

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE,
For 1838.

CONDUCTED BY
ROBERT J. BRECKINRIDGE,
AND
ANDREW B. CROSS.

Blessed is the man that walketh not in the council of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful. PSALM I. V. 1.

VOL. IV.

Baltimore:
PRINTED FOR THE CONDUCTORS,
BY MATCHETT & NEILSON.

BR
781

INDEX TO THE IV. VOLUME

JANUARY.	PAGE.
The Nature and Advantages of Union to Christ, - - - - -	1
State of Negro Apprenticeship in the British West Indies, - - - - -	7
The Bible Doctrine of Slavery, No. III.,	18
Two Hundred Thousand Irish Protestants Petitioning the British House of Lords,	24
Illustrations of the Papal Church abroad, No. IV. - - - - -	31
Speech of the Rev. Hugh McNeille, - - - - -	43

FEBRUARY.

Riot at Alton, - - - - -	49
The Bible Doctrine of Slavery, No. IV. -	57
An Elder's Testimony, from Western New York, - - - - -	64
He is my Refuge, A Hymn, by J. L. G. -	66
Illustrations of the Papal Church abroad, No. V., - - - - -	67
Documentary History of the Assembly of 1837, No. V. - - - - -	73
The Secrets of the New School Party Revealed. - - - - -	82
The Mystery of Jesuitism, No I., - - - - -	86
Rationale of Romish Conversions, - - - - -	90
Knowledge, Liberty, Righteousness, - - - - -	94

MARCH.

Documentary History of the Assembly of 1837, No. VI., - - - - -	97
Our Abolitionism, - - - - -	108
An Uproar in Mistake, or Bishop Purcell's first Kentucky Consecration, - - - - -	112
Junkin on the Moral Government of God, Chapter II., - - - - -	116
The Mystery of Jesuitism, No. II., - - - - -	120
The Church of England, - - - - -	121
Popery Subservient to the Designs of Despots, - - - - -	123
Illustrations of the Papal Church abroad, No. VI. - - - - -	125
Lent, - - - - -	133
The Literary Supremacy of the North, -	138
Testimony From New England, - - - - -	142

APRIL.	PAGE.
Sermon, by the Rev. Samuel Martin, D. D.	145
The Institution of Celibacy in the Papal Church, No. I., - - - - -	152
Junkin on the Moral Government of God, Chapter II. Continued, - - - - -	153
Sketches and Recollections from my Note Book, No. I., - - - - -	161
The Mystery of Jesuitism, No. III., - - - - -	166
The Condition of the Coloured Population of the City of Baltimore, - - - - -	168
Documentary History of the Assembly of 1837, No. VII., - - - - -	176
"The Three Kings of Cologne." - - - - -	191

MAY.

Sermon by the Rev. Samuel Miller, D. D.	193
The Institution of Celibacy in the Papal Church, No. II., - - - - -	204
Life's Voyage, - - - - -	212
Memoirs, to serve as a History of the Semi-Pelagian Controversy in the Presbyterian Church, No. I., - - - - -	213
Perfectionism in Western New York, - - - - -	232
Miracles, attesting the real Bodily Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, - - - - -	238

JUNE.

The Doctrine of Original Sin, - - - - -	241
Letter from the Rev. Mr. Baird, at Paris, -	249
Error of Place, and not of Person, - - - - -	254
Sketches and Recollections from my Note Book, No. II., - - - - -	257
The Institution of Celibacy in the Papal Church, No. III., - - - - -	263
"The Big Beggar Man." - - - - -	273
The Baltimore Discussion on Universalism, -	280

JULY.

Speech of Robert J. Breckinridge, in the Senate Chamber at Annapolis, at the Sixth Anniversary Meeting of the Maryland State Colonization Society, - - - - -	289
--	-----

INDEX TO THE IV. VOLUME.

	PAGE.
The Institution of Celibacy in the Papal Church, No. IV., - - - -	298
Important Protestant Movement in France, - - - -	311
Substance of Doctrine, - - - -	318
Priest Gildea, and the Odd-Fellows, - - - -	319
The Conflagration at Petersburg, - - - -	321
The Degrading Tendency of the Papal System, - - - -	325
Baltimore in its Infancy, - - - -	331
Decree of 1837, against Infant Schools, - - - -	333
The Mystery of Jesuitism, No. IV. - - - -	334

—o—
AUGUST.

The Sinner led quite to Christ, or, Conversations in an Anxious Room, - - - -	337
Ultraism, - - - -	344
Junkin on the Moral Government of God, Chapter II., Section II. continued, - - - -	346
The Institution of Celibacy in the Papal Church, No. V. - - - -	348
Memoirs, to serve as a History of the Semi-Pelagian Controversy in the Presbyterian Church, No. II. - - - -	354
Correspondence between the Second Presbyterian Church of Baltimore, and the Evangelical Church at Lyons in France, - - - -	361
Action of the Baltimore Presbytery in relation to the Schism of 1838. - - - -	365
Rise and Nature of the Doctrine of Assassination in the Papal Church, - - - -	369
The General Councils: with their principal Decrees, No. I. - - - -	380

—o—
SEPTEMBER.

Statistics of Crime and Punishment, - - - -	385
The Institution of Celibacy in the Papal Church, No. VI. - - - -	394
Memoirs, to serve as a History of the Semi-Pelagian Controversy in the Presbyterian Church, No. III., - - - -	406
Representative Character of Adam, - - - -	418
The General Councils: with their Principal Decrees, No. II., - - - -	426

OCTOBER.

	PAGE.
Petersburgh Conflagration, once more, - - - -	433
Illustrations of the Papal Church abroad, No. VII. - - - -	437
Archbishop Eccleston's Preaching, - - - -	447
Statistics of the Presbyterian Church, - - - -	450
Unsuccessful Preaching, - - - -	453
Conjunction of St. Bacchus & St. Ignatius, - - - -	457
Dr. Taylor's Early Opinions, - - - -	460
Letter from Mr. Wilson, in India, - - - -	461
The Doctrine of Transubstantiation, No. I. - - - -	464
The Relations of Adam to his Posterity; with the mode of constituting them, - - - -	474

—o—
NOVEMBER.

Illustrations of the Papal Church abroad, No. VIII. - - - -	481
Sketches and Recollections from my Note Book. No. III. - - - -	489
Memoirs, to serve as a History of the Semi-Pelagian Controversy in the Presbyterian Church, No. IV., - - - -	498
Fruits of the Baltimore Conference on Universalism, - - - -	495
D. D. the fourth estate in the Church, - - - -	499
Doctrine of Transubstantiation, No. II. - - - -	502
Definition of leading terms, &c. - - - -	513
Bull of Pius V. against Queen Elizabeth, - - - -	518
Wherewithal shall we be clothed? - - - -	525

—o—
DECEMBER.

The General Councils: with their Principal Decrees, No. III., - - - -	529
Illustrations of the Papal Church abroad, No. IX. - - - -	534
Monument to Ulric Zwingle, - - - -	542
Adam's Justification, Chapter V., - - - -	543
The Doctrine of Transubstantiation, No. III. - - - -	550
British Civilization, No. I., - - - -	560
The Restoration of the Bible as a Class Book to Common Schools, - - - -	567

THE
BALTIMORE LITERARY
AND
RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE.

VOL IV.

JANUARY 1838.

No. 1.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

THE NATURE AND ADVANTAGES OF UNION TO CHRIST.

Great is the mystery of Godliness! This mysteriousness pertains not only to the union of the divine and human natures in the person of Christ, but also to that of the believer with the divine Mediator; that our natures should be exalted to a union with the Divine in the person of the son of God, is so wonderful a mystery that *the angels desire to look into it.* Whilst they look with adoring awe upon this inscrutable profound, their admiring eyes are directed also to the other inferior in awful majesty, but glorious as a display of the divine condescension—the union of believing sinful men, to Christ their redeeming head. Not only is our nature exalted *on high*, and clothed with, indescribable glory; but we who believe, degraded as we may be in our own persons, are in union to *Him*, internally and eternally, who is enthroned at the right hand of the majesty in the heavens. “Of him *are we in Christ Jesus*, who of God is made unto us *wisdom*, and *righteousness*, and *sanctification*, and *redemption.*” This passage presents before us, in a single view, this profound mystery, and its ineffable advantages. Let us endeavour “*to look into it;*” and let us pray—that we also may be partakers of its benefits.

We are *in* Christ; or united to him, *by the bond of the SPIRIT.* The Scriptures teach, that man in his fallen state is “dead in trespasses and sins.” This is not a natural death—a destruction of the soul and its faculties, or dissolution of its union with the body. Man is physically a living being. His soul is active, exercises various and noble faculties, animates and governs its earthly tabernacle. The death which is here spoken of is a *spiritual death.* Although man is physically alive, his soul active in union with his body, yet in a spiritual and theological sense he is *dead.* His soul has no union with Christ, and the Holy Spirit, who giveth life, is

absent as to his life-giving and sanctifying influences. Such being man's condition, by nature, he has not, and cannot have, any power, either natural or moral, to unite himself to Christ; but his union to him must be effected by the mighty power of God. This power is exercised by the Holy Spirit, the omnipotent agent in the application of redemption. The Spirit operates in effecting this union, by *quickening* the spiritually dead soul, "you hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins." To "quicken" signifies—*to give life*. The spirit in quickening infuses into our spiritually dead souls a new spiritual life. "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." This new birth is effected by the Holy Spirit. "Except a man be born—*of the Spirit* he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." This is REGENERATION. The soul is not born again as to its essence and faculties; but is divested of its old qualities and endowed with new. "If any man be in Christ he is a *new creature*, old things are passed away, behold all things are become new." The soul in all its faculties is quickened with a spiritual and holy life. "The very God of peace *sanctify* you *wholly*; and I pray God your whole spirit, and soul, and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." Before the Spirit comes in his regenerating power the soul is "alienated from the life of God." But when he thus comes, it is "created in Christ Jesus." "It is the spirit that giveth life." When this life is communicated, a foundation is laid in all the faculties of the soul for *new*, spiritual and holy exercises. He gives a spiritual vision to the understanding, or discernment of spiritual things. "Ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord." He makes the soul "*willing*" in this "*day of his power*." The affections, which were formerly wedded to the world, he enables and disposes the soul to "set on things which are above." Yea, by his grace, it "puts off the old man with his deeds, corrupt according to the deceitful lusts, and puts on the new man, which after God, is renewed in knowledge—and created in righteousness and true holiness." By this quickening, or regenerating operation, the Holy Spirit becomes a bond of union to Christ. Christ dwells in us by his Spirit. "Hereby we know that he *abideth in us*, by his Spirit which he hath given us"—"and hereby we know that *we dwell in him* and *he in us*, because he hath given us of his Spirit."

We are united to Christ by *the bond of FAITH*. To complete this union we must not only have the Holy Spirit abiding in our souls, but we must also embrace Christ by a vital faith wrought in the heart by the regenerating Spirit. It is not "he that *liveth*," merely, but also that "*believeth*," that is completely in union with Christ. John xi. 26. "Whosoever *liveth* and *believeth* in me shall *never die*." Faith springs from that quickening, which is by the Spirit. When the soul is renewed, it is at the same time enabled to stretch forth faith, as its hand, and take hold on Christ, as "all its salvation and desire." "For this cause, I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus, that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man, *that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith*." There are three acts of faith,—*assent*,—*acceptance*,—and

ASSURANCE. By the first faith "sets to its seal that God is true." It says—"I believe that Christ is—and that he is *the Saviour* of his body the church." Acceptance says—"I take Christ as offered in the gospel, in all his offices, to be *mine*." Assurance says—"I believe and am *sure* that Christ died for me, and that I shall be saved through him." The justifying act of faith, or that act which completes this union with Christ, is neither the first nor last, but the second. The devils gave their *assent* to the truths of the gospel. They "believe and tremble," but they enjoy not *union* with Christ, but remain forever separated from him. Many true believers do not arise to the third act of Faith—but are not perfectly assured of their salvation—but walk in darkness, and have no light, yet trust in the Lord, and stay themselves upon their God. The union, however, is perfected by the *second*—the acceptance, or reception of Christ, in all his offices as the Saviour of the soul, "But as many as *received* him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that *believe* on his name." Those who thus receive Christ are *in* him; their union to him is consummated. "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall *believe* on me through their word; that they all may be one; as thou father art *in* me, and I *in* thee, that they also may be *one in us*."

