronage

you mention, as the number that would be sold, we are convinced, would be very few indeed; in fact, we should apprehend that the whole expense of paper would be nearly lost, and the books that would be sold would barely cover the charge of advertising and other incidental expenses.

REV. SIR—In reply to the inquiries contained in your letter, received this morning, we beg to state our opinion that one thousand copies would be the largest number which it would be prudent to print of a work described therein.

“In reply to your second inquiry, respecting the probable amount of the whole expenses of such a work printed in seven volumes, 12mo. containing in each volume about 400 pages, we estimate the cost of an edition of 1000 copies about £850, including advertisements, and the gross return of the edition, if all sold, and at the selling price of £1 15s. would be about £1,100, after deducting the allowance and commission to the trade and publisher. If the work were sold to the public at the price of £2 2s. boards (which would be the usual selling price), deducting the allowance above-mentioned, the gross return would be £1,350.

Now, seven volumes published at the cost mentioned in this letter, would amount to some £3,000, or £2,500. A friend of mine reminds me that I am not quite accurate in my calculation; but take it at £2,500, it will answer the purposes of the argument. One of the first houses in London is of opinion, that it would not be profitable to publish such a work at all, and another house advises that no more than 1000 copies at the utmost should be brought out; yet here is a bookseller in Dublin, without one-fourth of the capital of either of the houses I have referred to, who ventures to publish 3,000 copies of this work, and Dr. Murray declares he did not wish to interfere with the *fair speculation* of the bookseller on the probable profits of this work. Did you ever hear of a “*safe speculation*?”\*—(laughter.) One man might venture a thousand pounds on what he thought was a “*safe speculation*,”—another man might venture two thousand pounds on a “*safe speculation*,” but Mr. Coyne is a more sporting speculator than the gentlemen in London. He ventures between two and three thousand pounds upon what two of the first houses in London have declared to be a *very poor speculation indeed*. But I now dismiss Dr. Murray and this part of the subject.

I am now about to notice the work of a very painful apologist of Dens. That person is no less than a clergyman of the Established Church, the Rev. Edward Stanley, rector of Alderley, in Cheshire.

---

\* This was Mr. O'Connell's expression, well known at this time, in his letter to Mr. Raphael, as to the borough of Carlow.

This Rev. gentleman has undertaken to answer the statements that have been made respecting Dens's Theology, and you will consider whether he has succeeded better than Dr. Murray. He tells us that his observations "are the result of an excursion into the remoter districts of the West of Ireland, previous to the meeting of the British Association in August last." He tells us in his first page—

"Had the British Association done no more for Ireland than but for a few days to cast into the back-ground the bitterness of political discussions and religious animosities, it has thereby entitled itself to the gratitude of the good and wise of all denominations, creeds, and persuasions.

Now I value the British Association as high as Mr. Stanley. I have the honor to be a member of it, and had the privilege of attending some of its sections with pleasure and profit; but to talk of the British Association casting into the back-ground the evils of Ireland, is a melancholy proof how ignorant such a man must be of what those evils are. It is as if a poor creature were to lie wounded and bleeding at every pore, and a gentleman were to go and tickle one of his extremities with a feather, and then talk of the great benefit, indeed, he had conferred on the patient. The Protestants are proscribed in many parts of Ireland—churches are shut up—the very week that the Association was sitting in Dublin several churches were broken into, the Bibles torn, some of them shamefully desecrated—some of his brethren are starving, some in exile, most of them in want, many of them murdered—and this gentleman comes over and tells you the English nation, of the benefits which the British Association have conferred, in casting into the back-ground for a week, the miseries of Ireland!!

I cannot answer on this platform, all the statements contained in this reverend gentleman's pamphlet, which has evidently been got up, if possible, to divert the public mind—to delude the mind of the people of England, and turn it from the awful facts that have been brought before the nation. I am ashamed that such a work should have emanated from a clergyman of the established church; but if I have not spared Dr. Murray, most certainly I will not spare Mr. Stanley.\*

He states that in his conversation with gentlemen in Ireland it was natural that Dens's Theology should be a prominent feature, and that

---

\* This Gentleman was afterwards made Bishop of Norwich; his Lordship appears indebted for his elevation to the bench, solely to his defence of Dens.

he had the meetings which were held at Exeter Hall before his eyes. He then says—

“ That before an unqualified condemnation is passed on this celebrated book, one or two points require a moment's consideration. Dens's Theology, he says, consists of eight volumes, containing about 3200 pages. The objectionable passages quoted at Exeter Hall were only four in number, being not more than one eighteen-hundredth part of the whole work. Now I would ask, he says, whether this is quite fair—whether this is quite consistent with the honest and impartial dealing which we have a right to expect from Protestant clergymen, that an order such as that alleged to have been signed by the bishops in 1808, should be denounced as involving assent to every sentence.”

Now I would ask, did any one ever hear before, that, if principles of a wicked and immoral tendency are found in any work, that the book is to be estimated according to the number of pages in which the immoral matter is contained? We may elucidate this by an illustration. Suppose that an apothecary was indicted for selling some noxious, some poisonous drug, which produced the same physical effects that this does moral evil, causing, like this poisonous production, inflammations, convulsions, agonies, and death. Let me suppose a man indicted for selling this drug, to be administered as it might be expedient to the objects of his vengeance, and a lawyer, as learned in the law as this Rev. Gentleman is in theology, stands up in his defence, and thus addresses the court :—

My lord, and gentlemen of the jury, my client is indicted for selling such and such a drug ; but, gentlemen of the jury, let me assure you that all the drugs in this man's shop have been carefully weighed. The whole weight was 3200 pounds ; whereas, the whole of the poison found on his premises only amounted to four pounds ; and when this poison bears only one eighteen-hundredth part in proportion to the whole drugs in the man's shop, is it possible that my client can be justly convicted of such a charge ?

Such is Mr. Stanley's defence, if his assertion as to these pages were true. But there is not a shadow of truth in it ; for, from the beginning to the end of these eight volumes, the principles inculcated are consistent with those that were quoted at Exeter Hall, and that I have read to you in relation to the destruction of heretics this day.

There is not a single qualifying principle to be found in it from first to last, so that Mr. Stanley's assertion is not founded on the fact ; and if his assertion were true, the argument he deduces is absurd.

Then he says—

“ Is it right that such an order as that which is alleged to have been signed by the bishops in 1808 to publish such a work *should* be denounced as *involving* assent to every sentence ?

We do not say that it does involve assent to every sentence ; but we say that it does involve assent to those principles laid down in this book, which they have sworn to observe to the latest hour of their existence. There is nothing, on the other hand, which Mr. Stanley has said, which can at all detract from the weight of that fact which Dr. Murray has himself published in his last letter, wherein he declares that he believes his church to be infallible. If his church be infallible, then as infallibly true is it that Dr. Murray has sworn to observe these persecuting principles.

This is all the notice that Mr. Stanley has been pleased to take of so much of the work ; but he shoves another argument into a note, which I beg leave to read.

“ Besides the order here alluded to, it may be worth while to observe the following proved facts—that Dr. Murray, choosing the questions for the Leinster Conferences in the order of Dens, according to the uncontradicted statements put forth by himself and his chaplain, does in no way involve assent or reference to the answers given in Dens to those questions.

This is the Rev. Gentleman's second argument. Here Mr. Stanley has borrowed an argument from Dr. Murray and Mr. Woods, a threadbare argument before he published it, namely, that the questions did not involve the answers being taken from Dens. Now, for a gentleman who went over to attend the British Association, I must say the argument is rather an extraordinary one. Did he, while at the British Association, among the professors of science there assembled, hear one question propounded from any book to which the author did not give the solution ? I should be glad to know to what book of science or literature such a principle could possibly be applied. Let him go back from the first moment when he learnt his letters to the last moment when he answered for his ordination, and tell me of one single book from which questions ever were prescribed to him in which the answers were not given to the questions propounded, or for which he was to find answers in some other author. When men are deeply interested—when their feelings, and their passions, and their fears get the better of their judgment in exculpating themselves from the charges of believing in Dens's Theology, we can excuse their for getting common sense in attempting to defend themselves ; But I

know no excuse to be made for a clergyman of the Church of England, who professes to be a scientific man, too, when he puts forward such an assertion as this in his pamphlet to delude the British public. He says they are "proved facts." Who proved them? Dr. Murray asserted them. Mr. Woods asserted them. Mr. Stanley asserts them; but where are they proved? I am sorry that the Rev. Gentleman has not profited more by his connexion with the British Association than not to know that assertion and proof are two very different things.

Here is another of his arguments. He says—

"The approbation of the work mentioned in Mr. Coyne's dedication to him is limited by Coyne's own confession to the eighth volume only, compiled from the writings of Benedict XIV."

Here is another assertion that is not a fact, because Mr. Coyne's dedication occurs in the first part of the first volume. It is not the eighth, but it is the whole edition of the Theology of Peter Dens that he says is dedicated to Dr. Murray, as undertaken with his approbation. But I will take up the eighth volume, and I now call your attention to it. I say the eighth volume is worse than all the rest. Recollect what are the characteristics of the eighth volume. Remember that it is a collection of the letters, bulls and constitutions of the Popes, and more especially of Benedict XIV. This was a selection made in 1832; and give me leave to ask why, when all the authors who have written on the Roman Catholic faith might have been consulted by Dr. Murray, when all the tomes of Romish theology lay open before him, why did he give his patronage, and support, and sanction to the selection of persecuting doctrines that are to be found in this eighth volume, which I say is worse than all the rest?

For the work of Peter Dens does not profess to be a work of infallible authority. He quotes, in corroboration of the system which he lays down, works of infallible authority—canons of the Church, for instance. But this eighth volume contains selections of documents all of infallible authority; and they refer in numerous passages to Dens, and they bring all their authority in support and confirmation of those parts of Peter Dens's work, to which they refer. Now, as I stated at Liverpool, and as I state here again, there are ninety-three constitutions and bulls of the Pope's marked here as all referring to



Dens's Theology—that is, the passages to which they refer all stand corroborated by the infallible authority of the Pope defining *ex cathedra*, which definitions are preserved in this volume.

In order to give you some idea of the bearing of the eighth volume on the other seven, I will read to you one or two passages. There are certain privileges in the Church of Rome which are called "Local Immunities"—that is, if a criminal goes into a Roman Catholic chapel when flying from justice he finds protection from the law in that sanctuary—there he is safe. But there are certain crimes which are deemed by the Church of Rome to be so enormous, that an individual who is guilty of them shall not enjoy the privilege of local immunity; and if he flies to the sanctuary for protection, he is to be dragged out of it and punished. In the fourth volume of Dens's Theology we have a chapter on this part of the subject; and he mentions the Popes by whose successive constitutions these local immunities were established, and also those cases of peculiar enormity in which parties were exempted from the benefit of it. He states who can enjoy it, and who cannot; and he then says—

"All baptized believers, also unbelievers and Jews, provided they seek baptism, can; (but adds,) whether heretics can enjoy it is more doubtful; they certainly cannot enjoy it in the crime of heresy."

So that heretics cannot be protected, although they may fly to the sanctuary of a Roman Catholic chapel. Coyne says of the eighth volume that it defines several points that Dens leaves doubtful. Now, has Dr. Murray done any thing which is calculated to throw any light upon what Peter Dens has left as a matter of doubt? Dens says it is doubtful whether heretics can enjoy this immunity. Has Dr. Murray in his selection of infallible authority in the eighth volume, thrown any light upon this doubtful point in Peter Dens? No doubt he has told us that in this enlightened age these by-gone doctrines of intolerance and persecution were all to be forgotten; and he has selected some mild canon, some gentle constitution, some balmy letter from the Pope of Rome, which tells us that heretics can not only enjoy the privilege of the sanctuary, but there is no occasion for them to fly there at all. Dens says it is doubtful whether heretics can enjoy them. What says this infallible selection?

"Heretics, or those suspected of heresy, Jews after baptism who have fallen into apostasy, may be dragged out of a church by the Inquisition; but before or after their capture the bishop ought to be told of it."—Vol. viii. p. 88.

This is one of the selections from the eighth volume. I will read you another passage as to the duties of bishops. He says—

“The bishop is bound, even in places where the office of the Holy Inquisition is in force, to take sedulous care to purge the diocese intrusted to him from heretics: and if he *finds any one* he ought to punish him with the canonical punishments; but he ought to *take care not to hinder* the inquisitors of the faith from the discharge of their duty.”

Now what benefit does Mr. Stanley derive from his argument as to the eighth volume? He shows that if all the principles of persecution contained in the seven volumes were casuistical, that they are made infallible here in the eighth. If in the seven volumes they were matters of opinion, here in the eighth they are decisions of authority. If Dr. Murray only proposed them in the seven volumes as questions for his clergy, in the eighth volume he has registered them as the decisions of the Popes of Rome.

Besides this, in the eighth volume he has added that bull which denounces most of the fundamental principles of the Protestant religion,—I mean the Bull *Unigenitus*—in which it is stated, that if any man dare to think or speak of these propositions differently from the manner prescribed by the Church of Rome, they shall be punished as the Church directs; and that, if need be, they may call in the aid of the secular arm.

Dr. Murray, in his evidence before the House of Commons, swore that this bull was still in force in Ireland. He has now published it in the eighth volume; and yet we are to be told that the opinions of Peter Dens are mere casuistical opinions.

There is another thing which stamps the eighth volume with a degree of iniquity that I believe is not found in the other seven. I am not quite sure, but my rev. friend, Mr. O'Sullivan, will correct me if I am in error, that any notice is taken of the Inquisition in these seven volumes; but in the eighth volume, not only are the persecuting doctrines of Dens retained, but the Inquisition is added to them. I have read to you the passage in which the duty of the bishop is involved and incorporated with the duty of the Inquisitor. The inquisitor is to drag the heretic from the sanctuary; but he is to take care and inform the bishop. The bishop is to clear his diocese from heretics, but to take care not to interfere with the inquisitor. These are the selections made in 1832, by Dr.

Murray, from the established rules and regulations of the Church of Rome. If these doctrines are obsolete, why did he select them? If he has selected them, and sworn to observe them, how dares he stand before the British nation and pretend that they are obsolete, when they are established by his selection, by his publication, and by his oath? Another attempt of Mr. Stanley's to get rid of our arguments is that he endeavours to identify the Clergy of the Church of England, and the authority under which they act, with the Clergy of the Church of Rome. He gives a passage from one of the Homilies, and another from Jewell, and he makes reference to Aristotle. I will answer the questions on the Homilies a little in detail. He says—

'Because all clergymen and most laymen of the Church of England have subscribed to the proposition that the Book of Homilies contains a godly and wholesome doctrine, and ought to be read in churches by the ministers diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood of the people: are we to expect that every such clergyman and layman should, in obedience to the 25th Homily, believe that God's terrible wrath and indignation against nations and individuals cannot possibly be avoided without the utter destruction and abolishing of all images and pictures in temples and churches, and should therefore use his utmost exertions to destroy all the painted windows, and all the carved images which adorn every one of our cathedrals and most of our churches?'

Mr. Stanley asks that question, and he imagines it very difficult to answer. In the first place I tell Mr. Stanley that he ought to be ashamed to ask the question; he ought to be ashamed to say that the clergyman subscribes the fact that the Book of Homilies contains certain godly and wholesome doctrines and precepts which ought to be read by all ministers, and then turn round and ask whether any man believes it. I tell him I believe it. But I do not believe that he has read the Homily; or in the next place, if he has, I do not think he could have understood its meaning.—He ought to have known that the Homily was written in times when images and pictures were to be found in the churches, and to which the people of the Church of Rome had been accustomed to bow down. The Homily does not bid us go and extirpate images and pictures out of the churches of other persuasions in religion, but that they should be thrown down out of our own churches, for that the people had been accustomed to bow down to them. If we had recently been reformed from a superstition in which images and pictures had been set up as objects of worship, and if the people

were not so far instructed and delivered from the peril of idolatry, that they were in danger of again bowing down before them, I think, and so does every Christian man, that they ought to be thrown down out of every church and chapel in the kingdom. The Rev. gentleman ought to know as well as we do, that those images and pictures which produced no effect upon the mind of the enlightened man were but as a stumbling block in the way of those who were not converted. He ought to know with the Apostle Paul, that two men may sit at the same table, the one a Christian, with a firm conscience, eating meat offered unto idols and not be affected by it; while the other, of a weaker understanding, might have his conscience polluted by it. Therefore, though images and pictures being in our churches as a matter of ornament could do no harm, yet they might be prejudicial to those who had recently been reformed from a prostration before them. Perhaps Mr. Stanley has not read the Homily, but if he were to read them all I know no better book of instruction, or one of which he seems more to stand in need.—He says, are we bound to receive all that our Bishops recommend? He quotes a passage from Jewell, and refers to Aristotle as recommended by our Bishops and Universities, and asks are we bound to receive all that they contain? I answer him that we are not. In the first place we know that our Bishops do not recommend necessarily all the contents of a book of which they might partially approve, nor would intentionally recommend what was injurious; but if they did, although I am one who venerate episcopal authority, still if all the Bishops of England and Ireland did so; I for one should answer more decidedly, “To the law and to the testimony.” Our Church does not pretend to be infallible—we know no authority for our faith but our Bible—we acknowledge no arbiter of our conscience but our God. Yet Mr. Stanley says these are the general principles which formed the whole basis of our arguments at Exeter Hall; that is, because some men read books which are generally useful, although there be something objectionable in them; and because these men acknowledge no infallible authority in their books or in the world—therefore, other men are not bound, or obliged to hold the principles of certain other books, which they acknowledge to be infallible; and which they swear, every time they repeat their creed, to obey to the last hour of their existence! So much for Mr. Stanley’s argument as to Dens; but, when he pretends to justify himself on such principles as these, as an apologist of Dens’s Theology, I tell Mr. Stanley that

I hope, I expect, I believe he has not read that book ; for if Mr. Stanley had read that book—if he had seen the principles of treachery, of perjury, that that book contains—if he had seen the principles of persecution, not of Heretics, but of the victims of the Church of Rome—the *principles of persecution of female feeling, and female delicacy, and female honour, which pollute the confessional*—I say if he had read that book, and seen those principles; and had dared to stand up before the British nation as an apologist for that book, or the men who set it up as their standard, I tell him this in the face of England, that he would deserve to be stripped of his gown as a minister, and to be hooted from society as a man. And, therefore I apologise, and I beg that you will accept the apology which I offer for Mr. Stanley's principles, though I am obliged to redeem them at the expense of his understanding. I have not the pleasure of knowing the gentleman, but I think I can positively undertake to assure you that he has never read Dens's Theology. He has only had the weakness and temerity, (as a matter of policy, perhaps,) to publish a pamphlet in reference to a book that he never took the trouble of reading. But Mr. Stanley, I regret to say, has supplied us with a melancholy proof of the reasons why he is so tender of the exposition of the errors of the Church of Rome.

Perhaps you will be able to understand my meaning when I read you a passage:—

“ Whatever may be the laudable devotion of the well-informed and really pious Catholic to the sacred wafer, in which, by an act of faith to us incomprehensible, he humbly adores his incarnate Saviour; however deep may be the humility of mind, which, from a sense of its own insufficiency and unworthiness, offers up a prayer to the Mother of that Saviour and the holy Saints, and Martyrs, who, according to his belief are at the moment of death admitted into the visible presence of God, and permitted to stand before his throne as supplicants for themselves and those whose course has yet to run, can it be doubted by any intelligent Catholic, who has eyes to see and ears to hear, whether the indiscriminate faculty of the less-enlightened portion of his fellow worshippers may not too easily be satisfied with the formalities, instead of the essence of those and certain other acts of devotion, sanctioned by his Church?”

So, then, the only fear for a Roman Catholic is, that he should go through the forms of devotion, while he ought to have them in his heart! I do not wonder that this Rev. gentleman should be rather apprehensive of a public exposure of Dens's Theology. I should lay

down a principle directly the reverse of this. My hope is, and my belief is that there are hundreds, I trust thousands of poor Roman Catholics, who, although they may bow down in this form and manner, in which they have so awfully been brought up, will yet be rescued from their superstition and behold the Sun of Righteousness shining through the clouds with healing on his wings. I trust in God that there are many who, though they may bow down and repeat a form of prayer to saints and angels, in their hearts really fly from such idol mediators, and rest alone upon the Lord Jesus Christ. The blessing—the only blessing to be hoped for a Roman Catholic is, that he flies from the essence of this superstition to that which is the essence of truth; but I never heard a man professing to be a Protestant say that the danger was that he should only hold the form of idolatry and superstition, while he ought to hold the essence. There is one other of the enlightened statements of this gentleman, who wishes to vindicate the darkness of superstition, and to show that false charges are brought against those bishops and priests, which I will read to you. Mr. Stanley says—

“Who, that has visited those countries and shrines where Catholic rites have taken the deepest root, has not witnessed with pain and disgust the literal and abject prostration of body and mind which so widely prevails under the sanction of Ecclesiastical powers, who assume that they cannot err; when, for example, they permit a congregation to kneel before an altar of St. Denis, and under the eye almost of the Pope himself, sanction so gross an imposture as the annual liquefaction of the supposed blood of St. Januarius, every reflecting Catholic cannot but entertain some secret misgivings as to the boasted claim laid to infallibility and exclusive purity.”

Now I have taken some pains to answer this question—I got this pamphlet on Thursday, and I wrote over to Ireland for these books which I hold in my hand, and to which I beg to call your particular attention. You may, perhaps, not know what Mr. Stanley means when he speaks of the head of St. Denis and the blood of St. Januarius; I will read you a passage which will inform you.

“*Saint Januarius I. Bishop of Benevento.*—The standing miracle, as it is called by Baronius, of the blood of St. Januarius liquifying and boiling up at the approach of the martyr’s head, is likewise very famous. In a rich chapel, called the Treasury, in the great church at Naples, are preserved the blood, in two very old glass phials, and the head of St. Januarius. The blood is congealed, and of a dark colour; but when brought in sight of the head, though at a considerable distance, it melts, bubbles up, and, upon the least motion, flows on any side. The fact is attested by Baronius, Ribadeneira,

and innumerable other eye-witnesses of all nations and religions, many of whom most attentively examined all the circumstances. Certain Jesuits, sent by F. Bollandus to Naples, were allowed by the Archbishop, Cardinal Phillamurini, to see this prodigy; the minute description of the manner in which it is performed is related by them in the life of F. Bollandus. It happens equally in all seasons of the year, and in variety of circumstances. The usual time when it is performed is the feast of St. Januarius, the 19th of September."

What book am I reading this from to you? This book is the stereotyped edition of the Lives of the Saints, containing innumerable fables and superstitions as bad, or worse, if possible, than this I have read to you, and it is recommended as an illustration of the Bible. It is recommended to be in the hands of every Roman Catholic in Ireland, by the bishops of the Church of Rome, at the head of whom is the signature of the man appointed by your government to preside over the education of the people of Ireland. (Cries of shame, shame.) I am sure there will be no question as to these being the signatures of the Bishops, and in the catalogue in my hand, here are their names (showing the book.)

"We, the undersigned, Archbishops and Bishops, having seen a stereotyped edition of the Lives of the Saints, by the Rev. Alban Butler, in two vols. royal 8vo. now published by Richard Coyne, of Capel-street, Dublin, and being satisfied of its conformity with the twelve volume edition of the same work, do most earnestly recommend the same to the clergy and laity of our respective diocese."

"We assure them of the exceeding utility of this most pious and learned work, and are glad to express our ardent desire that a copy of it were placed in the hands of every family of the numerous people committed to our care. It will, if perused with humility and devotion, teach those who read it to aspire after that happy life which God does not fail 'to give those who never change their faith from him.'"

Now there is not one superstition of the Church of Rome from the beginning to the end that is not brought out in the most horrible practical relief in the lives of the Saints.—There are a number of individuals represented as performing the most extraordinary and remarkable miracles through the instrumentality of the superstition of the Church of Rome.

This is a new edition, printed in 1833, with a preface written by Dr. Doyle, in which Dr. Doyle recommends it as a sequel to the *Old and New Testament*.

I must now inform you what Mr. Stanley means as to St. Denis, which I do from this paper—

St. Denis, in about his 100th year was beheaded with an axe, on the 7th of the Ides of October, of whom it is recorded, that he took up his own head

after it was cut off and carried it two miles in his hand.—(*Loud laughter and cheers.*)

Now where do we find this? This is to be found in the Breviary of the Church of Rome, and the priests have to recite these fables as a part of their offices. This Life of St. Denis is their office for the 9th of October; and this fable of St. Januarius is the office for the priests and bishops on the 19th of September.

Now, when Mr. Stanley presumes to come before the public and offer his apology for Dens's Theology, and tells you that he has gone into the national schools of Ireland, and examined some of the catechisms there; when he comes back with his flippant assertions to deceive the people of England (I do not say intentionally, but it has that effect), and calculated to turn their minds from the awful facts I have placed before you, and to blind them as to the state of Ireland; I ask you what you think of him when he talks of enlightened Catholics on the continent thinking of these things with distrust; when these very men, for whom he is attempting an apology, are the men who circulate these fables among the people, and who stand up and recite them as a matter of duty before God and the saints!

It was my intention to have brought forward other documents, but I have already trespassed too long on your patience. I will merely say this—Mr. Stanley, compromising, as he does, truth, and principle, and matter of fact; compromising, as he does, the great principles of eternal truth, as to his statements of transubstantiation and the worship of the saints, complains, indeed, that we do not live in peace.

He tells us that we ought to be ministers of peace, and that if we chose to live in peace with the Roman Catholic priests every thing would be perfectly tranquil and at rest in Ireland. So we are taunted here, and taunted throughout the press, as being any thing but ministers of the gospel of peace—I wish that my voice could thunder through every circle of latitude and longitude that marks the limits of the empire, so that it might break on every ear and be responded to in the heart of every individual of this great nation, while I would answer thus—I am indeed most unworthy to be so, but I am a minister of peace—it is my privilege, my duty, my honor, my glory, that I am a minister of peace—poor, indeed, as far as concerns this world, and having no temporal interest whatsoever in the Church—but I would not exchange my holy office as a minister



of peace for the highest temporal office your monarch could bestow. But of what peace am I minister? I find my fellow-sinner in his unconverted state—whatever church he belongs to—whatever nation he has been born in—whatever complexion stamps his countenance, I find him at war with his God—at war with his fellow man—and at war with his own conscience—at war with the only doom that is certain to him in this world, and that is the doom of death, and the doom of judgment. Oh, that I had a voice that could reach every ear and every heart when I say to my fellow-men—to you, my fellow-sinners, and, if the world was assembled here, to all—oh! that I had a tongue to catch the chorus that descended from the skies, and to proclaim to them, “Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace and good-will towards men!” Peace! the only peace through him who made peace for sinners by the blood of his cross—Peace, purchased by the blood of him who came to redeem the guilty on Mount Calvary!—Peace, pardon from the living God to the very chief of sinners, the vilest on the earth!—Peace, in the name of Him who could arrest a persecuting Saul; that could turn a look of mercy on an apostate Peter; who could give consolation and salvation to the dying thief!—Peace, I say, from the bottom of my soul to all my fellow-sinners in the name and through the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. Is this the peace proclaimed in the eternal word, and is it required in stewards that a man should be found faithful? Then, if my Redeemer be the only hope of sinners, and if it is required of me to be found faithful in my stewardship, I say by all the fidelity that I owe to my lord and master, no peace with the lying superstitions that blast the hope and destroy the peace of the souls of the dying Roman Catholics of England and Ireland! I say, not by the hatred or feelings of antipathy which I should blush for as making me a vile and guilty apostate before my God—I say, not by those feelings of antipathy, but by all the love I bear to my fellow-sinners; by the love which I bear in an increased degree as a patriot, as well as a Christian, to my poor Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen; I say, if this be their only peace, as it is my only peace, by all the love I bear to them, no peace with the superstition that turns them from the only peace that God has given to man. I say, in the name of the living God of truth, no peace with the superstition that inculcates treachery and perjury.—I say, in the name of the God of holiness, no peace with the superstition that inculcates profligate

obscurity. I say, by all the veneration that is due to the memory of those good and faithful men who bore testimony to the Gospel to the death,—by the memory of those men to whose fidelity you are indebted that you now sit there as a Christian Protestant people with your Bibles in your possession, and that I stand here a Minister of the Gospel, with the word of eternal truth in my hand :—I say, by the memory of Latimer and Ridley,—I say, by the blood of all the British martyrs,—I say, no peace with Popish superstition. (Loud and long-continued cheering.) I care not for your politicians.—I care not for your statesmen,—I care not for any of your quibbling sophists, that preach peace—your false prophets that say peace ! peace ! when there is no peace !—I say by all these things, and before all the world, no peace with Popery ! (Loud and reiterated cheers.) But what war are we to wage against it ? Is it the war of your penal laws ? Is it the war of oppression—the war of cruelty ? I say perish such instruments from the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ. I know no weapon, nor I wield no weapon against the Church of Rome but one—a little sword,—(holding up a small pocket Bible,)—but a sword of better temper than all that ever flashed upon the plains of Waterloo—the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of the living God. I wish for no other sword against them than the one I would wish plunged in my own breast,—the sword that pierceth to the dividing asunder the joints and the marrow, and is a discernor of the intents of the heart. It is not a sword of war, but a sword of peace ; and with that sword in my hand, never to be sheathed, no never ! with that sword in my hand, I say, no peace to the Church of Rome ! (The speaker sat down amid loud and long continued acclamations from all parts of the meeting.)

Mr. M'Ghee concluded by moving the following resolution :—

“ That it has been proved to this Meeting by evidence, the most incontrovertible that Dens's Theology was adopted by the Irish Roman Catholic Bishops as the guide for their priesthood, in the year 1808, and by the four Bishops of Leinster for their province, as a conference book, and that it is strictly accordant with the principles of their church. That this book contains doctrines the most intolerant, cruel, and persecuting ; that the evasive replies of Dr. Murray and other Roman Catholic Priests have only tended still more strongly to establish the fact ; and that it is especially important at the present time that Protestants and Roman Catholics should be made acquainted with the real tenets and principles contained in the accredited works of the Roman Catholic Church, and authorised and sanctioned by her prelates.”

The Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan rose, and after some considerations on topics of local interest, and intended to meet and discountenance rumours circulated in the neighbourhood of Birmingham, he proceeded to speak on the necessity of having the character of the Church of Rome exposed, and on the little reliance which could be placed on individual testimony, afforded by members of that Church. He showed the distinction between it and the churches which have a set and well-known formulary, like those of England or Scotland, or systems which appeal to Scripture and individual comments. The Church of Rome, claiming the authority of a set formulary of faith, should not be allowed the advantage of individual disclaimers, especially when made by individuals who have been convicted, as some Roman Catholics have, of criminal evasion,—who have concealed with an evasion, or denied with an oath, the existence of an authorised commentary on Scripture—the obligation upon priests to become bound by a secret oath—the existence of Peter Dens, and of the book in which now his abominable questions are answered. As these and other topics to a similar effect have been already treated of in Mr. O'Sullivan's letters, which appeared recently in the *Standard*, we omit the report of them. He proceeded fully to expose Dr. Murray's insinuations and false statements, and to refute his answers to the charge of teaching the doctrine of Dens. As to the oath and assertion, he said, when we have an interpreter who will let us into the secret by which the oath of a Roman Catholic and his conduct respecting the Church temporalities can be reconciled, we shall know what respect is to be paid to such topics of defence; and commented strongly on the danger to which Protestants were exposed by that contempt for oaths. He insisted that all classes of Roman Catholics, according to the principles and practice of their Church in Ireland, are trained up in hostility to Protestants—the young and poor by their books of instruction—students in divinity by the theology of Maynooth,—and priests by the theology of Dens. He commented in severe terms on a passage from the catechism, quoted by Dr. Murray, to the effect that Roman Catholics should love all without exception of persons, “even those who injure them or differ from them in religion;” paid a well-merited eulogy to the memory of Dr. Phelan, who had detected the virulence of such a classification; insisted that the love thus recommended was such as should be felt towards an enemy, and such as, when the truce was ended, would not prevent a sangui-

nary conflict ; appealed to O'Connell's threat of the impatient million, and to an article in his paper, the *Pilot*, comparing his people to a regiment billeted in a country town, and ready, at a blast of the trumpet, to form into line and charge their enemies—a state of things not at all wonderful, he said, when “precepts of charity were made to convey inuendos of revenge.” He next adverted to the instructions given at Maynooth, quoted the testimony of a professor to the earnestness with which the *Secunda Secundæ* of Thomas Aquinas was recommended to the students as “the best book of Ethics,” and produced proofs from this that the worst intolerance and disaffection of Dens have their virulence surpassed in those pages of Aquinas ; that, according to this best book of Ethics, no allegiance is due to a Protestant monarch, and that heretics should be put to death. Mr. O'Sullivan then proceeded to show that the principles avowed in Ireland, and the state of disorder which prevailed in it, as well as, especially, the nature of public opinion there, gave proof that the principles thus instilled into the minds of the divinity students did not slumber in the hearts of the priests, or become unproductive when disclosed to the people. He quoted, in illustration, the story recently told by Lord John Russell at Bristol, of a labourer being murdered because a new tenant had hired him, and of the opinion pronounced by the people, that he was righteously put to death. The instructions given to the priesthood, he affirmed, had been already made known : they were found in the theology of Peter Dens. He showed here the weakness of the last defence of Dr. Murray, and completed the proofs that the book has been adopted. He proceeded to show what has been the effect of its instructions, and instanced this in the great Church question. On this both of the leading parties had been agreed respecting the expediency of a reform in the distribution of ecclesiastical revenue, and of a transfer of the burden of tithes visible to the landed proprietors, who always really bore them. Another question the parties had agreed to postpone, namely, that of appropriation. The Roman Catholic party inverted the order, and compelled, as Mr. Shiel declared, the Whigs to accede to their proposal, compelling them to adopt as the basis of a coalition the principle which recognises a right to disappropriate church property from ecclesiastical purposes. Here Mr. O'Sullivan entered into some views to expose the character of such a coalition, and of the effort by which it had won a temporary success over the assertors of sounder principle.

I for one, said he, do not regret the seeming defeat ; at least I can discern good in it. Principles have become more clearly manifested, the circumstances which concealed their character, no longer qualify or disguise them. The contest of principles is now made manifest, and the hour is coming when all who are zealous for the Lord, whatever their numbers may be, shall be gathered on his side, and separated by boundaries which admit no longer of confusion, from those who maintain the cause of his enemy. I do not say that as yet the attempt to disguise foul principles by specious pretexts has been abandoned. I do not mean to say, that all who are harnessed as champions of evil, know that the cause which they defend is undeserving of an honest man's support or countenance ; but the disguise is becoming so transparent, that it cannot long serve as a visor for the iniquity. The character of that measure, by which the church in Ireland was to be overthrown, made the nature of the contest plainly intelligible. It was too palpable to be misunderstood, at least too distinct not to be understood the moment it was decyphered. What was it? What would that measure have been had it been enacted as a law? I speak not of its probable consequences ; what would the measure itself have been? *A national protest on the part of England against endeavouring to convert the professors of a religion which British law had pronounced to be damnable and idolatrous.* Yes, this was the measure to be carried. It was the assertion of a principle that the provision made in more pious times for preaching the Gospel to all, should be diverted from its proper end, and applied to uphold perhaps the very superstition which it had been designed to enlighten and overcome. This renders intelligible the effort made to carry that principle into effect. This explains the exultation of the Roman Catholic member at the union which he boasts is to endure for ever, and which has been solemnised by so fearful a sacrifice. It is easy now to understand why the delay was not allowed—why the order of proceeding was inverted. That power, whatever it be, which tempted England in the hour of sore trial, cared little for the visible consequences of success, cared little whether much or nothing was given over to the purposes for which it was apparently required. The object was, that England should stand committed in a war against divine truth ; that she should, avowedly, sacrifice religion, and, so far as not of course to interrupt God's appointment, but to provoke his malediction, she

should take upon herself to pronounce the perpetuation of a false religion, and, in a spirit not unaptly described by the bitter satire of the French pasquinade, by a national edict forbid God to work further miracles of conversion from the Church of Rome.

It is not from the wise and good you will expect any longer to hear that that miracle was not to be hoped for. When they acknowledge that the Church in Ireland had become so improved as to be not inferior to any national establishment which the world had ever seen, they cannot persist in asserting, because they cannot believe, that God raised up faithful ministers, without encouraging a hope that their labours must be attended with success. But we rest not on these assurances. We have the acknowledgment of enemies, including that even of Dr. Doyle, that it was because of their "*overzeal for religion*"—*their endeavours to make proselytes*—that the war against the properties and persons of the clergy of Ireland was commenced; and we can see in the desperate and criminal zeal—in the faithlessness and cruelty with which that war was waged—proofs that the dangers, to avert which it was undertaken, were of a kind that bade Christian men be of good cheer, and which almost audibly spoke to legislators the most depending or indifferent—"let it alone this year also." Remember always that so long as the Church in Ireland was supine, it was permitted to be at ease, and that the wild war which raged against her was called out when she had been visited with a new spirit, and her energy was confessed and dreaded. It was well contrived by her enemy—that at the same time the war of lawless violence should assault her in Ireland—and, in the parliament of Great Britain, a principle should be asserted, which defied God, in proclaiming, that error must remain uncorrected.

Yes—this principle has been advanced—praise to him from whom all good cometh, the nation has not owned it.—But it has been proclaimed; it is the motto of a party;—their device, their creed, the word in which they seem to have conquered. They call it separating religion from politics. This they avow, of this they boast, and so utterly darkened appears their spiritual discernment, and such is the influence of the companionship in which they rejoice, that they seem to think the boast righteous.—Politics without religion! Is it in England, aye, and once in a British senate too, this blasphemy has been uttered? Is it for creatures, who say—"There is no health in

us,"—who confess that they "have erred, and strayed like lost sheep,"—is it for them to boast that their politics shall have no reference to religion?—Creatures over whom the bolt of vengeance may be suspended!—Shall they provoke its fall by the defiance with which they protest against being influenced in their laws by the law of God?—Is it for creatures, to save whom the Lord Jesus Christ came into the world—for whose sake he was of no reputation—a man of sorrows—is it for them to declare that the laws of the Redeemer's kingdom, his counsels, his precepts, his death and passion, shall not have authority or influence over them when they are making those laws by which his redeemed creatures should be governed? We know well that religion has been in act too often estranged from the politics of this world—we know that it is the *absence*, not the *influence*, of religion, which has caused what are termed politics to become vile—we know that for this postponement of principle, this exaltation of expediency, we have kindled God's anger against us; and, to use the words of our pure formulary of prayer, it may literally be said, we have provoked him to plague us with divers diseases and sundry kinds of death. But still in this there was something to forbid despondence. The separation of politics from what should be its corrector was an offence,—it was not the essence of a system—religion was interwoven with the constitution. The Bible was part and parcel of the law—and it was left for the evil days on which we have fallen to hear of a coalition between Protestants and members of the Church of Rome, of which the binding condition was to be—the defence of Popery against the Gospel, and which has not scrupled to set forth as its motto the appalling announcement that, among the elements of british legislation, ungodliness is an indispensable requisite. Oh that those to whom power has been confided would remember that God has appointed a law and a testimony, and that if human ordinances speak not according to these holy counsellors, there is no wisdom or truth in them! I wish, as guardians of their country's interests, they would bethink them of the memorials with which history is inscribed—that men have never formally defied God without being given over to a reprobate mind—that glory to the Highest, and peace on earth and goodwill towards men, are indissolubly joined together—and that if there be nations or men who yield not honour where it is due, He whom they forsake will make them know that such sin is destruction, as it is

reproach, and that the land whose laws refrain from an acknowledgment of God's glory, has put itself out of the sphere of the divine protection.

What a lesson was set before the nations when, in its hour of mad revolt, France had defied the living God, and in what words of awful eloquence has that lesson been recently recommended to this land's attention—words spoken from a Christian pulpit on the memorable day when the translation of the Bible was commemorated, and sent forth from the press, perhaps on one of those days when the irreligion of statesmanship was avowed openly as a principle to be praised and rewarded. "Now, for the first time," speaks the Rev. George Croly, after a fearful picture of the plagues which had fallen upon France,—“now, for the first time, man was to make the dreadful experiment of trusting altogether to his own nature. Despotisms had been subtle, ambitious, and revengeful—republics stern and cruel—democracies wild, capricious, and sanguinary. But there was still a saving principle—religion was not altogether abjured—and, deeply as the true God was lost to human view, in the incense offered to the passions and imaginations of man, that Holy Spirit which strove with the generations before the flood, still hovered above the darkness of the earth, and infused peace into its reluctant bosom. But now all religion was abjured, and as the act was utterly without example so were the horrors that instantly followed. Vice itself assumed a blacker hue. A hundred thousand heads must fall, was the unequivocal principle of the leaders of the state. The fact outran the calculation, and the massacre amounted to millions. The scaffold groaned from morn till night. The leaders themselves were successively swept away in the cataract of blood which they let loose. Atheism—the last fury of the mind, had brought in anarchy, the last torture of nations.” This is language of solemn warning—may the power with which the Speaker was gifted to convey his great thoughts to the heart, and to fix them on the memory, not be in vain; but, while the example of another land is brought so fearfully before all eyes, may its sins remind us of temptations by which we too are endangered. Never let the pestilent doctrine be adopted, that the politics of English statesmen should be irrespective of religion. He that is not with Christ is against him; and assuredly he who would discipline men by laws which have no better guidance and rule



than the suggestions of the human heart, is not framing a discipline for good.

But mark the consistency of those whose principle it is, in their political controversies, to disregard God's law. Politics without religion is their cry—politics governed by the worst species of religion is their practice. What is the principle to which they owe their power—the spell-word which, once unsaid, leaves them wrecked and stranded? Is it not the protection of a false religion? What is the rule of their legislation? Is it not this—to leave the rights of men unasserted, their properties insecure, their lives in peril, merely because they are ministers in the religion professed in England? If politics are to be irrespective of religion, why disturb existing settlements—why not enforce existing rights—why demand the affirmation of a principle offensive to the consciences of men before enacting a wise and salutary law? Why inquire into men's religious opinions, and inquire under most forbidding circumstances, if politics are to have no respect to religion, or to diversities of religious opinions? In truth, it would seem as if the words—"politics without religion"—meant ruin to the Protestant religion, if politics can effect its overthrow—ascendancy to the religion of Rome, if by political contrivance it can be exalted.

And here I must return to that subject with which I have been, in the paper published in this place, so unjustly taunted—a circumstance which has recently, in my unhappy country, afforded an exemplification of the species of indifference which modern politics observe upon the subject of religious opinion. An outrage of that class which so frequently occurs in the south and west of Ireland as almost to pass unnoticed, was, it is said, lately perpetrated in Ulster. Five houses are represented as having been entered and attacked after nightfall, and having been robbed of arms. The owners of these houses are Roman Catholics—the Irish government offered a reward for information of the offenders. In what form—you have heard the document read—in what form did the maintainers of the principle that politics have nothing to do with religion announce the crime? In what form did the government which boasts its efforts to conciliate all classes make proclamation of the outrage? It proclaimed that a representation had been made, to the effect that "the houses of five Roman Catholics had been attacked." Was this, under any circumstances, right? How is it to be described when its peril was hazard-

ed in Ireland? I know well, for I am intimately connected with, the part of the country in which this unhappy offence took place, and I will tell you what has hitherto been its condition. I will not tell you to rely on my testimony, or the testimony of those who are friendly to the institutions by which Protestantism and peace have been generated in Ireland; but I will state what is its character, as confessed by the testimony of witnesses, whose political bias takes away from them all suspicion of being under any other constraint than that of undeniable truth. The parish of Killyman, in which the offence took place, contains a population of nearly 8000 individuals; and, on the testimony of Lord Gosford, whose voice was strong against the body to which many of the Protestants in that parish belonged—on the testimony of the police officer of similar opinions, to whose care the district in which it is placed was confided—that parish—although without police, military, or a resident magistrate, has been uniformly free from outrage and disturbance. Here it is slight praise to say that a rural district can be at peace without armed guardians to protect it. In Ireland, unhappily, we understand the value of such a report, and feel sensitively any such perilous experiment upon the good feeling of a population not at strife, as this of the late government proclamation.

I put a restraint on my feelings when I speak of it, because, if I gave them way, my language might not be temperate. When I bring to my mind the kindly interchange of offices between Protestants and Roman Catholics which I have seen—when I remember in the distribution of charities collected in the church of that severely judged parish, Protestants who would be accounted men of the strongest prejudices, placing first in the rank of those on whom the largest donations were to be conferred, their Roman Catholic neighbours, because some distress had come upon them—and, as I once heard an humble man (an orangeman too) affirm, as he gave in the name of a Roman Catholic, and prayed that he might be liberally relieved—“the family are weak and wanting—there’s no Popery where sickness is.” When I remember the mutual good offices—the interchange of social attentions—kindliness to the living, honour to the dead—I cannot but feel bitter regret that an act should have the stamp of government sanction, calculated to create or promote disunion. The district over which the threatening proclamation hovers,

is one which in years long gone by has had its inauspicious renown—and retains still remembrances and memorials of happily composed disorder, of reconciled strife. Indeed it was not wise or good, that a government proclamation should call up feelings and recollections, which might rend this amity asunder; that it should give occasion to discourses, and suggest comparisons favourable to the wishes of troubled spirits, to whom the aspect of a peaceful country is an intolerable affliction.

But I will not dwell upon a local topic. I look to the country at large. I ask, is a proclamation such as I have described, adapted to the peculiarities of Ireland? Is the character of the Irish people such, that it is merciful to make known, on the authority of government, that the houses of Roman Catholics have been attacked, and that the religious belief of the complainants demands the sign of an especial notice? This in Ireland! where it is known that vengeance seeks out the remotest connection or acquaintance of an offender, and never sleeps until it has been slaked in blood! in Ireland, where that shocking story told by Lord J. Russell was related, not as an instance, but as an example, of ordinary atrocity; is that the country where professors of religious indifference hold it right to issue proclamations of so stimulating significance? This is “politics without religion,” politics without mercy—God grant we may be visited with no more samples of it! In Ireland! Is the history of Ireland utterly unknown? Are the contrivances to accelerate and enlarge massacre unregarded? Who knows not the device by which, at all times, whenever rebellion was to be arrayed, or bloody excesses to be perpetrated, the passions of great part of the Irish people have been set on fire? There has been no variety of stratagem. Reports of outrages perpetrated on Roman Catholics, or preparations to assault them, have been spread—falsehood has been favoured by distance—stories of persecution have been believed in districts remote from the scene where the fiction was laid—and the imaginary grievances of suffering brethren have been dreadfully avenged on Protestants, whom, perhaps, no tidings of the false rumours had reached until the moment when cruel tormentors also came, and their forfeit lives were demanded. It is a fearful thing, that at a time when Roman Catholics, or their instruments, fill places of trust and power, when Mr. O’Connell has announced the million of men ready to take the field—impatient to get leave to fight—impatient to be loosed for that

saturnalia of cruelty and cowardice, in which, he says, they look to have a butchery which they may call a battle—when his especial organ proclaims that the furious multitude is organised and concentrated—ready, at one blast of a trumpet, to fall into the ranks and rush upon their enemies—it is fearful, that at such a moment, the government Gazette should give the signal on which that blast of death might be sounded—that the highest authority should seem to adopt, however inadvertently, the device which preluded the woe of 1641, and the sore persecution from which William the Deliverer was made an instrument to release afflicted Protestants, and the indescribable atrocities of the last open rebellion. Ought this to have been? When Mr. O'Connell threatened his million of foemen, was there a proclamation issued to disarm these bands equipped for massacre? Or were Protestants assured of protection, and taught to be of good cheer? When Protestants were beaten to death in the open day—in places of crowded resort, and notice of the auto-da-fe made public, did the Irish government think it right to specify the religion of the victim? When, in the week before these memorable houses were attacked, a Protestant of the neighbourhood was waylaid, murdered, and left on the way side, a shocking spectacle, with twenty gashes on his person, his tongue torn out, his throat cut—and all, so far as can be known, because he was a Protestant—was his religion thought of consequence to mention? When Protestants in the south of Ireland were murdered because of their religious belief; and the same week, which produced the proclamations told of a clergyman of most benevolent dispositions and engaging manners, at his own door, within call of a magistrate's house, and a police-station, beaten almost to death, and left with his skull fractured, and with a life which was thus rendered a burden, before the assassins took flight—was it (or will it be) held necessary to announce that they were Protestants who were murdered—that he was an Englishman upon whom this merciless outrage was committed? No; in the eye of the law the nature of crime is not altered by the religious profession of the agent or the victim, and therefore it should not be noticed unnecessarily in any government proclamation. But there occurred a case in which to notice the religion of the sufferers was calculated to exasperate the passions, and direct the vengeance of murderers upon defenceless Pro-

testants ; and in this instance—I speak not of intentions, I do not presume to say what the Irish government intended, I only can say what it did—it taught Tipperary and Kildare what had been suffered in Tyrone by Roman Catholics. This is politics without religion ! May God shield menaced and persecuted Protestants from its consequences ! I have done—I have shown you the character of the Church of Rome, and the pitch of power to which it has attained. You have a painful assurance, that the politicians who have now most power will not take alarm from such a character, and be vigilant to prevent the success of still more ambitious efforts than have as yet been made. I leave it to you to judge whether, in such a state of things, the people should not be on the alert, by all means which a policy not without religion suggests, and prayer may sanctify, and the laws of their country approve, exert themselves to guard the principles of the true faith, to give words of cheer to brethren who profess it, in a land where they are sore beset, and to maintain, for God's honour and for the salvation of souls, the right of those whom the Church of Rome oppresses, and would debar from knowledge of the truth which maketh free, to hear the everlasting Gospel preached, and to be taught how they may come out from an evil system, and be not sharers in the plagues which are denounced against it.\*

J. TAYLOR, Esq. :—Ladies and gentlemen, it is with pleasure that I accept the office of proposing the resolution which I have to submit to this Meeting, conveying our thanks to the Rev. Mr. M'Ghee, and the Rev. Mr. O'Sullivan, for the very eloquent, argumentative, and convincing addresses which they have delivered. I do, gentlemen, most cordially join in a resolution, expressing approbation of the sentiments which you have heard so ably spoken, for they have for their tendency the establishment of truth and the diffusion of the word of God. It is with great satisfaction that I bring forward this resolution, because I am convinced that in this populous place the principles which have been so ably delivered will be deeply impressed upon the mind of the auditory—they are such as the country will support, who

---

\* After the above was in type, Dr. O'Sullivan found that a pamphlet had been published at Birmingham, containing a fuller report of his speech than appears in this publication. Rather than delay the press, it is thought better that the types shall not be displaced, and that such portions of the report as it might seem useful to insert, shall be given in an Appendix.

look, to the King of England as the father of his people, and will convey to the Crown sentiments of respect for the Protestant Religion. We are anxious to possess the confidence of the Crown, and we hope its main principle ever will be not to sacrifice the interests of the Protestant faith. The resolution I have the honor to propose is,

“That the thanks of this meeting be given to the Rev. Robert J. M’Ghee, and the Rev. Mortimer O’Sullivan, for the kindness with which they acceded to our request to attend here this day, and for the able and convincing statement with which they have favored the meeting.”

The Rev. W. MARSH, in seconding the resolution, spoke as follows :—Ladies and gentlemen, a most painful, most pleasant, and, as I am told, a most fearful duty devolves upon me this day.—Painful, indeed, because my poor vocabulary cannot furnish words which would suitably express the feelings of my heart, when seconding a vote of thanks to those reverend friends who have visited us on this occasion.—Pleasant, indeed, because although I never had the pleasure of seeing Mr. O’Sullivan before, I hope to commence a friendship this day which shall not terminate with time.—And particularly pleasant to meet my beloved friend Mr. M’Ghee, with whose personal piety I have been for some time acquainted, and with whose information on the subject before us, and zeal and eloquence in the cause, I certainly wished this populous neighbourhood to be favoured, as well as those cities and towns which have already been visited.—I knew he was not to be hired for money, but he was to be drawn by love ; and love for the truth has brought him here. But fearful was it said, was my duty this day. What cause could there be for fear ? If one hundred thousand men were assembled in this town, and I differed from them, I could with the utmost safety place myself in the midst of them all. Our only object is to elucidate truth, and to persuade those who, we believe, have wandered in the region of error, to forsake it, and return to the Paradise of truth.—In referring again to the object of this resolution, I must say, not only we give thanks, but the Church of England, the Church of Scotland, and the Reformed Churches on the Continent,—yea, not only they, but “all the Churches of the Gentiles” give thanks to men who are the friends of civil and religious liberty, and would expose every thing contrary to the same. May I not add that those who entered this room differing from us, will also feel thankful if convinced of any error,

for are we not all rational and accountable and dying creatures, to whom truth, and truth alone, is of infinite importance?—These gentlemen pass before us this day under the names of O'Sullivan and M'Ghee; but allow me, under the impression of what I have heard, and of what I have witnessed of their zeal and devotion in the Protestant cause, to introduce them before you this day as faithful representatives of the early reformers,—as Latimer and Ridley risen again from the dead; and I will therefore say of them, like Louis IX. when threatened with an invasion by the enemies of his religion, and told that there was great danger, they also would answer, then “we will live as conquerors, or die as martyrs!” Another resolution will come before you this day, in which I am sure you will unite with acclamation, that of a vote of thanks to our highly esteemed friend in the chair. I shall therefore detain you no longer at this late hour, except to express my own wish, that, as we began with prayer we should close with praise.

The resolution was then put and carried, with two or three dissentient voices.

Lord Viscount LORTON then moved that Richard Spooner, Esq. do leave the chair, and that James Taylor, Esq. should take the same.

JAMES TAYLOR, Esq. took the chair accordingly.

Viscount LORTON.—Ladies and gentlemen, I have the honor to propose the cordial thanks of this very large and highly respectable meeting to our worthy Chairman, for his able and dignified conduct in the chair this day. This proposition, I feel confident, will be received with acclamation. (Loud cheers.) I trust that all present will bear in recollection the interesting matter that has been this day laid before us by the Rev. Gentlemen from the other side of the water; they have clearly and manifestly explained that our only hope of having real and effective civil and religious liberty, is by standing firm by the Protestant Establishment. The Noble Viscount then read the following resolution:—

“That the thanks of this Meeting be given to Richard Spooner, Esq. for his able and dignified conduct in the chair.”

The Rev. J. GARRETT.—Ladies and gentlemen, it affords me great pleasure to second the resolution of the Noble Viscount in presenting our cordial thanks to Mr. Spooner, for his kindness in taking the chair, and for the dignified manner in which he conducted himself in it; and I cannot help expressing, as an inhabitant of Birmingham,

the great gratification I feel for the kind and courteous spirit that has pervaded this meeting; and I hope and trust that our own feelings will not be in the slightest degree excited towards our Roman Catholic brethren, or theirs towards us. We desire to indulge no sentiments but those of charity and candour. We are the subjects of a common Sovereign, and live under the protection of common laws—but we believe that the principles of the Church within whose pale they are at least outwardly embraced, are subversive of the laws of God and the rights of man—and, therefore, as Protestants, we feel it our duty, by every Christian means, to bring them to a knowledge of the truth. (Cheers.) I can, for myself, say—and I am sure I may speak for all my Protestant brethren assembled here—that they have perfectly misunderstood both our motives, our principles, and our conduct, if they imagine that our aversion to what we believe to be the principles of the Church of Rome is to be construed into an uncharitable feeling toward themselves.

The resolution was put and carried unanimously.

RICHARD SPOONER, Esq. was received with loud and repeated cheers, and said—Ladies and gentlemen, I could not excuse myself, nor do I believe you would willingly excuse me, if, at so late an hour, I were to detain you for many moments. I will detain you only so long as I present to my Lord Viscount Lorton my thanks for the kind manner in which he has introduced me to your notice, and for the cordial way in which you have honoured and flattered my conduct in the chair. I will now venture to say a very few words, and request you not to forget the excellent advice which we received early in the morning from Mr. M'Ghee, and to remember that peace is our motto—that we have no evil feeling towards our brethren the Roman Catholics—that our simple object this day has been to call your attention to the difference between the tenets of the Roman Catholic religion and of the Protestant faith, not for the purpose of irritating your feelings or exciting them, but simply for the purpose of raising in you a determination to support the Protestant Church, as by law established, by all the constitutional means in your power—to raise in your town a voice which cannot be mistaken—(loud cheers)—a voice which will fall elsewhere—a voice which will act as a support to those who have hitherto stood firm in the defence of our constitution—(loud



cheering)—a voice which will encourage them to go on, which will insure their success, and will announce that Protestants we are and Protestants we are determined to be to the end of our lives. (Loud and repeated cheers.) Ladies and gentlemen, I thank you for the honor you have done me.

At the suggestion of the Rev. Mr. Marsh, the assembly joined in singing the hymn which he proposed; after which the Chairman declared the meeting to be dissolved, and in a few minutes the vast assembly had dispersed. The proceedings, which commenced at eleven, closed at five o'clock.

# PROTESTANT MEETING

AT

## EXETER,

FOR THE

### RELIEF OF THE DISTRESSED IRISH CLERGY.

---

THE next meeting was held at Exeter, on Thursday, November 26. In the early part of the day the annual meeting of the Exeter Auxiliary Association of the Kildare-place Society, was held in the Guildhall, the Lord Bishop in the Chair. After the proceedings of this meeting, (at which the Rev. J. Graham, on the part of the Kildare-place Society, delivered an able and instructive speech) were adjourned, the Chair was taken by the Worshipful, the Mayor of Exeter, P. C. De la Garde, Esq. and, as appears in *Trelawny's Flying Post* of December 3.

The meeting now proceeded to the consideration of the  
DISTRESS OF THE IRISH CLERGY,

And the Mayor having taken the chair, addressed the meeting, saying, that in consequence of a requisition addressed to him requesting that a meeting might be convened in order to the public being made more fully acquainted with the present condition of the Protestant clergy of Ireland, he had appointed that hour for the purpose. He need not say how highly gratified he was in witnessing the sympathy which was displayed in this city towards that excellent and much injured body of men: still less need he say how cordially the object of that meeting met his concurrence, and he trusted the result would be not only to render these deserving persons support, but to consider also the peril in which the Irish Church is now placed. (Great applause.)

SIR JOHN T. B. DUCKWORTH, Bart. rose to move the first resolution. He had not intended to address them, because he felt that the success of the resolution might depend in some manner on the mode in which it was advocated, but he no longer declined when he reflected that if he did not stand forward, it might be thought he was lukewarm in the cause—that he did not feel a true sympathy for the distressed state of the Protestant clergy in Ireland. (Applause.) The resolution, then, which had been put into his hands ran thus—

“That daily information from Ireland, impresses on us the conviction that the clergy of the Established Church in the greatest part of that country are, by a continued and vexatious opposition to rights which have all the sanctions of the law, reduced to a state of destitution as severe as it is unmerited—whilst their conduct throughout the severe trials to which they have been, and are exposed, has been firm and exemplary, exhibiting a devotion to the maintenance of the great purposes for which the church is established, and a fixed adherence to the fundamental principles of the Protestant faith, which call both for the sympathy and support of their Protestant brethren in this country.”

And he moved its adoption by the meeting.

JOHN KENNAWAY, Esq. seconded the motion. He could not refrain from giving it his support either as an individual, or as a Christian and a Protestant. With respect to the evils of Ireland, he thought that a very large preportion of them were to be attributed to the errors of the Roman Catholic faith, and with every charitable consideration towards those who differed from him in so important a matter as that of religious belief—he could not withhold this expression. The circumstances of distress under which the Protestant clergy laboured, were so notorious, that it become an important duty for every man both by sympathy and actual assistance to mitigate that distress as much as possible. (Great applause.)

Rev. FRANCIS HUYSHE desired, as an ejected parson, and the executor of Clithydon, and therefore now an animal something between a clergyman and a layman, to support the objects of the meeting. He then eulogised the learning and zeal of the bishop, and expressed his warmest thanks to the Mayor and laity for having called the meeting.

The Mayor was about to put the motion, when

Mr. JOHN D. OSBORN rose and said, as one who dissents from it, I beg to make a few observations, and to propose an amendment. In doing so, I beg to state distinctly that I have not the slightest wish

you should withhold such relief as I am sure the Protestant clergy in Ireland now require; on the contrary, if my words have any weight—if my example should have any weight—if I could almost make it of double extent, I assure you seriously and candidly that I would do what I could to promote that object. (Laughter.) I know I stand here in rather a suspicious situation. I repeat these words because I cannot be supposed to admit the truth of the proposition now laid down, inferring as it does, that the evils now visited on the clergy are mainly attributable to proceedings brought on by his Majesty's Government.

Sir JOHN DUCKWORTH—No, no.

MR. JOHN D. OSBORN—Certainly it does.

Sir JOHN DUCKWORTH—I beg you to specify when you arrive at that part of the resolution which attributes their distressed state to the consequences of any measure adopted by the Government.

MR. JOHN D. OSBORN—Be good enough to let me go on in my own way, as I cannot even allow Sir John Duckworth to dictate to me what course I shall pursue. I will shortly endeavour to prove what I say, but I will prove it in my own way. I say that I do feel sympathy for the clergy of Ireland, and further than that, that the situation in which they are now placed is not of their own seeking. I say that I believe the deplorable situation in which the greater portion of the Irish clergy are now placed has arisen from the folly of their friends; I will not call them their pretended friends, for I believe them to be perfectly sincere in the line of conduct they adopt; but I will say that these unfortunate men are placed in that situation entirely from their opposing that measure which I believe would have been a healing balm for the evils of Ireland.

Several gentlemen interposed and requested to know whether it was their intention to discuss the question.

Rev. Mr. VICARS—The meeting was not called for political discussion.

Rev. R. H. TRIPP—You had better hear Mr. Osborn.

MR. JOHN D. OSBORN—I assure you that I stand alone—I have not a single supporter here that I know of. We are assembled then to-day for the purpose of considering the best means to be adopted for the relief of the Irish clergy, and I conceive that I have a right to discuss what is the best way in which this is to be brought about.

nor will your proceedings be damnified though you admit that this distress has not been caused by his Majesty's Government. (Great disapprobation.)

The **MAYOR**—Allow me to say that I do not exactly see the drift of Mr. Osborn's observations, they may not be very germane to the purpose, still it is better to hear him. (Hear, hear, chair, chair, and confusion.)

Mr. **JOHN D. OSBORN**—It is a notorious fact, that for several years past, the tithes which were intended for the clergy of Ireland have become almost a nonentity—the government have seen this—they have seen that the clergy have been left almost destitute—they have endeavoured to collect the tithes for them—they have done more—they have introduced measures for their permanent relief, which the zealous friends of the Protestant clergy have done all they can to thwart—(great disapprobation)—the Government also introduced measures before Parliament which would have raised these distressed men to a state of greater comfort—that would have secured them a permanent and larger income than ever they had before, and yet the very friends of these distressed men had deprived them of that relief, and thrown them on the charitable contributions of the English people. It was a notorious fact, that parishes in Ireland did not possess a single Protestant, and that the Catholics were obliged to contribute to support clergymen who had no flocks—to men with whom they were entirely unconnected, and from whom they received no sort of benefit in return. (Disapprobation.) Very well, what did the Government say? We will commit no injustice to any man who has a flock to attend, but we do protest that the working clergy shall receive these wages which the idle and absent are now receiving—(cries of bravo, and great disapprobation)—that the efficiency of the Protestant Church shall be as it is in England, carried out to its greatest extent—that instead of its being a church existing for the benefit of rich mens' sons, it shall be a church existing for the benefit of the people.—He denied any man breathing to dispute this fact, that the Government had never declined its support to the Protestant clergy.

Rev. R. H. **TRIPP**—To the amount of £5 a year.

Mr. **OSBORN**—The gentleman who says that, knows that it is under peculiar circumstances. There are now in Ireland a great number of curates, exemplary men, who do all the labour for a miserable stipend

of some £80 or £70 a year.—(several persons, they don't complain).—They would complain if they dared, but we will go into that by and by, whilst the fat absentee spends his time at Bath and Cheltenham, or at Almacks, revelling on his 14 or £1500 a year.—(great uproar.)—I know these things are very unpalatable, but are they true? That is the question. (No, no, and uproar.) You shall have an opportunity of correcting them if there is any thing fallacious in what I say.—(disapprobation.)—But I say, in proof..of the anxiety which the Government has entertained for the welfare of the Irish clergy, that a million of money has been voted, and lent in lieu of tithes, and which there is very little chance of ever been repaid, and yet under the circumstances, I ask you not to withhold relief from the Irish clergy—not to lessen the amount which you would otherwise give—but I do ask you as consistent men, as men anxious to inquire into causes which produce effects, in order at some future time to correct them, I ask you as consistent men, wishing to relieve the Protestant clergy, to adopt a resolution which I believe to be much more in accordance with sound sense, and then I shall most cordially unite with you in the object which you have in view, and that is to give, not the expression of our sympathy merely, but more solid proofs of the interest which we take in their cause. (Laughter.) If there is any one in this hall, who for a moment supposes that I can be set down by a side sneer, or unfair taunt, he was never more mistaken in his life. I express with all seriousness that I do feel for the distress of the Irish clergy, but I beg to say that it is brought about entirely by the mistaken zeal of their injudicious friends. Now, having said this much, I shall conclude by moving this amendment, whether it be seconded I know not, nor care. The object I have in view, is to show that there is one man in this hall, who, humble though he be, is loyal to the king and his government, who will maintain the principles which they promulgate, who will carry as far as he can into effect their laws and dispensations, and I now stand in the proud situation of being the only loyal man amongst you. (Loud laughter.) Mr. Osborn concluded by reading his amendment as follows—

“That whilst this meeting laments the distressed situation in which many of the Protestant clergy in Ireland are placed, and are desirous of affording them relief, they fully concur in the opinion, that had the Bill commonly called the ‘Irish Church Bill,’ lately introduced by his Majesty’s Government, been passed into a law, most of the evils now in existence, and which, if the

present system continues, are likely to be perpetuated, would have been entirely removed."