This faith which thus completes the union with Christ, is of the grace and operation of God. "By grace are ye saved *through faith*, and that not of yourselves—it is *the gift of God*." "This is *the work of God*, that ye *believe* on him whom he hath sent."

This union is *real* and *intimate*. Christ dwells in their souls, and they dwell in him. The reality and intimacy of this union can be more easily understood by Scriptural illustrations, than made evident by philosophical discussion. It is illustrated by the union that subsists between the head and the body and its members—that between the vine and its branches—and the union of husband and wife. Christ is called "the head of the body, the church."—"The head, even Christ." The union which subsists between the natural head and its body is both real and intimate. The head is incomplete without the body, and the body without the head. The members of the body also—are really and intimately by nervous and vital bonds connected with the head. Equally real and intimate is the union which subsists between Christ the mystical *head*, and believers, the members of the church his mystical body. The church is called "the fulness of Christ," and Christ "fills all in all." The church is not personally, but relatively the fulness of Christ. Relatively *as the head*, he would not be "*complete*" without the church *his body*; and the church would be *lifeless*—would be *nothing*—without Christ her head;—for he fills the body and its members. As the members of the natural body receive vital spirits from the head by virtue of the reality and intimacy of their union to it—in like manner the members of the mystical body receive vital influences from their head, by which they grow. "We grow up into him in all things, which is *the head*—even Christ, from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the

edifying of itself in love." Yea, so real and intimate is this union, that believers are said to be "*members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.*"

The vine and its branches are also a striking illustration of the reality and intimacy of this union. The branch grows out of the vine, and receives constant supplies of its juices by which its growth and fruitfulness are promoted. Destroy its union with the vine and it dies. "I am the vine" says Christ, "ye are the branches." As the branch receives nourishment from the vine, because of its union to it, so do believers receive nourishment from Christ the "true vine" by virtue of their union to him as "the branches."—"He that abideth *in* me, and I *in* him, the same bringeth forth much fruit." Is the branch dead, which is severed from the natural vine? So he is dead who is not united to Christ "the true vine."—"If a man abide not *in* me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is *withered*, and men gather them, and cast them into the fire and they are burned." That must be a real and intimate union upon which life and death are dependent. The sinner is dead who is not in union to Christ; he is *alive* who is united to him—and liveth forever more.

The union of husband and wife illustrates also—the connection which believers have with Christ. "For this cause, shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be *joined* unto his wife, and they two shall be *one flesh*. This is a great mystery; *but I speak concerning Christ and his church.*" Husband and wife are really and intimately—though mysteriously—*one* by virtue of the matrimonial bond; and this conjugal union happily illustrates the reality and intimacy of the union between Christ and his church. Christ and his church are as certainly *one* as are husband and wife. There is not an identity of persons—but there is a union of persons by the marriage bond. *The twain are one*, really and intimately before God. The personality of believers is not lost in that of Christ, nor his personality in theirs—yet they are *one*—not merely by covenant bond, but *actually* by the Spirit, and by faith. The wife belongs to the husband and is a part of himself—"his own flesh," and the husband in like manner pertains to the wife. "*Ye are Christ's*" saith Paul, and again "we are the Lord's;" and on the other hand, saith the church—"my beloved *is mine*—and I *am his*." They are therefore really and intimately *ONE*.

This union is *indissoluble*. You may sever the natural body from its head; you may sever the branch from the vine; but no power in earth or hell can sever the mystical body from its mystical head; or the branches from the true vine. The union is as indissoluble as that which subsists between the Eternal Father, and the Eternal Son. "*As thou Father art in me and I in thee, that they also may be ONE IN US.*" What can separate the persons of the God-head united in one indivisible essence? Who can enter, if such language may be used, who can enter into the bosom of the God-head and separate the Son from the Father? None, surely none. Neither can any destroy the union between Christ and his members. As the Father is in him and he in the father, so he prays that believers may be united to himself, and the Father. Not that the union

should be of the *same nature* with that which subsists between the persons of the God-head. This is an *essential* union. But that it should be as indissoluble. "Father I will that they also whom *thou* hast given me, be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory." He prays for a union which shall exist during the residence of the believer on earth, and by virtue of which, at his dissolution, the believing soul shall be with him when he is in heaven, and contemplate his glory as it is unfolded in the duration of eternity. The union is therefore indissoluble. Yea, "who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us.—For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor ANY OTHER CREATURE, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

INNUMERABLE are the advantages which accrue to the believer from this union—several only will be specified, as presented in the passage quoted in the introduction. Christ becomes to the members of his body—WISDOM; Christ is the wisdom of the believer, as it is by him alone he obtains a correct knowledge of God, and his will. He is the image of the invisible God—the brightness of the Father's glory, the express image of his person. Christ is the image of the invisible God, as he is the second person of the God-head, in the form of God.—Possessing the same undivided essence, and all the glorious perfections of Deity, equally with the Father. Being "made flesh," his glory was seen, "as the glory of the only begotten of the Father." The brightness of the glory of the invisible Father shineth forth in him as "God manifest in the flesh," because in all his offices and work of mediation, the attributes and excellencies of God were gloriously displayed—so that *he who hath seen him, hath seen the Father also.*" Being the eternal son of God, as well as man, he is peculiarly fitted to reveal to us the nature and will of God. This he has done as the prophet of the church. "No man knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." The Son hath revealed the nature and will of God in his word. This word he makes effectual to the illumination of the minds of his chosen. By it God "shines into their hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."—"The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." But Christ, when he unites the sinner to himself, in the manner described, "opens the eyes of his understanding," so that he, who was previously "darkness," is made "*light in the Lord.*" As the glorious, and transcendently brilliant "Son of righteousness" he sheds abroad his divine light in the soul, so that it is made to "know God and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent—*whom to know is eternal life.*" "The world" indeed "by wisdom knows not God," and "God has made foolish the wisdom of this world"—but "unto them that are called, Christ is made the power of God, and the *wisdom* of God."

RIGHTEOUSNESS, is another all important benefit acquired by union with Christ. Christ by his obedience and sufferings unto death, "hath brought in an everlasting righteousness."—"He hath magnified the law and made it honourable," and "the Lord is well pleased for his righteousness' sake." He hath now become "the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth;" because "what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending forth his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, for sin condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us." When the sinner is united, as we have explained, with Christ, this righteousness becomes his righteousness, because this is "the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all, and upon all them that believe." On account of this righteousness thus his own, he is *justified*. "All his iniquities are forgiven him," and he is "accepted in the beloved,"—so that there is therefore now *no condemnation*, to them that are *in Christ Jesus*.—

SANCTIFICATION, is another benefit derived from union with Christ. The unpardoned sinner is under condemnation, and dying in this condition—must perish forever. Necessary as justification is, holiness is equally requisite, for "*without*" it "no man shall see the Lord." Christ therefore is made unto those who are "**IN HIM**" *sanctification*. He hath not only "redeemed them from all iniquity"—but he also "purifies to himself a peculiar people." The mission of the Spirit as the *sanctifier*, is dependent upon the mediation of Christ. He is hence "the spirit of Christ"—and becomes, in the hearts of the redeemed "the Spirit of life" and "the Spirit of faith;" so that we "are saved through the *sanctification of the Spirit*." He applies the blood of Christ, which "cleanses from all sin." The Spirit, we have seen, regenerates the sinner, *quickens* him by the communication of spiritual life. This quickening, however, does not render him, who experiences it, perfectly holy. There still remains "a law in his members, warring against the law of his mind,"—"a body of sin and death," from which he is yet to be "delivered." This the Spirit removes gradually in his work of sanctification. Having regenerated the soul, he dwells in it, as in his temple, purging it from all its pollution, and adorning it with all "the beauties of holiness." It is on account of the righteousness of Christ he is sent, and he applies to the redeemed the crystal water of the fountain opened to the house of David, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin and uncleanness—the fountain of Christ's blood; hence they are enabled to say—"unto him that washed us from our sins in his own blood;" and are described as those, "who have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb;" and hence saith Christ—"if I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me."

In addition to the benefits already enumerated, and evidently comprehending all blessedness, **REDEMPTION** is the inheritance of those who are in union with Christ. This signifies, evidently, in its connection, complete salvation. The verb signifies this in other passages. "He delivered himself for us, that he might *redeem* us from all iniquity." The word in this passage, manifestly signifies

complete salvation from sin, death and hell. It is "from *all* iniquity"—and therefore from all its consequences. His precious blood is the ransom price, by which he hath purchased a right to deliver his elect from the guilt of sin, and from its pollution, and its consequences—and to place them on high in the presence of his glory. The word therefore, carries the mind forward—to the complete emancipation of the sons of God—when their souls shall be delivered from the thralldom of the flesh, and perfected in holiness, and shall enter upon the full enjoyment of God—and to the ultimate period, when the body, after the slumber of ages, shall awake, and arise from the tomb—when "this corruptible shall put on incorruption"—when "death shall be swallowed up in victory"—when "this mortal shall put on immortality"—when the glorified and happy spirit shall re-inherit its ancient tabernacle, now re-built, never to be taken down, and filled, and covered, with "the glory of the Lord"—and when the innumerable ransomed throng, shall enter upon the eternal possession of the "inheritance, incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for them"—*all* this is comprehended in the word REDEMPTION, and shall infallibly be enjoyed by ALL WHO ARE UNITED TO CHRIST.

L.

STATE OF NEGRO APPRENTICESHIP IN THE BRITISH WEST INDIES.

WE hope the *British party* in this country, as the Abolitionists well deserve to be called, have duly weighed the article on *British Idolatry in India*, published in a late number of this Magazine; and that they will ponder solemnly, the one now laid before them, in regard to the atrocious cruelties of *British West Indian Slavery*.

A certain *Joseph Sturge*, a Quaker of Birmingham, in England—after a visit of considerable length to the British West Indies,—undertaken expressly to see and examine the working of the famous apprentice-ship system in those Islands—returned home, during the last spring, and commenced disseminating the information he had gathered and the opinions he had formed—by public addresses in various parts of England. The one given below was delivered to a large public meeting, in the town hall of Birmingham convened to hear, and to do honours of various kinds, to their philanthropic towns-man.

Nothing can be more evident, than that the system of apprentice-ship, is really a more cruel and wicked slavery, than ever did, or ever could exist in this country; or indeed in any other, where pub-

lic decency and the voice of humanity, justice and religion—were not “ready to perish.” We sincerely hope, the men of “Great Britain, will set earnestly about ameliorating the terrible condition of *their own slaves*, (not forgetting their wicked Asiatic idolatry); and that they will find therein the warm sympathies of those selfish allies, in our abused and insulted country,—by whose aid, in their crusade against America—under the hypocritical name of humanity—they have so effectually concealed their own real condition, and so sinfully exasperated and misrepresented ours. This branch of the subject, is also again commended to Dr *Wardlaw* of Glasgow—from whom we still expect a reply, to a civil and too long unanswered letter!—

I can sincerely say, that nothing but an earnest desire to promote the cause of our poor oppressed fellow-subjects, could ever have induced me to consent to be so peculiar an object of your attention this day; or to take a part so opposed to my habits and inclination. Various feelings oppress and almost overwhelm me, not the least of which is the deep and humiliating conviction of the immeasurable difference between what you indulgently suppose me to be, and what I feel I am. I need not dwell on the motives which induced me and my friends to undertake the mission; or why some of us felt that we could not be satisfied with the investigations of a committee of the House of Commons, a majority of whom were either slave-owners themselves, or under circumstances in which an acknowledgment of a violation of the imperial act must bring condemnation on them or their friends. Their report at the close of last session must convince all who have studied the subject of the influence under which it was drawn up.