Rev. Mr. O'SULLIVAN—It gives me no ordinary satisfaction to find, that to this great meeting, assembled to take into consideration the distress of the Irish clergy, and the dangers to Protestantism, his Majesty's ministers have been pleased to send a representative. I am glad of the assurance thus conveyed, that loyalty to the throne, and attachment to the King's ministers, can be effectually reconciled with a deep and lively interest in the afflictions of men whom those ministers have hitherto thought proper to try by the severest suffering. I thought I should have had to address you, Sir, under more embarrassing circumstances. I thought I should have spoken, with your permission, to a resolution on behalf of the suffering clergy in Ireland, a body who, although their afflictions have rarely been exceeded, would be very unwilling that one of their body should come as a suppliant before the people of this country to speak of their distresses. I am not so circumstanced as many of my worthier brethren. I have not, indeed, been found worthy to suffer with them; residing, as I do, in a part of the country where loyalty and patriotism are not of that description which resists law and disturbs order, and renders meetings like the present necessary—meetings in which private benevolence is compensating and supplying the deficiencies of disabled justice. So circumstanced, I have felt myself more free to speak of sufferings in which I am not a sharer, and of these sufferings only I thought I should this day have spoken. But another office has been assigned to me—I have to defend the characters of those injured men, in sympathy for whose distresses you have assembled. Sir, I am ready to do so. I am glad to have been here when the necessity for such a defence was created, and that I can, on principles which it is impossible to dispute, answer the statements and the arguments which false advisers, or his morals, or malice, or loyalty, may have suggested to the champion and representative of his Majesty's ministers.

We have been instructed, and it is well to bear such instruction in mind, coming as it does from his Majesty's government, through the representative with whose presence they have been pleased to grace our meeting, that sympathy like our own is felt in high places for the sufferings of the Irish clergy; and further, that these sufferings have been wholly unmerited. But, at the same time, I must say, that

another part of the gentleman's discourse was not altogether in keeping with this compassionate and amiable strain of sentiment, and might more fitly have been reserved for another place. Desiring, as he seems to desire, to recommend the case of the Irish clergy to the consideration of this meeting; discoursing of their sorrows, confessing that those sorrows have been undeserved; it might seem more consistent with his design to omit, for the present, his charges against these injured men, and reserve them for a private communication to that government which he so zealously advocates, and so meetly represents. The gentleman has not observed this salutary caution. He has told us here, where we meet in sympathy for sorrow.—He has told us of abuses. There are abuses, he informs us, in the Irish branch of the church. There are beneficed persons in that church, largely endowed from its revenues—receiving large incomes from parties who should not be called upon to pay; and, while thus enriched by their offices, deserting their posts, abandoning their duty, and spending extravagantly in Bath and Cheltenham, and the graceful vagaries of Almack's, wealth which in justice and charity they owed to Ireland. Why has he brought these charges here? Is this a place in which to entertain them? Is it consistent with his professions of clemency towards the church to make them? Why does he not state them to his friends and clients in cabinet council assembled? Why have they not, if duly informed, abated the monstrous nuisance? Why is it that his Majesty's ministers, in the plenitude of their power, having a deep interest in the matter, personal and political, and a legislature almost at their command to second them—why is it that they allow such a grievance to exist, and that instead of redressing the wrong by constitutional measures in Parliament, they shall send their representative to a meeting held at Exeter, to make here a discovery of the abuse, and to denounce it? This is, in our day at least, an unusual proceeding. In former years, I am aware, Parliaments were not always holden in London. They were assembled at times in Oxford, in York. Recently we have heard of a proposal that Dublin should have its turn. To-day, I suppose, we may regard *ourselves* as benefiting by such a principle, and as constituted, by the presence of the gentleman in whom the Government finds a representative, a Parliamentary assembly.



And here, Sir, in the face of this assembly, I directly contradict the gentleman's assertions. I deny the justice of the charges he has thought proper to advance against the Irish clergy. I deny that disgrace attaches to them from the crime of absenteeism—and further, if in any instance the charges of the gentleman could be sustained, I affirm that it is discreditable to the Government he represents not to have applied the necessary corrective and remedy. I charge the gentleman——

Mr. OSBORNE—Oh, you are too warm, Sir.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN—Too warm, Sir! It is easy to speak of being cool—easy to come here, uttering with complacency false statements, special pleas, and then saying to those whom the slanderous charges smite, "be cool." What is the gentleman's charge? That Irish clergymen spend enormous incomes raised from their benefices in folly or extravagance, at places of fashionable resort. But where or how have they procured these incomes? What has their accuser himself informed us? That for several years back such incomes were wholly unproductive—that tithe could not be recovered. What are you to think of statements such as these? What are you to think of the cause of one who can make them—one who can tell you that now, and for years back, the clergy of Ireland are in a state of the direst penury and want—that law is unable to assert their rights, and that no income can be recovered for their support—and who can then, in almost the same breath, add the astounding intelligence, that nevertheless, they do procure these irrecoverable incomes, raise them to an enormous amount, and squander them in fashionable follies?

Mr. OSBORNE—No, no.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN—I am in the correction of the chair and the assembly. To me the gentleman seemed to put forth two contradictory propositions. The first expressed his compassion for the Irish clergy, because they were impoverished—because they were wholly unable to procure the revenues allotted for their support; and he then accused them because they do procure these incomes, and spend them, to an enormous amount, extravagantly and criminally. If the gentleman can reconcile these statements, he will display no ordinary ability—he will prove himself well fitted for his office, and will display a power of reasoning and calculation in which few can equal him.

The matter of importance is, however, this. His Majesty's ministers have declared, and their representative here has notified to us their pleasure, that so far are they from desiring to visit upon the Irish church the consequence of those misdeeds of which we have heard so inconsistent an account, they wish to secure to every one of its ministers his rights, and to provide for him even a more ample income than that to which he is at present entitled.

Mr. OSBORNE—I said distinctly the distressed Irish clergy.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN—I wish we could find, in the disturbed districts of Ireland, some clergy who are not distressed.

Mr. OSBORNE—I mean curates.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN—Are we to understand that the poor and oppressed rectors are to be left without support or justice? But, in truth, the distinction is of no moment; if it be, his Majesty's ministers have given us to know, through their representative, that the rights they are more especially sworn to defend are the rights which it pleases them to despise. I return to the matter of importance. The clergy in Ireland are suffering sore and unmerited distress. The King's ministers are desirous, we are told, to right and to relieve them. But is it not remarkable—(and encouraged by the expression of sympathy employed by their representative, and by his assurances of being open to conviction, I will put the question to him)—is it not remarkable, that until the day when the government of his country was fixed upon its basis of modern liberalism, and of attachment to the church of that nature which to-day we have heard vaunted—is it not remarkable that until the day when such friends of the church were set in power, the rights of the Irish clergy had been respected; and, although complaints had been made respecting vexations in the collection, there was no war waged against the principle of tithe, until the present Government had formed that compact by which they came into power? Is not this remarkable? The Government profess sympathy with the Irish clergy, and a most earnest desire to relieve their sufferings, and give them redress in their wrongs. This is the profession of Government; and the people who have raised the Government into power and place, and who keep them there, are the cause, by their violence and injustice, of the distresses which have fallen on the church and its ministers. Is there not, at least, a seeming inconsistency between

such professions of favour from ministers, and such acts of hostility from those whose support keeps ministers in their places? Up to the year 1830, there had been no warfare against the principle or the right of tithes. Since that year, I need not tell you what has been the state of Ireland. And yet the gentleman tells you that ministers are friends to the Irish church.

Mr. OSBORNE—To the Irish clergy.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN—I thank the gentleman for his correction. Ministers are friends to the Irish clergy. Why, then, are those befriended clergy left so destitute? Why have they not their rights? Never certainly was injury inflicted, and bitter affliction endured, under more extraordinary circumstances. One House of Parliament decidedly favourable to the cause of the church or of the clergy—the other house at the command of those ministers, who are, as their representative instructs us, the best friends of the church; one house already secured, the other easily gained over; the votes of ministers and their immediate dependants, indeed, being quite sufficient to ensure its support; and yet, in this auspicious state of things, there is some principle of disturbance by which the exertions of friends in the House of Lords, and the professions of the powerful friends who could influence the House of Commons—all set forth in favour of the Irish clergy—neutralize each other, and leave those for whose benefit they were designed a prey to their sworn enemies.

How is it that this result has been produced? Friends on all sides having power to protect, and yet enemies every where prevailing! How is this to be explained? We may, perhaps, gather an explanation from the ministerial representative. The friends for whose favour he would have us be most thankful, have accompanied their offers of service, with notice, that a certain little condition is annexed to these offers. These friends to the clergy require that their services shall be purchased at the cost of the church. This was a condition which ought not to have been proposed. It never would have been proposed, if those to whom ministers owe their places were not fearful of the church they would destroy; and constrained to feel in their hearts a respect for the clergy whom they would seduce or impoverish. To bribe the clergy with the restoration of their rights, on condition that they will be assenting parties to acts by which the

stability of their church must be shaken—by which its extent must be narrowly limited; and which would at once grievously impair its usefulness. Assuredly, this was not right.

We have, Sir, two things to consider, as we reflect upon the condition of the Irish clergy—one is a question respecting the injuries endured by individuals—one respects the maintenance of a holy principle. The requisition on which this meeting was called comprehends both. It unites two topics, which in the circumstances of the country, ought not to be separated—the distresses of the Irish Protestant clergy, and the dangers to Protestantism. These topics meet together, not arbitrarily, or by accident; they are connected as effect and cause, as end and means. It is because the church is threatened and assailed, that the clergy are in affliction. If it could be overthrown by other arts, even if its progress could be checked and stayed by other arts, I feel confident, a more creditable species of resistance would be opposed to it. The wrongs done to the clergy are actually a confession of their worth. Their enemies would have suffered the church in Ireland to sink under its own incumbrances, if its clergy were of the description most unjustly applied to them this day. I repeat the expression most unjustly, and I put it to the proof. The representative of ministers accuses the Irish clergy, in this their day of rebuke, of raising enormous incomes from their deserted parishes, and spending them extravagantly at Cheltenham or Bath. Will he name the clergy to whom his censures apply? Will he name one? (A pause.) I defy him, Sir, to name one single individual.

Mr. OSBORNE—Prove your assertion.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN—The gentleman calls for proof—proof that he cannot name one individual so culpable as he has pronounced a whole body of men. It is not for me to furnish such proof. I am not an accuser—I am defending the accused. I am justified in calling for proofs. I ask for names—I call upon the gentleman, the accuser, to name one individual guilty of the charge he has advanced against the Irish clergy, or to admit, by his silence, that he has uttered a railing accusation.

Mr. OSBORNE—I am in the protection of the chair. I will not be bullied.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN—Yes, to name; I protest against your being in

the protection of the chair for any other purpose. (Great sensation, and renewed cries of name, and groans, which continued for some moments, but Mr. Osborne gave no name.)

Mr. O'SULLIVAN—Protection of the chair! Resolve not to be bullied! Are these the answers of one who makes a sweeping charge against a body of men, when called upon to name one individual to whom his charge applies? Will not be bullied! We have, no doubt, high authority for such a reply—for such a refusal. "Reason; give a reason on compulsion—not if reasons were as plenty as blackberries." And yet there are cases in which a little compulsion is allowable. The present seems to me one of them. A gentleman accuses a body of men; surely he should not be surprised that he is called on to name one guilty individual. He has brought the inconvenience on himself. One of Carleton's Irish stories recites a case of greater hardship, because the sufferer had not provoked it. It is that of a man, a Roman Catholic, teased and perplexed by the interrogatories of his bishop, who observes, when his tormentor has left him—"It is a hard case entirely to have to talk with a bishop, for one must *invent a little truth* for him."

Mr. OSBORNE—I will not bear this personality. I appeal to the chair.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN—While the gentleman accused the Irish clergy I did not speak one syllable to interrupt him. It is not fair that he shall meet my call upon him to name with clamour and interruption. He calls upon me for proof. How can I prove until the opportunity is given me? Let him name the delinquent.

Mr. OSBORNE—Sir, on my honour, I cannot recollect a single Irish name.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN—Oh, Sir, it would, I feel, be unreasonable to expect that a gentleman of such a memory should have organs capable of pronouncing Irish names; I, therefore, apologise for dwelling upon his charges, and proceed.

I stated that if the members of the Church of Rome thought our church to be such as you have heard it this day represented, they would not have engaged in that species of warfare against it, by which the Irish clergy have suffered so grievous wrong, and by which the doers of the wrong have incurred so deep disgrace. Were the clergy in Ireland graceless, godless, as the delegate from his Majesty's Govern-

ment has described them to be, Roman Catholics would rely upon them to do the work of ruin upon the church they dishonoured—would have respected their own reputation, and sat quietly by, whilst the church was sinking under the iniquities of its ministers. They have not been careful for their reputation—they have not sat quietly by—but have engaged—yes, all orders and descriptions of men in their body—have engaged, body and soul, conscience and character, in their efforts to shake down the Church of England, and to oppress and ruin men whom they acknowledge to be meek and innocent sufferers. Need I prove this to you? No; you have not forgotten what has been read in this place, nor are you so unobservant of what has been, day after day, occurring throughout the country.—Of the mass of the Roman Catholic population in rural districts in Ireland, need I prove to you that their feet are swift to shed blood? Of gentry and educated persons in that communion, need I say that they have not abhorred falsehood—need I ask whether their solemn, sworn professions, have not been disregarded? Of the clergy of the Church of Rome, from the humblest to the most exalted, I ask, have their acts been such as were calculated, or were intended, to promote peace and good will, among men? Or have they been such as had a tendency to exasperate evil passions, and to remove from the most rancorous, the blackest, and most baleful, those restraints which have sometimes been supplied by the thought of moral obligation? It is not necessary for me to repeat to you the undeniable answer. But I will repeat to you, what must be, indeed what can by just reference be shown to be, the answer of the Roman Catholics of Ireland.—They would not have done violence to the instincts of humanity in their hearts—they would not have looked on unmoved while a body of men whose worth they acknowledged, and whose rights they had sworn to protect, were wasting under the intolerable wrongs and cruelties which they had visited upon them.—They would not thus have given up their own names and characters to the reprobation of all just men, if they could rely upon the vices or the inertness of the Irish clergy for the undermining or the overthrow of their church. I set the conduct of Irish Roman Catholics against the detractions of the gentleman whose amendment I am opposing. I adduce the oppressors of the Protestant-Church in Ireland as witnesses to refute the defamation of its accuser here.

I refer you to the report of a Parliamentary Committee appointed

to consider the subject of tithe in the year 1832. Dr. Doyle (I need not remind you that he was the most eminent of the Roman Catholic bishops in Ireland,) was asked a question to this effect—"Do you believe the Roman Catholic priesthood in Ireland have been encouraging their people to resist the payment of tithe?" He answered—"I believe they have." And what was the justification for this advice, so directly opposed to the plainest principles of duty and honour, given so obviously in violation of a solemn sworn engagement? Was it found in the character or conduct of the Irish clergy? Not in their character, as the same witness, Dr. Doyle, has testified. You shall judge whether that incident in their conduct, on which he was pleased to animadvert, can be regarded as a justification. With respect to their character and circumstances, his testimony was this, or to this effect—"As to their acts of benevolence, there are many of them very kind, and their wives and children also, but their means are small." I recommend this truth to the gentleman who has moved the amendment. He taxes the clergy with their wealth, which they spend at Almacks. Dr. Doyle testifies to their want of wealth as the only check upon their benevolence and charity. But what is Dr. Doyle's charge against them? "They have lately," he says, "become possessed"—possessed of what? Avarice?—Ambition?—Profligacy?—Passion for Almacks—Bath—Cheltenham? Is this the charge? No; the passion which has gained the dominion over them, Dr. Doyle has testified, is—"over zeal for religion." This is the testimony, not of a friend to the Irish clergy, but of one who avowed and boasted of his having recommended a persecution of them. "Unhappily," said Dr. Doyle, "for themselves, and for the peace of the country, they have become possessed with an over zeal for religion; and thus, while on the one hand they distributed benefits, on the other they disturbed the peace of the country." This is in substance the testimony of Dr. Doyle. "They disturbed the peace of the country." How? Was it by teaching doctrines which brought the law of the land into contempt?—which taught men that they might, without sin, violate the obligations to which they had pledged themselves—which they had incurred by their condition in society? Was it by instruction of this kind the clergy of the Established Church had disturbed the peace of the country? No; it was by declaring to men that by the appointment of God the Bible had been written for their learning—that by

the death of Christ upon the cross, there was a way for their prayers and supplications to the throne of grace through the mediation of the Lord Jesus. This was their offence. They spoke in tones, and of things, which startled the hearts of men who had been slumbering under the night-shade of Popery—this was their offence.

Unhappily for themselves and for the country they have become possessed of an over-zeal for religion. Is this true? Was it unhappy for themselves that they obeyed the command to preach the Gospel to the poor? No; they have had persecution—some have passed through the martyr's trial, but their Master had declared to them that they were blessed who thus suffered for His name's sake. Nor was their zeal unhappy for the country, unless the country bring upon itself the punishment of those who oppose a good work and fight against God—unless the country, by its own act or acquiescence, be given up irrecoverably to the government of men who, clamouring for religious liberty, would place the Bible under a ban, and rob the poor man of the sacred privilege to learn from it. The attempt to do so has failed—God has, in his mercy, saved the nation from such an iniquity. The policy which the gentleman recommends as wise—the Parliamentary enterprise which he praises, has failed. England has not yet become chargeable with the twofold crime of pronouncing that the moderate endowments of a church like that of Ireland are too much to be given to the service of God, and that it would be better to divide them between the Scriptural ministration of a faithful church, and a system in which Scripture is prohibited. On what grounds could conscientious Protestants approve a principle like that which has been proposed in the amendment? On what grounds could they approve of impoverishing a ministration of truth—of shutting up churches in which the Gospel was preached, in order that the revenues may maintain a system of unscriptural education? Why certain Roman Catholic ecclesiastics should approve, is sufficiently clear. They feel that there is danger to their cause, wherever Protestant clergy and Protestant churches testify against error. They feel how dangerous it is to a cause which shuns the light, that a country shall be gemmed, as it were, with churches and residences, where a faithful clergy, by their lives and their public ministry, make truth known and respected. They fear that "over-zeal for religion" of which Dr. Murray com-



plains. They know that a pious clergy would be loved by the warm-hearted people of Ireland, if the natural impulses of the heart were suffered to prevail. They know in how many instances the house of the Protestant minister, the depository of the Bible, has become, as it were, a light by which the surrounding district has been enlightened. And, therefore, they would put enmity between the people and the clergy; and therefore, because they could not rely upon their power to render the animosity eternal, they would bring down upon the clergy the persecution of Government. And thus, it has come to pass, that, by inflaming a misguided people to deadly crimes, and by indisposing those who should maintain the right to discharge their solemn duty—thus it has come to pass that, in many instances, Romanism in Ireland has protected her people against that over-zeal of which she is afraid—by cruelly impoverishing the clergy whom it had animated—by taking from them not merely the power to give the Bible to Roman Catholics, but by rendering them unable to purchase a morsel of bread for their suffering children.

And the gentleman asks you to approve of an act which would pretend to relieve the Protestant clergy at the cost of impoverishing their church. On what principle could he hope to prevail with you? What would that act have been to which he requires you should give your approbation? It would be a natural protest on the part of this country against the endeavour to convert Roman Catholics. What a grievous delinquency this would be—England pronounces the religion of Rome superstitious, idolatrous, damnable; and she is to be required also to make peace with such a religion and to declare that there shall be no longer an effort made to save or to win souls from its influence. She is required to decide that there shall be no more Protestant ministers and Protestant churches in Ireland than are absolutely necessary for Protestants themselves—that is to say, she is required to ordain, that there must be no endeavour made to convert Roman Catholics. Why was the church in Ireland, and for what purpose, instituted? Not only to train up in the truth, its own children, but to be a witness of the truth to those without—that they might see by its light and be edified. And it has served both these purposes. In recent times it was beginning to serve them most efficiently. Protestants, Roman Catholics, both were receiving benefits from its ministrations. And it

was at this time, government was called on to interfere. I remember having been much impressed by the observation of an accomplished scholar and a benevolent man, lecturing once in the University of Dublin on the subject of lighthouses for our coasts. He would have them numerous, and he would have a school added to each. "Do not," he said, "grudge the cost. It will be amply recompensed by a double benefit, for while one side is holding out a beacon to the benighted mariner on the deep, the other will hold a light to the more sadly benighted wanderer on the land." The church in Ireland was discharging this two-fold duty—returning this two-fold benefit—when the government, and friends like the gentleman who has spoken in their favour here to-day, attempted to abridge its usefulness, and proposed to secure it the privilege of attending to one of its duties, by an act through which it would be prohibited and incapacitated to attempt discharging the other.

"But," it is sometimes said by those who do not carefully investigate the truth, "the people of Ireland, that is, the Roman Catholic people will not receive instruction from Protestant ministers. Ages have passed by during which they have refused it—why do you hope they will be instructed now?" Because, as unsuspecting testimony has taught us, the age has come in which they will accept it. What is Dr. Doyle's complaint against the ministers of the church? Their over zeal for religion—their endeavours to instruct the Roman Catholic population. What is his remedy for the evil? Not a zeal which shall surpass the zeal of Protestant ecclesiastics—not assiduous endeavours to outdo them in the instruction of the people—not resistance to them in free discussion. No, the remedy is, to resist law—to render life and property insecure—to persecute unto death the faithful servants of the Lord whom they could not otherwise hope to subdue or silence. These are the remedies or preservatives against the over zeal of the clergy. No man could have recourse to them who did not feel that they were indispensable. They would not have been adopted by Roman Catholic priests, unless they were persuaded that the difficulties of their cause demanded them.

Is not this a presumptive proof, that Protestantism is not in those circumstances of hopelessness in which some adversaries are prompt to describe it? In truth, fear of the assassin has far more power to keep Roman Catholics nominal members of their church, than the

arguments and instructions of their church. Romanism, which already profits by that natural fear, would strengthen herself by attaching the government to her interests—thus wielding the baseness of bad men on the one hand, and on the other the severity of unjust laws. Are we to believe that government in granting its aid, is deliberately exerting itself to defend or exalt Romanism—is pronouncing its sentence that the religion of the Church of Rome merits the support and countenance of British law?

Can a Protestant government form a judgment such as this? Has the British government formed it? How have they spoken of its effects as exemplified on the character of the Irish people? You have heard the answer in this room—you have heard the judgment of a Cabinet minister pronounced upon the subject.\* You have heard what may be considered as an intimation of the designs of government and an avowal of the reasons which have led them to form it. The reason is, that opinion is depraved in Ireland. The scheme devised by government is intended as a remedy. To show the unsoundness of public morals in Ireland, Lord John Russell has selected an instance—(I beg it to be understood that I would not have voluntarily occupied your time, with topics of this nature—with any thing which might seem to bear the slightest approach towards party politics—if the mover of the amendment had not made it necessary)—Lord John Russell, I repeat, in order to show the unsound state of opinion in Ireland, where law is concerned, has insisted upon the appalling fact, that murders, numerous as they are in Ireland, have a character of deeper horror impressed upon them, by being, as they most commonly are, the crimes of combination and conspiracy. The noble Lord exemplifies this description by an incident. A person had taken land from which the tenant previously in possession had been ejected, and had sent a labourer into the grounds. The ejected tenant came armed with an intention to murder his successor. Failing in his purpose, he directed his rage against the unoffending labourer. He presented the musquet with which he was armed towards him. It missed fire. He examined his lock—presented again and shot his unhappy victim dead. In some time after the Police came to the

---

\* A passage from the speech of Lord John Russell had been read at the previous meeting—that for the Kildare Place Society.

fatal spot, but could procure no intelligence respecting the assassin. The people thought the labourer was rightfully put to death, accounted the crime as a species of judicial and laudable infiction—and therefore they harboured the murderer.

Such is in substance, the statement of Lord John Russel; by which he shows the unsoundness of opinion in Ireland, respecting crime and duty. And how does he propose to remedy it? By taking the people out of the hands of those under whose instructions they have become thus demoralized? No. He seems to argue that the true way to improve Ireland is to give up the young of the rising generation absolutely and irrecoverably to the teaching of those to whom their fathers' bad principles are to be ascribed. I have heard the noble lord praised here to day. His praise must, I am persuaded, be very acceptable to his enterprising advocate and representative, who has moved the amendment. May I be permitted to try whether I can a little propitiate the gentleman by offering my tribute to the noble lord, and declaring, as I do most sincerely, that the argument to which I have directed your attention is absolutely unrivalled for the accuracy with which its premises are stated, and for the originality of its conclusion. The Roman Catholic people in Ireland have learned to account murder as not a crime, and that, to give the murderer shelter and protection, is a duty. How have they imbibed so pernicious principles?

would observe that in commenting on the education which the Irish people have received, I would not impute to the instructions of their priests, acts of crime—but I do think it reasonable and just to ascribe the moral notions prevalent among a people to the spiritual instructions in which they have been educated. I mean, of a people so circumstanced as the Roman Catholics of Ireland. They are taught to believe that what the confessor teaches them is true as if God had spoken it. They are not allowed to exercise their reason. Their consciences are given up to the keeping of the priest as tablets on which he shall trace the precepts by which the people are to be guided. Is it not reasonable to affirm that for the moral notions of men so circumstanced, their priests are answerable? And when the moral notions of such a people are grossly and flagitiously corrupt—such as have a direct tendency to strike all social institutions, in which the law finds enemies, and crime, even murder, finds support and protection.

Mr. OSBORN—I deny it in toto.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN—I thank the representative of his Majesty's government for his energetic denial. When he interrupted me I was not speaking my own sentiments of my countrymen. I have opinions. I was then, however, reminding the assembly of what Lord J. Russel has stated. The gentleman surely made a mistake. He reminds me of the Irishman at a fair who saw the outlines of a large, round head, fairly defined in the folds of a tent, and was so provoked by the convenient exposure of it, that he could not resist—up went the cudgel, and down dropped the man. There was a rush from within the tent where he was prostrated, and the rush was of clansmen and friends. Did not you know, said one, that was our friend Nicholas? No, was the reply—I did not know *who was in it*, but if it was my father was there and the head looking so nice, I couldn't help myself. Had the gentleman been a little under conservative training, he probably would not have been so rash. The Duke of Wellington could have given him a salutary lesson. It is said that at some one of the Peninsular engagements, an officer very accomplished in his art, had pointed a gun with admirable precision at a wood in which a body of troops was discernible. Just as the shot was discharged, the Duke rode up, and turned his glass for a moment towards the spot where it had fallen. "Well aimed, Jenkinson," said the great Captain, "but don't fire again—they are our own Thirty-ninth." Had the gentleman who moved the amendment been a little while under the training of a leader like this, he would have learned the necessity of satisfying himself that the statement he wished to damage, was his adversaries', not his own.

I return to the speech of Lord John Russel. I praised him for the accuracy with which he stated facts and premises—for the originality he manifested in the drawing his conclusion; and I would venture to affirm that if the noble Lord, in the presence of any assembly likely to be collected, were to state his conclusion and the argument which it terminated, were to state that under the training of Roman Catholic priests a great majority of the people of Ireland had imbibed principles the most immoral and flagitious, and that therefore he required a grant of two hundred thousand pounds in order to enable the same priests to train up the children of these abused parents, he would not find countenance for his argument from any portion of the assembly where

he had solicited favour—he could find no approval for his conclusion. The nursery rhyme would be realized—

“ Nine peacocks in the air,  
I wonder how they all came there.”

So would the wonder be respecting the noble Lords conclusion. The fathers have been demoralized—therefore let their children be trained up by the same preceptors. The “ Patets ” in Newton’s Principia have usually, I believe, been termed the problems of greatest difficulty. Lord John Russel surpasses the great philosopher. Whoever can infer the conclusion from the premises to which his Lordship has annexed it may defy the difficulty of Newton’s “ Patets.”

But, Sir, I err strangely in my opinion of the English people, if they will approve of a policy founded on argument like this. Still more widely do I err in my judgment of them if they will break faith with the Protestants of Ireland and divert, from the purposes of a Scriptural religion, a holy worship, a reasonable service, the funds originally consecrated to these good uses and transfer them to the maintenance of a system like that of Rome. But even if the people of this country were indifferent as to the religion they would maintain, and concerned themselves not respecting diversities of doctrine, there is no man so incapable of reflection as not to understand that the religion which he values not for its origin or its evidences, he must at least estimate by its efforts. What is the aspect which Ireland presents to show the operation of the two systems of religion? Where Protestantism prevails, order reigns, law is respected, life is secure, loyalty to the throne, and attachment to British connection, freedom, tranquillity, are the happy distinctions of the place and people. Where the Church of Rome bears sway, disorder, strife, crime, general insecurity, general alarm, most corrupt principles, attest its pernicious influence—severe laws, strong forces of military and police cannot prevent confusion and violence. In Protestant districts, the law rules, and peace is preserved with, comparatively, no aid of military forces. And how has the government proposed to act towards those widely discriminated religions? What is the language in which those laws which we have heard so eulogised speak to the peaceful and loyal Protestants? It is this—this in effect—we will despoil you of part of your possessions. (No, no.) We will break with you the compact made with your ancestors, when

with stout hearts and strong arms they kept a country for us. We charged the estates they won with a tax which was to be used for their benefit in the maintenance of the Protestant Church—which was to be dedicated to God's honour by maintaining a Scriptural religion. We will still leave the estates burdened with a tax. We will compel the Protestants to pay still what they paid before; but we will not give to them the compensating benefit which we had assured to them—their contributions must be continued, but they shall be henceforth misapplied to the service of a false church and an unscriptural system of education.

But this is the system of which the gentleman who has moved the amendment approves—this unscriptural system which—

Mr. OSBORNE—No, no.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN—Does not the gentleman know that the Scriptures are not admitted?

Mr. OSBORNE—But extracts are.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN—Extracts!! What extracts? Who are to select them? Who are they in any church—whose characters are so unexceptionable—whose reputations are so far above all attain that their selections from the Scripture, which, as a whole, they prohibit, shall be accounted a sufficient compensation for what they reject. Extracts of Scripture! Almighty God has commanded all holy Scripture to be written for our learning—who are they who shall take upon themselves to forbid a portion of what He has given us, and then shall imagine that their selections from the remainder shall make amends for what they command to be withheld? Extracts from the Scripture! I do not object to them in connection with the divine word—as preparatory, if well chosen, to the free perusal of it—but, to think of extracts as a substitute—I would just as soon approve of the watchman who, when a benighted stranger solicited the guidance by which he was to find shelter, used to show him a few bricks, and to say that in some house built of materials such as those, he could find the solace of which he was in search. Extracts of Scripture! But even were they sufficient, the gentleman shows himself wholly unacquainted with the subject when he discourses of them. They are not of necessity to be taught in the schools. They are recommended—not required—and thus our friend shows that he altogether overstepped his line of policy or duty, when he affirmed that extracts of Scripture were assigned a place, which they are not, in the schools of national education.

To all intents and purposes the schools must be subservient to Romanism, and, conformably with the principles of that system, Scripture must be excluded. What Romanism would substitute in its place, you have this day heard. You have heard of the false doctrines which it teaches, of the intercessors with whom it would divide the Lord's honour. You have heard of these things as they are opposed to Scripture and truth. Think not that they are not also to be regarded as pernicious to the interests of society. Prayer to saints—to saints such as Ferdinand of Castile, or to the ambitious Pontiff, Hildebrand! The office of prayer is two fold. It is the vehicle in which the heart expresses its consciousness of weakness, and want, and sorrow, utters its thanksgivings, and supplicates mercy. It is also an exercise which reacts upon the petitioner and imparts to him profitable instruction. When we pray, through the Lord Jesus Christ, with fervour and faith, it is not more edifying to implore God's favour, than to contemplate the character which the great Mediator has left as our example. The meditation and the prayer both tend to the same good end, the changing us into the likeness of our blessed Master. But what is the effect of contemplating characters such as those of Roman intercessors—of regarding them as occupying thrones and exercising power in heaven? Is the effect likely to be that which naturally should be expected? When a Romanist reads of the ambitious projects of St. Gregory VII.,—of his destructive wars—his treacheries—his impious endeavours to promote his aims by treachery and treasons—and reads, that, after a life thus dedicated, one might say, to evil, he ascended into heaven and was to be worshipped there—is it likely that the votary who implores his favour will condemn his crimes and vices; or is it not more rational to apprehend that he will experience a confusion or a perversion of judgment and reason, by which he will be led to account actions and principles laudable and good, which ought not to be tolerated in any community? He prays to Ferdinand, and learns that heroic virtue elevated him to the majesty of a throne in heaven—he learns that this heroic virtue shone forth most brightly in the zeal with which he persecuted heretics—whom he would not permit to abide in his dominions—to whom he himself acted as executioner—bearing to the stake with his own royal hands, the wood by which those who were convicted of heresy were to be burned to death,—he prays for the favour of one who became a saint, by perpetrating



cruelties like this—is it likely that he will abhor atrocities which have been, he is taught, so highly, divinely favoured—is it to be for a moment accredited, that prayer to saints who were suborners of perjury and treason—murderers of those who differed from them in religious belief—and practices of perjury and murder continued without remorse—where heretics are the victims—should not be considered as connected each with the other, in the relation of cause and effect? No sane mind can separate them. And yet a system like this, so obviously calculated to debase and vitiate, has found an advocate at this meeting.

I wish to conclude my observations and release you, and, in concluding, would beg you to reflect without prejudice on this plain and momentous distinction between the system of religious ministration and teaching which we would uphold, and that by which the gentleman who has moved the amendment would supersede it. The Church of England gives the Bible as a standard of truth, encourages and assists her children in their study of it, and does not require of them to believe any doctrine as necessary to salvation which has not its evidence in that blessed book. The Church of Rome pronounces that they shall perish, who do not receive doctrines which God has not taught in his written word, and tyrannically debars her children from the benefit of studying the Holy Scriptures.

Mr. OSBORNE—No, no.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN—Really I am constrained to regard these repeated cries as the exclamations of a child uttered heedlessly and without any definite meaning. Does the gentleman know any thing of the Church of Rome? Has he read, or has he not read, the Creed of Pius IV.? If he is unacquainted with that Creed, I tell him he is utterly ignorant of Popery. If he has read it he must be either very forgetful, or more than commonly courageous, when he dares to affirm that Romanism does not discourage Scripture.

(Here the speaker repeated the promise respecting Scripture given in the Creed of Pius, and reasoned upon it at some length.)

You observe, Sir, said he in conclusion, the art with which this crafty church has issued her prohibitions—she has permitted the Scriptures to be printed—she allows them to be seen in the possession of many of her children—but she exacts, from the people, a promise, from the priests an oath, not to study them. It is no part of my duty

to reconcile her inconsistencies. If it be said to me by a Roman Catholic—I, with the free permission of my priest, possess and read the Bible, my answer is, that such permission does not invalidate the prohibition of the church. The act or opinion of an individual would not be received as conclusive evidence against his church, why then should an individual act or even a general practice be thought to set aside a principle which the Church of Rome has recorded in her most solemn formulary. If it be said again by a Roman Catholic, or an advocate like the gentleman on my left, I know nothing of the formulary to which you refer—I read the Bible and do not read the Creed of Pius IV., my answer is, that ignorance on the part of either client or advocate cannot be accepted as evidence against the truth of an adversary's argument. No individual who gives his countenance and name to Romanism without making himself acquainted with its creed has a right to take shelter from the charges against his church, under an ignorance which is voluntary and culpable. No advocate who is rash enough to defend a system without endeavouring to know what its most obvious profession of faith teaches, is worthy to be reasoned with. The conduct of the Church of Rome respecting Scripture adds equivocation, and the worst dishonesty, to intolerance. She first requires of her votaries to renounce the authority of reason, and to pledge themselves, that without her interpretation, and "unless with the unanimous consent of the fathers" they will not study and interpret it. She gives them no interpretation—she knows that the fathers are not unanimous. Is not this actual prohibition? But she knows that in an age like this, the prohibition would not suit all places—she would therefore disguise it under the seeming permission to study. Her children should have Bibles as the Vicar of Wakefield's daughters were to keep the guineas confided to them, that they might serve for the purpose of show, and with a special injunction to make no other use of them. She leaves the Bible, in some sort as Cornelius Agrippa left his fatal book, commanding his pupils not to read, but exposing them to temptation by leaving the key in the door of the study. You remember how Southey moralizes on the incident—

"Henceforth let all young men take heed  
How an injurious book they read."

The Romanist who engages in the interpretation of Scripture breaks

his promise, perhaps his oath, the moment he begins to study. But what cares the system which makes merchandize of souls—what cares Rome? If she can keep her votaries, and win advocates by her equivocations, her purpose is served; for the votary and the champion she is troubled with no concern. I thank you for your patience, and release you—I leave the decision in your hands. If you would support Protestantism, you will adopt the resolution submitted to you—if Popery you will vote for the gentleman's amendment.

When the Rev. Speaker had concluded, the report proceeds—

Mr. KENNAWAY and Mr. OSBORNE rose together, but the latter gave way, and Mr. KENNAWAY proceeded to express his regret at the turn the discussion had assumed, saying he could not find any thing in the resolution conveying a censure on his Majesty's Government, and if it had been so, he would not have sanctioned it. The meeting was called for the relief of the distressed clergy, without entering into political considerations. He put it to Mr. Osborne, that he should point out the words in the resolution to which he had alluded as conveying a censure on his Majesty's Government, and then they might, if it was judged necessary, be altered.

Mr. OSBORNE declined to do this, but thanked Mr. Kennaway for the truly Christian temper and feeling he had exhibited, which he could not help contrasting with that of the person beside him. But he was here interrupted by cries of "The amendment has not been seconded." Mr. Osborne said, the Chairman was the authorised person there, and he had not stopped him.

The MAYOR said, he must, in the discharge of his duty, call upon Mr. Osborne to have his amendment seconded before he made a reply.

Mr. OSBORNE, however, again rose amidst great uproar, and lamenting the total want of charity exhibited by the itinerant demagogue beside him, condemned the intolerant spirit he had displayed, and expressed his fervent hope that he should never look upon his like again. As, however, they had thus met, if there was anything like manliness and fairness in the meeting, and they would allow him to do so, he pledged himself to confute nearly all the statements which had been made, as he must maintain that his opponent had not replied to one of his (Mr. Osborne's) arguments, but on the contrary, appeared to think that he could palm upon them whatever monstrous

assertions he pleased, and bear down all of opposition by an exhibition of ribaldry, and a something which that gentleman might himself mistake for wit. (Continued uproar.)

The MAYOR now interposed, and said Mr. Osborne was welcome to state that he hoped he should never meet with his like again, but he could not be permitted there to charge Mr. O'Sullivan with uncharitable feeling. (Great cheering.)

Rev. Dr. PERKINS rose, and begged the meeting to consider the object in view, the dreadful state of distress in which the Irish Protestant clergy were involved.

B. FULFORD, Esq. proposed the second resolution. He expressed his regret at the course which the discussion had taken, and declared that he could not see that the resolution contained anything offensive to the Government.

Rev. FRANCIS HUYSHE seconded the resolution. He entirely dissented from what had fallen from his honorable friend who had spoken last, as to the expression of regret for the course the discussion had taken, and begged to thank Mr. Osborne for having drawn forth a splendid reply, which ought to enlighten not only the city of Exeter and the county of Devon, but the nation at large. (Great cheering.)

Rev. W. SCORESBY moved the third resolution, which was seconded by Captain THOMAS LOCKE LEWIS.

The LORD BISHOP desired to do justice to an absent gentleman, who had been deputed to move a resolution, but who was obliged to leave the Hall; he meant Visct. Exmouth, who had subscribed £25. (cheers) He had received an intimation from Mr. Parker, who was in Cornwall, that had he known of the meeting in time, he should have felt much pleasure in attending. His Lordship then said that he would state a fact of a very extraordinary nature, which he had no doubt would give much pleasure to the meeting. He had received a letter from an individual, whose name he must not mention, who had desired him to forward £1000 to the Primate of Armagh, for the relief of the distressed Protestant clergy. (Great cheering) He was strongly interdicted from giving the name, or stating in what part of the country the munificent donor resided, and this he should strictly adhere to; he would only say it was a noble donation. His Lordship then moved the thanks of the meeting to the requisitionists, and also to the Mayor, for his admirable conduct in the chair.

The **MAYOR** briefly but eloquently expressed his acknowledgements.

**R. S. CORNISH, Esq.**, moved the best thanks of the meeting to the **Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan**, for the kindness with which he had attended the meeting, and for the enlightened and powerful explanation he had given on the subject for which they met.

**J. BINGHAM, Esq.**, seconded the motion, which was carried by acclamation.

The **MAYOR** in conveying the sense of the meeting to the **Rev. Gentleman**, said he did so with great pleasure, and he personally thanked him for the splendid treat he had received by his luminous and enlightened explanations, and the most important information he had given. (Great cheering.)

**Rev. Mr. O'SULLIVAN** briefly returned thanks, and begged to present £10 from an individual, who desired to be called "A Friend." It had also been announced that other gentlemen round the table had subscribed to the amount of £200.

---

## PROTESTANT MEETING

AT THE

### SUBSCRIPTION ROOMS.

In consequence of a notice to that effect given during the meeting at Guildhall, on Thursday, another meeting took place on the evening of Friday at the Royal Subscription Rooms. The admission was by ticket, and this large room was filled.

On the motion of the **Rev. WILLIAM SCORESBY**, seconded by **G. S. FURSDON, Esq.**

**P. C. DE LA GARDE, Esq.** the Mayor, was called to the chair, who briefly explained to the meeting, that the object of their thus assembling was to hear from the **Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan** the state of Protestantism in Ireland.

The Rev. MORTIMER O'SULLIVAN then rose amidst great cheering, saying, he meant to make the Church of Rome the topic on which he was about to speak: not as a system which concerned the souls of those who were members of it, but as a system which concerned the rights and liberties, and the personal, spiritual, and temporal interests of those who dissented from it. That is, to consider Popery not as it was manifested in the conscientious belief of those who professed its doctrines, but as it was manifested in a tyrannous and despotic spirit, and the chains and snares by which it had extended itself over the world. Why it was necessary, in the light of the present day, to speak of the Church of Rome as it affected the interests of man, might not in general seem so apparent as it was essential. It might be said, to what purpose do you, not a member of the Church of Rome, give an account of those doctrines, when they can be obtained from the recorded documents of her own children. But if it were made apparent, and it required only the exercise of the memory and judgment to satisfy those who wished to make the inquiry, that the recorded declaration of the members of the Church of Rome were suspicious, and that those declarations were the declarations of a church made when put upon its trial, then it might be admitted that there was a propriety in calling into the inquiry other evidence than the declarations of its own members, when their church was so situated.

Mr. O'Sullivan now stated the creed of Pius IV. as containing the sum of the doctrines taught by the Church of Rome, the receipt of it having been admitted in a Parliamentary examination, and its authority and power established by the Council of Trent. Having detailed these, which are to be found in every book treating of this subject, he next adverted to two principles held by the canons and councils, the principles of persecution and perfidy, and that they inculcate doctrines which it was not right should be observed—that oaths, however solemn, if the church could receive any detriment from the observance of them, were not to be kept, and that it was held the solemn duty to persecute for what might be considered the good of religion. He now referred to the councils as testifying these principles, citing the instance of the death of Huss, and saying, it was clear that if such principles were universally known to be held by the Church of Rome, it would never obtain favour in the judgment of free and honourable men. Why, then, were they not known? The Church of Rome

had always and invariably warily modified itself according to the circumstances in which it was placed. When power was set strongly against it, then the church concealed its tenets—it was too wily to put them forth, and obliged to accommodate itself to the laws of the land in which it was permitted to reside, appeared to modify the acerbity of its principles, and put off its ancient cruelty and iniquity. He now quoted instances of this, commencing with excommunication of Queen Elizabeth, and stated the loyalty of the majority of English Catholics on that occasion. In Ireland, however, it was different,—there was no love for England. Another principle of the Church of Rome was bigotry, of which he cited instances, and that so recently as 1824 and 1828, persons had been burnt at the stake in Spain, for heresy. In Ireland, he could make it clear that the worst principles of the old times were revived. The clergy had at stated periods secret conferences on theological questions proposed for their discussion. In a book pronounced to be a guide for the Catholic clergy in their conferences, were these questions—

“ What punishment is proper to be given to persons infected with the taint of heresy ?

“ Is it lawful to tolerate the worship of heretics ?

“ Is it permitted to read the Scriptures ?

“ Do the Clergy owe obedience to any temporal law ?

Finding such questions in this best and safest guide for the Catholic clergy, a reverend friend of his, Mr. M'Ghee, had naturally been anxious to ascertain how they were answered. In one of these books he found an advertisement, announcing that in 1810, all the Catholic bishops in solemn conclave declared, that as the priests in Ireland had not access to public libraries, it was proper they should have prepared for them a good and safe guide, and a certain book, called the Complete Theology of Peter Dens, was pronounced the best and safest guide the priests could have. That was the book then appointed by the bishops for the text-book in conference, a book containing the most abominable principles ever promulgated in a civilized age. Mr. O'Sullivan then proceeded to a narration of the means which had been adopted to bring the Catholic bishops to a defence or avowal of the book, but all invitations of the kind had been rejected. Noticing also the manner in which the matter had been brought before the House of Lords by the Lord Bishop of this diocese. He next at great

length proceeded to state the various equivocations by which the book as a text for the conferences of the Catholic priests was attempted to be got rid of, but the Catholic Bishop (Murray) had been driven from every point on which he endeavoured to disprove the accusation brought against him. The advocates of Popery had repudiated the answers in Dens to the questions which they had selected for matters of conference, and we were told to read Bossuet, for the exposition of the Catholic faith. That book, however, did not contain the faintest allusion to any of those questions.

Mr. O'Sullivan next proceeded to the tenets of the Catholic Church, —to confession, in which a blind obedience to the priest was enjoined. That the priest did not owe submission to the state. The question asked in conference was—"Do the clergy owe obedience to human laws?" And the answer in Dens was, that there were two kinds of obedience to the law; but, as was understood, they were bound to obey them if they did not infringe their ecclesiastical statutes or the immunities of the clergy. The law of England, it was observed, allowed no exceptions, but while they required implicit obedience, so they also gave to every man equal protection. He next proceeded to speak of oaths. Dens declares that every oath involved certain conditions, and that all oaths contrary to ecclesiastical utility were perjuries not oaths, and that the Pope had the power of dispensing with them.

He then alluded to the case of heretics, which included all denominations of persons who dissented from the Church of Rome, and of penalties and punishments attached to it, and pointed to the state of Ireland as an example to what dreadful extent opinions such as these might be carried. A system of cruelty and pride had thus been raised into the government of the country, and unless the Protestant people of the empire came forward with strong expostulations, and made common cause with their suffering brethren in Ireland, crimes such as were sickening to think of must increase. The good must continue to leave the land or live in the fear of a terrible death, and the land be given up, a prey to the most fearful evils. In the Catholic Church, however, he was assured there were multitudes whose hearts had been awakened to its errors, and, if free to follow the dictates of their own consciences, would embrace the faith of the Protestant Church. He asked, then, that the clergy of the Church



of England should be free to preach, and the people free to hear. That murder might no longer be the guardian of one religion, nor the fear and terror of another. And having alluded to the state of Irish representation in the Commons House of Parliament, concluded and sat down amidst thunders of applause, by reminding them of the especial claim the Church of Ireland had upon that of England.

# PROTESTANT MEETING

AT THE OLD SHIP INN,

## BRIGHTON,

ON TUESDAY, THE 15TH OF DECEMBER, 1835.

---

The Brighton Protestant Meeting was advertised in all the newspapers, and by the following placard :—

“ A Protestant Meeting will be held at the Old Ship Inn, on Tuesday, the 15th December, at Twelve o’Clock precisely, at which the Rev. Mortimer O’Sullivan will make known the real character and purposes of Popery, as exhibited in Ireland, and the dangers to Protestantism.—Admission by tickets only.—For tickets apply at Mr. Loder’s, North-street; Mr. Wright’s Library, Colonnade, North-street; Mr. Brewer’s, German-place; Marine Library; and Mr. E. Wright’s Library, King’s road.”

Tickets were left at six bookseller’s shops, and were given indiscriminately to all applicants. The object of the meeting and its rules were printed upon the ticket, of which this is a copy :—

“ A public meeting will be held at the Old Ship, on Tuesday, 15th December, 1835, at Twelve o’Clock precisely, at which The Rev. Mortimer O’Sullivan will make known the real character and purposes of Popery as exhibited in Ireland, and the dangers to Protestantism. For rules of meeting see other side.

**RULES OF THE MEETING**—1st. No person, but those deputed by the Committee, can address the meeting.—2nd. Every person attending the meeting must submit to the chair.

Previous to the meeting, inflammatory placards had been widely distributed by persons anxious to disturb the meeting, of which we subjoin one :—

“ **BATHCORMAC!! VERSUS O’SULLIVAN!**—Men of Brighton! a short time since a host of soldiers, led on by a minister of the established Church of Ireland, made war upon a poor WOMAN!—a widow!! for 4s. 6d. alleged to be due for Tithes. The people resisted the unholy demand,—the soldiers

fired,—nine persons were murdered, among them the son of the frenzied widow Ryan.—‘He left her in the morning.’ A demand of 4s. 6d. was made upon her for tithes. The military fired. She ran out wild—‘Where are my sons?’ She found a dead body. She took it up to see the face. It was not her son—and she laughed! The poor woman laughed aloud, forgetting that there was another woman to weep for that boy. She took up another body. She laughed aloud—a frantic laugh!—it was not her son. She went to the third—it was her boy!—the boy who had left her a few hours before—blood-bolten, stiff, and dead!—*Mr. O’Connell’s speech.*”

“Since this horrible event, the Beresfords and the Protestant and Christian landowners of Ireland have turned out of their miserable dwellings, NINE HUNDRED men, women, and children, at this inclement season, without food, raiment, or the means of providing lodging or sustenance, to perish in the highways or ditches; and this because, and only because, these poor wretches are Catholics! What horrible outcries would be raised if Catholics were serving Protestants thus!—Whilst these enormities are yet green, the Rev. Mr. Mortimer O’Sullivan\* has the audacity to offer to come before the Brighton public to malign his own countrymen because they do not hold the religious opinions which he AT PRESENT professes!—Men of Brighton! will you suffer the People of Ireland, thus to be insulted in your Town? If Mr. O’Sullivan be overflowing with honesty and Christian love, let him hie home and restrain the Ryders from massacreing his own countrymen, and the Beresfords from turning them out to perish in the bogs in the depth of winter. Why comes the maligner here to sow the seeds of religious discord in this town?—Men of Brighton! a “PUBLIC MEETING” has been anonymously called at the Old Ship, at Twelve o’Clock precisely, on Tuesday, December the 15th. It was intended to have made it an EXCLUSIVE meeting, but the callers of it have BLUNDERED; it is a PUBLIC meeting (as expressed on their own cards,) and every man, of whatever rank or station, has a right to be present; it will be a *meeting of the public*, and a meeting so called will have a right to choose their *own* Chairman, and reject one selected before-hand by a self-constituted Committee.—At the Meeting on Tuesday, the Friends of Civil and Religious Freedom will be present, and if supported by the meeting, appoint a liberal Chairman, and pass resolutions condemnatory of the Rath-cormac Massacre, and of the expulsion of hundreds of men, women, and children, in the depth of winter, from their homes, on account of their religious opinions; OR, they will at once proceed to dissolve the meeting, and make the Reverend Mr. Mortimer O’Sullivan and his crafty supporters, the laughing stock of all England and Ireland.—Friends of Civil and Religious Freedom! be at your posts at the Old Ship, by twenty minutes before Twelve o’Clock, and when that hour has arrived, appoint your own Chairman.

On the morning of the meeting the bellman was sent round to

---

\* The Rev. Mortimer O’Sullivan is allowed Two Thousand a-year out of the Conservative Funds, while on his present mission of Christian charity and good will in this country. No wonder clerical agitation should thrive under such circumstances. The revenue of Mr. O’Sullivan’s parish of Killyman makes another Thousand a-year; which, deducting the expense of two Curates, he receives for doing nothing!

summon the lower classes, and so soon as the doors were opened a number of persons, well known as the leaders of the disaffected population in Brighton, took possession, with a large body of their followers, of the centre of the room. It subsequently appeared, that many of these persons had obtained admittance by presenting false tickets. At 12 o'clock, as the Committee were approaching the platform from a side door, a rush took place from the party in the centre of the room, who forcibly took possession of the platform, thrusting aside and trampling over the ladies, upsetting the seats, and driving back the committee and their friends from the platform. Notwithstanding this disorder and violence, by which the meeting was virtually dissolved, Mr. O'Sullivan, impressed with the duty of advocating, under all circumstances, the cause of truth, felt it incumbent upon him, in spite of the unpromising character of the meeting, to make an attempt to obtain a hearing, and so soon as the uproar had somewhat subsided he appealed to the Chairman, and demanded, that as he had been publicly accused, he should at least be heard in his defence.

The Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan then rose, and was proceeding to address the meeting, when the Chairman said he wished to know the gentleman's name.

Mr. O'Sullivan,—Am I to understand that unless I give my name I am not to have a hearing.

The Chairman.—No, Sir, you shall be heard, but I wish to know who addresses the meeting.

Mr. O'Sullivan.—You shall know, Sir, presently. I have no doubt, Sir, that an impartial hearing will be afforded me. The circumstances under which we are assembled are such as to assure me of it. The meeting, as we have heard repeated here, has been called, and arrangements made for it by individuals holding one class of opinions. Individuals holding opposite opinions, it is said, have availed themselves of their power to defeat the measures of their opponents, and to appoint a chairman. You, Sir, placed in the chair under such circumstances, must necessarily feel more than common anxiety to do strict justice, and those who have so closely identified themselves and their character, with the character of the proceedings which take place, will no doubt be very determined in their resolution to support your authority and give effect to your impartial decisions. I rely then

on the assurance of being patiently heard. Every gentleman will feel it his imperative duty to see that your assurance is verified, and, disregarding the promise implied in a name of conventional distinction, I feel satisfied that not alone gentlemen, but every man who has an English heart, and the proud consciousness of belonging to a country like England, will feel that he is personally concerned in maintaining that strict and impartial justice which, in the admitted idiom of his language is called "fair play," and for which this land has ever been pre-eminently distinguished.

I would observe, Sir, further, that, independently of the constitution of the assembly, there is another circumstance which justifies me in hoping for an impartial hearing. If there be any man who, beyond others, has a right to expect this, it is assuredly the man who may have been accused and called upon to defend himself. Such an individual, Sir, now addresses you. A placard, of which I saw a copy for the first time only within the last half hour, has proclaimed my name in connexion with a name of most unhappy notoriety. It has been held up in this meeting. (Here a placard was handed to Mr. O'Sullivan, and he proceeded.) This paper has a heading, of which it is not very easy to understand the propriety. It is "*Rathcormack versus O'Sullivan.*" Now, Sir, in what respect Mr. O'Sullivan can be held as at all connected with the calamity which was suffered at Rathcormac, except in the deeply deploring so mournful an occurrence, it passes my judgment to comprehend. I certainly was in no way instrumental to the attempt to execute the law, nor did I incite any individuals to resist it. How then can I, in fairness, be held responsible for the event? And yet it is intimated that a cause is to be tried, as it were, between Rathcormac and Mr. O'Sullivan. (Uproar.) A gentleman on my left expresses his indignation. It is, I trust, against the frightful outrage which the name of Rathcormac brings to his mind, not against the individual whom he has summoned to stand here on his trial. I shall read the paper—

"He left her in the morning. A demand of 4s. 6d. was made upon her for tithes. The military fired. She ran out wild—'Where are my sons?' She found a dead body. She took it up to see the face. It was not her son—and she laughed! The poor woman laughed aloud, forgetting that there was another woman to weep for that boy. She took up another body. She laughed aloud—a frantic laugh! It was not her son. She went to the third—it was her boy!—the boy who had left her a few hours before—blood-bolten, stiff, and dead!"

Thus Mr. O'Connell concludes the distressing narrative. Your imagination can readily supply the probable conclusion, that the widow knelt in the agony of her bereavement, and lifted up her voice in passionate supplication to God that he would visit the curse of a broken-hearted widow on the authors of her affliction. (Cries of "To he sure she did—why not.") But where, if her imprecations were heard, where should the bolt of vengeance fall? (Hisses and cheers.) Let the story I have to tell, guide you.

May I, however, before I proceed, advert to another accusation exhibited against me in the placard with which I have been presented? I find it stated there, that I am a paid agent of the Conservative Society, having a salary of £2000 per annum, and that the income arising out of my church preferment amounts to £1000. This latter statement is a gross exaggeration of the truth—the former is utterly false—utterly groundless. In the unprecedented circumstances of my country, and of the church in which I am a minister, I have felt it no less a privilege than a duty to exert myself to the utmost, however little that may be, of my abilities. At personal—at pecuniary sacrifices, I have availed myself of every opportunity to render myself, in some small degree, useful. I have experienced, I thank God, gratifying results and recompences, and I have not had the mortification to learn that any person whose good opinion is of the slightest worth, could think so meanly of me as to suppose that I must be retained as a hireling advocate in what is, in every sense, my own cause—a cause to which I would cheerfully dedicate whatever of strength, or faculty, or possession has been bestowed on me. This, Sir, it was perhaps wholly unnecessary for me to have spoken; but as the insinuation has come so directly before me, I thought it perhaps better that it should not have even the equivocal sanction of my contemptuous silence.

I return to the graver accusation. It is urged on the faith of a statement made by Mr. O'Connell. But how did that gentleman behave when an opportunity was afforded him of bringing the charge directly to trial? "*Rathcormac versus O'Sullivan*" is a good heading for Mr. O'Connell's placarded speech; but Mr. O'Connell had the opportunity of examining Mr. O'Sullivan for-six whole days. He had this opportunity given him while acting as a member of a committee in which his party, if such an expression may be used, constituted a clear majority, and of which five Roman Catholics, the most

distinguished for ability and of the highest reputation, were members. Acting in this committee, under so favourable circumstances—although the subject of tithes and the attendant consequences was introduced, and made a subject of inquiry—the name of Rathcormac was never mentioned, not a single allusion to the mournful catastrophe which took place there, was once hazarded. I put it to the assembly whether, if Mr. O'Connell and his friends, (cries of "We have no business here with O'Connell.") I am charged as if I were especially concerned in a quotation from that gentleman's speech, and although the individual who so vociferously interrupted me, may feel himself called on thus to express his detestation of Mr. O'Connell's conduct or character, (laughter—cries of "No, no, his honour of him,") and although the individual on my left may think his favourable testimony sufficient and necessary to give currency to Mr. O'Connell's dishonoured name, (cheers, hisses, three cheers for O'Connell,\* chair, chair,) I trust I am not out of order in referring to a statement extracted from that gentleman's speech, and ostentatiously placarded with the intention, avowedly, of doing me or my cause disservice. (Cheers.) I put it then to the assembly, whether if Mr. O'Connell and his friends thought the calamity suffered at Rathcormac a subject profitable to their views and disadvantageous to me to be inquired into, they would have abstained, under circumstances so favourable to themselves, from the slightest reference to it.

Another question has been asked on this painful subject—a question not mine, but proposed by one of the most distinguished and ardent assertors of what have been called the rights of the Roman Catholics—himself, an individual much honoured in their body, I mean Mr. Æneas M'Donnell. His question is, why was not the calamity at Rathcormac made the subject of parliamentary investigation. If there were circumstances attending that dreadful catastrophe such as to justify the use which has been made of its distressing story—why were they not subjected to the most solemn and searching investigation? Was human blood to sink unavenged into the earth? Were the lives of several individuals to be wantonly sacrificed—and while the party loudest in complaint possessed the power of enforcing an inquiry into all the circumstances of the mournful event, were they

---

\* Six hats were held up, but no voices were raised.

to let the opportunity and advantage of their position to pass by unregarded, and instead of having a full and deliberate investigation, by which the legislature of the country might be guided—were they to preserve the assumed grievance, that it might minister strife and debate to meetings where it could be named, for the purpose of creating anger and confusion? I repeat Mr. M'Donnell's question. Why was not the Rathcormac case made the subject of Parliamentary inquiry—and I ask is it just in the party who shrunk from the duty of bringing it in the proper form to a sufficient test, to resort to such practices as those by which I am constrained to detail the circumstances of that most unhappy case for your consideration? Before I enter upon them, however, it is necessary to state that while Mr. M'Donnell proposes a case in the form of a question, another Roman Catholic gentleman, Mr. Finn, directly ascribes to Mr. O'Connell the guilt of having occasioned the loss of lives at Rathcormac. (Interruption, cheers, cries of "Why do you accuse a man behind his back?") Because I am myself accused, and must notice the person on whose authority I am charged, when answering to my accusation. How otherwise can I justify—(Interruption. "Why don't you give a more correct account?") If the gentleman who has placed a paper in my hand, will point out where I have been incorrect, I will, when I have concluded my notice of the placard, attend to him. I apprehend the subject which now engages me is more acceptable to the meeting. It is, I take it for granted, well known to this assembly, that for the last four years there has been in Ireland a settled and organised hostility to the payment of tithe. (Cries of "To be sure there has, very right there should.") I need not then trespass on you with proofs that this warfare is in operation. You hear it, Sir, declared and justified. ("Why not, why should Catholics pay tithes?") Because they have contracted to pay them, and have advantages accruing to them on condition that they pay. But is there any justification for their withholding such a debt? (Cries of "There is.") There is—what can the justification be? What are the grounds on which the resistance can be justified? Am I right in supposing the ground to be this—that the professors of one religion should not be taxed to maintain the ministers of another? I believe I am right in supposing that this is the ground on which resistance to the claim for tithe in Ireland is justified. ("It is, it is.") Now, Sir, if the Roman Catholics in



Ireland can justly avail themselves of this defence, if they have a right to complain of tithe as a tax imposed on them, I, for my part, will cheerfully give my signature to a petition imploring that they be released. I will do this, although I am one of those who would, in a pecuniary point of view, suffer by the withdrawal of a portion of my income which Roman Catholics are supposed to pay. (Ironical cheers and laughter.) I really thought, Sir, that I was making a fair proposal—I am quite ready to sign the petition and abide the consequences. But is there, in truth, the least foundation for asserting, that Roman Catholics in Ireland are aggrieved by the demand for tithe? What is the condition of the country? It was conquered by England. (Cries of “by treachery.”) Of this I do not speak. I am not the individual who brings this accusation against Englishmen. Whether by treachery or by strength, Ireland was conquered, and since the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the whole island, almost, is confessed to have been three times confiscated. Every grant made by the Crown, of lands liable to the payment of tithe, recognized that liability, and bestowed the land, subject to the incumbrance. Has the individual to whom the grant was made any right to complain that a fulfilment of the consequent obligation is demanded, and that while he is acknowledged proprietor so far as nine-tenths of the produce are considered, the remaining tenth shall be allocated to the clerical incumbent on whom it was conferred by the same authority which granted the land. You will perhaps respect the declaration of Lord Brougham on this subject, that the proprietorship of the land was a partnership between the landlord and the owner of the tithe. (Cries of “Lord Brougham! who cares for him?—He is a pensioner.”) Lord Brougham’s pension, however, cannot change truth into error. The same power bestowed two species of property, and none who profit by it have a right to complain of the conditions while they consent to enjoy the advantages.—Again, land has been purchased in Ireland. Since the time when Roman Catholics obtained the privilege to acquire landed property—(cries of “Privilege! No, their just right.”) Well, it matters little: the right, at least, involved the privilege of acquisition. Since they obtained this privilege or right, they have availed themselves of it, and made purchases. You, of course, frequently see advertisements in the public prints of land offered for sale. You may, perhaps, have

adverted to the fact, that in some instances the incident of the land being free from liability to tithe is noticed. The lands "are tithe-free." Why is this circumstance noticed? To indicate that the land is more valuable, and must be sold at a higher rate of purchase. Now if an Irish Roman Catholic has purchased a property, let us say £1000 per annum, liable to the demand for tithe, for which he has paid £18,000, while, if the lands were tithe free, he must have paid £20,000, has he a right to complain that the conditions which he has not bought off must be fulfilled? Has he a right to say that, because he is not a Protestant, he has no equivalent for the sum he pays? No, he has had the equivalent in the diminished rate of purchase, in the difference between what the price of tithe-free lands must have been, and that sum which he has paid for the tithe-encumbered property. Has the Roman Catholic tenant right to complain? No, he has a corresponding abatement in his rent. He need not now have even the annoyance of in his own person paying the demand. If he become a tenant, he has nothing to think of but the intrinsic value of the land. The amount of tithe is a matter with which he is as much unconcerned as with any other debt by which his landlord is encumbered. Let me suppose a case, such as has occurred in my own neighbourhood, of a Roman Catholic landed proprietor, who makes a lease to a tenant. He says to him, you shall have nothing to do with tithe or county taxes, or any other impost upon the land; you shall merely pay me that amount which your farm is worth. Examine it. I think it worth twenty-five shillings per acre. If you agree with me, you shall have possession of it. Does that tenant, who thinks his ground worth the amount he stipulates to pay, who pays nothing more than the stipulated rent, justly bring an accusation against a Protestant minister, or war against the church, as if he paid the tithe? (Cries of, "He does, he pays it by his landlord.") And if another landlord have land tithe-free, and who charges for land of inferior value twenty-five shillings and sixpence per acre, thus leasing his inferior land at a higher rate to a Roman Catholic tenant; does that tenant, too, on his tithe-free land pay tithe? And if he does not, how can it be said that the other tenant, who has better land at a lower rent, can be said to pay? Sir, the clamour is most unjust; cases such as I have stated are well known. It is perfectly well known that where the land is free from tithe the landlord exacts a

higher rent ; that where tithe must be paid, the landlord makes a commensurate reduction. And if the reduction be not made, and in any instance a landlord exacts the same rent which might have been just where there was no demand for tithe, and exacts it where tithe is demanded, who is the offender ? Is it not he who exacts the excessive rent. And is it just to raise a war against the church, or a clamour against the clergyman, because the landlord is unjust or oppressive.