After consulting with those of my friends who have long laboured in this cause, it was concluded that our mission to the West Indies should be independent of any society, and entirely unshackled as to the publication of facts. As, however, one of them was of opinion that it might serve us, and the object, to have some document from the Colonial-office to the authorities in the colonies, I thought it best to address the following letter to Lord Glenelg, just before our departure. [Mr. Sturge here read the letter to Lord Glenelg, stating the intention of him and his friends to visit the West Indies; that the object of their journey was to investigate the present state and condition of the negroes, with a view to communicate the result to their friends and the public; that their anxious desire was to do full justice to all, but that they should prefer pursuing their investigation through those private channels which were open to them, rather than obtain the advantage of official sanction, if accompanied by any restriction as to the publication of facts.] Subsequent events fully proved that in this they pursued the right course. Probably he should not again have a fitting opportunity of referring to the American question, and as he believed it would serve the cause better by not mixing it up with the West Indian

one, he would now briefly advert to it, and then pass to the West Indies. (Hear.) During the few days (said Mr. Sturge) passed at New York, I met the committee of the National Anti-Slavery Society, and also a still larger number of the friends to the cause, at the house of one of its most zealous advocates. Their progress is most encouraging. Petitions to Congress for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia had been signed by one hundred and ten thousand individuals. It was anticipated that at least as great a number of members, forming upwards of 1,000 auxiliary societies, would be reported to the next general meeting to be held at New York in the course of last month. I had also an opportunity of seeing what liberty is in the city of New York, in the trial of a case in which one of the southern slave-holders had claimed one of the citizens, who had resided there for a number of years, as his goods and chattles. The man had been kept in gaol for weeks, and was hand-cuffed when brought to court. Our anti-slavery friends in America say that the greatest service we can render them is to continue our remonstrances against the guilt of the professing Christian churches.

After arriving at Barbadoes, Dr. Lloyd and Mr. Scoble proceeded south to Demerara, and Mr. Harvey accompanied him (Mr. S.) to Antigua, where complete freedom had been granted to the negroes by the local legislature on the 1st of August, 1834; and Mr. Sturge acknowledged the uniform kindness and hospitality the deputation received from the Moravian and Methodist missionaries in Antigua. In the space of seven months (continued Mr. Sturge) I accomplished a journey of about 12,000 miles by sea and by land, and in company with my friend Thomas Harvey, whose able and efficient assistance was invaluable, we visited in Jamaica alone between thirty and forty sugar, cattle, and coffee estates: were at the courts, or had personal communication with between twenty and thirty stipendiary magistrates; visited nearly twenty gaols of different descriptions, and were at the places of worship and schools of all the principal religious denominations. Mr. Sturge read a summary of the result of their inquiries in this island, in which it appeared that the great experiment of abolition had succeeded beyond the expectations of its most sanguine advocates, and that the moral and religious education of the inhabitants had kept pace with this amelioration. The little island of Montserrat, which we next visited, contains only 6,000 negroes, who are very backward in a religious and moral view. A disposition was at one time manifested to abolish the apprenticeship on the part of the local authorities there, which would have been carried, had the Government at home encouraged it. The measure was lost in the assembly by one vote only. Four of the proprietors, however, granted complete freedom to their own negroes.

Mr. Sturge gave accounts of visits to other islands. At Dominica, which contains about 15,000 negroes, there is a more than usual proportion of intelligent and influential people of colour. We spent an evening at the house of one of them, and in a party of twelve or fourteen gentlemen and ladies, we were the only white persons present. We also visited the estates of some old resident

French families, whose paternal management of their negroes forms a striking contrast to that of the non-resident English. There are probably not more than 200 or 300 negroes on the whole of the island who can read, and the means of efficient instruction are greatly needed. (Hear hear.) At the French island of Martinique slavery still legally exists in its unmitigated form. At port Royal, the seat of the local government, we had an interview with the governor, who has felt so much interest in the working of our measure, that he has visited Antigua and some of the other British islands. One of the many evils of the apprenticeship system is its retarding emancipation in other countries, which are waiting to see its results in our West Indian colonies. (Hear.) At St. Lucie, containing a negro population of about 13,000, we visited the only school in the interior which we heard of; it is on the estate of a benevolent English proprietor; but "not one ray from any of the benevolent and religious institutions of Britain had ever reached this island." In the capital of Barbadoes, Bridge-town, there are several excellent schools, under the superintendence of the Episcopal Church and the Methodists, but in the country, among the great mass of the negro population, very little comparatively of proper education. As a proof what an obstacle to instruction the apprenticeship presents, we found, on inquiry, there were but two children present, who were not made free by the abolition act, in 1834, being then under six years of age, and the relative of these two paid something to their employer that they may be allowed to attend. At Jamaica, although we obtained much information from individuals of various denominations, and particularly from the Methodist and Moravian missionaries, yet these latter are under such restrictions, that whatever oppressions might exist, if we published any facts communicated by them, we might expose them to the censure of their own body at home. (Hear, hear.) A Moravian minister candidly told us that if all had acted as their Society did, slavery would never have been abolished. (Hear, hear.) Another, after entering into a detail of most important information, and saying it was quite a relief to unburden his mind, said that he must impose silence upon us. (Hear, hear.) A Wesleyan minister, to whom we had a letter of introduction, said that he should be glad to give us information as far as was consistent with his instructions from home; and although he received us with kindness at his own house, I believe he would have been afraid to have been seen with us in public. It should be distinctly understood, that whatever may be the physical sufferings of the negroes, we must not expect information from the Methodists and Moravians. (Hear, hear.)

The act for the abolition of negro-slavery in our colonies came into operation on the 1st of August, 1834, or nearly three years ago. This act professedly granted liberty, fully and freely, to the negroes, with the exception of withholding some political privileges; and for the usual allowance of food and clothing the predials, or field negroes, were to work for their employers forty-five hours in the week, for six years, and the non-predials, without limit to the hours of labour, for four years. I now briefly state,

1. That the conditions of the contract have been fulfilled to the letter by the British Government. 2. That the conditions required of the negroes have been performed in the most exemplary manner by them. And 3. That the conditions required of the planters have been violated, and continue to be violated, in almost every particular, in the colonies which I have been able to examine, except Antigua. (Hear, hear.)

It was provided by the Act that a compensation of twenty millions sterling should be paid to the planters, as soon as the colonial secretary should report that the provisions for the benefit of the negroes had been faithfully carried into effect by the colonial assemblies. Lord Stanley having reported to this effect to the House of Commons, and also having previously given a solemn assurance, on the part of the West Indians, that they would heartily and sincerely concur in carrying out the intentions of the British Legislature, the princely sum of twenty millions was not only paid to them—but also interest on the same, from the 1st of August, 1834. The contract of the British Government with the planters for the payment of compensation, although the sum required was monstrous in amount, and unsupported by any claim of justice or equity, and wholly disproportionate to any loss which has actually occurred, or which can possibly accrue, has been fulfilled to the very letter. (Cheers.) The negroes are quietly and industriously labouring under oppressions and injustice which, were they not the most patient race on earth, or restrained by religious principle, would drive them to desperation. I went out with a determination, if possible, not to be biassed in my judgment by any opposition or harshness I might experience; but I have to acknowledge, without a single exception, nothing but courtesy and attention from all classes of society. (Hear, hear.) I may, however, mention, at the same time, one or two amusing facts which came under our notice, to show the sort of information which we were likely to get from the planters and local authorities, had we adopted their views. In visiting a celebrated estate in the island of Jamaica, in company with the attorney, one or two stipendiary magistrates, and the Attorney-General, we were shown through the negro house by a favourite negro. While there, a woman, who had some grievance to complain of, thinking it most probably a very good opportunity to make it, came up to us for that purpose, when the head negro turned round, and sharply rebuked her, asking if she had not better manners than to give her master's property a bad character. (Laughter.) While on a visit, shortly after, to a planter, well known for his humanity, his lady told us that a few days before some negroes from an adjoining estate had inquired of her if there were not some gentlemen coming to see them, for "they had been whitewashing the dungeon, and clearing up the hospital." (Renewed laughter.)

Mr. Sturge next noticed the conduct of the planters in Barbadoes. In the district of one of the stipendiary magistrates, there were, in the space of one month, 226 complaints against labourers, who received the following punishments:—697 days of confinement and hard labour; 517 Saturdays forfeited to the estate: 127 days of

solitary confinement; and 180 days on the treadmill; making altogether 1521 days; and independent of the suffering and wrong inflicted, the poor negro is afterwards compelled to pay this out of his own time, and consequently his whole Saturday is forfeited to his master. (Loud cries of "shame, shame.") While we were in Barbadoes, circumstances occurred which led us to deviate from a rule which we had laid down, not to agitate the question of the working of the apprenticeship system there, knowing well that if the battle was to be fought at all, that it must be fought in England —(Cheers)—but having heard that a strong effort was making to oblige the parents to apprentice their children, we were so alarmed that we wrote a strong letter upon the subject. Facts respecting Jamaica are so voluminous, that I will confine myself to a very few. I think they will show that almost all the provisions of the imperial Act have been violated on the part of the planters. At ——— we saw some members of a Christian church, one of whom was a constable, who said he found it very difficult to act according to his oath. He was frequently obliged to remonstrate with the overseer, on account of the oppressions which he practised. The people were deprived of their usual allowances of salt fish and salt, and had not more than half their former quantity of clothing. They were likewise deprived of their time, the overseer taking it when he wanted it, and it was a very hard thing to get him to pay it. Some had been flogged or sent to the treadmill who had never been punished in their lives before, under the old system. Two of those were present. One man who was a carpenter on an estate; one of his fellow servants died, and he went instantly to his master, who gave him no orders about the coffin, and because he refused to make it in his own time, he was brought up for insolence, and with another of the negroes, an excellent deserving woman, sent to the treadmill. (Shame.) He showed us one of his legs, which was much injured by the mill. A poor woman also present had been most spitefully treated. She was the mother of eight children, and in weak health, and because she did not work on the first gang (where the hardest labour is to be performed), the overseer got her sent to the treadmill. She had the best house in the estate, but the overseer pulled it down, and destroyed her grounds. (Shame, shame.) If a free child is taken ill, parents have to pay back the time they spend in attending to it, and if they take them to the doctor, they have to pay him. I have mentioned the treadmill: I believe the people of this country have no idea of it. Almost every one of these instruments of punishment is of a different construction. This was a cylinder of about ten feet in diameter, with broad steps. The handrail above it has eight pair of straps fastened to it, with which the hands of the prisoners are secured. The board under the handrail descends perpendicularly towards the wheel, and does not therefore afford the slightest protection to the prisoners in case of their hanging. The steps of the wheel project about 12 or 15 inches beyond the board, and are bevelled at the edge, so that the keen side revolves much against the bodies, knees, and legs of the prisoners, with torturous effect. We asked the gaoler at ——— whether the driver was allowed to use a cat, and

asked to see the instrument. It was a whip, composed of nine lashes of small cords knotted. He said it was absolutely necessary to "touch them up," women as well as men. They struck the latter on the back, but the women on the feet. Not only all the steps, but the very drum of the mill, were stained with old and recent blood; the latter, being that of a poor old woman, had been shed so profusely, that even the sand on the floor underneath was thickly sprinkled with it.

This appalling statement excited the deepest feelings of indignation and horror in the meeting, in the course of which the Rev. Mr. East rose and said—"Allow me, Mr. Sturge, to ask this question: Did you see this blood you describe as recently shed?" Mr. Sturge—"I saw the blood, and put the question myself to the gaoler respecting the cause of it, who informed me that the poor old woman had been put on the mill that morning, and being unable to keep the step hung for the whole fifteen minutes, suspended by the wrists, with the revolving steps beating against and bruising her body the whole time." (Cries of "Monstrous!" "horrible!" and calls of "Name the magistrate.") "I intend to name him before a committee of the House of Commons." (Loud cheers, and cries of "Is he an Englishman?") We saw this woman the next day with the penal gang working on the roads, compelled to carry a basket of stones on her head, and chained like the rest in pairs, two and two with iron collars. She was so dreadfully mangled, they had not attempted to put her on the mill again that morning. ("Shame, shame.") Other women shewed us their legs lacerated in the same cruel manner. We afterwards inquired of the negroes from the estate to which she belonged, why she was subjected to this horrible punishment? They stated, that from her inability to labour through weakness, a former magistrate said she might cease from work; but that on a change of magistrates, her owner had sent her to look after sheep. One of them died, and the fear of punishment induced her to run away, though it did not appear that the least blame attached to her. She had been absent two months, and when found and brought back again, this cruel punishment had been inflicted by order of the magistrate, who is paid by this country to protect the negro. (Shame, shame.) Instances had come under his own observation where the poor negro was mercilessly mulcted of his Saturday on the most frivolous charges, in defiance of every principle of law and justice, and the people were obliged to work their grounds on the Sabbath for subsistence. We went to — in the morning to see the prisoners and the treadmills; at first there were four men. The cylinder of the mill is of small diameter, and the weight of the prisoners, when they all stepped, sent it round with such velocity that they were at once thrown off; it moved by jerks, quickly and slowly alternately, so that to keep step in the ordinary way appeared to be perfectly impossible. The prisoners were obliged to step sideways, taking two or three steps at a time in a very awkward manner; one young man, who had never been on before, hung by the wrists the greater part of the time, after many painful attempts to catch the step; he seemed to be in perfect torture, and cried out, "I don't know what they sent

me here for; I have done nothing to be sent here." &c., &c. When he came off he appeared quite exhausted. We were informed, on good authority, that in a whole district there was but one estate on which the people have not been deprived of their half Friday. The overseer, knowing it was the wish of the proprietor at home, persisted in giving them the half Friday, but the attorney insisted upon his not doing so, saying he would take upon himself all risk as to its illegality; and before I left, these people were deprived of their time like the rest. A poor woman, with three children, had been ill for nearly four years, and being unable to do any thing for herself, she had been put into the dungeon for three or four days at a time by her master, and taken out again without any authority from the magistrate. When locked up, her child had been deprived of the breast a whole day and night, and when she was brought before the justice, he refused to punish her, on account of her weak condition. Facts related by Mr. Sturge, relative to the treatment of females, were of the most thrilling description. Not only were they most cruelly punished, but their infants also suffered from the inhuman treatment of their parents. The men and women work in penal gangs in chains. The case of ten women with children, in gaol, was this:—They said that on Friday morning last, as it was very wet, they did not turn into the field before breakfast on account of their children; for this on the Monday they were brought before the special justice, and ordered to pay five Saturdays; they told him they could not, as their provision grounds were six miles off, they did not get their half Fridays, nor their salt fish, nor flour, nor sugar for their infants, and that without their Saturdays they were destitute of the means of support. This refusal of theirs to submit to so unrighteous a decision was construed into rebellion. They were sent to the workhouse for three days, and will still have to pay their Saturdays. Pregnant women are often obliged to pay back most of the time their masters lose by their confinement. They are not permitted to leave the field to suckle their children, and when they complain of this cruelty, their masters turn round upon them, and say, they do not care what becomes of them, for they are free children.