But, Sir, even were the system of tithe a bad one (cries of " Say it is a bad one ")—no, I will not say that the system which, under any circumstances, the Almighty was pleased to appoint for his favoured people, should be called bad—(cries of " It is, he did not appoint it ")—I repeat my assertion—but granting, not conceding the question ; if the tithe system be injurious, is there not a better mode of redressing the grievance than that by which it has been opposed in Ireland ? What is the advantage of all these reforms by which popular power has been so much augmented, and the will of every individual invested with so much worth and power, and made to bear on the legislation of the country, if it do not produce respect to the laws which exist ? Suppose a law objectionable, let it be petitioned against—let your representatives in parliament be instructed to have it repealed ; but let not violence, and outrage and dishonesty be employed to make resistance against it, while it is yet law. (Cries of " the House of Lords. ") If there be in the House of Lords aught which you would correct, seek your redress by just and constitutional endeavours, but do not, as you feel yourselves identified with the honour and prosperity of your country—do not countenance the overthrow of her laws by illegal resistance, and with consequences ruinous to private and public welfare.

Whether the tithe system be or be not injurious, it was the appointed maintenance of a certain body of men whose rights the law protected. They have been made subject to many close restrictions. They cannot defend their rights in the Commons House of Parliament—they cannot engage in the duties and obtain the emoluments of the learned professions—they cannot even by agricultural occupations so employ themselves as farmers, that thus they may earn bread—they cannot by any of the ordinary sources of gain procure for themselves a subsistence ; and the laws of the land, which have

cut them off from all these resources of profitable industry, by which other subjects may be benefitted, should be considered as doubly guaranteeing to them that one means of subsistence assigned to them in lieu of all that they surrender. You perceive I am taking the humblest view of the subject. The clergy of Ireland, on the faith of the government, depending on British law, made the required sacrifices, and received the offered equivalent. Ought not the stipulation to be kept to them? When was it that their property became affected, and by whom? I have spoken of the privileges granted to the Roman Catholics. (Cries of "rights.") Well, rights,—powers at least which were withheld long, because it was believed they would be used for the overthrow, or the injury of the Church Establishment. Securities were given in the form of an oath, that no such use should be made of them. Roman Catholics swore that they would, to the utmost of their power, maintain property as settled by the law—an engagement in which, of course, church property was included. They swore that they disavowed and abjured any intention of subverting, or weakening the Church Establishment; and after having taken this oath, they thought themselves justified in endeavouring, out of parliament, to give every resistance to the payment of tithes, a part of that property which they had sworn to the utmost of their power to maintain, and in parliament in voting for measures by which the Church Establishment would be weakened. On this part of their conduct I have nothing here to say. I confine myself to that which especially connects itself with the subject, on which I have been called upon to make my defence. A warfare was waged against the demand for tithe, and in consequence many excellent men were reduced into a state of extreme destitution.

It is now very generally known that there is a confederacy or society in Ireland, very extensively organised, by which the peace and good government of the country has been disordered and obstructed. (Cries of "The Orange Society," for some time repeated.) No, Sir, not the Orange Society. (Cries of "Doesn't it exist?" Yes—and where it does, its nature is best seen in the influence it has exerted upon society. May I state to you an answer which was made to Mr. Shiel, a Roman Catholic, when he was inquiring into the character of that society, and had put a question whether it had not occasioned outrage? It was answered, that within the seven-and-thirty years in

which the Orange Society has had a permanent organization in the province of Ulster, where it prevails, there could not be found so many outrages in the worst county he could name, as had been within two years committed within the county which that honorable member himself represented,—the county of Tipperary. What policy did the hon. member observe? He had it in his power to continue the interrogatories; he did not continue them. It would have been imprudent so to do, for the challenge would have been triumphantly maintained, and an inquiry would have shown that a single month in the annals of Tipperary—and I would take a month in the present year, because it is said to be tranquil—the annals of a single month would set forth more cases of deliberate cold-blooded murder than could be charged upon the Protestants of Ulster during the seven and thirty years which have elapsed since the completion of the Orange Society. What a taunt, then, Sir, is this. There is one province in Ireland tranquil as England herself. In that province there are, I believe, fourteen hundred Orange lodges. It contains considerably more than two millions of people—nearly a third of the population of the country. It is free from tumult, and the government, which sends twenty-five regiments to Ireland, think two sufficient for the nine counties and the crowded population where the Orange Societies prevail. I, then, Sir, who enjoy the benefit of the peace to which the power of those Societies, by God's blessing, conduces,—I accept the taunt in which they are named as a congratulation.

The confederacy of which I spoke is of a far different nature. It is that which is called the Ribbon Society, which, under its various appellations, as various regiments of the same army, meditates, and is bound by a dreadful oath to effect, the extirpation of Protestants from Ireland. It was well known that the vengeance of this Society would fall mercilessly on any who paid tithe; and for a time the prohibition to pay them under any circumstances was considered as prevailing. But a change was introduced, and thus, by slow advances, I have arrived at the point of my story, and I beg the assembly to bear in mind that the delay was not mine, but was owing to the necessity imposed upon me of replying to the many interrogatories with which I have been addressed. A change took place in the laws of the midnight legislators. Mr. O'Connell having sworn that to the utmost of his power he would maintain property, gave a practical ex-

emplification of the sense in which he understood his oath, and the feeling in which he respected it, by declaring in a letter which appeared in the public prints, that he would never again *voluntarily* pay tithe. The laws of the "conspirators" against tithes and the peace of the country were said to have profited by this declaration, and it was affirmed that vengeance would be visited on those only who paid under circumstances in which no appearance of compulsion excused them for the unseasonable honesty. A secret message was conveyed to Captain Collis, intimating to him that many of his debtors wished, but feared to pay, and that if he would have a demonstration of strength made, by having military called out, the people would gladly acquit themselves of the debt, feeling that they were protected against the dreadful consequences of disobeying a command which was much more imperative upon them than the law of the land.

This intimation Captain Collis had received, a gentleman who holds, as he ought, a high place in the judgment of all who love Ireland or its people. ("Is he an Orangeman?") He is, I believe, a member of no political society—his opinions, I apprehend, were what would have been called liberal, and if they have become, which I do not know, more cautious and reserved in later days, it is only because increasing dangers have rendered caution more necessary. But as a country gentleman and a landlord, Captain Collis has few equals. He is one of those whose constant residence on his estates is felt as a constant blessing. He has a thriving tenantry, and numerous labourers residing on his lands, and living in much comfort. He is, in short, one who could boldly conduct a stranger through his demesnes, could show him the farms and houses of those who dwelt upon it, could leave him to hold free converse with the labourers and tenants, and feel assured that the reputation of the landlord would not suffer from the reports which should be made by any, down to the very humblest of his dependants. In compliance with the suggestion he had received, Captain Collis and Mr. Ryder solicited a military escort. Mr. Ryder was a gentleman, ("No gentleman, an assassin, a murderer.") An individual by my side affirms that Mr. Ryder was not a gentleman. Certainly, if extreme poverty could deprive him of the title, he was effectually barred from it, for he endured during two wasting years almost every species of

suffering which penury could inflict; but he had always been, I understand, accounted an upright and charitable man.

In obedience to the intimation they had received, these gentlemen accompanied a military party, and the consequence was that for one, I believe for two days, the tithe was freely brought in. ("Freely.") I say freely. ("No.") An individual says no, and I tell the person who thus interrupts me that there are men, and Roman Catholics too, in Ireland, who merit not such slanders—men who, knowing that they have taken land on certain definite conditions, will feel that they ought to comply with the conditions, or else give up the land. ("What, and starve.") No, but pay the just debts they had contracted. There were Roman Catholics in Ireland who would say—will my conscience allow me to pay tithe—if not—what right have I to take land to which condition of such a payment is annexed? I have said that for one, or perhaps two days, the people *freely* paid their tithes; and I again repeat, whatever may have been said in this room or elsewhere, that there are such things as honest men to be found among the Roman Catholics of Ireland. Was it not on record before Parliamentary Committees, that men had stolen in the silence of midnight to the clergyman's abode to make payments to him—because they could not tamely permit to perish one whose kindness and indulgence they had experienced, and because they dared not, from the apprehension of a dreadful death, openly discharge the debts which they felt had been fairly contracted?

In pursuance of advice received from individuals thus honestly disposed, a military party was employed, and during the first day on which its services were used, they were found to be eminently successful. Settlements were made generally for tithe demands, and, I believe, thanks were secretly given. (Cries of "For what?") For the opportunity thus afforded of reconciling the demands of law and justice with personal safety. I am not quite sure, but believe, that a military display was made on a second day, and with equal success. It was made a subject of deliberation, whether the appearance of force should be again employed; and an intimation was secretly conveyed to one of the parties concerned, that another display of military strength would accomplish all that was desired, and reinstate the law in its proper authority. It was unhappily made, and the military party was conducted—an impression having prevailed that there could

be no hazard of personal collision—into a place where such collision would be extremely hazardous. It was thought they were only serving the purposes of display, and they were not so cautious as they would have been had danger been apprehended. (Cries of “Why did they go armed then?”) I will tell you. A dreadful calamity had given a warning not to be disregarded. It happened some time since that a party of police in the county of Kilkenny, attended a person who went to serve notices which the law required on some tithe defaulters—the purpose was merely to serve notices, and it was necessary that the agent should be protected. The party consisted, I believe, of eighteen policemen, the process server, and the officer in command. As they proceeded on their way they heard the ringing of the chapel bells, and beheld multitudes gathering from all sides, and closing upon them. One of the policemen, a serjeant, experienced in the habits of the people, and able to understand the signs of their intention, warned his captain of danger. He said, do not allow the multitude to press too close upon you. (Cries of “Ah, now it is coming.”) Yes, it is—he warned the captain not to allow too near an approach—but his warning was disregarded. A leader of the multitude approached the officer, patted his horse’s neck, (“what had he to do with the horse?”) assured the officer that neither he nor his party was in the smallest danger, that not a hair of their heads should be touched, and the officer believed him. The party continued its march, the multitude and leader their pacific demonstrations, until the police party, in their route, had entered into a narrow pass, enclosed by heaps of stones, within which discipline must be wholly unavailing, and then the cry was raised, “Now, boys, is the time,” and in an instant the party was assailed by the ferocious multitude; and, despite whatever resistance they could make, the captain, the notice-server, and fourteen of the police were barbarously murdered. Is it wonderful, after this, that in any matter where popular prejudice is concerned in Ireland, men shall not go forth in a condition which invites the attempt at slaughter? I return to my subject.

The military party, which Captain Collis and Mr. Rider accompanied, found obstruction where it was least expected. A large body of men appeared in mass to resist their further progress. Captain Collis, relying justly on his influence with the people, leaped his horse over the enclosure, within which the multitude were assembled;



and, to his amazement, he knew not a single individual of those who met his view. Although familiar with the faces of all—(loud laughter and cheering for some time)—I am glad, Sir, to find that I have unconsciously provided amusement for the meeting; or rather that the assembly has taken upon itself the toilsome task of making its own provision. I feel myself inadequate to entertain—I have neither the power nor the eloquence to do so—and I am relieved by finding that my deficiencies have been supplied, and that by the simple process of mutilation, by skilfully interrupting while I was in the act of speaking—by breaking a sentence into disjointed parts, the fragments have been converted into wit.

Although Mr. Collis was familiar with the faces of all who live in his neighbourhood—and that word may be taken in a large acceptation—although familiar with their habits, their houses, their families, his eye did not rest upon a single countenance in the multitude on which he looked, with which he was acquainted. What is the inevitable inference? *That what the people of the place were indisposed to do, strangers were called in to accomplish.* The fatal catastrophe that ensued, was, I believe, to be ascribed, not to a command volunteered by either the military commander, or a magistrate. A collision took place between an officer who attempted quietly to remove an obstruction, and a man who resisted. It is said that, while this effort and resistance continued, an attempt was made on the officer's life by an individual who seemed active among the people, and who assaulted the officer with a very formidable weapon. He was not seen by his meditated victim, but it is said that the first shot fired was that which intercepted his attempt at murder. It may be asked why, when obstruction was given, did not the party retire? The commanding officer, on oath, I believe, declared, that to do so would have been most dangerous, and could not have been effected, without a greater waste of life, than that which unhappily took place. It is said, certainly, that a suggestion was made that the military should withdraw into a house prepared for their reception; but it is also affirmed that combustibles had been prepared, had they entered, to set the house on fire. It may be said that this is one-sided evidence; but let it be remembered, that the party loudest in clamour on the

melancholy catastrophe, had the power to place the circumstances of the case in the light of a parliamentary inquiry. (Cries of "So they will.") Let them, then, do so; and *while they leave the duty undone, let them not set forth, rancorously to injure private character or to distract quiet meetings, charges, which as yet, at least, although they had the power, they have not dared to submit to a parliamentary investigation.*

But, sir, the real question which ought to be brought to issue, is not whether certain individuals are to be deprived of their rights and made the victims of an unprincipled combination against them—it is whether the Church of Rome shall be rendered predominant, and Protestantism prostrated, and made subject to a despotism from which it can hope for no mercy. The question, Sir, is clearly one between Popery and Protestantism.

(A gentleman here asked "What does Protestantism mean?"—"Pounds, shillings, and pence.") I doubt, Sir, whether you will accept that as the true answer to the question. It should be regarded as expressing only the sentiments of the individual who has given it—and I do not think it was to him the question was propounded—I thought it was *from me* an answer had been desired. My answer, assuredly, is not what you have heard. In my judgment, Protestantism is the religion of the Bible—the religion which gives the right of private judgment—liberty of conscience—and the free circulation of God's holy Scriptures. This, Sir, is Protestantism. To this the Church of England ministers a support and defence; and I can with the most solemn sincerity declare, that it is as a ministration of true religion I regard it; and that if the interests of religion were not promoted by it, I should consider the continuance of a Church as a matter of quite subordinate consideration. I then, Sir, regard the Church Establishment in Ireland as an instrument of the Protestant Religion; but, whatever may be thought of the importance of such an institution—what I look upon as most formidable in the efforts of the Church of Rome, is, the purpose to *root out the Protestant religion, by overthrowing the Protestant establishment.* I cannot otherwise understand the doctrines and principles of that aspiring Church. It is, in all important respects, contrasted with the Church it would cast down. It imposes ungodly restrictions on the study of the

Divine word. It pronounces liberty of conscience a pestilent error. It declares the assertion of the right of private of judgment a heresy ; and it proclaims that all to whom the right of baptism has been administered, and who do not worship within its pale, have incurred the judgment of everlasting ruin in the world to come, and even here in earth have had sentence of death pronounced upon them. It is impossible to think of a Church, maintaining principles like these—to see it waging war against an establishment which its members had become sworn not to injure—without feeling convinced that every effort which can be made to exterminate the religion, must be made, in further prosecution of those endeavours which are now directed against the Establishment.

And here, Sir, I would beg permission to make an observation respecting myself and my conduct, which the clamours uttered against me seem to demand. I am one whose fortune it has been to know that he has been more spoken of within the last year, than, from the tenor of his former life, he had reason to anticipate or apprehend. It would be, perhaps, not unreasonable to suggest, that until within the last year, with, perhaps, a single exception, I have never attended as a speaker at any public meeting ; that I have been studiously withdrawn from all that was called agitation in my country. I had, no doubt, my opinions ; but I belonged to no party, and I engaged in no political contention. During that sharp struggle which ended in the recovery of what were called Roman Catholic rights, I was altogether abstinent ; I had no part in it ; I never left the peacefulness of my quiet occupations, until it had become the fixed persuasion of my mind, that there was a daring and an increasing party in Ireland, which has for its great object *the destruction of Protestantism—the extermination of Protestants*. Further, Sir, I would add, that had not the events which have taken place, and the principles which have been developed, taught me to rely on the suggestions of my own judgment—had not painful experience taught me that my anticipations in former years were confirmed in the disasters of this our day, I would not have departed from the obscurity in which I have found it most pleasing to abide, and come forward to take such a part as I have taken in appearing here to-day. But when I feel that the Church of Rome is the immitigable enemy of all freedom of opinion—when I feel that she displays herself now, as in dark ages past, in inveterate hostility to the

principle as well as the institutions of Protestantism ; I feel it also a duty to the utmost of my power to expose her intolerance, and to set forth the dangers necessarily resulting from it. It is, I repeat, simply and solely from a conviction that that intolerance is alarmingly manifested, and the dangers which result from it near at hand, that I have assisted in exposing what I conceive to be the real character and purposes of the Church of Rome.

The main points which it seems to me essential to have made known are these, that the church of Rome is hostile to Protestantism, and that in Ireland, as the circumstances and incidents of the times unhappily prove, it has much power to effect its purposes of destruction. An individual in this room has demanded of me what I mean by popery, as opposed to Protestantism? My answer is, that the church of Rome is a persecuting church: it denies liberty of conscience; it denies the free use of the Holy Scriptures; it arrogates for fallible mortals in authority a power and command which God's word disallows, and it looks upon all who dispute or deny this power as beings over whom the wrath of God is hanging, to destroy them in the world to come, and upon whom sentence of death has been passed in this. (Cries of "Both churches are bad; there were tyrants in both.") No doubt there were. Many argue in the spirit of these cavils, and urge the offences of Protestants and Reformers as a set-off against the persecutions of Popery. They affirm that Cranmer and Jewell and other eminent men held intolerant opinions. I admit all—many Reformers came forth from Popery with her scars upon them. They had acquired from her principles of persecution which they did not immediately renounce. I admit all this; but what shallow sophistry or what shameless effrontery is that which can adduce such arguments, which would propose as a counterpart to an accusation like ours, acts of persecution committed by individuals not members of the Church of Rome, or sufferings endured by some whom she regards as faithful children. Were it a part of wise controversy to array in opposition the acts of intolerance by which contending systems may be found dishonoured, it is clear, beyond all question, that the most cruel of her adversaries would seem mild and unspotted, when seen in comparison with her whose sanguine vesture has drank so profusely the blood of Christ's saints. But it is not of acts perpetrated by the ministers or champions of the Papacy we

complain. It is not because of those acts we look upon the Church of Rome with abhorrence and dread; and although there is no power to escape to a time when her rage devoured not, or a region where traces of her cruelty are not branded deep—no land in which accusing memories rise not up to witness of her enormities in the days when the apostacy was proud,—though in the exercise of her cruel will she owned no pity for man, no reverence for nature,—although this fair creation has been abused and marred with the mementoes of her vengeance—although no memory or thoughts by which the everlasting hills are hallowed—the law delivered—the Man of Sorrows transfigured and glorious—the cross of him who willeth not the sinner's death—the names of Sinai and Calvary (here there was interruption and a voice said, "You mean cavalry,")—The Rev. speaker said, this is a subject on which I will not stoop to parley with such interruption. While the subject endured it, I trust the assembly will bear in mind that I was duly respectful to their wishes, and followed, however desultory, the questions of any trespasser that led me away. The subject is now of a loftier character. The interruption indicates more clearly the evil heart and purpose—and I tell the individual who has offended, that I vouchsafe him no answer or notice, except that of silent scorn or of Christian pity. It is a poor device to distract the attention of a meeting or a speaker. It shall not be successful. I was stating that no veneration, because of holy names or circumstances smote wrath upon the hearts of those remorseless members of vengeance who persecuted the fugitives from the wrath of Rome, into the recesses of the hills, and spared from testifying of God's saints, the Alpine regions cold—but although there was no pity for man, no reverence for nature—although water, and air, and light, and fire were witnesses of Papal tyranny—although it was impossible for thought or memory to escape into a time, or a region in which it was not surrounded by a cloud of witnesses, testifying of dark deeds done in every region under heaven,—yet it was not for these cruelties we accused the Church of Rome. We call up in the judgment against her, not the victims she has made, the dark deeds she has committed—we call forth her unrelaxed, immitigable doctrines. It is by these terrible principles of action, by the voices for ever heard among them, that she is to be judged and condemned. Yes, Sir, Rome is condemned, not because of her

enormous trespasses, but for her destroying doctrines—for what *she always teaches*, not for the crimes she has committed. If the crater were peaceful, and the volcanic fires had spent themselves to decay—if, within the caverns of the mountain, there were no longer materials of flame, no laboratory of future eruptions, we might regard, with a composed, though a melancholy interest, the vestiges, from old times, of its once desolating energy. But when we stand upon the lava, and hear the menace of the mountain;—cities, on which sudden destruction had come, beneath our feet—the smoke of that furnace which had sent forth the fiery ruin, darkening the air above us, and going up for ever,—can we then be beguiled by verdure on the mountain's side, into forgetfulness of the destruction which burns within; or should we think the monitor honest, if we accounted him wise, who strove to divert our apprehensions and our thoughts from the monuments of human power and helplessness, and from the unceasing murmur and menace of the destroyer, by assuring us that there were other hills from which a winter torrent had rushed down upon the fold and the pasture, and when it had passed away, left sad remembrances behind? No, Sir; it is not because Pliny perished by fire, or Huss died at the stake, or Galileo wasted in a dungeon—it is not because Pagan cities have been destroyed, or Christian nations exterminated—not because provinces have been rendered desolate, by the rage of a devouring bigotry or a devouring flame; it is not for this we look with apprehension on the volcano of Vesuvius, or the volcano of Papal Rome. It is *because both have perpetuated within them, principles from which evil cometh*, and because (whether by low mutterings or murmurs that menace loud, it matters not,) both are constrained unequivocally to declare, that whatever their power may be, they cherish still the unaltered purpose of destruction.

This, Sir, is the reason why we believe that all who would uphold the noblest right of man, liberty of conscience, are interested in guarding vigilantly against the encroachments of the Papal system. We discern the intolerance of her character and spirit, both in her principles and her practice. She is at this moment, as to spirit and purpose, what she was in the age of darkest bigotry. She will not now tolerate the exercise of religious worship different from her own, unless where she has not the power of suppression, or where she derives

some advantage from yielding a precarious toleration. She, to this hour, advances her arrogant and anti-christian claim to exact a blind obedience to her decisions, and regards all who resist her judgments or withdraw from her authority as having incurred sentence of death. [No—from a gentleman who was known to be Mr. O'Dwyer, the late Member for Drogheda.] I am glad to hear that expression of dissent from a gentleman who can support it by argument. I am glad that the occupation in which I have seen the learned gentleman engaged (taking notes) teaches me to expect a reply from so distinguished a champion of the Roman Catholic party. I receive the contradiction of the learned gentleman as a challenge, and for this day or any other, accept it fearlessly (Cries of, Now—a fair challenge.) I repeat again the proposition from which he has dissented, and have no doubt it will receive the ablest answer of which it is susceptible. My statement is that the Church of Rome in Ireland regards all who are not of the Roman Catholic faith, as having sentence of death passed upon them.

Mr. O'Dwyer—I deny the statement—and join issue with the Rev. Gentleman.

Mr. O'Sullivan—If the learned gentleman shall succeed in controverting the statement he impugns—he will have done more for his Church than any of its accredited rulers, or teachers, have yet accomplished.

The Rev. Mr. Goulty asked what was meant by the sentence of death. Was it to be understood as a civil judgment, or as an eternal condemnation?

Mr. O'Sullivan—The question shall be answered presently and with authority. In the mean time, he should perhaps most consult the convenience and facilitate the object of the gentleman, who had undertaken the case of the Roman Catholics, if he sent down to him the books, which contained the grounds of his charge.

Mr. O'Dwyer—I beg leave to tell the Rev. Gentleman that, although I am an Irishman, it is not my practice to deduce my argument from my opponent's books.

Mr. O'Sullivan hoped he should not be considered as denying his country when he stated that he (Mr. O'Sullivan) pursued quite a

different course; he had never used any but his adversaries' books (cheers), and further he would say that he should consider himself disgraced if he resorted to any other authority than that of his adversaries for the grounds of any charge against them. It was perhaps not unknown to the meeting that a discovery had been lately made of a certain book which had for a long time been the guide of the Roman Catholic Priests in Ireland; a book which for 27 years had been their guide and director; a book which was published by order of the Roman Catholic Bishops of Ireland, and which was by them declared to contain the best and safest guidance that could be given to Roman Catholic clergymen; a book that was deemed by the Roman Catholic Bishops to be a substitute to Roman Catholic clergymen for a theological library; a book which, although they thus recommended it to Irish clergymen of their own communion, they on three solemn public occasions before Parliamentary Committees, had refused to declare to be a book in common use among them.

This book, which was providentially discovered within the present year, is the conference book of the Roman Catholic Clergy in Ireland. When the Rev. Robert M'Ghee made his discovery known, a sensation was produced throughout the country which has not yet subsided, and which, I trust, will not die away unprofitably. Every attempt to refute Mr. M'Ghee's charges has not merely been ineffectual, but has made the justice and the force of his accusation more plainly manifest. The sophistry which has been unravelled—the wiles which have been exposed—the asseverations which have been proved false; all have made more obviously intelligible the character of the Roman Church, and the arts to which its champions would have recourse without a scruple. Mr. M'Ghee produced proof undeniable that the detected book, the complete Theology, as it is called, of Professor Dens, was favoured with the explicit approbation of the Roman Catholic Bishops in Ireland, was declared by them to afford the best and safest guidance to their clergy, and was the book selected to be the director of their theological conferences. What are these conferences? They are meetings of the Roman Catholic Clergy to discuss points of doctrine and matters of casuistry,—meetings in which they prepare themselves to exercise with advantage the office of guarding the consciences of



their penitents, and discharging the duties of the confessional. Of secret conferences held for these solemn purposes, Dens was pronounced to furnish the best and safest guidance.

The guidance which the patrons of this execrable book think best and safest, a single case will be sufficient to exemplify. One of the subjects proposed for discussion in conference is heresy; and in the order of proceedings, arranged with the sanction of Dr. Murray, and announced in the calendar for the use of the Roman Clergy, published by their official bookseller, questions on the subject are set forth, and the authority of Dens is given as that by which, in the consideration of them, the clergy are to be directed. "Following Dominus Dens, *auctorem*, we shall discuss," &c. Of the questions which follow, one is—"What is heresy?"—one—"What are the punishments decreed against those infected with an heretical faith?" Where should we look for the answers, except to the work which is described as affording the best and safest guidance—to which, indeed, in the very programme of the questions, reference is made with authority? And what are the answers? To the first we have the answer which we of course should expect, teaching us that all who dispute the authority of the Church of Rome, every species of Protestant we may add included, are classed as heretics; that, in fact, heresy being a crime which consists especially in the exercise of private judgment, which consists in choosing—a man who claims and exercises the privilege of freedom to judge, will incur the guilt of heresy, even in *choosing* the articles of faith in the Church of Rome itself, if he maintain his right still to examine and prefer. But omitting further notice of this inconsistency—I turn to the answer which it most imports us to ascertain, and learn from Dens that the question, what punishments have been decreed against heretics—has for its answer the intimation, unlooked for, I believe, at the present day, that the punishments decreed against heretics are *confiscation of goods, infamy, imprisonment, exile, and death*. Such is the answer to the question addressed to the priests in conference, and given by the author who is recommended as affording them the best and safest guidance. But Dens is not satisfied with affirming that sentence of death has been passed—he must prove the justice of this extreme penalty. The Church must have exclusively the responsibility and honor of the rigid decree.

Dens quotes precedent in its favor. They who disobeyed the Jewish priests, were to be punished with death. The council of Constance set forth an example of unbending and unscrupulous severity. These are the instances by which Dens illustrates the justice of condemning heretics to death. The selection of them proves that it is not the civil law, but the ecclesiastical he would justify. It serves, I trust, also to answer, with sufficient plainness, the gentleman who asked of me what species of death was implied in the Romish condemnation of that exercise of man's best right, which she pronounces heresy. Thus clearly was it established that the Church of Rome in Ireland is at this moment not less fiercely intolerant than she was in the darkest ages of her ancient dominion.

It has been said, Sir, that sufficient facilities were not afforded to members or ministers of the Church of Rome, to defend themselves against the imputation of holding these iniquitous maxims, or of countenancing books which teach them. No allegation can be made with less justice. It is difficult to imagine any species of facility, which has not been afforded, or any invitation withheld, which might have the effect of inducing those who hold a prominent place among the Roman Catholics, or in their Church, to appear as its apologists. Not only was Dr. Murray, the Roman Catholic Archbishop in Dublin, invited to appear, (an invitation which was extended to all his episcopal brethren,) but the privilege was conceded to them of selecting whom they pleased, as advocates on whom they could rely, and delegating them to be their advocates. Not only were they invited to appear in London before public meetings, but it was proposed, that there should be an assembly in Dublin, if they preferred it, and that a distribution of tickets, and a chairman for each party, should ensure an equal hearing. All this was declined. It was said that to accept such offers would not be becoming. ("Certainly," from a gentleman.) And yet defence was made in the public prints—defence by the imputation of corrupt motives—by replying to imperfect reports, never by fair and direct answers. What was the nature of this defence? At first, denials that the publication of Dens *was directed*, denials that it was a conference book. Then the denial softened to a confession, that the publication of the book *was approved*—that it *was made* a conference book, but with this reserve, that it was used in conference

only as a book from which *questions* were to be derived, and to which the *answers* must be sought *elsewhere*. To this we replied that never had the office of a guide been so strangely described before,—that Dens had been pronounced, by all the Roman Catholic Bishops in Ireland, the *best* and *safest* guide of which their clergy could avail themselves, but that he was a *guide* whose *only duty was to ask questions*. We asked, had ever man been promoted to the place of guide in order to serve such a purpose? We said, that in the old time, and in plain speaking, a guide was accounted to be one who *directed*, not one who *perplexed*, by asking questions which *he was unable to answer*. But we proceed. Admitting this guidance to be a partnership-concern, in which Dens asked the questions which another guide answered, we asked *where is the answering part*. In *what book equally authenticated, having the approbation of 23 archbishops and bishops, can we find answers to the questions in Dens of which the Church of Rome need not be ashamed?* And although we have repeatedly proposed this question, it has never yet been answered. Farther, we assigned the inability to answer it, as a probable reason why the public invitation was declined. We said, that had it been stated at any public meeting, that the replies found in Dens were not accepted in answer to the questions he had suggested, we would ask where the answers were to be found; and that it was because no work of authority supplied answers less hateful than those in Dens, the hazard of being called on to name such a book had been avoided. We hold ourselves justified in affirming that these repeated instances of shrinking from the question contain proofs that the authority of those abominable answers to be found in the book from which the questions in conference have been taken, *is and must be admitted*. But, Sir, there is another remarkable test under which our accusations have passed. Among the invitations given to eminent individuals in the Church of Rome, one was addressed to Mr. O'Connell, allowing him to choose whether it pleased him to attend a public meeting, or if he preferred, a conference before certain select judges. This was Mr. M'Ghee's proposal. It was declined—I believe left unnoticed. There was another. Mr. O'Connell was member of a committee, on which the numbers of his friends or party predominated, and on which, beside Mr. O'Connell, there were

four distinguished Roman Catholics. It was proposed that Mr. M<sup>c</sup>Ghee should be examined before this committee, which had already turned its attention to the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, and that proposal was declined. However, another trial was undergone. An individual who was previously under examination, had declined answering a question on the ground that certain discoveries having been made respecting the Church of Rome, showing it to be now as intolerant as it ever had been in times past, he could scarcely answer the question without prejudicing the mode in which the discovery should be made known. Thus there was notice given of what was to be communicated. Subsequently Mr. M<sup>c</sup>Ghee was offered as a witness in this matter, and Mr. O'Connell and other Roman Catholic members were on the committee which rejected his proffered testimony. The offer having been declined, another witness (cries of "Who was he? Name, name.")—I have the reports of evidence here, and will read them with the names, if it be the pleasure of the meeting—delivered in a list of the books by which his statements were to be corroborated. He named the *Theology of Dens*. He was informed that he should get notice of the time when he would be required to produce his books, and the interval of a fortnight was suffered to elapse between the day on which *Dens* was named, and that on which his pernicious and abominable instructions were examined. In the mean time Mr. O'Connell had abundant opportunity, and needed no stimulus to prepare himself for his duty. The day came. The detestable tenets taught by *Dens* were displayed—the proofs that Romish bishops in Ireland have adopted his hateful volumes were produced—and under the silence, it might be said, of so many Roman Catholic members, these proofs of holding iniquitous and execrable principles were set in evidence against the Church of Rome, and are recorded in the proceedings of a parliamentary committee. Let this be remembered, and it will be admitted that those individuals who challenged inquiry under a council, where Mr. O'Connell, Mr. Wyse, Mr. Sheil, and Mr. Finn, with their friends, were to be the inquisitors, were not likely to shrink from discussion with any other champions whom Romanism in Ireland might array against them. But the best arguments on the side of the Church of Rome are before the world; her public professions, which Protestants are courted to

examine, can be viewed in comparison with the instructions intended for her own children, and of which Protestants may for ever be in ignorance ; and it is easy for a candid mind to deduce the proper conclusion.

Nor is it difficult, even from the selection which Roman Catholic advocates have made of topics for the defence of their church, to discern the character of this cause and its supporters. From the moment in which first my Rev. friend Mr. M'Ghee announced his discovery to the public, and that I became associated with him in the endeavour to make its importance known and felt, he and I have been the subjects of unceasing personal invective. Is it thus a good cause should be sustained? You have heard of that strange peculiarity in the Irish character, a phenomenon witnessed in no other land, that while the basest hireling assassin shall be effectually screened from justice, and shall find an asylum in every cottage which, covered with avowed guilt—with blood upon him—he approaches ;—the man who, overborne by the solemn constraint of conscience, shall denounce the murderer to justice, can have no hope of escaping the vengeance of an enraged people, but sees his name consigned to infamy, and his family, to the remotest relationship, exposed to vengeance and execration. That this unnatural wickedness is to be charged upon the Church of Rome might be perhaps not unreasonably asserted—but how has that Church acted in defending herself against recent accusations? In a spirit accurately corresponding to that by which her votaries in Ireland are governed. Mr. Coyne, the bookseller, who published *Dens*, is called a respectable man, and retains his profitable employment as bookseller to the College of Maynooth. Mr. Sheil, Mr. O'Connell, and the various other gentlemen who have pronounced the Theology of *Dens* to be pernicious and execrable, are loaded with honors and praise ; but Mr. M'Ghee and the individual who addresses you—we who did no more than prove that *Dens* was published agreeably to the statement of the respectable bookseller, Mr. Coyne—that the character of the work is such as other respectable Roman Catholics have pronounced it to be—we are considered fit subjects for every species of rancorous insinuation. Is not this in that spirit which prevails in Ireland—where the violator of all law is the “respectable man,” and where he who denounces the murderer is persecuted with every species of opprobrium and outrage ?

But, Sir, is it likely that this impolitic course of action would have been adopted, were a better course advisable? Would the advocates of the Romish bishops in Ireland have exhibited their intolerance, in the nature of their defence, if they could, by authentic and authorized documents, have exempted themselves from the charge of uncharitableness directly preferred against them? No, Sir;—they have addressed themselves to personal abuse, because they had no defence in fact or argument. Is it a defence to utter contumely against Dens—to call his book “exploded theology”—to tell us that he was a person of no note, or station, or repute, in the church of Rome? Is that a defence?—should we not be justified in calling it an aggravation? Why was a worthless theologian selected and pronounced the best and safest guide? For my part—I value not the rank which this pestilent theologian may have held. I care not how humble or how exalted he may have been. Call him worthless—vile—he was *the straw thrown up to shew how the wind blew*—how the current of Romish theology had set in. He is to be regarded, not in his own merit or worthlessness. He is to be looked upon solely because of the episcopal names inscribed upon him. It is not from Dens, but from the Romish bishops in Ireland, we learn the character of their church. We decide upon it, not by what an obscure or an eminent theologian has written, but by what its own bishops have approved.

There is no escape for them out of the difficulty in which they have become involved. What would it matter to them to deny Dens? We would go to the terms of their oaths as priests and bishops, and find them pledged to the maintenance of doctrines the most revolting and intolerant. The questions in conference and the guidance of Dens, prove that the foulest principles of Popery are not suffered to become obsolete and be forgotten. They teach us that even now the priesthood of Rome occupy themselves with discussions of the most abominable description—but for the flagitious principles which they are bound to embrace, we have better authority than even that of Dens. *We have the authority of their own oaths.* A Roman Catholic priest swears that he receives without any doubt, whatsoever has been delivered, declared, and defined, in the sacred canons and general councils. *He who has sworn this promise need not be fastidious about adopting Dens.*

I do not mean, after having so long trespassed on your attention, to cite many passages from these intolerent councils. I must, however, state generally one or two of the principles they teach. One Lateran council teaches, *that oaths are not oaths, but perjuries rather, which should prove prejudicial to the Church.* Another teaches, that it is a *positive duty of Princes to exterminate Heretics from their dominions*, and that he who neglects this cruel charge forfeits his subjects' allegiance, and the right to reign. The council of Constance is memorable for its conduct to John Huss, and its justifying the breach of faith which accompanied his cruel death. Let it be remembered that these are among the principles which priests swear they, without any doubt, receive; and which the Pope, in that day when he goes *to be adored*, for that blasphemous form is used towards him—(No)—yes, to be adored—swears that he will maintain and execute. It should be mentioned also that the Council of Trent, in language somewhat milder, but with, perhaps, sterner purpose, declares that if any man say that no severer punishments than denial of sacraments and exclusion from prayer should be employed to compel the religious assent of persons baptized, when they are come to years of reason, that man shall be accursed. Thus, does the Council of Trent, (the best, and among the mildest of Romish Councils,) preserve the full intolerance of those which have preceded—*and to all this the priests and bishops of Ireland have pledged themselves by a sworn engagement.*

After having taken this irrevocable engagement, I ask, of what consequence is it, that men, sworn to intolerance, shall speak charitable expressions? As it has been well expressed in a pamphlet\* of no ordinary power, "what the priests say to us is of little moment, if it correspond not with what they swear among themselves." What avails it to say, that priests speak gentle expressions, or utter strong denials of uncharitable doctrine, if we find that they have sworn without any doubt to adopt councils which teach the most intolerant, and while they give a qualified and guarded, we might say a contemptuous assent to the word of God, provided the fathers and the church approve, declare themselves, without qualification or reserve,

---

\* See "Popery and Priestcraft," by J. C. Colquhoun, Esq.

as pledged to every thing, however perfidious and intolerant, contained in all their canons and general councils? To what purpose is it for men who are thus sworn, or for advocates on their behalf, to disclaim their solemn obligations? They say we are not bound by these religious or intolerent principles. We reply they are *sworn to receive and observe them*.

To recapitulate briefly:—The church of Rome has pronounced sentence of death on all who dissent from her creed and communion. The book in which this and similar decrees of intolerance have been recorded, has been adopted as the guide and authority of the Romish priests in Ireland. It was not acknowledged, when, on three solemn occasions, bishops of the Church of Rome were examined by a parliamentary committee, or a royal commission, and questioned as to the books wherein the doctrines of their church could be learned. Under these suspicious circumstances, priests, sworn to preserve the intolerance of councils and canons, were instructed by a book embodying the foulest principles of a most rancorous theology. After this brief recapitulation, I leave to the learned gentleman, the opportunity of reply, of which no doubt he will make a good use. I ask him, as I have repeatedly and vainly asked of the rulers of his church, can he name any book of equal authority with the pernicious and reprobate work of Dens, in which the questions discussed in conference are answered in a charitable spirit. If there be any such—any in which milder doctrines are taught with authority, let it be named. If none such can be discovered, the Church of Rome in Ireland must retain the opprobrium of teaching and enforcing those doctrines which her priests and bishops are sworn to maintain, and which are preserved and propagated in the solemnity of their secret conferences.

Mr. CAREW O'DWYER\* then ascended the platform, and was greeted with loud cheering, intermingled with some hissing from the Tory party. He assured the meeting, that he rose to address them with feeling of great pain. He did not voluntarily present himself to

---

\* Mr. O'Dwyer's speech is copied from the *Morning Chronicle*: the *Brighton Patriot* introduces it by the following remark:—"We give this gentleman's excellent speech in his own words, as furnished to the *Morning Chronicle*."—*Brighton Patriot*, 22nd, December, 1835.



their notice. He was constrained to attend that meeting by a sense of duty. He was only a sojourner amongst them. He had visited their town in search of health, thinking too—vainly thinking—that in the bosom of English society he would find a refuge from the raucour and exasperation which were the bane of Ireland—a country where men, dressed in the sacred garment of Christianity, defiled its sacred precepts by practical irreligion, and outraged the God of charity by spreading ill-will amongst his creatures—(loud cheering.) One of the placards so profusely circulated in the town for some days had been placed in his hands, and in that vile document he found his own name set down as amongst those who had committed perjury by voting in Parliament in favour of Irish Church Reform; he also read in that statement a disgraceful misrepresentation of the tenets of the Roman Catholics which was reiterated in the speech of the Rev. Gentleman who had sat down, and which, to use the precise words of that gentleman, asserted that “Popery had for its object the extermination of Protestantism, and that in the opinion of the Roman Catholics all those not belonging to their Church were adjudged to have sentence of death pronounced upon them, and were to be considered as being under the Divine wrath.” I could not, said Mr. O’Dwyer, repress my determination to meet my calumniators on this platform; and relying on the love of justice and the fair play, which (I do not speak it in flattery) are the characteristics of a genuine English assembly, I have come to this meeting without the advantage of knowing, in the slightest degree, one individual of those present, if I except one whose appearance I now recognise, and whom I knew to have been a gallant and honourable opponent in the House of Commons. My first duty shall be to inquire, what is the object of this meeting? I am bound to give the Rev. Gentleman who preceded me, full credit for his positive assertion, that his missionary wanderings in this country are instigated by motives more honourable to him than the stimulus afforded by the rumour which has received his contradiction, of his having received two thousand pounds a year, by way of *viaticum*, from some Conservative fund. Yet I am persuaded the motive must have been lofty and cogent, indeed irresistible, which could have imposed upon him the painful task of making a martyr of his duty, and leaving his parishioners of Killyman to take care of themselves, devoting himself to such exhibitions as we have witnessed this day—

(loud laughter.) Possibly the Reverend Gentleman might yet receive a reward suitable to his services to his party, which would satisfy his pious ambition, and glorify the cause to which he had espoused himself. If a certain party returned to power, it was to be hoped that some persuasive member of the new Administration might overcome the objections of the Reverend Gentleman, and, by a gentle violence, force a vacant mitre upon his ample brow—(laughter.) But the object of this meeting—was it religion, or haply was it politics—(loud cheering, and cries from the Tories, “No politics!”) No politics! How innocent is that cry, proceeding from the gentlemen of “one class of opinions.”—(cheers.) What was the drift of the Reverend Gentleman’s long speech? Political, and nothing but political—(hear, hear, hear.) Yes, and it is the manly way at once to denounce the object of this meeting. I assert that this meeting has been convened to raise a No-Popery cry within the hearing of our gracious Sovereign. This place is now the resort of the titled and wealthy of the land. This meeting is composed largely of that class, who may be said to have great influence in high places. It was the design of this meeting, by the inflated assertion of Irish Protestant grievances, to act upon the alarms, the prejudices, and the interests of many who are identified with the existence of the present Church system, and to produce a re-action in the public mind in favour of an Administration, who were resolved to uphold the Irish Church in the integrity of its abuses—(loud cheering.) The resolution to which this meeting will come will have reference distinctly to this issue. I know not how to apply myself at this late hour, in refutation of the multitudinous assertions which have been made on the other side. They are all capable of positive contradiction. With respect to the dire calamity which had taken place at Rathcormac, and to which reference had been made, I must briefly say, that the statement of the Reverend Gentleman hangs loosely. If the peasantry, as he asserts, are willing to pay tithes freely, what occasion for spurring on their volition by the top of a bayonet? Roman Catholics pay tithes to a minister of a religion, from which they dissent, “freely?” The Reverend Gentleman must have jested. This voluntary compulsion, for so I must call the process which, according to Mr. O’Sullivan, the starving Irish people are so willing to undergo, resembles the military ardour that inflamed a party of handcuffed men, who, during the Peninsular war,

were met by a traveller on the high road to the Cove of Cork, where transports were in waiting to convey them to Spain. "Who are you?" inquired the traveller. "Why, then, plaze your honour, we are volunteers from the Tipperary Militia," was the quaint reply—(loud laughter.) It appeared from Mr. O'Sullivan's statement, that those who resisted Mr. Ryder in the collection of his tithes were strangers, and that his own parishioners were willing to pay him. By what accident, then, did it happen, that Mr. Ryder's parishioners were amongst the slaughtered?—(loud cheers.) Was there no *malice propense* in going out with a military party, armed and prepared for mortal combat?—was it becoming in a man having a pecuniary interest in the matter in dispute, to make himself an active party in this tithe levy?—(cheering.) But the firing commenced by mistake. There was no proof of this on the inquest; on the contrary, it was sworn that the military acted under orders. Well, then, comes the question which an Englishman, confiding in the administration of public justice, will eagerly inquire, "was there a prosecution of the parties implicated?" I am ashamed to tell the story of disgrace which attaches to the public tribunals in Ireland:\* they are all tainted by the virulence and abomination of party—(cheers.) There were bills preferred against certain persons charged with this murder.

---

\* Mr. O'Dwyer "is ashamed to tell the story of disgrace which attaches to the public tribunals in Ireland." The modesty of the learned gentleman he shares in common with the leading men of his party. It is a modesty which is remarkable for manifesting itself always at the moment when frankness and candour would have been more desirable, and for disappearing when consideration for the absent would have been somewhat creditable. Accusations against the administration of justice in Ireland were constantly urged in Roman Catholic meetings in that country, and charges of Orange partiality brought, and measures accordingly were taken by the Catholics to acquire precise information by which these could be sustained. After some time a Parliamentary inquiry furnished the opportunity of producing this information: and what was the result? Not a single act of political partiality was even alleged as having been committed by either Grand or Petty Jury at Assize. There was one case of injustice *alleged* by Mr. Sheil. A client of the learned gentleman was the sufferer. Damages were not awarded to the full amount to which Mr. Sheil thought him entitled. Now observe the facts: Mr. Sheil's injured client was, if not an *Orangeman*, at least what is termed an ultra, or high Protestant, his antagonist was a Scotch Presbyterian.—(See Commons Committee, March 3, 1825.)

The Grand Jury of the county ignored these bills—(cheers.) I dare not anticipate what the verdict of a Petty Jury might have been if the case had ever come before them; it might have been guilty, or it might have been innocent. I only state this fact, and let you draw the inference—that as the Grand Juries in Ireland are nominated by the High Sheriffs, and as the High Sheriffs are invariably men of strong politics, there is no confidence reposed by the public in these bodies. There is one fact notorious in this case, that before the assizes had commenced it was generally understood that the bills of indictment would be ignored—(hear, hear.) I shall dismiss this affair by giving a contradiction, as strong as I am enabled on my own personal belief, to the statement of Mr. O'Sullivan, that Mr. Finn attributed the casualty in this instance to Mr. O'Connell. I am satisfied that Mr. Finn himself will correct this statement whenever it shall meet his observation.\* The Rev. Gentleman has confounded the

---

\* We extract the following passage from the well-known letter of Mr. Finn, a Roman Catholic Liberal and Reformer. It is dated Carlow, February 9, 1835: "The melancholy homicides consequent on the collision of the peasantry with the King's troops at Rathcormac, form for you an inexhaustible theme of expatiation, by which you may exasperate the poor people in every part of the kingdom. Now, I shall demonstrate to these poor people, that by one audacious and truculent speech, delivered at a public dinner at Cork, you may have been the proximate cause of these homicides. Not very long before this public entertainment had been provided for you, a meeting of Protestants was held at Lord Bandon's, where it was reported in one of the public journals, that the number collected on the occasion amounted to eight thousand. When your health was proposed at the Cork dinner, you answered the compliment by delivering one of those speeches so peculiar to your own taste, and your own character; an oration composed of "shreds and patches," of braggadocio, lying, and vulgar personalities. You alluded, in that speech, to the meeting held at Lord Bandon's, and the paltry numerical strength of the Protestants. You said that, "the *garsoons* (the boys) of Cork, would drive the eight thousand Protestants into the sea." The driving of those eight thousand Protestants into the sea, could not be effected, I presume, "by constitutional agitation, and passive resistance." You well know it could not be so effected, and that it would require muskets, bayonets, and artillery, to drive those Protestants into the sea. But when this speech of yours was conveyed, through the medium of the press, to the different towns and villages in the county of Cork, and read on the ensuing Sunday to the wondering peasantry, by village pedagogues, what a high opinion must they not have entertained of their own invincible prowess, when

terms of the oath taken by Roman Catholic Members of Parliament. He says that they swear to defend the settlement of Church Property.\* This is a misrepresentation of the words; but they do swear not to subvert the Church Establishment—(hear, hear.) Now, in the

the "garsoons" of Cork could drive eight thousand Protestants into the sea, without guns, baynets, pikes, or cannon. Oh, thought the poor people, if the boys of Cork could drive eight thousand Protestants into the sea, without fire-arms, sure we can drive away the tithe collectors in the same manner." You offered no explanation of your words; you did not say you spoke in metaphor. You cared not whether the lower classes put a true or false interpretation on your braggart menaces; you left those menaces to be adopted in their obvious meaning by the people, and dearly have they paid for listening to the *craven* council of so lying an oracle. It is manifest by the report taken at the Coroner's Inquest, that the patience of the officers and soldiers engaged at Rathcormac, was tried to the utmost limits of human forbearance—that the poor people struck both officers and soldiers with sticks and stones—broke their arms, and wounded some of the party. But then the contents of your speech were uppermost in the minds of the tithe debtors. If the boys of Cork could kill eight thousand Protestants by the breath of their nostrils, why should not the peasantry at Rathcormac be able to annihilate a small military force with sticks and stones? *It is clear, as is the sun in the firmament of heaven, that your cowardly vaporing at the Cork dinner led to the lamentable catastrophe at Rathcormac.* Will you now, most distinguished patriot and unrivalled moralist, inform the public, what was the amount of the professional fee that accompanied the Rathcormac case, on which you pronounced a solemn and deliberate opinion, that if something was done, (and what that something was I do not now recollect,) the peasantry had been "all murdered?" But this I recollect, that the time I read this case and opinion, I discovered in the latter the same proportionate *quantum* of equivocation and circumstantial falsehood, with which every production of yours is so abundantly interlarded. You will not deny, that you received on that occasion a large professional fee from the relatives of the slain peasantry. 'Put money in thy purse,' said Iago, 'at any hazard;' and this you have done—extracting gold with remorseless avarice, from the very blood of those men, who had been consigned to premature graves, by adopting the drunken calculations of a heartless demagogue.

\* The learned gentleman is in error. Mr. O'Sullivan's statement was more comprehensive. It was that the Roman Catholics are sworn to maintain *all* property, ecclesiastical, of course, included. We hear much about calumniators of the Roman Catholics of Ireland—let the public judge who they are. Mr. O'Sullivan says, that there are Roman Catholics in Ireland who swear in sincerity, and, if permitted so to do, would honestly fulfil their engagement. What does the Roman Catholic champion say? Let his words as reported by himself, instruct the reader. We are satisfied to rest the case against the party of the learned gentleman on *his defence*.

opinion of some persons, the Church and tithes are convertible terms; but I trust that there will not be found in this meeting any Protestant so little imbued with the spirit of his religion, as to imagine that its establishment is identified with the existence of tithes—(cheers.) I would not feel myself at liberty to vote for the subversion of the Church, but I do feel myself justified in voting for an alteration of the tithe system. Mr. O'Sullivan conceives it no grievance that a Roman Catholic population should pay tithes to a Protestant Church. He says that the tenant on entering into the possession of the land is apprised, that it is subject to the payment of tithes, and that if there were no tithes payable the landlord would place on his land an additional rent. Mr. O'Sullivan also states, that tithes are property granted to the Protestant Clergy on the conquest of Ireland. The first of these statements is a great fallacy. Every\* burden upon the land is a burden upon the occupier—every

---

\* Mr. O'Dwyer argues, that for the tenants' benefit tithe should be abolished, because every burden on the landlord incapacitates him to some extent, from lightening the burden on the tenant. If there be any force in this argument it should have a further application, and the landlord's debts of every kind—to butcher, baker, tradesmen, annuitant, &c. &c., should be remitted. This is precious reasoning, no doubt, and very attractive to the commercial interest. To show how Englishmen reason, we copy the letter of a Whig and a Reformer, who seems to think—but let the letter speak for itself. It is from the present Earl Fitzwilliam to his Irish agent:—

Grosvenor-place, March, 10, 1832.

Dear Challoner—The information you have imparted to me, that a meeting has been held in one of the townlands of the parish of Kilcommon, with a view to withhold the tithe and church cess, has caused me great regret. I was in hopes that the inhabitants of our part of the country had too deep a sense of the importance of respecting the rights of property, and of obeying the laws, to permit them to contemplate, what I can call by no other name than a scheme of spoliation and robbery. It seems that the occupier proposes to withhold payment of tithe, &c.; but let me ask, what is it that entitles the occupier himself to the land which he occupies? Is it not the law which sanctions the lease, by which he holds it? The law gives him a right to the cattle which he rears on his land, to the plough with which he cultivates it, and to the car in which he carries his produce to market; the law also gives him his right to 9-10ths of the produce of his land; but the same law assigns the other tenth to another person. In this distribution of the produce of the land there is no injustice, because the tenant was perfectly aware of it when he entered upon the land; but in any

reduction of taxation increases the ability of the landlord to assist the tenant, and it is assuming too much to say, that because a tenant, by abridging his own comforts, is able to pay both rent and tithe, an abolition of the latter would go into the landlord's pocket. Then, as to the nature of tithe property: it cannot be said, that the Protestant Clergy hold tithes by a better title, or on a different foundation than they were held by the Roman Catholic Clergy before the Reformation. When the tithes were transferred from one clergy to another, they came charged with all the incidents appertaining to them before the change of possession.\* In Catholic times, the tithes were applied to the quadripartite objects of sustaining the dignity of the bishop, repairing the church, maintaining the clergyman, who was of the religion of the people, and feeding the distressed poor—(cheers.) The case now stands thus:—the clergyman is not of the religion of the people from whom he exacts tithes, and he appropriates to himself, to the exclusion of the bishop, the church, and the poor, the tithes which he

---

forcible change of this distribution, there would be great injustice, because it would be a transfer of property from one person to another without an equivalent; in other words, it would be a robbery. The occupier must also remember, that the rent he pays to the landlord is calculated upon the principle of his receiving only 9-10ths of the produce. If he were entitled to the other 10th, the rent we should call upon him to pay would be proportionably higher. All our land is valued to the tenants upon this principle; but if tithes, &c. are swept away without an equivalent, we shall adopt a different principle, and the landlord, not the tenant, will be the gainer.

Yours most truly,

MILTON.

\* This argument, derived from the transfer of tithe, is utterly unsound. The entire property of Ireland changed masters. We enter not into a discussion which must be far too extensive for our limits. The simple fact is, the property in Ireland was transferred to Protestants, and those who received grants were subjected to the encumbrance of tithe, which is a charge on the Protestant landlord—not on either Roman Catholic or Protestant occupier. A charge amounting, at an average, to about eight-pence per acre. The character of the Roman Catholic tenantry, Mr. O'Dwyer described, when he intimated that they would promise to pay tithe, because of their necessities, with no intention to keep the promise. It is only necessary to add, that they take an oath with similar sincerity, and we need no graver accuser than their advocate.

receives—(cheers.)\* There can be no doubt, however, that tithe is public property, and that as it has been dealt with before by Parliament, so may it again—(cheers.) The Rev. Gentleman has said, that the real question now is, "Shall the Protestant or Catholic religion predominate in Ireland?" I shall here observe, that I think the predominance, by which term I understand the ascendancy of Protestantism, should be reduced in Ireland; and that so far as the Catholics are to be regarded, they do not desire nor seek ascendancy; and that sooner than permit a Catholic ascendancy to be established in Ireland, if it were attempted, I, for one Catholic, would sacrifice my life, rather than endure it—(cheers.) The Rev. Gentleman emphatically asked, "What was Protestantism?" and there was a response from some individuals in the meeting not altogether complimentary. I shall not adopt the answer to which I allude. I believe there is to be found amongst the professors of Protestantism much piety, much charity, and as great an abundance of human virtue, as one can meet with elsewhere. I must add, that I believe that there is mixed up with the politico-religious agitation that is encouraged in Ireland, under the name of Protestantism, a great deal of what is, in its nature, truculent, mercenary, and insincere. I cannot forget, that one of the most animated appeals made to the Protestants of Ireland to hold the Church firmly within their grasp, enforced the advantages which the establishment presented as a comfortable provision for the younger sons of the Irish gentry—(cheers.) The Reverend Gentleman defined Protestantism to mean liberty of conscience, and a free circulation of the Scriptures. If this be Protestantism, I avow myself a Protestant. I should say that this is Catholicity—(much cheering.) I shall prove it. I know that there is much misrepresentation of the practice of Catholics in circulating the Scriptures. I do not profess to be a proficient in controversy, but I have read the rule on this subject, contained in what is called

---

\* This quadrupartite division of tithe was proved never to have had effect in Ireland or in England, since the adjustment of property under which possession is now held. It has been further established, that even on the Continent, the division was not of *one-tenth* of the produce, but that agreeably to what was accounted the import of the *old law*, four-tenths were exacted and allocated to the specified uses.



“The Index,” I have not the rule by me—but I can substantially quote it.\*

Mr. O’Sullivan here proposed to read the rule referred to, but the meeting were disinclined to hear the Rev. Gentleman again.

Mr. O’Dwyer resumed:—As the object of Mr. O’Sullivan was to exhibit Popery as it was practised in Ireland, possibly the meeting will allow me to refer to the regulation of the bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland. But to hear the allegation of Mr. O’Sullivan on this subject, one would imagine that Protestantism always encouraged the circulation and general perusal of the Inspired Volume (cries of “So it has.”) If that be the opinion of “the gentlemen of one class of opinion,” I refer them to the statute, the 33rd and 34th of Henry VIII., passed eight years after the Pope’s authority was abolished by act of Parliament, in which it was stated that the indiscriminate lecture of the Holy Volume had taught ignorant men to discuss the meaning of the Inspired Writings in alehouses and taverns, till heated with controversy and liquor, they burst into injurious language, and provoked breaches of the peace. It was enacted, to remedy these evils, that the Bible should not be read in public, and that in private families the reading of it should be confined to lords and gentlemen, and families of noble or gentle birth. If any artificer or labourer opened the Sacred Volume, he was subject to a month’s imprisonment—(laughter.) So far for Protestantism on this subject. I shall now read the regulation of the Irish Catholic Church, as stated in the exposition of faith published by the Bishops in the year 1826 :—“The Catholics in Ireland of

\* The facts were these:—Mr. O’Dwyer turned to Mr. O’Sullivan, and inquired if he would admit that the Congregation of the Index was an Ecclesiastical authority. Mr. O’S. said, that he was not so sure that Mr. O’Dwyer would admit it to be such; but begged that Mr. O’D. would read the entire rule. Mr. O’Dwyer stated, that he had not the rule, but only an extract, and that he would rather call on Mr. O’Sullivan to read it. Mr. O’Sullivan said that it was the 4th rule of the Congregation of the Index, and that he should repeat it. Mr. O’Dwyer said that he could not accept the Rev. Gentleman’s repetition of it; he must have it read. Mr. O’Sullivan said that he had the book which contained it, and that he should be happy to read it. Mr. O’Sullivan then produced a book to read the note; but Mr. O’Dwyer continued, and at the close of the speech opportunity was not given to Mr. O’Sullivan to read the note.

mature years are permitted to read authentic and approved translations of the Holy Scriptures with explanatory notes, and are exhorted to use them in the spirit of piety, humility, and obedience. The clergy of the Catholic Church are bound to the daily recital of a canonical office, which comprises in the course of a year almost the entire of the Sacred Volume; and her pastors are required on Sundays and on festivals to expound to the faithful, in the vernacular tongue, the epistle or gospel of the day, or some other portion of the divine law." This is the practice of the Catholic Church in Ireland. There now remains one charge of the Reverend Gentleman, to which I come, passing over without notice a variety of important matter, which I should advert to if there were time. Mr. O'Sullivan has stated that the Catholic religion encourages the extermination of Protestantism. I am sorry that the Reverend Gentleman should have gravely asserted the prevalence of a doctrine which he must know—he cannot be ignorant—has been repeatedly repudiated and solemnly abjured on oath by the Roman Catholic body. He may refer me to the acts of informal Councils, in bygone and intolerant times, when the Catholic Church, linked with the Governments of Catholic States, dealt with heresies as civil offences, and may have countenanced persecution. If ever these practices were pursued, they have been long since abjured. If it were an argument to justify such abominable crimes, I could point to Protestant persecution of Catholics, when I am taunted with Catholic bigotry. But on what authority does Mr. O'Sullivan rest his charge?—On the authority of Dr. Dens?—Who is Dr. Dens? Why, he was a mad Flemish priest, and is no more to be considered an authority amongst the Catholics than any of our grandmothers. Dens was an individual, and the Catholics should be no more held participators in his doctrines, than the Protestants should be accounted as sharers in those doctrines of Paley, Bacon, and Hume, who justified persecution, or in the practical brutality of Myles Coverdale, to whose memory so much honour was lately paid, who could burn Joan Boucher, an old idiot, because she could not agree with him in his reading of the Holy Word—(cheers.) When Mr. O'Sullivan stated that the Bishops of Ireland, with Dr. Murray at their head, approved of the sentiments contained in Dens' Theology, he should have had the candour to have added, that Dr. Murray had indignantly disclaimed any participation in the atrocious doctrines of this book.