The planting attorneys are the aristocracy of the country. Many of them have seats in the legislature. The overseer may be cruel and unjust with impunity, provided he increases the crop of sugar and coffee; but he dare not be more humane than his neighbours, even though it may be the wish of the proprietor. Their employment mainly depends on the continuance of the present system, which enables them and their subordinates to lead lives too profligate for description. Yet with a certain knowledge of their infamous character, these men continue to be employed by the non-resident proprietors, mortgagees, and merchants, in this country, some of whom are political reformers, and other religious professors. (Hear, hear, and cries of "Shame.") Of the stipendiary magistrates, a large proportion are mere tools of the planters. One of them was known, before his appointment, to have been active in destroying the Baptist chapels. (Hear, hear.) The administration of the colonial department, under what was called the Tory party,

was more merciful to the negroes than under the present administration. (Hear, hear.) Lord Stanley; when the twenty millions were granted to the planters, did not oblige them to pay, nor did he recompense the Baptists out of the British exchequer, even one third of the amount of the property lost in the destruction of their chapels, and though something more was granted under Spring Rice, a large portion of it was supplied by the voluntary contributions of the English people. There were eleven magistrates publicly known to have assisted in destroying their chapels; and not one of them, up to this day, has been removed from office for it, but one who assisted in this infamous proceeding is appointed a special magistrate, and now receives 450*l.* a year from this country to see justice done to the negro. (Shame.) When Sir Lionel Smith came to Jamaica, a commission was appointed to inquire into the cause of complaint of the planters, against the conduct of Dr. Palmer, who is present this day. (Cheers.) This commission consisted of two local magistrates, both of them planters or managers of estates, and two stipendiary magistrates, the bias of one of whom, at least, if he had any bias, was against Dr. Palmer. (Hear.) They summed up their report by saying that they considered Dr. Palmer had administered the abolition law in the spirit of the English abolition act, and in his administration of the law had adapted it more to the comprehension of freemen than to the understandings of apprenticed labourers. (Much laughter.) Now not only did Sir Lionel Smith suspend Dr. Palmer on this report, but the colonial office at home have dismissed him from his situation. (Shame.) The effect of such a proceeding as this was to discourage every honest man who was disposed to act fairly towards the negroes. (Hear, hear.) Then there was the case of Lord Sligo. When this nobleman was appointed governor of Jamaica, it was considered injurious to the negro, as he was himself a slave proprietor, and had been chairman of the West Indian body. At first he committed some errors of judgment; but it was soon ascertained that he was honest in his intentions. (Hear, hear.) When he obtained an insight into the working of the system, he saw what was going forward, and endeavoured to check it. The consequence of this was, that a great storm was raised against him by the West Indian party. Some of these men applied at the colonial office to have him removed, but the answer they said they received in substance was, that in consequence of the estimation in which he was held by the dissenters, they could not remove him; but that a dispatch had been sent which would secure his resignation, and that that resignation would be accepted. (Hear, hear.) Now, if even Lord Sligo had been sacrificed to the planters' influence, could any man hope honestly to discharge his duty in the West Indies? (Hear, hear.)

There were however, still remaining in the commission some valuable men, who deserved their warmest sympathy under bitter persecution. He would give one illustration of this. The facts of the case were briefly these. A book-keeper of the name of Maclean, on the estate of the Rev. Mr. Hamilton, an Irish clergyman, committed a brutal assault upon an old African. The attorney on the

property refused to hear the complaint of the negro, who went to Stephen Bourne, a special magistrate, when Maclean was brought before him: he did not deny the fact; but said as the old man was not a Christian, his oath could not be taken! The magistrate not being able to ascertain the amount of injury inflicted upon the negro (whose head was dreadfully cut), but feeling that it was a case which required a greater penalty than 3*l.* sterling, the amount of punishment to which he was limited by the local acts, detained Maclean, and afterwards committed him to gaol, and wrote the next day to the chief justice upon the subject. He was discharged as soon as a doctor's certificate was procured of the state of the wounded man, and bail was given for his appearance at the assizes.

Maclean's trial came on at the assizes, he was found guilty by a Jamaica jury, and very severely reprimanded for his inhuman conduct, and fined 30*l.* The poor African, however, got no remuneration for the injury inflicted upon him, and the special justice has been prosecuted for false imprisonment, dragged from court to court, represented as an oppressor and a tyrant, put to above 400*l.* expenses in defending himself, and actually had judgment given against him for 150*l.* damages. ("Shame, shame.") By such means the planters have succeeded in pulling down every magistrate who ventures to do more than fine them 3*l.* for any act of cruelty of which they may be guilty. Mr. Sturge said, the Government was considered pledged by the report of the parliamentary committee to the House of Commons, to pay Bourne's expenses, but the Governor has not yet done so, and Bourne was liable, when I left Jamaica, to be arrested any day, and imprisoned in Kingston gaol. On the other hand, there were two magistrates who were dismissed while I was there, through, I believe, the representation of Lord Sligo, for flagrant violations of the law in their punishments; but he perceived by a Jamaica newspaper, that the planters were about to entertain them at a farewell dinner, and had actually set on foot a subscription, as a tribute of gratitude for their "impartial" conduct in administering the laws, as special justices. (Hear, hear.) Thus were two men, notoriously guilty of violations of law and humanity, publicly encouraged and protected, while Stephen Bourne, who, according to the testimony of the present and late Attorney General, had acted not only justly, but *legally*, was suffering every species of persecution and indignity for so doing. ("Shame! shame!") This horrid system would not end even in 1840, unless they exerted themselves in this country. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. Sturge concluded by reading the following document, which had been presented to him by 15 missionaries, to make what use of he thought proper, saying, at the same time, that they expected to be had up to the House of Assembly to answer for the statements which it contained. The parties who signed this document might be stated to possess a direct influence over one hundred thousand individuals, or one-third of the negro population. The missionaries, after bearing the highest testimony to the industry and good conduct of the negroes, proceeded as follows:—

"We cannot refrain expressing our deliberate opinion of the total unfitness of the apprenticeship system as an act of preparation for

freedom; and that it is to the unparalleled patience of the apprentices, and not to its tolerant spirit, that the present peaceful and prosperous state of the island is attributable.

"To you we unhesitatingly declare our belief, that this mockery of freedom is worthless as a preparation for that state to which it can have no possible affinity; that while it represses the energy of the negro, it has rendered him distrustful of the British public, by whom he considers himself to have been cheated by a name;—that it has entailed, and is still entailing, excessive suffering, especially on the mother, and her helpless and unavoidably neglected offspring; and that to secure its termination, no effort can be considered too great.

"We do, therefore, most earnestly entreat you, on your return to your native land, to exert your influence to effect the total abandonment of this system in 1838.

"But if every effort fail in procuring the abolition of the term of apprenticeship to the predial apprentices, that those advantages may at least be secured to them to which they are entitled by the provisions, imperfect as they are, of the act for the abolition of slavery.

"We further urge you, to watch with vigilance, any law which may be introduced in the imperial parliament, or passed by any of the colonial legislatures, to curtail the liberty of the negro after the termination of the present system; and any enactments of a restrictive and oppressive nature, calculated to keep them more degraded than any others of their fellow-subjects for one moment beyond that period.

"Your own observations in this colony must, we think, have convinced you that the costly apparatus by which it was intended to secure a measure of protection to the negro, is in many instances made instrumental in carrying on a system of coercion and oppression as odious as that from which he was intended to be freed.

"We cannot but express our regret at the apathy manifested of late by some of those friends in England, who so long and so zealously exerted themselves in behalf of the injured sons and daughters of Africa, and must consider that the responsibility rests on them, who have the power to obtain justice for this still injured people, for any consequences that may take place. Meanwhile we shall continue to exert our influence to tranquilize their minds under every disappointment, and to induce them to bear with patience the wrongs they are called upon to suffer."

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF SLAVERY.*

No. 3.

THE phrase "*bought with money*" is the next to which we call attention, as one that is strangely misunderstood in this controversy. Our familiarity with the American method of buying and selling human beings leads us to misconstrue such language in the Bible. It is taken for granted that to purchase a servant was to procure him of a third person, as a piece of property; although this idea is in direct contradiction to the whole tenor of Scripture on this point. It was a general practice among ancient people of God to buy their wives. Did they hold them as goods and chattles? The transaction between Joseph and the Egyptians (Genesis, 47,) casts light on the subject. It is the only case in the Bible where the whole business of buying men is given in detail. Joseph says—"Behold I have bought you this day;" yet this included nothing more than that they should cultivate the soil as Pharaoh's tenants, giving him one fifth part of the produce, and retaining the remainder to themselves. In Leviticus, xxv: 47, where provision is made for an Israelite to become the servant of a stranger, it is expressly said—"If he *sell himself* unto the stranger." Now in the 39th verse, the same word is rendered "*be sold*;" which no doubt, leads many to suppose that they were disposed of by third persons; the mind being pre-occupied with the manner in which slaves are sold in this country. In 1 Kings, xxi: 20, it is said—"Thou hast *sold thyself* to work evil." And in the 25th verse; "Ahab did *sell himself* to work wickedness." See also Isaiah I: 1, Is. LI: 3. and Jer. xxxiv: 14. These furnish a clue to the usage on this point. The persons "*bought*," sold themselves; it was entirely a voluntary contract; and involved in it nothing more than a disposal of their *services* for value received, until the termination of the prescribed period; which in some cases ended at the beginning of the seventh year, and in others at the commencement of the Jubilee. It vested no right of property in the *person*, and hence we never read of a man selling

* THE Conductors of this Magazine have learned with surprise that several persons have supposed that they adopted the sentiments of the two preceding numbers, on the same subject with the following article—merely because they inserted them in their Journal.—We therefore observe *first*, that our sentiments on the subject of Slavery and Abolition, are to be found in our own articles—not in those of our correspondents, and the editorial articles on these subjects, as upon all others, are always distinguished from those contributed for our pages.—*Secondly*, that our Journal is, and is meant to be, eminently a free and independent one; and can therefore well afford to publish many things which its Conductors dissent from,—the proper authors being responsible. There is of course, a limit to such indulgence; but it is a limit very difficult to fix, one which we prefer to step over rather than come short of, one which we are not aware the author of these essays has transgressed. We disagree with him in many things,—in some very widely; while in others we concur in his views. The subject is of great importance, and the author of these essays, though often mistaken—is both a gentleman and a Christian—and therefore deserves to be heard.

his servant, under the Mosaic code. Could the history of a Southern state be written without the mention of such a transaction? Here it may be asked, did not Joseph's brethren sell him as a slave against his consent? Very true. Such was the practice in Heathen nations, and these wicked men availed themselves of it to get rid of their brother. But how pointedly is such conduct rebuked afterwards. Joseph says, when speaking of it,—"*indeed I was stolen*" There is an exception in Scripture to the rule respecting men selling themselves. The case of the thief legally condemned, and unable to make restitution. The public authorities must sell him for the theft. It was an isolated case, and the penalty of a violated law. Does not this fact, however, afford strong presumptive evidence that involuntary servitude could not be likewise a regulation of civil society. Would God, in his enactments, place rogues and honest labourers in the same predicament?