The meeting were to judge of Popery in Ireland. Let their opinions then be formed, not upon the statement of Mr. O'Sullivan, but upon the recorded doctrines of the Catholics themselves. I will refer again to the exposition of Catholic doctrine, from which I have before quoted:—"The Catholics of Ireland not only do not believe, but they declare upon oath, that they detest as unchristian and impious the belief, 'that it is lawful to murder or destroy any person or persons whatsoever, for or under the pretence of their being heretics,' and also the principle, 'that no faith is to be kept with heretics.' They further declare on oath their belief, that 'no act in itself unjust, immoral, or wicked, can ever be justified or excused by or under the pretence or colour that it was done either for the good of the Church, or in obedience to any ecclesiastical power whatsoever;' 'that it is not an article of the Catholics, neither are they thereby required to believe that the Pope is infallible;' and that they do not hold themselves 'bound to obey any order in its own nature immoral, though the Pope or any ecclesiastical power should issue or direct such an order; but, on the contrary, that it would be sinful in them to pay any respect or obedience thereto'"—(loud cheering.) Mr. O'Sullivan had connected the name of the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin with intolerance. If the meeting knew that eminent divine—if the meeting were acquainted with the amenity of his disposition, the charity of his life, the mild unobtrusiveness of his demeanour, which made him the object of regard of the most distinguished Protestants in Ireland, I need not occupy your time in defending that Prelate from the imputation of approving of the atrocities of *Dens's Theology*. But I feel the necessity of demonstrating to this meeting what are the real sentiments of the Catholic Church. I have cited for you the opinions of the Roman Catholic Bishops, as a body, on the subject of persecuting those who differ from them in religion. Let me now follow out this line of argument. Let me refer, not to an official document, but to the familiar words of the Roman Catholic Archbishop himself. I now refer to a sermon delivered by him in his own church, in aid of the funds of a society of an unusual character in Ireland, a society instituted for the relief of the distressed without distinction of religion—(cheers.) The extract is rather long, but I trust to your kindness to permit me to submit it to you—(cries of "Read, read.") Mr. O'Dwyer then read

the following extract from the sermon, which was listened to with much attention, and produced a great impression on the meeting—

“ Another circumstance regarding this institution which has a distinguished claim upon our notice, is the genuine liberality with which it embraces within the sphere of its charitable solicitude, all the children of sorrow, without the least distinction on account of religious opinions. Real and deep distress is alone the object of its care ; and wherever that object attracts the eye, the discriminating features of religion are wholly lost in the melancholy prospect. In the true spirit of charity it beholds in the suffering victim a man and a brother, and the measure of his wants is the sole measure of its compassion. When will this heaven-born spirit be infused into every bosom, and banish hence those unnatural antipathies which have spread so many miseries among us? When will the fiend that delights in discord be no longer able to awaken those religious animosities, which extinguish in the hearts of brethren all the tender charities of life, and sever every tie by which their gracious parent intended to unite them in affection? Of all the passions that degrade the human breast, religious rancour is the most unjust; it brands as an enemy the man who never injured, and it does so merely for his conscientious obedience to what he believes to be the voice of God, calling him to the pursuit of happiness and immortality; and what is, if possible, more abominable still, an alleged zeal for the honour of that God and of his religion, is made the pretext for this unchristian feeling. If a brother be in error, where nothing less than his own eternal happiness is at stake, surely religion can inspire no sentiment in his regard but that of tender pity for his misfortune. Like the good shepherd of the Gospel, it will endeavour to reclaim its wandering child. It will hold up the torch of truth, to throw a glare on the precipice to which the path of error may conduct him; and, if every human effort fail, it will recommend him still to the mercies of that God, whose creature he is, and by whose judgment only he must live or perish. But in the mean time, if he languish in distress, it points to him, with unabated tenderness, as to a brother—it suggests the example of the good Samaritan, and whispers those accents of peace which were taught by its Divine Founder, ‘ Go thou and do in like manner.’ In a country like this, still bleeding from the wound which religious discord has but too deeply inflicted on its

bosom, how consoling the view which this Institution exhibits! Its members of every creed, rallying with one heart and one soul round the standard of charity, to mitigate the pangs of sorrow wherever they are endured; confining their professions of faith within the walls of their respective places of worship; and rushing forth with emulous ardour to practise that primary duty without which all religion is vain. 'For this,' says an Apostle, 'is religion pure and undefiled before God and the Father, to visit the fatherless and widows in their tribulation.'—James i. 27. Mr. O'Dwyer resumed:—Is this persecution?—is this intolerance? Will you form your opinion of our faith on the words of our own church of the present day, or on the words of the accredited accuser of the Catholic body, who stands beside me—(cheers?) I have done. I have trespassed long upon your patience, although I could say much more in reply to the speech which you have heard, but I am willing to rest my case on the refutation which I have given to the speech of Mr. O'Sullivan. I beseech you to give this day some demonstration of your feeling in favour of Ireland—some sign of your disapproval of the system of faction, which it is the object of the Orange party to revive and perpetuate in that distracted land. This evidence of your sympathy, and such indications, will convince the people of Ireland that you do regard them as fellow-subjects, and fellow-christians, and that you feel for their sufferings, and are anxious to redress their wrongs. I told you early that I was a Roman Catholic and an Irishman. I shall now add, that I am one of those who, at a period not remote, was opposed to a continuance of the Legislative Union between this country and Ireland. I am free to confess, that my opinions upon this point have undergone much modification, if not a total change. I witness daily proofs of the growing sympathy of the English people for their Irish brethren; and I have every confidence, that if the will of the English people prevail, there will be ample justice done to Ireland. Let the Irish Church be reformed, not destroyed. Let it be made commensurate in its establishment to the duties which it has to perform. This will be one great move towards justice for the Irish people; because, under the protection of the Irish Church, there grow up a thousand other abuses. If the Irish Protestant Clergy now suffer distress, they are victims to the policy of the ferocious leaders, to whom they have

committed the conduct of their cause. I sincerely pity their distress—(here a person at the Tory side laughed out.) I care not whether the person who expresses his incredulity believes me or not. I am sure I would go as far to assuage the individual suffering as he would. If I see a man struck down and bleeding in the highway, I shall not stop to ask him if he have been attacked by robbers, or if he have been himself a spoliator. My first duty, as a Christian, is to bind up his wounds, and minister to his necessities—(loud cheering.) In conclusion, I conjure you to repudiate all apprehension of Protestantism being in danger; and when you read details of bloody transactions, inquire into the causes, and, making due allowance for the wrongs of the uneducated, ask if no injury, no unmerited injustice has provoked the revolting deeds. With reference to the abolition of tithes, the question has been virtually settled by the Legislature, which has said in effect, “If this system cannot be maintained but at an immense outlay of English money, English soldiery, and Irish blood, it must abolished be.” I trust that the meeting will arrive at some resolution demonstrative of its feeling of indignation at the attempt made this day to delude them—(cheers.) Had it been composed only of persons professing “one class of opinions,” no doubt it would have been resolved that Protestantism was in imminent danger, and they would have come to other conclusions of a similar nature. If I have not resorted to councils, canons, &c. so fluently as the Rev. Speaker, I hope to be excused, since I feel that the precepts and practice of living bishops and ecclesiastics are of more value than those musty documents; and if the Rev. Gentleman moved for a return of persons persecuted by Catholics, a similar account could be rendered of those who have suffered from Protestant persecution; for persecution ever was the result where a too intimate union took place between Church and State. In conclusion, he was grateful for the attention with which he had been favoured, and he fervently hoped, that the strongest and best feelings of sympathy would exist on behalf of the people of Ireland.

Mr. Colquhoun said that two assertions which had been made respecting the conduct of the Committee, induced him to address the meeting, to state that, in the first place, no political motives had led the Committee to make arrangements for the meeting; in the second place, that no attempt had been made to render it of an exclusive

character; on the contrary, the tickets had been left at the public libraries, and were given to all applicants; and so little desire was there to exclude the public, that he and another gentleman had applied for the Town-Hall, which had been refused. He, however, would speedily put to the test on which side lay the disposition to shrink from a public discussion; and he, therefore, would make to all of them this offer: that if they would procure the Town-Hall, throw its doors open, and appoint their chairman, guarantee the preservation of that order and decency, without which discussion could not take place, the Committee would be ready to maintain before the public, and against all who controverted it, this position, "That the doctrines and practices of the Romish Church, as now existing in Ireland, are intolerant and persecuting, and that Protestantism is in danger."

It will be observed that the object of the intention of the meeting, as they professed in their placard, was either to pass resolutions condemnatory of the Rathcormac massacre, or to dissolve the meeting. Instead of effecting *either of these*, their resolution, as stated in the *Brighton Guardian* was—"That it is inexpedient for this meeting to entertain any question as to the religious differences between the Protestants and Catholics of Ireland, as introduced in their present state to this meeting." So ended a meeting composed of the enemies of Protestantism.

# CORRESPONDENCE

OF THE

## REV. J. N. GOULTY.

---

WE introduce this by quoting the following passage from the *Morning Chronicle* and their Brighton correspondent of the 23rd December, which shows *their understanding* of Mr. Goulty's position, and of the following proceedings:—"On the termination of the proceedings of Tuesday, Sir T. Blomfield, as chairman of the Protestant Committee, applied to the Commissioners for permission to hold a meeting—a really public meeting, in the Town-Hall, to discuss 'Popery in Ireland,' and to show 'that Protestantism was in danger in Ireland.' The Commissioners, contrary to the expectations of the "Protestant Committee," granted the use of the Town-Hall. *The Rev. Mr. Goulty, a Dissenting Minister, expressed ON THE PART OF THE LIBERALS, THEIR READINESS TO DISCUSS THESE MATTERS.*"

After this let our readers turn to No. IV. of the subjoined correspondence, and perceive from this, and No. VI., the readiness of the Liberals, and Mr. Goulty to discuss these matters.

The *Brighton Guardian*, a liberal paper, has said "The acceptance of the challenge, *so ostentatiously announced*, was scarcely communicated, ere they meanly withdrew their previous pledges, and absconded from the arena, from which they had previously trumpeted forth their sanctimonious valour. We agree with these men, however, in their concluding remark, that great and important good has been effected, *hypocrisy* has been detected and unmasked, and will receive its due reward."

When the public have read the annexed letters, they will be at no loss for an application of these words.



## No. I.

LETTER OF THE REV. G. N. GOULTY, TO SIR T. BLOMEFIELD, BART.

"MY DEAR SIR T. BLOMEFIELD—I heard some vague reports that another Protestant meeting was to be held in Brighton early in the next week, and have been looking for some official notice of it, as I understood that it was to be really public, and in the Town-Hall. Upon inquiry, this afternoon, I am informed that the holding of another meeting depends upon the challenge being accepted. I do not know exactly what the challenge specifically is, or to whom it is given. Will you be so kind as to inform me on these points, because if it extend to all, whether Protestants or Catholics, on the danger to Protestantism from Popery, I shall, if allowed to bring with me two supporters on the platform, be most ready to accept such challenge, provided my friends can come at the time proposed: and I will lose no time in making application on hearing from you. Yielding nothing to any man in my attachment to Protestantism, and my disapprobation of Roman Catholic errors, I am nevertheless the unflinching friend of freedom of opinion, and the avowed opponent of all Ecclesiastical domination. With the highest respect, and with Christian affection,

"I am, yours truly

"Brighton, Dec. 19, 1835.

"J. N. GOULTY.

"To Sir Thos. W. Blomefield, Bart."

SIR THOMAS BLOMEFIELD, BART. TO THE REV. J. N. GOULTY.

"68 Regency-square, Dec. 19, 1835.

"MY DEAR MR. GOULTY—I have just received your letter, and should be very willing to answer its contents had I the means or authority to do so. As this is not the case, I would beg you to address to the Protestant Committee such a letter as you would wish to lay before them, and if you will send it to me, I will undertake it shall be delivered.

"Ever truly yours,

"T. W. BLOMEFIELD."

REV. J. N. GOULTY TO SIR THOMAS BLOMEFIELD.

"Saturday evening, half-past 10 o'Clock.

"MY DEAR SIR THOMAS—I lose no time in replying to your letter just received, and only regret that it is too late to send to you this evening. I have nothing more to say than what my note to you this afternoon expresses; and therefore I shall be obliged by your laying that note before the Protestant Committee.

"Waiting a reply,

"I am yours truly,

"J. N. GOULTY.

## No. II.

"On the forenoon of Monday, December, 21, the above letter of Mr. Goulty was laid before the Protestant Committee, and was answered by their referring Mr. Goulty to their address, published on Monday evening, of which the following is the extract referred to;—

"The Committee have received a letter from the Rev. J. N. Goulty, which, while it expresses that he yields nothing to any man in attachment to Protestantism, and disapprobation of Roman Catholic errors, yet offers to controvert one of their assertions, viz. that there is danger to Protestantism from Popery. The Committee entertained the sincere and honest intention of having the subject fully and publicly discussed; but, from the information they have since received, they have been compelled to come to the opinion that, in the present excited state of party feeling, such a meeting cannot be held in the Town-Hall without the probability of that uproar and violence, which would defeat the calm investigation of truth."

## No. III.

J. C. COLQUHOUN, ESQ. TO THE REV. J. N. GOULTY.

"13, *Marine-square*, Dec. 21, 1835.

"REV. SIR—As a reply was addressed to your letter of the 19th, by the Protestant Committee to-day, referring to a printed statement, by which you will observe that your offer of a *public* discussion is declined, and as I was unfortunate enough not to concur with the other members of the Committee in this part of their address, I think it my duty to inform you, that Mr. O'Sullivan has been absent from Brighton since Saturday, and is consequently altogether unaware of the steps thus taken by the Committee, in whose proceedings, indeed, he has taken no part. I have felt it due to him to make you this private communication without consultation with the Committee, as I was the individual through whom the offer of discussion was originally made.

"I have the honour to be,

"Your obedient servant,

"J. C. COLQUHOUN."

## No. IV.

J. C. COLQUHOUN, ESQ. TO THE REV. J. N. GOULTY.

"13, *Marine-square*, Dec. 22, 1835, *Eleven o'Clock*, a. m.

"REV. SIR—As Mr. O'Sullivan returned to Brighton last night, I have, without delay submitted to him the enquiry and proposal which were addressed in your letter of the 19th to Sir T. Blomefield. I am now able to state, on the part of Mr. O'Sullivan, that the position which he has from the commencement maintained before the public, and which it was his object at the late meeting of the 15th inst. to establish, was, *that the Church of Rome in Ireland is intolerant and persecuting, and that it entertains the purpose of extirpating Protestantism.* This position Mr. O'Sullivan is at all times pre-

pared to maintain. Should you be inclined publicly to controvert it, he will be prepared to engage in the discussion with you. He has no objection to your receiving the assistance which you desire of two supporters. You will feel with me, that if such a discussion is to take place, it is essential that it should be conducted with order and decency, that both sides be heard, and that no interruptions from violence or clamour be offered. With this view, certain preliminaries must be arranged; the rules of discussion must be fixed—the persons who are to take part in it named, and a chairman able to enforce order selected. Mr. O'Sullivan is ready to name, on his side, some gentlemen who will act as a Committee for making the arrangements; but as these gentlemen are unconnected with Brighton, they cannot undertake to guarantee that decency, without which such a meeting ought not to take place. They will, however, be ready to confer with any other Committee named by you, for the purpose of making the necessary arrangements, so constituted as to be capable of affording to them adequate assurance that the meeting will be conducted with tranquillity and order. Waiting the favour of your answer,

“ I have the honor to be, Rev. Sir,

“ Your obedient servant,

“ Rev. J. N. Goultly.”

“ J. C. COLQUHOUN.

---

V

J. C. COLQUHOUN, ESQ. TO THE REV. J. N. GOULTY.

“ 13, *Marine-square*, Dec. 23, 1835.

“ REV. SIR—As I perceive in the *Brighton Guardian* of this morning, observations reflecting on that part of the proceedings of the Protestant Committee of which I was unable to approve, and as it is necessary that the real state of the facts should be laid before the public, I shall feel obliged by your informing me what answer you are disposed to make to my letter of yesterday. Should I receive no answer from you before six o'clock this evening, I shall feel myself at liberty to publish the correspondence which has taken place.

“ I have the honor to be, Rev. Sir,

“ Your obedient servant,

“ Rev. J. N. Goultly.”

“ J. C. COLQUHOUN.

---

No. VI.

“ *Brighton*, Dec 24th, 12 o'Clock.

“ REV. SIR—I received a verbal answer from you through the bearer of my yesterday's note, that I might expect from you a reply to my letter of the 23rd instant, by six o'clock yesterday evening. At six o'clock no answer from you reached me, nor up to this time has it arrived. I am very un-

willing to take any step which may close the doors to that public discussion which the friends of truth have so much reason to desire. At the same time you will perceive that, while I have no intimation from you, I ought not consent to leave the matter longer in suspense. I therefore take the liberty of bringing the matter once more before you. If you are disposed to engage in a public discussion, on the terms stated in my letter of the 22nd, you will have the kindness to intimate this to me before five o'clock this afternoon. The matter has been so long before you that a decision on this point is easy, and a simple intimation to me of your intention will be sufficient. If, however, I receive no letter from you before the hour specified, I shall conclude that you decline engaging in this discussion, and that you abandon the proposal made in your letter of the 19th instant. The friends of Protestantism who concur in the view stated in my letter of the 22nd, will, in that event, feel themselves at liberty to pursue the course which, under such circumstances, may seem to them expedient.

I have the honor to be,

“ Sir, your obedient servant,

“ J. C. COLQUHOUN.

Rev. J. N. Goulty.

[“ To the above, no answer was received.”]

---

“ It will hence appear that the Rev. Mr. Goulty, the minister of an Independent congregation at Brighton, was at the public meeting on the 15th inst., and joined Mr. O'Dwyer in questioning Mr. O'Sullivan as to the intolerance of the Church of Rome. On that occasion Mr. Goulty received an answer which silenced him. Mr. Goulty also heard Mr. Colquhoun's challenge, when the position offered for discussion was clearly defined, viz.— ‘ That the doctrines and practices of the Romish Church in Ireland are intolerant and persecuting, and that Protestantism in Ireland is in danger.’ On Saturday, Dec. 19, after an interval of some days, Mr. Goulty wrote to the Protestant Committee, stating that, if allowed two supporters, he would be ready to controvert that assertion. On Tuesday, the 22nd, he was informed that his terms were acceded to, and that Mr. O'Sullivan was ready to meet him in the discussion. Mr. Goulty then receded from his offer—did not support it—did not withdraw it—but took refuge in silence. On the 23rd he rallied his spirits so far as to promise an answer in the evening, but in the evening his spirits failed, and *he again took refuge in silence.*

“ From this silence\* it is assuredly not our object to draw him. We leave him in the position which he has chosen. But we would offer to the Protestant public a remark called forth by the proceedings of Mr. Goulty. Is Mr.

---

\* See note at the end.

Goultly to be taken as a specimen of the ministers of his body?—of that class of Independent Dissenters? We understand that they highly regard him. Then observe the conduct of these Dissenting Ministers. They ally themselves in politics with the Roman Catholic party, who are now powerful in Parliament. A public statement is made in the presence of one of them, that the principles and practices of that party are persecuting, and that they persecute Protestants in Ireland. An Independent Minister, professing to love Protestants, and to teach men to cherish Protestant truth, comes before the public and questions this statement. He returns after some days' deliberation to the charge, and offers publicly to controvert it. Now, we ask this gentleman, and through him his brother ministers, one question. Is he aware of the facts on which this statement rests? Has he ever read the doctrines now enforced on the Priests of Ireland? Has he ever read the works of theology now taught at the College of Maynooth? Has he ever seen the extracts from the sermons of the priests, proved by sworn witnesses in Irish Courts of Justice to have been delivered? Has he ever read the addresses, which the priests *on their oath* admit that they delivered? Has he ever read the evidence taken before the Parliamentary Committee of last Session? Has he read any part of that evidence? Has he read the newspaper extracts of that evidence? Has he read any one, or any part of one of these documents—any single portion of the mass of public and Parliamentary evidence on this question? If he has, then with what aspect can he rise in a public assembly, and question that, which, from that evidence, *he must know*, admits of no question. If he has not, how can he, in utter and culpable ignorance of the whole subject, presume to offer an opinion, which can have no effect, but by the sanction of his authority as a Protestant Minister, to mislead the public into ignorance equal to his own? If, after stating this rash opinion, he has since found it to be groundless, and that he is unable to support it, (and this is evidently Mr. Goultly's case) why has he not the manliness to come forward and avow it? If he made his error public, why does he not make equally public the truth? Or is it that Mr. Goultly and his brother Dissenting Ministers know well the intolerant and remorseless character of Popery, and are well aware that the Irish Protestants are now writhing and sinking under it, but *because a union Pwith the apists is necessary to their own political advancement*, they sacrifice to this Protestantism and liberty of conscience, content to leave these under the feet of the persecutor, provided that persecutor will assist them into power? Let the public watch this union, draw their own conclusions, and by them regulate their practice.

---

“ NOTE.—We regret the less the delay in printing, as it enables us to inform our readers that Mr. Goultly has at last broken silence. His answer in his published letter is this:—‘That the original offer of discussion was understood to be made by the committee, my acceptance of the offer was declined by the committee, and so announced by them to the public.

Here I conceive the matter ended.' With Mr. Colquhoun or any such unknown individual, Mr. Goulty declines communication. Now, we would remind Mr. Goulty that the original offer of discussion was made by Mr. Colquhoun himself, in Mr. Goulty's hearing; that it was well known that the Protestant Committee had no concern in the matter, except that they were to make arrangements for the discussion. The person who was to engage in the discussion on their side, was Mr. O'Sullivan. Now, the same individual, Mr. Colquhoun, who made the first offer of discussion, repeated that offer to Mr. Goulty; and Mr. O'Sullivan, who was to have engaged in the discussion, at first declared himself ready to meet Mr. Goulty. With regard to the committee declining Mr. Goulty's acceptance, Mr. Goulty is aware that he received Mr. C.'s first communication before he had the answer of the committee. But waiving all these, which are very trifling matters, how stands the fact? That Mr. Goulty professed himself ready and anxious for a public discussion on the Saturday, and on Tuesday found it convenient to shrink from it. What would Mr. Goulty have said if the Protestant Committee, on receiving his acceptance of their challenge on Saturday, had answered that their challenge had been before the public since Tuesday, and that no one had noticed it—that Mr. Goulty was therefore too late, that 'he was *personally unknown to many of the committee*, and that they conceived the matter ended.' What would have been thought of this lame and halting excuse of the Committee, and what will be thought of the excuse of Mr. Goulty? We cannot felicitate Mr. Goulty upon his answer. His silence showed his difficulties. His answer shows them more strongly. But we can explain to the public why Mr. Goulty accepted the offer of discussion on the Saturday, and withdrew his acceptance on Tuesday, *On Saturday Mr. O'Sullivan left Brighton*, and the Brighton Liberals raised, through the papers, their shouts of triumph over the fugitive orator. Out came Mr. Goulty from his retreat, and shot forth his note to the committee. On Monday Mr. O'Sullivan returned, and Mr. Goulty sunk back into silence. Mr. Goulty, however, is not the only one who has been placed in a like predicament, and for his consolation we shall tell him a short story. In the days when Mr. Pitt (afterwards Lord Chatham) electrified the House of Commons, there was a forward and insignificant member who never ventured to speak in Mr. Pitt's presence, but used sometimes to attack him behind his back. On one occasion, after a very powerful speech Mr. Pitt was leaving the House, and had just reached the door, when this bustling gentleman started up and said, "I rise to answer the Right Honourable Member." Mr. Pitt, hearing the words, returned calmly to his seat. The poor member, struck with confusion, sat down and remained silent—but, in this, wiser than Mr. Goulty, he did not break silence again.

"We recommend this anecdote to Mr. Goulty, and we part from him with two words of advice—not to challenge a discussion when he is unprepared for it, and not to judge of other men's temper by his own."

## TO THE EDITOR OF THE BRIGHTON GAZETTE.

" SIR—The *Brighton Gazette* of last Thursday having been the medium of publishing Mr. Colquhoun's letters to me, I request that you will allow the following to be inserted in your next paper.

" It is perhaps become desirable to explain why I did not reply to the communications of Mr. Colquhoun. The fact is, that I did not consider any reply necessary, as I had no wish to be drawn into a correspondence on the subject in question with any stranger.

" The original offer of discussion was understood to have been made by the Committee, who, through Sir Thomas Blomefield, applied for the use of the Town-Hall for that purpose, at the Commissioners' Meeting on the 17th instant. My acceptance of that offer was declined by that Committee, and so announced by them to the public. Here I conceive the matter ended.

" Any subsequent proposals made by an individual, personally unknown to me, inviting discussion on quite different propositions, and any anonymous papers I do not consider myself called upon to notice.

" I am Sir,

" Your obedient servant,

" J. N. GOULTY.

" Western Road,  
" Monday, Dec. 28, 1835."

# GREAT PROTESTANT MEETING

AT

## CROYDON,

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 30TH, 1886.

---

THE last meeting in the year was held at Croydon, on Wednesday, December 30th. The following report is taken from the *Surrey Standard*, January 2nd, 1886.

On Wednesday one of the most important and influential meetings that for many years past have assembled in Croydon, was held in the spacious ball-room of the Greyhound Inn, for the purpose of promoting subscriptions in aid of the funds for the relief of the Irish clergy. Twelve o'clock was the hour appointed for the commencement of the proceedings; but long before that hour a number of ladies, and many of the most influential landed proprietors of the neighbourhood, had assembled in the room. Indeed, the object of the meeting created the deepest interest throughout every class of the inhabitants, and it is much to be regretted that the place of meeting, large as it was, could not afford accommodation for all, whose sympathy with the sufferings of the Irish clergy, or anxiety to hear and see the great champion of Protestantism, the Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan, whose presence added a double interest to the proceedings of the day, drew them to the meeting. At twelve o'clock, Captain Alsager, M.P., was called to the chair. The honourable gentleman was greeted with much enthusiasm. Amongst those present we observed Henry Alexander, Esq., J. S. Carter, Esq., James Keen, Esq., the Venerable Archdeacon Hoare, the Rev. Henry Lindsay, the respected Vicar of Croydon, the Rev. Edward Miller,



the Rev. George Cales, the Rev. John Fisher Hodgson, the Rev. William Hoskins, the Rev. J. B. Ferrers, the Rev. Mr. Marsden, the Rev. J. C. Bessitt, the Rev. Thomas Browne, the Rev. John Saundhurst, Lord Viscount Encombe, grandson of the venerable Earl of Eldon; John Carbonell, Esq., Samuel Skinner, Esq., Daniel Richard Warrington, Esq., President of the West Surrey Conservative Association, Thomas George Knapp, Esq., R.W. Eyles, Esq., John Keen, Esq., George Drummond, Esq., Charles Longfield Crowley, Esq. Alfred Raven, Esq., Joseph Reed, Esq., Newman Smith, Esq., Samuel Skinner, Esq., Thomas Keen, Esq. George Dupin, Esq., Charles Chalfield, Esq., and Messrs. Russell, Crafton, Thomas, Turner, Kayley, Ennend, &c. &c.

The presence of the Archbishop of Canterbury was very generally expected, but the right reverend Prelate did not attend. The Rev. Mortimer O'Sulliver sat beside the Chairman.

The Chairman then rose amidst loud cheers, and said, elected to the honourable distinction of chairman upon the present occasion, I consider it my duty, in the first place, to call your attention to the purport of the present meeting. It is of all others the most congenial to the feelings of Englishmen. Our fellow-subjects, ministers of our Established Church in Ireland, are in distress—not from any improvidence of their own, but from the evil designs of men, who withhold from them their just rights, and wish to annihilate that church altogether, and we are assembled to hear their state, and contribute towards their relief. It is a noble sight to see a good man struggling with adversity, and rising superior to it; but there is another sight of higher estimation in the sight of God—a good man coming to relieve him. And this is an assembly that God will bless, for we are met to deal out bread to the hungry, and to satisfy the afflicted soul. And what a blessing it is that we are enabled to do so. And where does that nature exist, which comes forward more frequently, more nobly, to relieve distress, either foreign or domestic, than this favoured land; yet I must forbear, “for charity vaunteth not itself.” But let us trust in Him that he will not permit a single fabric of that Protestant church to be annihilated, while one precious soul remains, and may be saved by the pious exertions of its minister. With respect to the immediate objects which lay claim to your contributions, they will be brought before you in a much abler manner than

I can do it, and I only request your calm and deliberate attention to the different speakers who may address you.

Lord ENCOMBE then rose and was loudly cheered. He said that, concurring as he did in the objects of the meeting, he felt that in coming before them, he did not appear as if that were the first occasion upon which the object they had met to assist, had not been stated before. Little remained to be said upon the subject, as the distress under which the Irish clergy now sunk was generally known, in consequence of the statements made at the several meetings that had taken place, and through the medium of the public papers. He regretted that some person, who from residence was acquainted with Ireland, had not been selected to move the resolution with which he had been intrusted, for he was spared witnessing those scenes of wretchedness which were so prevalent in Ireland. It was true, that Ireland was wretched and miserable, but she was not so because of the will of nature, nor because of England, but she owed her misery to those disturbers of the peace, who, for their own purpose, agitate and inflame the populace, urging them on to the commission of crime, while they craftly screen themselves from the halter, which they most rightly deserve. The hands of men in high station had not actually been red with blood, but men in the higher walks of life, and even members of the senate, had openly declared their intention of not submitting to the laws of the land. And when such declarations were made by such persons, was it to be wondered at that the populace, following their example, should outrage the peace of the country? He felt that in speaking in behalf of the distress of the Irish clergy, that he should avoid as much as possible all political topics, but yet he thought that what he had said was intimately connected with the subject. The noble Lord, after some further remarks, called upon the meeting, in the proportion that they estimated the blessings of their religion, and the advantage of their own pastors, to come forward and secure similar blessings for Ireland. His lordship, after moving the first resolution, resumed his seat amid loud cheering.

The Rev. HENRY LINDSAY, Vicar of Croydon, in rising to second the resolution just moved, said he considered it due to many of his parishioners and neighbours to state thus early to the meeting, that if their names did not appear in the list of that day's subscriptions,

it was not because they felt no interest in the subject before them; but because they felt so warm an interest as to have anticipated the present meeting, and sent their contributions at once to the committee in London. If their forward liberality detracted from the apparent amount of contributions from this neighbourhood, they had at least the satisfaction of knowing that it would be applied to the same object. He (Mr. Lindsay) had also been requested by the Rev. John Courtney, of Sanderstead (who had forwarded to him 5*l.* in aid of the subscription) to express his regret at being prevented by illness from attending the meeting. It is not my intention (continued the Rev. Gentleman) to trespass long upon the valuable time of this meeting, but, considering my connexion with this extensive parish, I cannot be altogether silent on a subject which, I thank God, is exerting a deep and painful interest among all classes of persons in every corner of the land. I trust, however, that in the few observations which I have to offer I shall avoid all unnecessary introduction of politics; for, except where the interests of religion have been involved, I have never mingled in political strife at all. Having read the resolution, which he had undertaken to second, Mr. L. observed, that whenever a call was made upon the sympathy of others on any occasion of distress, the first question generally asked respected the facts of the case. But these, in the present instance, had been already brought before the public in so authentic a shape, that he conceived it would be scarcely necessary at present to enter into any minute details of suffering. It might not be difficult, he said, to excite our feelings, both of pity and indignation, by a description in no degree exaggerated, of the deep and extensive distress under which the Irish clergy are now labouring. It might not be difficult to refer to numerous instances where they were reduced to such a state of utter destitution as to feel uncertain from day to day whether the morrow might not find them and their families without so much as bread to eat. The Rev. Gentleman then proceeded to mention generally the distresses to which they had been exposed, and read the following extracts from letters and printed documents:—

“ My Lord, I feel unwilling to go much into details of particular suffering; nor, in fact, is it in my power, nor in that of any other individual, to give a faithful and full picture. There is, even at this moment, so sensitive a feeling on the point, so shrinking a delicacy, so strong a reluctance, to own the

extent of privations actually submitted to, that although our good friends and the public have been made acquainted with numerous striking instances, I am fully persuaded that the whole truth is not, and will not, be ever known. Men of every station, and rank, and age, are suffering—are wasting away with anxiety and trouble; yet they do not repine or complain: their greatest solicitude seems to be to keep their miseries secret.

“ I have been thirty-three years an humble minister in God’s church, constantly resident; I have been obliged to sell my furniture and stock to pay debts, and to obtain a temporary supply of the necessaries of life, reserving merely that portion required for a bed-room and sitting-room. I have been obliged to permit my wife, who became so alarmed at the state of the country and threatening dangers, that she was losing her health, to leave Ireland. I have found it necessary to send out six of my seven children, one being too young, as tutors and governesses, thankful to find board and lodging for them. I have been necessitated to take my son’s name off the college books, being unable to pay his bills. I am burdened with debt, and unable to pay my creditors—debt incurred for the necessaries of life, and due before total inability to pay became apparent. When called from home, or to visit or catechise in my parish, I feel it quite necessary, for my personal safety, to carry arms. My glebe-house is closed up, as if in a siege; at night it is necessary to have bolts, and bars, and bullet-proof planks to the windows and doors! Here is discomfort and suffering! I may write, that I have suffered the loss of all things. My life, through the sparing mercy of God, remains; though that life has been several times threatened, and previously to our last persecutions was attempted to be taken, a bullet having been fired at me on my glebe-land!”

Now, the question (the Rev. Gentleman continued) naturally occurs, what has occasioned all this suffering? It is not that God, in his mysterious providence, has seen fit to visit that land with famine, for the present distress is limited to one class of men. It is not that this particular class is really destitute of property, for the existing laws assigns them an income which, would place them far above the reach of want. But the law is paralysed—it is for the moment prostrate beneath a superior force. It is not, Sir, that these men have forfeited their legal rights by any unfaithfulness in the high and holy office with which they have been intrusted as ministers of the gospel; for it is admitted on all hands, that there is not to be found in any nation on earth a more zealous or devoted body of Christian ministers than the clergy of the Established Church in Ireland at the present crisis. Sir, it is in vain to disguise the fact—they are suffering merely because they are Protestants—simply and solely because they are Protestant ministers—ministers of that Church which our forefathers first purified, and then died at the

stake rather than abandon. And will their Protestant descendants permit the stronghold of Protestantism in Ireland to be overthrown, without an effort to relieve it? The enemies of gospel light, by cutting off the supplies, may hope, perhaps, to force the garrison to surrender, under the pressure of starvation. But I ask again, will the Protestant population of England permit so deplorable a result? Never, Sir, I trust, never, so long as they have one morsel to share with their suffering brethren. Never, so long as they have a hand to stretch forth for their assistance, or even a breath to breathe out in prayer to the Lord their Saviour. They are already forward, with self-denying zeal, to throw succours, as it were, into the distressed citadel—to enable it to hold out still, “until this tyranny be overpast.” It has pleased God, in his infinite wisdom, to subject our clerical brethren in Ireland to the fury of the oppressor. He has seen fit to try them, for a season, in the furnace of affliction; but we trust, that he will bring them forth from the fire a still purer—a still more glorious Church, having been made, in some degree, “like the Captain of their Salvation, perfect through sufferings.”

THOMAS KNAPP, Esq. was then called upon by the chairman to propose the second resolution. He said, “Friends and neighbours, it falls to my lot to address a few words to you; fortunately for me but a few, and I do so willingly. I am requested to move that subscriptions be received at this meeting in aid of the fund now in course of collection for the relief of the Irish Clergy. Were I capable of addressing you at any length I should be brief, knowing how much better those around me are qualified to discharge such a duty. I shall only add, that the Irish, and especially the clergy, are our brothers—they are in want, and it is our *duty* to assist them. Loud cheers followed this brief, but most effective appeal.