The remaining phrase on which some build their system of slavery is found in the 46th verse. "Ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a *possession, &c.*" How eagerly do some snatch at such words, without reference to connection or Bible usage, in order to please themselves with the idea that they may lawfully hold and use their fellow immortals as *property*. They forget that among the very people to whom God gave this code, *servants were not applied to the uses, nor subject to the contingencies of property*. Where were they ever taken or offered in payment for their master's debts? Cattle, horses, furniture, the productions of the soil, &c., were all taken, but servants never. Property of all sorts was given and held in pledge; but no servants. All lost property was to be restored, but the Israelite was expressly forbidden to restore the runaway servant to his master. The penalty for stealing property was *restitution* on a large scale, that for stealing a man, in order to make a slave of him, was *death*; so much for the idea of holding men in *possession as property*. The term *inheritance* is so used in Scripture as to shew that it suits the purpose of our opponents no better. In 2 Chron, x. 16, it is written—"The people answered the King, saying, what portion have we in David? And we have none *inheritance* in the Son of Jesse." It would be ridiculous to suppose that they disclaimed the holding of their King as an article of property. See also Ezekiel xlv: 27, 28, and Johua xiii; 33.—Much more might be advanced, were we disposed to go beyond a mere sketch on each point. The sense, then, in which Israel were to possess these nations, and take them as an inheritance for their children, was, as a continued source of supply for permanent servants; and this regulation was to go down to posterity as a standing rule, or national usage. But as it respected the *nature* of the service, we have already seen that it was voluntary, and highly beneficial in its tendency to all parties. Consequently it was just the reverse of slavery in this land.

In view then, of all that has been said, is it not evident that the advocates of slavery deceive themselves in clinging so tenaciously to the phrases, "bought with money," "inherit them for a possession," "they shall be your bond-men (*servants* in the original) for-

ever." These expressions when interpreted in the light of the whole law and bounded by God's directions and threatenings, evidently convey the idea that the Jew must pay for the services which he received from his fellow creature, no matter of what nation, in opposition to stealing him, or forcing him to work without wages. And that after he had thus bargained for his servants *with themselves*, (not with a slave dealer,) they were bound to remain in his possession and serve him with fidelity during the whole period prescribed. These enactments, also, were not given as a temporary arrangement, but, as a permanent provision so long as the Jewish ceremony should exist, or in Scripture phrase, forever. Any other interpretation will bring these expressions into direct conflict with many of the plainest precepts, as well as with the general scope of the Word of God. It is the fair conclusion of the whole matter, then, that the Scriptures of the *Old Testament* give no countenance to the system of slavery established in this land; but on the contrary, they decidedly condemn it as oppressive and unjust.

The bearing of the NEW TESTAMENT on the subject next demands our attention. Are its teachings respecting human rights and human freedom in accordance with those of the Old Testament? Or, is it possible that the Lord Jesus Christ came into the world to curtail the privileges of the weak, and strengthen the hands of the powerful and despotic? Did he really sanction a system, calculated to grind the faces of the poor? Such an idea is directly at variance with the Bible account of his mission. He was sent—"to bind up the broken hearted, to proclaim *liberty to the captives*, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound." Does not slavery break the hearts of thousands, and bind them in captivity to their masters? I am aware that the language is figurative, and describes a release from the dominion of sin. But would not such figures be wholly inapplicable, were it not for the fact that bondage or captivity is a grievous affliction? Nay, so frequent is the use of such language throughout the Bible, that no candid mind can resist the conclusion, that slavery was deemed a curse, and freedom a blessing.

It is asserted, however, that slavery existed in its worst forms under the Roman government; and that Christ and his Apostles uttered nothing in opposition to it, and thus tacitly at least sanctioned the relation. It is true that tyranny and oppression prevailed largely in those days; and that masters lorded it most unfeelingly over their slaves. Now, is it credible that the benevolent Saviour sanctioned such wickedness by his conduct? If any man can fairly show that he countenanced the system of slavery then prevalent, (remember it was slavery, "*in its worst forms*,") he will construct a more powerful argument against the divine origin of Christianity than any infidel has ever framed. Nay, more, it would prove also, that Malachi, one of God's prophets, had uttered lies respecting the Messiah. He tells us—Mal. iii: 5,—that God, through him, as the Messenger of the covenant would come near, and "be a swift witness against sorcerers, &c."—and against those that oppress the hireling in his wages, (that oppress) *the widow and*

the fatherless, and that turn aside the stranger from his right." Could words be better chosen to describe the workings of slavery? No single term in Hebrew or Greek, answers to our word slavery. Hence the necessity for circumlocution, or such language as would describe it most plainly. No words could convey the idea more graphically, for the tree is best known by its fruit. And this is exactly the fruit produced by the tree of slavery, wherever it has taken root. Now our Saviour was a *swift witness* against such sinners, or he was not. If not, then did the inspired Prophet speak falsely; but if he did bear his testimony against such oppression and injustice, how futile the assertion that he sanctioned the slavery of his day. Again;—we learn that Christ's mission restricted him in a great measure to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel." And even his disciples were commanded "not to go into the way of the Gentiles." Now it can hardly be doubted that individuals among the Jews oppressed their servants, by holding them in unjust bondage. The custom of their Roman masters would certainly be followed by some. But the question arises, did slavery as a system, or general thing, prevail among the Jews in Christ's day? They had been carried into captivity chiefly for three sins—Idolatry, Slavery and Sabbath breaking. In practising the first and second of these sins, they copied the customs of the heathen; but so powerful was the impression made upon them by their captivity, that we never read that they openly or generally fell into either sin, after their return from Babylon. True, they had *douloi*, or servants, translated by some, slaves; and the Mosaic law regulated their servitude. Every person, however, who is acquainted with the Bible use of the word *doulos*, knows that it is a general term signifying *any kind of servant*, just as the word tree is applicable to every kind of tree found in the forest. On the supposition that slavery such as ours existed then among the Jews, and was sanctioned by their laws and rulers, what fools must the scribes and pharisees have been, to spend so much time in making long-faced prayers, and in taking pains to become finished hypocrites, in order "*to devour widows' houses.*" Why not do as in this and other slave-holding countries, take the widows themselves, and their children too, into their possession *as property*; and then every thing else would have been theirs of course. For a slave in this land "*can possess nothing but what must belong to his master.*" Such is our equitable code! We learn then, that when Jesus met with individual Israelites who "oppressed the widow and the fatherless, and turned aside the stranger from his right," he was a *swift witness* against all such. So says the Word of God. But why should we expect formal homilies from him against the system of slavery, when no such institution, as an established system, prevailed among the Jews to whom he ministered?

It may be alledged, however, that our Saviour knew that slavery prevailed in heathen nations generally; and as the gospel was intended for all, the question may properly be asked—*did he give such general principles as plainly lead to the overthrow or destruction of slavery, if honestly and fairly acted upon by all?* I answer, that Jesus Christ did give, in numerous instances, just such principles.

He condemned slavery precisely in the way that he condemned other sins then prevalent among men. But it is a remarkable fact, that many will acknowledge the opposition between the practices to which we allude, and the principles of the gospel, and then hesitate about slavery, although the contrast is more apparent in the latter case than in the others. Let us see. Polygamy, was a prevailing sin, yet we do not find a dissertation about it in the gospels. All acknowledge, however, that it is incidentally condemned. That there was no existence after the body dies, was a gross error of the Sadducees. They acknowledged the authority of the five books of Moses only; consequently our Saviour must refute them, if with success, by that part of Scripture. How did he undertake it? By quoting a direct assertion of Moses? No, but by an inferential argument merely. Jehovah said—"I am the God of Abraham, of Isaac and Jacob." "Now God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." That is, when Moses wrote, these Patriarchs were alive, for God is called their God; although their bodies had mouldered in the dust. This argument, although but an inference was decisive; for the Sadducees, it seems, did not insist upon a direct condemnation of their doctrine in so many words. But why did they not perceive this inference themselves? Just because their minds were blinded by prejudice, or pre-conceived opinion. Now let us apply some of the gospels principles to slavery. Christ says "whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." This has been called the golden rule, it is more, it is the heavenly rule; and its observance tends to lead the soul to God. Does not this precept, let me ask, as decidedly condemn the slaveholding of this land, as the declaration of Moses condemned the error of the Sadducees? Nay, is not the opposition ten fold more obvious? Would we, under any circumstances, consent to have our persons, our wives, and our children the *property* of another; to be subjected to his will, and liable to all the treatment permitted by the slave code? No, it is impossible. Then this just rule utterly prohibits our holding another in this predicament. It is often boasted that the slave-holders of the South, prize liberty so much, that they would die, rather than yield themselves and families to become slaves. Then they ought to die, rather than make slaves of others. Yet not content with holding the present generation of blacks in slavery, they busy themselves in enslaving their children as soon as born!! Alas! The inconsistency of man. How would they stare, after descanting upon the propriety and even benevolence of thus seizing their neighbours' children, if a serious proposition were made to take their own children, and raise and work them as slaves? The reasoning by which men evade the application of this principle of Scripture to slavery, is but miserable sophistry, and proves the truth of the maxim, that familiarity with sin blinds the mind as to its turpitude and deformity.

Take another precept of our Divine master—"thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." Look at the laws by which slavery is upheld in these United States. I allude not to those alone, that deprive the slaves of the right of locomotion, and sink him to the level of the brute; but also to such as hinder his instruction in the art of

reading, and thus forbid him to search the Scriptures, and virtually prevent the salvation of multitudes. Was it a principle of benevolence that led to the enactment of such laws, and that still continues them in force? It is, in truth, too much to be told, that slavery is based upon heaven born charity, or love. Common sense revolts at the assertion; and nothing but the same state of mind which hindered the Sadducees from perceiving their error in the light of the writings of Moses, prevents slave-holders from holding the incongruity of their system with this precept of our Lord Jesus Christ. Our Saviour then, in forbidding every thing inconsistent with the law of *love*, clearly condemns the system of slavery which prevails in our land.

Once more:—It is evident to all, that gambling, and piracy, and gladiatorial shows, all existed in ancient times, yet none of them are denounced by name in the Word of God. Still, it will be acknowledged that they all were sinful. Those who contend for the lawfulness of slavery, because the simple sentence is not found in the Bible—slavery is sinful, ought to be consistent, and contend for the lawfulness of gambling, because the Bible will be searched in vain also for the sentence—gambling is sinful. We shall be told probably, that gambling violates the tenth commandment, which forbids us *to covet any thing that is our neighbours'*. Very true. But if it be a sin to covet our neighbours' money, that we may use it as our own, must it not also be a sin to covet his bones and sinews; that we may appropriate them to our use; or to covet his child as soon as born, and hold and use it for our benefit as long as we live? If we would wipe the film of prejudice from our eyes, there would be no more difficulty in applying Bible principles to the subject of slavery, than we find in applying them to polygamy, gambling, piracy, gladiatorial shows, &c.—None of them is condemned *by name*, yet all of them are condemned by implication in many precepts, and they are clearly inconsistent with the whole spirit of the Word of God. All this was acknowledged by slave-holders themselves at different periods. Rev. Dr. Hill said, in the Synod of Virginia, in 1835,—“the relation of master and slave had its origin in injustice and wrong, *and was never sanctioned in the Bible.*” Mr. Maxwell said—“It is preposterous to go to the Bible to defend slavery. Its universal spirit is against the institution.” How readily did David condemn himself, in the parable of the ewe lamb, before the Prophet made the application. Just so with these men. Dr. Baxter, with a more discerning eye, shews them the bearing of their doctrine. He “denied that the relation was unlawful; it was recognized by the Scripture. If it were not true that the Bible sanctions the existing relations, then the abolitionists are right in their principle of immediate emancipation; for if there be sin in the relation, its immediate abandonment is a duty.” The application of the doctrine is that which slave-holders generally hate. The expression, “thou art the man,” which justly belongs to every one who aids in upholding the system, causes multitudes to shrink from their own avowals, and turn eagerly to the Bible for a justification of slavery. When will men be wise? Has not God said,—“he that covereth his sins shall not prosper; but whosoever *confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy.*”

A PRESBYTERIAN.

TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND IRISH PROTESTANTS PETITIONING
THE BRITISH HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE Marquis of DOWNSHIRE said, the petition which he was charged to present to the House was agreed to at a Meeting held in Dublin on the 24th of last January, and convened by public notice. The Meeting was attended by men of rank and property in Ireland, as well as by all portions of the Protestant community. He had the honour to preside over that Meeting, and he was happy to have the opportunity of bearing his testimony to its respectability, and he would declare that he never beheld so large a meeting conducted in so regular a manner—in a manner so honourable to all concerned, and so illustrative, as far as his (the Earl of Downshire's) experience had gone of the Protestant community—of their general desire always to preserve the good order of society, and support, in their different stations, the laws of the realm. (Hear, hear.) It perhaps would be necessary for him to state some grounds for the holding of that meeting. The paramount point was this, that the affairs of Ireland had assumed an aspect which gave very serious cause of apprehension to the Protestants of that country, and he would only instance the proceedings of a Society held in Dublin for a considerable period before the meeting in question, termed the General Association. That Association condemned the Protestant body generally, and charged it collectively with motives which they (the Protestants) considered to be unjust. They felt that if they had permitted themselves to remain long under the imputations cast upon them, they would be undeserving of the rank which they held in society, and the property which they possessed in the country. (Hear, hear.) For that reason it was thought that the most fitting, becoming, and constitutional mode of proceeding would be, to meet together in the capital of Ireland, and there to come to such resolutions as they might think proper, and concur in petitions to the throne and the two Houses of Parliament. He had already stated to the House how the meeting had been conducted. In presenting this petition, he would not enter more fully into the subject. He would leave its advocacy to other Noble Lords; but this he would say, that he most cordially agreed in the objects and proceedings of the meeting held in Dublin, and that he presented this petition to the House earnestly praying their Lordships to give it a fair and impartial consideration. He would only add, that the petition was most numerous and respectably signed. It was signed by nearly, if not fully, 200,000 signatures (hear, hear); the signatures of all persons, of all ranks and classes in Ireland. These signatures had been affixed to the petition in the most open manner, and it was only from the press of time, and from an anxiety to have it presented on as early a day as possible, that the number of signatures had not been much more numerous. He should, therefore, thinking it more respectful, both to their Lordships and to the petitioners, read

the petition at length. (The Noble Lord then read the petition.) The appearance of this document was very remarkable. It was wound round a wooden roller, of which the ends were about two feet and a half in diameter.

VISCOUNT MELBOURNE said, the statement of the Noble Lord had been, he was ready to admit, very temperate; and he would say, that it was of a tone, temper and manner very different from that which appeared to prevail upon the other side of the water; but, considering the great magnitude and importance attached to this petition, and considering the great pomp with which it had been got up, he certainly did feel it his duty to rise and make a few observations upon the present occasion. In the first place, he would call the attention of the House to the real history of this Meeting. It was held in pursuance of a requisition signed by eight Noble Lords, some of whom he saw opposite. The Noble Lord then read the requisition, and denied that the reasons given for calling the Meeting really existed. He proceeded to say, that the Meeting had been protested against by more Peers than had signed the requisition, and that he could not consider it as a Meeting expressing the sense of the Protestants of Ireland. (Hear, hear.) With respect to the General Association, and to the prudence of its existence, he (Viscount Melbourne) had already stated his opinion to the House, and from that opinion he now saw no reason to depart. At the same time, however, he would beg leave to say, that it did appear to him, under all the circumstances of the case—and as the Noble Duke opposite, on the very first day of the session, had said that he did not call upon the Government to adopt any active measures against that Association—it did appear to him, that he had a right to infer that the Government of Ireland was now doing no more by not taking any measure on the subject than was in accordance with the general opinion of their Lordships. He apprehended that the General Association was not, *per se*, illegal, notwithstanding that assertions to that effect had been made. The Noble Lord then proceeded to notice some of the Resolutions passed by the Meeting, and denied that they were justified by the facts. There was another topic to which he wished to allude. In the course of the Petition, the petitioners had made an attack on the doctrines and character of the Church of Rome; now he was extremely sorry to see those opinions expressed by persons of such weight and character. Was it possible, he would ask, ever to obtain peace in Ireland while they thus attacked the religion of the great majority of its inhabitants? (Cheers.) It was no slight matter even to declare war against the religious opinions of a small sect in a village; but it became very much more dangerous to declare war against the faith of a large portion of the population of a considerable country. He could easily believe that an individual, considering the Roman Catholic Church to be grievously in error, might feel himself bound to attempt to wean others from an error which might be detrimental to their salvation, and if that were the conscientious opinion of every one, he (Lord Melbourne) would say nothing to dissuade him from such a course of conduct; but for those who were entrusted with the safety of the nation, with its councils,

and who might probably be entrusted with the administration of its laws—it was incumbent upon them to think a little before they ventured to attack with invective, or overwhelm with ridicule, the religion of a great proportion of their fellow subjects. He undoubtedly had felt it to be due both to the petitioners and to those who had protested against the Petition, due to the state of Ireland, and due to this country, not to let a Petition of such importance pass by without offering to the House these few observations. (Ministerial cheers.)

The Earl of RODEN said, he had listened with the greatest attention and respect to the speech which had just been addressed to the House by the Noble Viscount; but he trusted that he should be able before he sat down to show, from documents which he should be obliged to read, that the Noble Viscount had come to very erroneous and incorrect conclusions respecting this Meeting and the object of it, in that there were circumstances which called aloud on the Protestants of Ireland to come forward at that very period, and to stand up for the principles which were so cruelly assailed. The Noble Viscount had read the requisition, signed by several Peers, whose names he did not read; but he (Lord Roden) might appeal to the House whether the words employed in that requisition were not most constitutional in their nature and defined in character; and he could confidently assert, that the Meeting which had been the result of that requisition, was not a Meeting where all kinds of charges were made, but for the simple purpose of approaching the two Houses of Parliament, and respectfully putting forward the grievances under which the Protestants of Ireland were labouring. However, as the House was aware, a protest against that Meeting appeared in Dublin on the very morning, he believed, during which the Meeting was to be held, signed by most respectable Peers and Members of the House of Commons. For some of those Peers he entertained the greatest respect, and for many of them very great regard, but he must say, he thought they had taken rather too much upon themselves when they put their names to a document of this nature, which appeared to him to be characterised by unnecessary and improper interference. But what was the language of the Protesters? In the first place, they had objected to this as an "exclusive Meeting of the Protestants of Ireland," and so far the objection was very natural. They then stated that they considered "a Meeting of such a character calculated to interrupt the tranquillity which at present happily prevailed in Ireland." What tranquillity, he should like to know? The Noble Viscount had made some observations in reference to that subject, and he (the Earl of Roden) confessed that it was with the utmost astonishment and surprise that he had heard the Prime Minister of the Crown, who ought to be acquainted (whether he was or not, he knew not) with the state of every part of His Majesty's dominions—heard him re-echo that statement of the tranquillity there referred to, when he believed that he should be able to show to their Lordships what that tranquillity really was, and what was the course which His Majesty's Government had pursued for the increase of it. He might call on the Noble Viscount opposite to refer to the proclamations which had

been issued by his own Lord-Lieutenant in the course of less than one year, and then he might ask the House was it a signal of that tranquility, that within that period no less than 290 proclamations had been issued, of which 71 were for actual murder? (Hear, hear, hear.) And let their Lordships mark how that tranquility had increased, for from the 7th of February to the 23d of the same month, a period of 16 days, let them only turn to the proclamations of the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, and they would find that, within that period of sixteen days, eleven proclamations had been issued for actual murder. Where, then, was the tranquility which had been referred to in the protest, and re-echoed by the Noble Viscount? He would now proceed to prove, from another instance, what little grounds Noble Lords had for speaking of the tranquility that prevailed in Ireland. He found that the applications from the Irish clergy, in order to insure their lives at the insurance offices, were now universally met by the answer, that such was the present state of Ireland—so tranquil, forsooth, according to the statement of the Noble Viscount—that they could not insure the lives of any Protestant clergymen. (Loud Cheers.) He would mention to their Lordships one or two cases of that sort. An application had been made by the Rev. W. Frazer, of Killaloe, to the Asylum Insurance Company, in order to have his life insured at that office, and the answer which he received was, that his proposal might be completed on certain terms, which were mentioned, but “that the policy would except death by popular violence or assassination.” (Hear, hear, hear.) That was an exception which was now always inserted in the policies of insurance upon the lives of the Protestant clergy in Ireland (hear, hear), and it afforded another convincing proof of the perfect tranquility which there prevailed. (Cheers.) [The Noble Lord then referred to several other cases to show the danger that at present surrounded the clergy of Ireland.] Those who were in the habit of hearing any thing about the proceedings of the National Association in Dublin would be aware, that on the first announcement of that loyal assembly from which this Petition had emanated, that Association met and entered into Resolutions expressive of their indignation that the Protestants should presume to meet for the purpose of setting forth the grievances under which they laboured. (Hear, hear, hear.) In that or the following day’s debate one of the Members had moved that a Committee should be appointed for the purpose of taking measures to prevent the Protestant Meeting from taking place; and the mode which it was proposed to adopt was this—would the House believe it?—that 100,000 men should be marched into Dublin on the very day, in order to overawe the proceedings of the Protestants. (Hear, hear.) Such language appeared to be very far from testifying the peace of the country; it was highly inflammatory and unconstitutional, for it was, in fact, calling on the Crown not to deprive the country of the Government of that man, who, he believed, was the great mover of the present Administration. (Hear.) The efforts, however, of the Association fortunately were not successful in putting a stop to the Protestant Meeting. The Noble Lord then referred to the rebellious speeches and toasts at different Meetings

of Roman Catholics, to show the disturbed state of the country. He was sorry to detain the House so long upon this subject; but he confessed that when the Noble Viscount talked so confidently of Ireland, he had felt it to be his duty to call their attention to some facts, in order to prove what a deception it was, and how unfounded was the assertion of the protesters and of the Noble Viscount. (Hear, hear.) He need hardly tell their Lordships that another proof was to be found in the fact that the law was a complete dead letter as to the recovery of the property of the clergy of Ireland. (Cheers.) The Noble Viscount had thrown out some doubts as to the reliance which was to be placed on the accounts that were received from different parts of Ireland; but he could tell the Noble Viscount that which had been told to His Majesty's Ministers in another place, that those who made these statements were ready to prove them to be facts; and, if there were time, he could then go into that discussion; but whenever there was a specific Motion before the House (hear, hear), he should feel it his duty to enter upon the entire investigation. (Hear, hear.) [He then alluded to the gross partiality shown by the Carlow jury, the majority of which were Papists, and which appeared in this paper very recently.] In order to prove what he had stated with respect to the jurors, he would take the liberty of moving, in the course of the evening, for a return of the panel which had been sent by the Sheriff of the county of Carlow to the Clerk of the Crown, and also for the jury paper. He had heard it said by one who had entered into the Resolutions referred to, and signed the protest, that the Protestants of Ireland were "a miserable, monopolising minority." Whether such language was becoming in a Minister of the Crown when he spoke of as respectable, as loyal, as important a part of the population as any in the British empire, he would not now say, but he would state, that if he did use these words, it neither proved his great sagacity nor his great temper. That they were a minority he must agree, but they were a minority in that sense in which their Lordships were a minority of the empire. If they were monopolising, it was the monopoly of all the offices of charity and liberality towards their fellow-countrymen, which were gratefully felt and acknowledged.

But there was a spirit in their Lordships' House, and a spirit growing up amongst the masses in this country, amongst the middle classes of the people of England, which would show its power at no very distant day. (Cheers.) They were then on the eve of a great crisis—they stood on the brink of a precipice—and no one could tell how soon they might be called on to decide whether the Act of Union should be repealed or the Act of 1829. (Hear, hear.) For his part, when the period arrived, he should not hesitate as to the course he should pursue. He always believed that no security could be given by Roman Catholic Members for the preservation of the Protestant Church, and experience had proved that those opinions were but too well founded. (Loud cheers.)