The Rev. MORTIMER O’SULLIVAN then rose, amidst applause, which continued for some minutes. He commenced by expressing some complimentary remarks on the discretion and zeal of the Central Committee, and proceeded thus:—It may be confidently affirmed—and it is an assertion painful to make—that the annals of human persecution and suffering present no parallel to the afflictions which a most deserving body of men have long been enduring for Protestant principle and for conscience-sake in this age of freedom, and in an integral part of the British empire. That the representa-

tions of these sufferings are true, it is unnecessary to prove. England gives assurance that she believes them, and that there is no suspicion of their having been exaggerated to serve base party purposes, is testified by the generous zeal with which all parties have responded to them, and by the unanswerable fact, that the royal Majesty of England, followed by the chosen advisers of the crown, by his Majesty's cabinet ministers, has authenticated the complaints made in behalf of the Irish Protestant clergy, of their severe and unmerited distress. It is not necessary for me, then, to prove to you the correctness of the representations which have been made respecting the sufferings of the Irish clergy, and which describe their extreme severity. For their truth, you have the most unsuspecting vouchers. For the extent of suffering endured, you have this distressing confirmation, that a body of men—in most instances by birth, in all by the habits of education, gentlemen—all acquainted, it may be said, without exception, with those more delicate feelings which consciousness of independence inspires, and which the influences of refined society render jealously sensitive—all, too, familiar with the happiness which is blessed in giving, and long unprepared for the not less edifying, although less directly gratifying office, of being the object of commiseration and bounty—that this body of educated and charitable men have felt the pressure of calamity so sore and subduing, as to have accounted it mercy and blessing to be sustained upon the Christian contributions of brothers in the faith, who sympathise in their affliction. When men long used to independence—long confessed to have been ready and glad to distribute—consent to be so relieved, it is not necessary to prove to any man capable of understanding the feelings of the independent, that the unpractised supplicants must have been overtaken by very sore distress, and that the calamity by which they have been bound down has smitten where its wound was of keener anguish than a solitary sufferer can experience.

Yes, it is true, that the afflictions of the Irish clergy are heavier and sorer than, in a land like this, any body of men should be permitted so long to endure. They have not, perhaps, been in set-form *proclaimed*, but they have been formally and actually *placed* beyond the law's protection. There is scarcely one among that estimable body of men, whose duties have been assigned him in a Roman

Catholic district, who does not feel that he stands in jeopardy every hour—who does not go forth, as if the brand of Cain were upon him, and has not frequent occasion to interpret scowling looks and muttered menaces, as if they pronounced him devoted to death, and complained that there had not issued forth the mandate for his destruction—There is not one in whom, when he proceeds on the duties of his sacred calling, it does not demand an exercise of faith to subdue the agitating fears which tempt and harass him; while he knows not, but imagines, what may be the trials and the terrors of the sad inhabitants of his home—what insult, and outrage, and agony may have invaded that house of mourning. Few sorrows incident to man's condition can equal those; and when the sharpest privation is endured amid such circumstances of peril and dismay, who can exaggerate in imagining or describing the afflicting consequences?

And what crimes have been imputed to the men who are thus cruelly treated? What are the arguments by which abandonment of them to their sworn and forsworn enemies, is sought to be excused or palliated? The crimes are faithfulness and zeal in their sacred vocation.—The arguments are—the atrocities of the merciless men who afflict them. For these offences, by reason of these arguments, have they been given up to their enemies, and subjected to persecutions not less cruel than those under which the outcasts of Israel mourned in the darkest season of their sorrow. The fifth year is now closing in, since the vial of this woe was poured out. Within the period of its influence, what unpunished crimes have been perpetrated?

The rolls of Martyrdom are not yet exposed that all men may read with reverence, but any who have searched, need not to be informed that no equal portion of the history of favored England, not even of that dark time when the flame, which dying martyrs prophesied should never be extinguished, was lighted up, is inscribed with the traces of more revolting bigotry and crime, or more nobly graced with record of Christian heroism and endurance.

I could not, perhaps, at this moment, repeat the names of more than thirty individuals who have suffered from open violence—of whom some have been driven from their homes, and compelled to seek a precarious subsistence in temporary employments within those realms;

or to enter upon a new life in foreign lands, and find there the protection which the laws of their lost country could no longer afford them; some have continued to dwell in peril and privation; some have been consumed by sorrow or have died by the hand of the assassin.

This is, perhaps, a scanty calendar of crime and suffering, but where, except Ireland, can there be found a country in which it would be thought so—Within the space of five years many Irish clergymen driven by violence and threatening from their homes—interrupted and compelled to forego the discharge of solemn duties; assaulted even at the grave in those affecting prayers which recommend hope to the mourner, and solemnise the thought of eternal things to the groups assembled to pay the last honour to departed humanity; many forced to seek a shelter beyond the far atlantic; some condemned to bear there a life of feebleness and pain, in the helplessness which cruel wounds have brought upon them—five, in open day, many passers-by consenting to their deaths, deliberately murdered,—where, except Ireland, is the region in which this would not be accounted a wonderful and horrible thing? What must the condition be of those persecuted and faithful men who are appointed to abide still in a land where such a catalogue of cruelties, which would once have been accounted sacrilegious crime, can have its place naturally in the chronicles of the times, adding nothing to the alarm which prevails, and creating no feeling of amazement?

It may be said that topics such as these are not pertinent to the occasion which has assembled you here. You are met to deliberate on the most effectual means of relieving the distresses of the Irish clergy, rather than to be disturbed by the recital of outrages of which they have been the victims. This, no doubt, is the truth.—Your purpose is one of mercy—but be assured that the expression of British sympathy will conduce not more to strengthen and comfort the sufferers, than to awe the cruel men who have so wantonly pursued them. They have been bold and vindictive, because they thought the church forsaken. When they see that you are interested in the fortunes of virtuous men, they will learn to wear the semblance of respect for them. It is necessary, also, that you should have full proof that the object which the persecutors of the Irish clergy have at heart, is, in truth, the destruction of the church; and this proof



is afforded in the obduracy with which the persecutions of some of the most amiable as well as the most exemplary men have been conducted.

Shall I detail some instances? I knew an individual well, the vicar of a moderate preferment, a man of most unostentatious life, and of ever active benevolence; one whose habit it was to maintain the most cordial intimacy with the Roman Catholic Clergyman of his neighbourhood—to call for his assistance when looking over the list of his debtors for tithe, that by his advice he might abate his claim, or exempt the poor from charge—and to be guided by his suggestions, so as that when the scrutiny was ended, the priest has said, “there is not one now named in your list who cannot better afford to pay than you can to exonerate him”—I know that this benevolent man’s life was twice, I believe more than twice, attempted to be taken, and that, disappointed of their purpose, his persecutors way-laid and wounded dreadfully, with intent to murder, his virtuous and most unoffending son.

I knew one who lived plainly and lived poor, although in possession of what, had he hoarded, would have become affluence,—one whose conversation, indeed, was in heaven, and who, in the exercise of the faith that worketh by love, incurred a heavy debt, which it kept him poor to discharge, that, in a season of famine, his Roman Catholic parishioners might have bread to eat: in the bright day he was murdered.

I knew one to whose door, frequent although my visits were, I seldom approached without having the opportunity to see that some deed of mercy and charity was being performed. He has not been exempted from bitter distress. He has not even been spared from threats and violence. He has been harassed by nightly alarms. He has been wasted by sore privation. With a family of not less than eleven individuals, unprepared for such hardships, he had for their maintenance, the produce of a potato-field and one milch cow. The cow was seized—because of his inability to discharge a debt—seized by a man who was his debtor to three times the amount which he demanded. The clergyman remonstrated, but in vain. His cow, upon which such a family was dependant, was impounded. The extremity of penury urged him to seek redress, and he seized in return the cow of

the debtor who had so unjustly afflicted him. But what was the result? The people assembled and effected a rescue. It was in vain he expostulated—in vain he appealed to their justice and their humanity, told of his pining family, and of the unjust severity of which they were made the victims; all was vain! he but made mirth for his barbarian tormentors. I thank God he and these like him have not appealed in vain to you.

I knew another—he has been withdrawn from extreme mental suffering—his death will not be set down among those which violence has caused—but assuredly the man who had been subject to repeated acts of outrage, had been brutally assaulted and most severely wounded, had been driven with his wife and children from the sphere of his duties and the shelter of his home, had been thus, advanced in life, with the encumbrance of a family yet unable to assist in providing for their wants, constrained to seek every species of honest employment by which he could provide for them a morsel of bread, and who had by his enforced toils and unabating anxieties, provoked an access of brain fever, and died under it—the sin of that man's death lieth at the door of those who drove him forth, unhoused, unprovided, upon an unkindly world. I had seen him once, when every tongue praised his kind and conciliating manner—when his Christian eloquence was the theme of general eulogy. I had heard that his character and his meritorious exertions had advanced him to preferment. But when last I saw him he was an exile, and was strenuously exerting himself to obtain the means of continuing an insurance on his life, the only provision he had been able to make for those whom his death would otherwise leave portionless. When the last report reached me, it was of the utter destitution of his widow and orphans.

It is not possible that any training can harden men's hearts so as that they shall contemplate without pity or remorse such sufferings as these. They have not been wantonly inflicted—they have a definite end and purpose. Deprive the Protestants of Ireland of their ministers; let these faithful men be driven away by fear or force;—the expected result will follow—Protestantism will withdraw from Ireland. To effect this great end, rather than to satiate a cruel thirst for vengeance and for blood, the Protestant clergy have been so sorely persecuted.

It strongly confirms this view of a momentous subject to recollect what was the condition of the Protestant church when its ministers were less systematically persecuted, and what was their character in that day, when their enemies exposed themselves to charges from which man most sensitively shrinks, in order to exercise their hostility against them. You hear, then, of abuses in the Church of Ireland, as having, in times gone by, materially impaired her usefulness. You have only to look to the authentic records of parliamentary inquiries to perceive that the progress of improvement has been rapid; and you have only to read a valuable paper which lies on the table before me, the testimony of individuals, competent to know, and whose political bias would rather temper than quicken the warmth of eulogy—such individuals as the present Lord Chancellor of Ireland, Mr. Fowell Buxton, and many others of similar views,—in order to feel that the reports favourable to the Irish clergy are such as cannot be denied or disputed. When you find, therefore, that the improvement of the Church has been followed by a fiercer excess of persecution, you cannot hesitate long before you are led to the conclusion that it is this improvement by which the persecution has been provoked. But no space is left for conjecture. Doctor Doyle—the well known Doctor Doyle, assented to the praises of the clergy, acknowledged their benevolence, and assigned as a reason for the cruel outrages which were directed against them, that they had become more strongly possessed with a zeal for religion, and that they had become very desirous to make proselytes, and had entered into the activities by which they thought their desire likely to be effected. Then the hidden rage of Popery broke forth, and those who could not be overcome in argument were to be silenced by death, or subdued and banished by unceasing perils and persecution. It was upon this occasion that that defence of abandoned promises and pledges so frequently urged in latter days was most solemnly promulgated. Dr. Doyle was reminded of assurances given by him in 1825, that concession to the demands of the Roman Catholics would be attended with the happiest consequences to the peace of the country, and even to the security of the Established Church. His expressions were recited, in which, on behalf of himself and his party, he promised all that a legislature could desire for

the security of established institutions, and he was asked how he could reconcile such promises with the conduct he had hitherto pursued. What was the purport of his answer? It was that had that measure which was called Catholic Emancipation, (and which was in truth a surrender of a great multitude of men to spiritual despotism,) been carried in 1825, he would have observed the quiet course he had undertaken to do; but that the delay of four years made such an alteration in the circumstances of the country and the case, as to account for the alteration in his conduct. And yet he had repeated his promises. He had subsequently to the year 1825, directed the attention of the head of his Majesty's Government to the engagements he was willing to take, and the securities he had offered. Further, he had pledged a solemn oath, by which he ratified his preceding engagements, and the whole body of his people had bound themselves by this oath to provide the fullest security for property as settled by law (church property of course included), and not to disturb or subvert (not the Protestant religion merely, but) the Protestant Church Establishment. When we remember such engagements, and listen to the flimsy professions of those who say that the benefits of Catholic emancipation were forfeited by delay, and that the measure which would have been good in 1825, was, four years afterwards, pernicious, it is difficult to preserve one's tranquillity and not be betrayed into expressions not the most respectful towards those who can offer such excuses. I, for my part, never heard a suitable illustration of them except one, which is hardly suitable to the gravity of this occasion; but which, relying in your indulgence, I will venture to submit to you. An English gentleman purchased a lobster, which on being used was found to be stale, and which proved detrimental to the health of those who had indiscreetly partaken of it. When next he saw the fraudulent vendor, he called to her and said, "You a hawker of fresh lobsters; what could you mean by deceiving me as you did? You have occasioned serious illness in my family." "Well!" said the brazen-fronted merchant, "Well," said she, "what would you have? Who is in fault? Wasn't I crying it by your door this fortnight; and if you did not choose to buy it when it was good why should you vent your anger on me? Just thus had the Relief

Bill been hawked as fresh and good, year after year, before the legislature, and just thus, when it has produced injurious effects, the hawkers acquit themselves. Their excuse does them little credit. Such was the excuse of Dr. Doyle. Emancipation, he promised, should free the church from all danger; and when it was found that it had only encouraged animosity and assault, then he cries it was not granted sufficiently soon. Not sufficiently soon, although it procured the security of an oath. But the truth is, the Church was assaulted, because its influence was dreaded. Of this dread Dr. Doyle had once given a significant intimation. It was in that remarkable letter in which he proposed that the Churches of Rome and England should be united; declared that the differences between them were such as admitted of easy adjustment; but, also added, that, in the same proportion as the Church in Ireland was improved, in the same proportion as the residence of the clergy was enforced, in precisely the same proportion would the people's hatred be augmented. What could this mean? The clergy were, he declared, amiable and benevolent, they performed many acts of kindness, and yet the people would hate them more passionately when acting thus, as their benefactors, than when remote from them. How is the prediction to be understood, but by believing that Romish Ecclesiastics would exert themselves to accomplish it; that they would inspire distrust and hatred, as the only antidote to the effect, which a godly life and conversation was likely to produce on the wretched people who have been too long resigned to their influence?

With such facts, resting on such evidence, can it longer be denied that the Protestant Clergy in Ireland are sufferers for the faith? If there be a doubt remaining on the subject so clearly exposed, it will be dissipated by calling to mind the terms on which these persecuted men were offered a remission of their sufferings. If they would only solicit of the legislature to apply the revenues of a third of the parishes in Ireland to other than Protestant uses, a proportion of the income of the remaining two-thirds would be secured to them. This proportion they should receive, guaranteed by the state, and without liability to inconvenience or casual deduction. To the loss of income which they were personally to suffer, however unjust the deduction must be considered—however injurious the precedent, they did not

object. They were not in conscience responsible for the act, and knowing the difficulties and alarms with which their cause was surrounded, they patiently submitted. Why did they not extend their submission to other matters, and purchase relief by subscribing to the terms which were proposed to them? Think for an instant what these terms were, and judge how they were bound to consider them. They involved, as was clearly shown in a speech to which no answer was attempted, a surrender of resources indispensable to the due agency even of the Church, and they involved the assertion of a most sinful principle. Accede to the terms, and the Church must become impoverished, so as to insure its decay. Accede to the terms, and the principle on which they were offered is recognised. They would record a natural protest on the part of Great Britain against the endeavour to turn men from what had been termed an idolatrous and damnable religion.

Mr. O'Sullivan continued at some length a statement of the various attempts made to legislate for the Church of Ireland, and the character of those to whom the Irish clergy had attempted opposition. He gave a sketch of the history of the Church in Ireland, and rendered it clear, that its abuses had arisen out of circumstances which had been altered, and that they were in modern times rapidly disappearing. He showed that since the Legislative Union, the most beneficial results were experienced; that the Churches and globe houses had been more than doubled—that residence had been enforced—that unions had been dissolved, and pluralities abolished—that all these important improvements resulted from the efforts and suggestions of the Irish Bishops themselves; not called upon by the legislature to reform, but anticipating the proceedings of Parliament, and soliciting powers to introduce the reforms under which the Church had been prospering. He showed, also, that the vice of pluralities had ceased, in consequence of the resolution adopted and acted upon by the Lord Archbishop of Armagh, Primate of Ireland, not to allow of any clergyman's holding two benefices. It was these improvements, he argued, and the increased efficiency in the Church which was the result, to which the hostile efforts of her enemies should be ascribed. They persecuted because they found her powerful. The terms of relief offered manifested the same persuasion. The Irish

Clergy had not objected to the various reductions of their income and the taxes imposed on them. They thought it unjust to impose on them these various mulcts, they thought it injurious to set precedents of such a character; but feeling that difficulties and dangers surrounded their cause, they rejoiced that conscience was not concerned so as to require that they should give opposition; and although many Ministers of the church in undisturbed districts in Ireland were subjected to very severe losses, no one sent in a remonstrance against the injustice of the contemplated or completed measures. Matters were altogether changed, when it was proposed to divert the Protestant revenues to purposes contemplated by the Church of Rome. To this, the Clergy of a Protestant Church could not in conscience accede. Their church was founded, not for those only within its pale—it was designed to hold out light also to the professors of another religion. To say that it should be reduced to the most limited establishment, which the wants of its own members demanded, was to say, that the provision made by our ancestors for instructing Roman Catholics, should be withdrawn—it was to enter a national protest against making an endeavour to convert them. On this point the Rev. Speaker dwelt for some time. He referred to the statement of Lord Encombe, that Ireland had received Popery through the intervention of England, and insisted on the guilt of England, if her interposition should continue the influence of that false religion. He knew that there were some who would say, that conversion of the Roman Catholics was hopeless—that the Protestant Church had had a trial of three centuries, and had been unsuccessful; but he ventured to say, that those, at least many of them, who were ready with such assertions now, were to be found six years ago among those who insisted that up to that period the Church of England never had a fair trial, and who proposed that Roman Catholics should have their claims granted, and be admitted into the legislature, in order to procure a fair trial for the Protestant religion. It was rather hard, he argued, to grant high and dangerous privileges in 1829, for the purpose of giving Protestantism an opportunity of exercising what it never had an opportunity to do, its powers of winning affection; and now to affirm, that it had had the opportunity for more than three centuries, and to cut it down simply because in six years of the

stormiest contention ever remembered in Ireland, it had not succeeded largely in making proselytes. The facts, he said, were, that the amplest encouragement was afforded to give good hopes, that the efforts of the Protestant Clergy in communicating a religious education to the Roman Catholics must prove successful. And with such encouragements to animate them, and with the great principle to be maintained, that the Church was to be a light to enlighten all the inhabitants of the land, it is a matter of thanksgiving, that the Irish Clergy of the Established Church did not formally renounce the duty and the power of endeavouring to win to a true church, the professors of a religion, which has been declared superstitious and idolatrous. After reasoning at some length on this subject, Mr. O'Sullivan proceeded :—

I have entered into these explanations because I feel that it would be doing much wrong to the persecuted clergy in Ireland, were your compassion solicited in their behalf only because they are in sorrow. If you grieve for them that their distresses are severe, you will not fail to remember also that in their endurance of sore calamity, there is the grandeur of a voluntary self-renunciation. Literally, they endure for the faith. If you can credit the promises of those who most complain against their patient suffering, there never were men more disinterested than the Irish clergy. Their enemies proclaim towards them peace and good will. The permanence of the Establishment may be shaken—the borders of the church may be contracted : but individuals now existing—they, it is affirmed, shall not suffer in their temporal interests. Nothing more is demanded of the present race of clergy in Ireland than that they shall record their approbation of the scheme to weaken the ministration in the church, and they may look for a reward, which they shall have, in the restored protection of law, and the assurance to them of competence and comfort renewed within their afflicted households. They seek a better reward. They had been zealous for Christian truth, and had availed themselves of every advantage to be found in the circumstances wherein Providence had placed them in order to make known the truth as it is taught in the Holy Scriptures. The word had not gone forth and returned to them profitless. Many a heart had felt its power—many of those to whom the souls of men are merchandise trembled for their endangered craft



—many of those who have shown the state of their cause and the character of their system by the nature of their defence. The Protestant legislature of Great Britain concede to Irish Roman Catholics all that they demand—the ample privileges of the constitution. The Protestant clergy and men zealous for the faith in Ireland recommend to Roman Catholics the best gifts which man can receive, the riches of divine mercy and truth, the everlasting gospel. What is the recompense—the reply? To the indulgent legislature it is given in the unambiguous demonstration that their authority is disregarded, that their laws shall have no reverence. Threatnings, and outrage, and impoverishment, and murder, are the answers with which the entreaties of pious and charitable men are met, and the arguments by which their reasonings are silenced. God has put into the hearts of his servants a spirit which sustains them, and will sustain them, until the rage of this tyranny be overpast. Even now there are symptoms that the period of their sufferings draws to a close. In the generous response to the story of their distresses so loudly and so generally made, hope is communicated that the purpose for which they have been tried is accomplished, and that their deliverance draweth nigh. Our respected Chairman has reminded you of that great truth, that among spectacles which most interest the most exalted creatures, nothing is more affecting than that of the good man in distress—he has added that there is one perhaps more gratifying still—the good man going to relieve his virtuous and suffering brother. In the sorrow of the evil days in which we have fallen, God has awakened in us the double interest—He has placed before our view the two-fold spectacle—the ministers of Christ's church suffering for conscience sake, and their brothers in the faith zealous to yield them succour. It was a sore struggle in which the persecuted church was called upon to testify. The fickle and false-hearted left her in her distress—the champions and flatterers of the summer hour saw the storm coming, and drooped and disappeared. The church was left alone in the wilderness—alone with the enemy. In the extremity of their distress, the tempter assailed her perishing inmates—“Purchase peace by sacrificing the provision made for proclaiming the gospel of grace, and ye shall eat and live.” The temptation had been spoken once before, when the

wilderness heard the insinuated blasphemy, "command these stones that they be made bread," and the words by which temptation is defeated were also spoken, when He, by whom the church endureth, said "it is written man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." This was written and spoken not in vain. The persecuted kept it in their hearts : it sustained them in the hour when they seemed destitute and forsaken, and it preserved them for, I firmly trust, the season of rest which is approaching. The tempter will cease from troubling, and will depart. Expressions of Christian sympathy such as we have heard here, the general and generous ardour with which they are answered, will be influences to awe the enemy and sustain the faithful sufferer—they will be as the fluttering of wings on the fearful silence of the wilderness, and the afflicted will learn that their redemption draweth nigh—that England has been commissioned (and has thankfully accepted the commission) to take to herself the angel's office, and is come to minister unto them.

The Ven. Archdeacon Hoare, in seconding Mr. O'S. began by asking of the audience still more indulgence in succeeding such a speaker, than that which the rev. gentleman who spoke before had craved, in making way for his address. He could only desire to second him, by taking the simplest possible view of his own position, and that of the audience assembled in such a cause,—which indeed, did not, for its simplicity, demand that splendour of eloquence and force of effect which had nevertheless been so well bestowed upon it. They were met to perform a plain, straightforward duty—that of rescuing from starvation their most afflicted brethren—fellow-labourers in the gospel—fellow-churchmen, and fellow-citizens in the Sister island ; and he must own, if any apprehension had visited his mind at the first opening of Mr. O'S.'s address, it arose from a fear that he might be about to confine his speech to them that day, to a forcible appeal to the feelings only ; or, at the most, to their understandings also ; without a direct and simple application to the conscience of the hearers. The last words of the speaker were truly well calculated to dissipate these apprehensions, when he presented the Church of Ireland to us as not so much merely demanding our sympathy for their heavy and unpre-

cedented trials, as being placed before us in the very same, and the self-same, condition, of that Divine Saviour whom she owns as her head; as being placed before us now in her own wilderness country, as He was once in the wilderness of Judea, under temptation. With the tempter on the one hand, exhorting her to a surrender of her principles, that she might convert stones into bread for her immediate sustenance; but, with the example of the Saviour on the other hand, pronouncing, "Man doth not live by bread alone, but by every word of God,"—we are to decide on her behalf—whether or not we will give her the means for the support of her faith, and her final and complete victory over the trial presented to her by her enemies. In the aspect of the present meeting, and in the tone of that rev. gentleman, to whom (the Archdeacon continued) we are all so greatly indebted, and whose sentiments have, I trust, sunk deep into the hearts of all here present, and will be long borne in remembrance by every individual, as an index of the true position of the question before us; intelligently and essentially viewed, nothing can have been more instructive or impressive than the sacred colouring thrown over the whole proceeding, together with the absence of all private or political party feeling. In saying which, of course, therefore (he continued), I do not designate *that* as party, or exclude *that* as political, which makes the whole question before us a question between Popery and Protestantism in these realms. And here I must be free to say, that I mark, in the whole course of events, much more of a providential and divine procedure that may at first be recognised. The purposes of man and the purposes of God are widely different. Even that measure of Catholic emancipation (I replace the words most gladly after Mr. O'SULLIVAN'S "Popish enslavement"), I regard as a step in that series of measures which, however contrary to the intentions of too many of its promoters, have been, and are, providentially working, through the painful steps we now witness, for the result which I cannot but, with MR. O'SULLIVAN himself, gloriously anticipate, viz., the final, sure, and unprecedented triumph of Protestant principles throughout the empire. Already we see the lurid glare and murderous step of genuine popery recognised by the most incredulous. On the other hand, we see already the ministry of the true Irish church in a position of pure and suffering grandeur, (if the expression

may be allowed,) acknowledged to be unprecedented in modern times. Within this very century, how far different from that condition alluded to just now, as indeed to be accounted for, but inexcusable I own—I repeat it, utterly inexcusable,—in which long years of misgovernment and political intrigue had placed that much-abused church and ministry; while we see that it is the very improvement of its spirit, and the blamelessness of its conduct, which its enemies (taking a treacherous though expected and characteristic advantage of that relief, which was for ever to have secured their good will) make the opportunity, which was the very occasion and cause, and plea, of their attack. Allusion was made to documents before us descriptive of the character of those for whom we plead. Time may be surely well bestowed, on such an occasion, in their perusal. One from the Chancellor of Ireland, Lord Plunket, pronounces them “a most exemplary and deserving body of men. They are mild, temperate, charitable, just, and no praise can be bestowed on them which their conduct does not fully justify. But they are a most unfortunate body of men, and their fate so now trembling in the balance.” MR. F. BUXTON, in the same strain, describes them as “exposed to the fire of persecution; and out of that flame has arisen as pure and apostolical a ministry as any in the world. A more pure, a more virtuous and devoted, ministry the world has not than the protestant ministers of Ireland.” Couple then with this, and fix it deeply and indelible on your minds, that it is *because* they are thus virtuous and devoted, thus pure and apostolical; because they are mild, temperate, charitable, just, therefore they are persecuted and trodden under foot, their sight shunned, their character odious, and their exertions repelled, as destructive of error and a witness of the truth; and you have then the case before you which you are this day called to behold, to sympathise with, and to relieve. We may, but we should not, speak slightly of the comforts derived from the sympathy of the brethren in the faith. I may be allowed to illustrate this source of encouragement under trial, by reference to another document, in reply to the Winchester address of sympathy accompanying an announcement of near £800, (now swelling to near double the amount of contribution.) I allude to the encouragement expressed in a reply from the head of the church, to the address communicated. (The Archdeacon here read an interest-

ing document to the meeting.) From reading this I would rather turn to that important observation offered by MR. O'SULLIVAN, that the sympathy you expressed, evinced more especially in these substantial marks of your esteem, must of itself have an indirect effect, glancing on the adversaries of the church, beyond all amount of calculation. That which is support to the friends will be terror and overthrow to the enemy. It will speak in language which must be heard to the remotest corner of the empire, that friends in England multiply in a tenfold proportion with enemies in Ireland. But when we speak of that sympathy itself, let us not forget its real object in the case of our unhappy brethren ; and that it is their mental pain far more than their bodily sufferings—it is not that their families only are divided and separated, or reduced to a labouring condition ; that their course of education is stopped ; that their life insurances are vacated ; and—dreadful thought !—that life insurances cannot now be effected but with the horrible proviso “ except they shall have died a violent death :”—but it is that sufferings like these, coextensive with the will of a dark and unknown tribunal, are inflicted in defiance of law and justice. The unhappy sufferers are put out of the reach of civil protection, and feel themselves forsaken by their natural guardians and protectors, the government under which they live ; and that, for no fault or offence of their own, but because they are conscientiously performing their duties, being at the same time the best friends and natural protectors of the union of the two countries, and true promoters of the best interests of their own. It is not the whole amount of what you see, but what you must imagine of the feelings of men, of high or low birth as it may be, but distinguished in learning and talent, and rank, filled with benevolence, and conscious of high purposes of good, formerly effectuated in act ; but now their persons exposed to scorn, to mockery, and insult ; now driven destitute in many instances from their home, like those of whom it was said that the world was not worthy ; threatened, maltreated, and outraged by those very persons whose benefit it was their only aim to promote, and whose instruction, consolation, and salvation, they had ever made the first and main object of their lives. The Archdeacon proceeded to congratulate the meeting on the charitable efforts already made in many neighbouring districts, and through the surrounding diocese of

Winchester generally. His own rural deanery had reported upwards of £300 in a single day; those of the Rev. Messrs. Boscawen and Triton, in Surrey, likewise similar sums; at Guildford, also £500. The cause was one, he observed, not of charity only, but of a godly sort of competition also. The district of Croydon, must stand on its own resources. The Rev. Vicar had justly remarked, on opening, what he must himself confirm, that their contributions this day must not look for much support or enlargement from many then present, whose names and subscriptions had been elsewhere enrolled. The feeling manifested, and the crowded assembly around him, left all doubt behind as to the result of the present effort; whilst, he concluded, the sight of a nation thus uniting as one man in the noblest of struggles, in a conflict of charity for the highest and most sacred of causes afforded a spectacle beyond all adequate description. If the sufferings were unprecedented which they were assembled to relieve, so beyond all question were the efforts now making to relieve them. Unexampled, truly in the history of other nations, was to say but little, for he felt them to be so even in our own, and he doubted not but an admiring posterity would look back upon the period of history embraced in the present winter, as one of the brightest spots in our national records, if not of all others, the most precious jewel in our national crown. Acknowledging in cordial terms the obligations of the meeting to the Rev. Mr. O'Sullivan for his presence and luminous exposition of the case before them, and the facts and arguments he had so powerfully adduced, the Archdeacon then seconded the resolution.

The Rev. J. B. MARSDEN, rector of Tooting, said that so much had been spoken in terms of such commanding eloquence, that could he consult his own feelings, he would not say a word. He felt it, however, due to the clergy and the Protestants of England, to state the strong feeling of sympathy with the undeserved suffering of the Irish clergy. The rev. gentleman then related the following anecdote:—"A young woman," said he, "who was the daughter of Jewish parents, and who herself had been educated in the Jewish religion, but had become a Christian, and on that account had been bitterly persecuted by her family, came to his house in Tooting on Monday week, and handed to his wife two-pence as her contribution to the

Irish clergy fund, adding, 'I can feel for those who are persecuted, for I have endured persecution myself.'" The rev. gentleman stated that the amount subscribed in his parish was unusually large. He concluded by moving the resolution expressive of sympathy with the Irish clergy.

DANIEL RICHARD WARRINGTON, Esq., seconded the resolution, and begged them not to think, because he did not express himself on the subject, that he was insensible to the wants of the Irish clergy. He sympathised with their sufferings as much as any person could, and any thing that lay in his power he would do for their relief. (Cheers.)

NEWMAN SMITH, Esq., then rose and said, there is yet one resolution, ladies and gentlemen, to which I must call your attention, and I think you will agree with me, that it is scarcely second to any that has preceded it for the unanimity wherewith it deserves to be passed; and, if by taking even this part in your proceedings, I shall contribute in minutest degree to promote the benevolent object for which we are all met together, I can assure you it will render this one of the proudest days of my life. Happily for me, ladies and gentlemen, there is now no necessity for my offering any comment on the melancholy cause of our assembling here, after the eloquent address you have just heard, nor would it avail any thing that I should echo the powerful appeal which has been so nobly made, and no less nobly answered throughout the country, on behalf of the Protestant clergy of Ireland. I will, therefore, content myself with congratulating you on the temperate manner and the good feeling with which the proceedings have been conducted in this room. I trust that your example will be appreciated; and let me add, too, a hope, that the period is not far distant when those misguided persons who have been the authors of those evils in Ireland, which we are here met to alleviate and deplore, will be made conscious of their error. Oh, yes, Sir; I think I have reason to believe it will be so; I think I see a gleam of sunshine breaking through the cloud that has too long hung over that ill-fated land, and that ere long those blind—those deluded beings,—who have so wantonly brought ruin on the heads of our Protestant ministry, will be no less ready to repair than they have been to inflict these evils. And, if this be done, I am sure those pious men, who

have shown with what resignation, humility, and fortitude they can bear their late trials, will be found ready to forgive and to embrace the very authors of all they have endured. God grant my anticipations may be realized! But, ladies and gentlemen, my feelings are leading me from the chief object for which I rose, which was to say, that much of the good and temperate feeling manifested here to-day must be attributable to the discreet tone in which the proceedings were opened by our worthy chairman, who is ever so ready to contribute his aid towards the promotion of any object that can benefit his fellow creatures. Mr. Smyth concluded by moving the resolution.

JOHN KEEN, Esq., seconded the resolution.

Captain ALSAGER, returned thanks, and the meeting soon after broke up.—At the close of the meeting the chairman announced that upwards of £300 had been received.

END OF VOL. I.

---

GEORGE FOLDS, Printer, 1, Saint Andrew-street,  
Opposite Trinity-street, Dublin.

Printer to the Church Education Society for all Ireland; the Killare Place Education Society;  
the Irish Trinitarian Bible Society; and of the New Irish Pulpit  
or 3 pp. Teacher & Co. Co.











JUN 13 1932