The Earl of DONOUGHMORE, was one of those who had signed that Petition, and he would tell their Lordships why. For upwards of twenty years his family had been on terms of friendly intercourse with the Roman Catholics, and he had always supported their

claims to an equality of political privileges; but on a clear and distinct understanding that the political power with which they were to be entrusted should not endanger the security of the Established Church. (Hear, hear.) Since the passing of the Relief Bill, the compact, which was the basis of that measure, had been violated, and the engagements which had been entered into broken. (Hear, hear.) He would not then enter into a detail of those violations, but he would ask their Lordships whether it had not been stated, in the evidence given by the leading members of the Roman Catholic party, before Parliamentary Committees, that the Emancipation Act would strengthen the security of the Protestant Church of Ireland? (Hear, hear.) How far those anticipations had been realised it was unnecessary for him to tell their Lordships. It was unnecessary to remind them that Protestant clergymen had been stoned to death, and other acts of violence perpetrated against their persons and property. (Hear, hear.) For three years past he had taken no part in particular, in the hope that His Majesty's Government would have taken some steps to afford protection to the Protestants of Ireland; but in that hope he had been disappointed, and therefore it was, he felt himself called on to sign that Petition. (Hear.) The Noble Viscount had stated that Tipperary was in a state of comparative tranquility, but in this he believed the Noble Viscount was misinformed. He (the Earl of Donoughmore) had returns in his possession, by which it appeared that in the last three years no less than *six hundred and forty-one persons had been deprived of life in that county.* (Hear, hear.) *He then complained that the Lord-Lieutenant had opened the prisons and discharged notorious offenders.*

The Earl of GLENGALL rose, but the Noble Earl spoke in so low a tone that he was very imperfectly heard in the gallery. Now how was the justice to Ireland rent levied? Why, by intimidation. The people, in point of fact, dared not refuse to pay it, because, if they did, they would be subjected to all the consequences of that system of terror which prevailed in Ireland. (Hear.) With regard to the protest, and the Noble Lords who signed that protest, he should say little more than that certain of them were absentees. Now, on a late occasion, in the west of Ireland, what was the doctrine held with regard to absentees? Why, that absenteeism, like the Church, should be got rid of. (Hear, hear.) Some proposed that half the estates of the absentees should be taken from them, and applied for the maintenance of the poor, while others went the length of saying that they should be deprived of the whole of their estates. He was one of the Peers who attended the Meeting in Dublin which was held for the purpose of obtaining Roman Catholic Emancipation; but he must say, that he was surprised to see affixed to this protest the names of four Roman Catholic Peers. He should have thought the time had not yet arrived for their taking such a step, and he must express his regret that they had not taken pattern by the laudable example which the English Roman Catholic Peers had set them on all occasions when the subject of the Established Church had been brought under discussion. (Hear, hear.) Prior to the last assizes at Tipperary as many as 1,507

committals had taken place to the gaols of that county, and yet the Noble Lords opposite talked of the tranquility of Ireland. (Hear, hear.) As their Lordships were aware, Lord Mulgrave, after due deliberation and consideration, of course (a laugh), liberated *ninety-seven prisoners from the gaol of Clonmel*. The Noble Lord then blamed the Government appointments of the sheriffs and assistant-barristers. The great tithe agitators perhaps were briefless barristers, and these were the persons who were appointed to fill the important offices of assistant-barristers. He was happy to say that the Roman Catholic gentry—those who were entitled to be called gentry—never mixed themselves in such affairs, and he only wished that their example had been imitated by others. He was not aware that there were any Orangemen in Tipperary, but he knew that all Protestants were so designated, in order to render them odious to the common people. In conclusion, the Noble Lord thanked the House for the attention with which he had been heard, and resumed his seat amidst loud cries of "hear."

The Duke of WELLINGTON said, his anxious wish had always been, that the Protestants of Ireland should always be on the best terms with the Government; and that the Government should always give them protection and support. The safety of the country, the permanence of the Union depended, he was satisfied, on that good understanding, as did also the safety of the persons and property of the Protestants. The Protestants of Ireland had been said to have cause of jealousy towards the government; and the Noble Viscount ought to do every-thing to conciliate them, and convince them that they had the protection of the Government, and would not be sacrificed to those who were every day preaching up sedition against the institutions of the country, and insurrection against their persons. The Protestants were in number two millions; they possessed nine-tenths of the property of Ireland, and were the best educated of the people; the province in which they resided was as well cultivated as any part of England. Let their Lordships look and see if the Protestants had not some reason for jealousy in the transactions of the last two years. Let them look at the total destruction of tithe property, the treatment of the Church and other circumstances, showing the existence of an intention of putting down the Protestant religion in Ireland, and substituting for it something like the Voluntary system. The Noble Viscount had referred to the history of 1782 and 1793. Let them look further back—to the letters of the Earl of Clarendon, when Lord-Lieutenant, and see if matters were not now growing to the same state as then; and if there did not exist the same power over the Government as in those days. He considered that all the statements made by his Noble Friends ought to have the greatest possible effect on the Protestant mind. He thought that the Protestants had good grounds for the suspicions, jealousy, and anxiety entertained by them. Decided statements had been made as to the diminution of crime. But if he relied upon Baron Foster's charge—a good authority,—he did not find so much diminution. On the contrary, crime continued excessive.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE PAPAL CHURCH ABROAD.

No. 4.

Letter of the Rev. Michael Crotty, Parish Priest of Birr, to the Most Rev. Dr. Murray.

“Magna est veritas et prevalebit.”

MOST REVEREND SIR—In the year 1820, shortly after my return from France, I was appointed curate to the Rev. Mr. Maher, the incumbent of the Parish of Birr, by Dr. O’Shaughnessey, Titular Bishop of the Diocese of Killaloe. In this situation I continued nearly four years, during which period the zealous discharge of my clerical duties, my unremitting attention to the wants and distresses of the suffering poor of the town and parish of Birr, together with my humble but persevering exertions to instruct and enlighten the poor, ignorant, benighted people procured me the general esteem and confidence of the parishioners, with the exception of a few bigots and their partisans, the priests, whose open and avowed hostility I incurred by a firm and uncompromising discharge of my spiritual functions. When I arrived in Birr, Sir, I found the Roman Catholics of that large and extensive parish, buried in the most profound ignorance of the Gospel, and of the truths of Christianity, the wretched votaries of the most revolting and debasing superstition, and the unhappy victims of that gross ignorance that panders to priestcraft.

I told them they must not look to priestly absolution and penance for the hope of pardon for their sins, and reconciliation with an offended God, but to a firm belief and confidence in the all-sufficient and atoning blood of a crucified Redeemer, and sincere repentance towards God for their iniquities.

When I came to Birr, Sir, I found that the Roman Catholics of that parish had directed all their prayers to the Virgin Mary, and that they seldom or never prayed to their Saviour. I told them they were guilty of the horrible sin of Idolatry, by transferring the homage of their hearts from the Creator to the creature—that God was a jealous God, and would not give his glory to another.

I found also, Sir, that the Roman Catholics of Birr, were in the constant habit of praying to saints and angels, and begging their intercession, which practice I denounced as injurious to the mediatorship of God the Son, and as opposed to the Word of God—that there was only one Mediator between God and man, the Lord Jesus Christ, who ever liveth to make intercession for us.

When I arrived in Birr, Sir, I found that the Priests had invariably inculcated upon the minds of the Roman Catholics of that parish the doctrine of exclusive salvation, which I denounced as unchristian and anti-social, and which I refuted by the most irrefragable arguments from the Scriptures.

By persevering and untiring efforts, but not without great persecution and suffering, my cousin and I have made the Roman Catholics of Birr, abandon the worship of saints and angels, and the revolting superstitions of the scapular.*

We have instructed them in the sound principles and truths of the Gospel; we have abolished the litany of the Virgin Mary, and substituted in its stead the litany of Jesus; we have made our flock look to the Saviour as the only foundation whereon to build; we have inculcated upon the minds of our congregation the leading doctrines of the gospel, which are belief in a crucified Redeemer, and repentance for sin, "for in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but a new creature." We still retain the Latin mass, which, after a time, we mean to translate into the vernacular tongue, and which we offer up as a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and as a memorial of the all-sufficient and atoning sacrifice of Christ upon the cross.

We have told our flock that the doctrine of purgatory was the invention of clerical avarice, a pious fraud of the Priests, to draw money from the pockets of the people, who daily make an unholy traffic and merchandize of their souls, and for the existence of which place not a single satisfactory or conclusive text can be deduced from the Scriptures.

No sooner, Sir, did the Bigots of Birr and their partisans the Priests perceive that my cousin and I preached these doctrines, than, like Demetrius the silversmith, and his craftsmen, who got no small gain by making silver shrines for Diana of the Ephesians, they assembled together with the workmen of like occupation, to defend the craft by which they got their wealth, and conspired to remove me and my cousin from the parish of Birr, for despising the temple of the Virgin Mary, the great goddess of the Roman Catholics, and abolishing her worship in Birr, and destroying her magnificence where all the papists worship.

Because, Sir, my cousin and I opened the eyes of the ignorant and benighted Roman Catholics of Birr, and "turned them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins and an inheritance among them, which are sanctified by faith in Christ Jesus," the bigots of Birr, and their partisans the Priests, conspired to remove me and my cousin from that parish; but the great majority of the Roman Catholics of the said town and parish of Birr threw around us the shield of their protection, and rescued us both from the murderous grasp of the most atrocious conspiracy that ever was organized, to effect the ruin, and accomplish the destruction of two men, whose whole lives have been spent in doing all the good they could to their fellow creatures—in whose hearts no anger durable or vehement has ever been kindled, but by what they considered as tyranny, and whose only crime is that they have preached the Word of God boldly and in its purity, and denounced priestcraft and the incurable scepticism of the Church of Rome, and are for so doing now persecuted

*The worship of the *Scapular* is the basis of the system of our poor Carmelite Nuns in Aisquith street; to which they add the worship of the *human heart of Mary*.

by a bigoted and superstitious priesthood, and by the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic persuasion.

I have read your letter, Sir, to the Lord Bishop of Gloucester, and I am bold to say you must be possessed of no small degree of hardihood to dare deny the truth of the facts stated by his lordship, at a public meeting convened in that city, for the laudable purpose of relieving the oppressed and persecuted Protestant Clergy of Ireland.

In that letter, Sir, you have sympathised with the widow Ryan and her children, who fell victims to O'Connell's agitation, and to their own folly and madness, in opposing the law of the land, and the constituted authorities of the country; but you have not breathed a sigh, nor shed a tear for the fourteen policemen who, under the command of Captain Gibbons, were decoyed, surrounded, and barbarously butchered in the narrow defile of Carrickshock, while the chapel bells summoned a savage, ferocious, and priestridden peasantry to imbue their hands in the innocent blood of those unfortunate victims.

In that letter, Sir, you have sympathised with the widow Ryan and her children, but you did not sympathise with the family of Corby, one of my flock, who was barbarously murdered by a savage banditti, who attacked his house at night, and who bravely fell in defence of his wife and children from a general and indiscriminate slaughter.

In that letter, Sir, you have sympathised with the widow Ryan and her children, but you have no sympathy or compassion for the *unfortunate Clavin*, who was one of my flock, and the only son of a poor widow who depended on his daily labour for her support, and whose murderer was rescued from the public justice of his country; but he did not escape the justice of heaven, for he died a melancholy and striking monument of God's vengeance.

In that letter, Sir, you have sympathised with the widow Ryan and her children, but you had no pity or compassion for the murder of *Mrs. Denison of Birr*, the mother of nine children, who was barbarously butchered by a ruffian, whose brother is now going to be made Coadjutor to the present Titular of Killaloe!

In that letter, Sir, you have sympathised with the widow Ryan and her children, but you had no sympathy or compassion for my congregation when their old parish chapel was thrown down over night by an armed banditti, and which sacrilegious and felonious act was committed for the twofold purpose of preventing me from having the use of said chapel, and also of fixing the guilt of this impious sacrilege and midnight felony upon me, and the most leading and influential persons of my congregation, but in which nefarious and diabolical design a certain priest in Birr and his accomplices failed, as I and my friends exerted ourselves and found out the real authors and perpetrators of this unparalleled outrage upon the laws of the land and the sacredness of private property; but as they were employed by that priest and sanctioned by a *high* authority, no informations would be taken by the Birr magistrates.

In that letter, Sir, you have sympathised with the widow Ryan and her children, but you had no sympathy or compassion for the

great majority of the Roman Catholics of Birr when they were expelled from their new chapel at the point of the bayonet.

In that letter, Sir, you have sympathised with the violators of the law and perpetrators of crime and outrage, but you had no sympathy or compassion for me when you and your fair penitent the Marchioness Wellesley,* and all the myrmidons of the late Government conspired against me, and sent down to Birr a stipendiary magistrate, who persecuted me and my congregation, and got up a government prosecution against me at the summer assizes of Philipstown in the year 1833, where all the crown lawyers to a man were arrayed against me, and a jury was packed to convict me and my Cousin for having committed a trespass upon the new Roman Catholic Chapel of Birr, which was built by the private subscriptions of the Roman Catholic parishioners who are devoted to me and my cousin from conscientious convictions; and for having broken the spell, and dissolved the charm, and snapt the chains that had so long rivetted their slavery, and emancipated them from the spiritual thralldom in which they had been so long kept by an interested, selfish, and superstitious priesthood.

In that letter, Sir, you have sympathised with the murderers, and plunderers of the Protestant Clergy of Ireland, but did your church ever show any sympathy or compassion for Henry the Fourth of France, that father of his country, who wished he might never die until he saw a fat fowl in the pot of every one of his subjects, which sentiment of homely benevolence is worth all the splendid sayings that are recorded of kings, but as Mr. Burke well observes, the goodness of the man exceeded the power of the king? I say, Sir, did your church sympathise with that benevolent and good king, when his murderer, the *ruffian Ravillac*, upon his examination alleged the sermons preached in Paris during Lent by the priests, before his assassination of that great and good king, as the ground and encouragement of that execrable fact?

Does not history, Sir, record, that shortly after that magnanimous Prince had fallen a victim to the fury and fanaticism of the priests and bigots, Cardinal Perron, in the assembly of the estates of France, and in the name of the first estate, that is of the clergy, did re-assert the power of the Pope to depose kings, and to absolve their subjects from all allegiance to their lawful sovereigns?

In that letter, Sir, you have sympathised with the widow Ryan and her children, but did your church sympathise with the 30,000 French Protestants, who, under a solemn oath of safety and protection, were invited to the court of France and massacred in cold blood? And when the news of the horrible massacre of St. Bartholomew was brought to Rome, and when the letters of the Pope's legate were read in the assembly of the cardinals, the cannons of St. Angelo were fired to testify the public joy; the whole city was illuminated with bonfires, and a solemn high mass was celebrated in the Church of the Minerva, at which the Pope Gregory xiii. and his Cardinals were present, and a jubilee was published throughout

* This fair bigot, was trained in our good city,—and is the pupil and sample of American papism. She is the grand-daughter of the late Charles Carroll of Carrollton.

the whole Christian world, to return thanks to God for the extirpation of the enemies of the truth and the church in France?

In that letter, Sir, you have sympathised with the widow Ryan and her children, but did your church sympathise with the proscribed and persecuted Protestants and Protestant clergy of France, when the revocation of the edict of Nantz subjected 60,000 Huguenots to sufferings and indignities, the very mention of which chills the blood, and harrows up the very soul, and with which scenes of desolation and horror the Popish clergy of France feasted their eyes and listened to the groans and tortures of those their suffering fellow creatures, not only with insensibility but with laughter!!!

In that letter, Sir, you have sympathised with the widow Ryan and her children, but did your church express its sympathy and compassion for the indiscriminate massacre and slaughter that were made of the Protestants in Ireland in 1641?

You see, Sir, how early the practice began of denouncing the Protestant clergy and their religion, as objects of vengeance by the priesthood of holy mother church; and yet in the face of history, which gives a faithful record of all the actions of men, you have the *frons meretricis*, the unblushing hardihood to deny, that at this very day, and in this unfortunate country, the Protestant clergy have been denounced as objects of vengeance from their altars by the priests, and that they are encouraged in this wicked and diabolical conduct by the Hierarchy of the Roman Catholic persuasion!!!

What! Sir, dare you deny the truth of the facts stated by the worthy and learned Bishop of Gloucester, at a public meeting held in that city, for the relief of the Protestant clergy of Ireland?

What! Sir, do you forget, and dare you pretend to be ignorant, that it was the language of *passive resistance* which the late Dr. Doyle proclaimed from the altars and pulpits of his diocese that generated these disturbances in the Queen's County, which distracted and embarrassed his administration, which he could not quiet—which robbed him of his repose, and at last consigned him to a premature grave? Was it not, Sir, the doctrine of *passive resistance* to the law of the land, and the constituted authorities of the country, which the Doctor recommended, and which the priests preached from their altars and pulpits, that has produced the present, and reddened the fields of Ireland with the blood of the unfortunate victims? Was not it, Sir, the language of the late Dr. Doyle to his infatuated countrymen and O'Connell's agitation, that have generated the massacre of Rathcormac, which you have so pathetically deplored, and made the surrounding hills and vallies re-echo with the sad and mournful lamentations of the disconsolate widow Ryan—this modern Rachael, who would not be comforted, because her unhappy children fell victims to the baneful influence of domineering priests, and turbulent demagogues? Was it not, Sir, the inflammatory language of the late Dr. Doyle, and the general cry from the altars and pulpits of the Roman Catholic chapels throughout Ireland, that have bequeathed to this unhappy country a lasting and imperishable legacy of blood and slaughter, of anarchy and insurrection? Have not you yourself, Sir, given your countenance

and support to the agitation which now disturbs the peace of Ireland, and renders our unhappy country the scene of blood and murder? Have not you yourself, Sir, given the sanction of your approbation to the system of denunciation which at present pervades Ireland, and which is encouraged and supported by the Hierarchy of the Roman Catholic persuasion?—"Wicked servant, from thine own mouth I condemn thee."

You saved appearances, Sir—you observed the *juste milieu* between the Tory and Radical party—you would not allow your altars to become the arenas of political agitation, nor your priests to degenerate from their true characters of ministers of peace and charity into political mountebanks and gladiators, nor your chapels to be desecrated by lawless and turbulent demagogues—in a word, Sir, you have sustained the character of a *Machiavelian politician*, and acted the part of a most profound and consummate hypocrite, until the very moment you discovered you had fallen into the pit you dug for the ruin and destruction of your Protestant brethren and their religion in Ireland, and were caught floundering in the great Sarbonian bog of Den's Theology, out of which, with all your casuistry and jesuitical dexterity, you could not possibly extricate yourself. You then threw off the mask by which you could no longer be concealed, and avowed yourself an agitator like the rest of your colleagues, and set an example of political partizanship to the clergy of your diocese, by contributing ten pounds to the O'Connell tribute! And yet, Sir, we are annoyed by having you called the *mild*, the *bland*, the *conciliating* Daniel Murray!

You, Sir, and your compeers rejoice at the persecution and sufferings of the Protestant Clergy of this country. I perfectly agree with you, Sir, that there seems to be a general conspiracy against the Established Church in Ireland—it is attacked upon every side; some of its own children are disturbing its unity, and lacerating its bosom within, whilst popery and infidelity, O'Connell and the Whigs, are assailing it without, with every species of hostile and deadly weapon.

But, Sir, if it be the will of Divine Providence that the present church establishment of Ireland must pass through a great variety of untried being, and in all its transmigrations to be purified by fire and blood, I hope and trust in God that an invisible spirit will preserve it unhurt by the conflagration, that it will come out of the ordeal of persecution like gold tried by the furnace.

Let me suppose, Sir, at the next meeting of parliament, the Archbishop of Canterbury should come forward at the head of the English and Irish Protestant bishops and clergy, and like the virtuous Archbishop of Paris, before the National Assembly of France, he should declare in the name and on the behalf of his brethren, that their only anxiety was that Divine Worship should be celebrated with dignity—that the Gospel should be preached by virtuous, zealous and well-instructed clergymen—that the poor should be supported and educated—and that these purposes might be carried into immediate effect, they were ready and willing to resign the whole of their tithes, revenues, and incomes—nay, to sacrifice every thing, and to trust for their own future support to the justice and

gratitude of their country, in order to redeem the character, and preserve the purity and integrity of the Established Church in Ireland—suppose such a case—you, Sir, could not deny, indeed no man could deny, that this would be a generous and disinterested sacrifice—a conduct worthy the spirit of the Gospel, worthy the successors of the Apostles, worthy the virtue and heroism of the purest and brightest ages of Christianity. You, Sir, could not deny that this would be an offering most acceptable to heaven—that it would ennoble and exalt the characters of the Protestant Hierarchy and clergy of Ireland in the estimation of foreign countries—that it would excite and kindle in the hearts and bosoms of other bishops and priests in every quarter of the globe a noble and generous emulation of virtue and patriotism—that it would refute the calumnies of their traducers, and extort from their enemies the unwilling and reluctant declaration that the religion which was capable of inspiring its teachers and professors with such a sacrifice as that, must be indeed the religion of Christ and his Apostles.

I would be glad to know, Sir, what effect such a sacrifice as this would have upon an English House of Commons—upon a reformed parliament? Would not the generality of that house, or at least would not O'Connell and his tail, together with the present Popish-Whig-Radicals, look upon it as a constrained rather than a free-will offering; as a sacrifice extorted by necessity and force rather than dictated by generosity and public spirit; and whilst they rejoiced at, and applauded the sacrifice, would they not deride the sacrificers as the greater part of the National Assembly of France did the noble, disinterested and public-spirited conduct of the worthy and virtuous Archbishop of Paris and of the French clergy.

I would be glad to know, Sir, what effect this sacrifice would have upon this unhappy country? Would it quiet Ireland? Would it satisfy the demands of Mr. O'Connell and the Irish agitators? Would it satisfy the priests, and make them good and loyal subjects? Would it harmonize the jarring and conflicting elements of which society is at present composed in this distracted country? Would it unite Roman Catholics and Protestants in the bonds of mutual love and affection, and put an end to all jars, and jealousies, and heart-burnings in this wretched country? Would it put an end to agitation, and diffuse the blessings of peace, of order, of industry, of education, of civilization, and of morals, among the wretched and deluded peasantry of this ill-fated country, and rescue them from the baneful and demoralizing influence of Popish priests, and turbulent, discontented demagogues? In a word, Sir, would it procure respect and attachment to the persons and characters of the Protestant clergy, preserve their houses and properties from violation, and themselves and their families from the dagger of the midnight murderer and ruthless assassin? It was thought, Sir, that Emancipation would have been attended with all these blessings to Ireland. Has it been the case? Look to the present state of Ireland. Was there ever such an anomaly in the history of mankind? Look at the spirit of domination that now rolls its revolutionary torrent over the country, and that is levelling every barrier which the laws have erected to arrest the progress of its destructive violence. Gracious God! how long will this

state of things be allowed to continue? or where will the encroachments of Papacy, and the demands of O'Connell and the priests end? Must not every day's experience, every record of past times, and every page of history convince the Protestants of the British empire, and English statesmen themselves, that the establishment of Popish ascendancy in these kingdoms is incompatible with the existence of Protestantism, with national freedom, and national prosperity? Does not the church government of Popery, which involves the spiritual authority, exercised by the Popish priesthood over their penitents and congregations, operate directly or indirectly upon every part of the community, Protestant as well as Popish? Does not Popery plant in the heart of society a despotism encroaching invariably and indefatigably upon every power which exists upon earth; and where it is acknowledged by any state to be the established religion, have not all its efforts and energies been hitherto exerted with unvarying success, for the subjugation of the state to its own policy and councils? Where, Sir, is the country of modern Europe where the Popish priesthood has been for any long period invested with the authorities and privileges of an established church, that its constant and uniform aim has not been the acquisition of political power. Can the Protestants, therefore, safely rely on the hypocritical professions of Mr. O'Connell, when he tells them that he hates factious ascendancy of any kind? Can the Protestants, Sir, trust the oath taken by the Roman Catholic members of Parliament for the safety, protection and integrity of the Protestant Church in Ireland? I think, Sir, I have satisfied every reasonable mind, that denunciation from the altars and pulpits of the Romish chapels throughout Ireland is the order of the day, and that I have vindicated the Bishop of Gloucester from the charges of falsehood and misrepresentation which you, Sir, in the fervour of your zeal for the unsullied purity of the Romish Priesthood, have vainly and impotently endeavoured to fix upon him. If the Protestants will not profit by experience and the light of history, I beg leave to call the attention of the Protestants of the united empires and of English statesmen themselves, to a close consideration of the following facts, in which I will clearly prove and demonstrate, that not only the Protestant clergy of Ireland have been denounced from the altars and pulpits of the Romish chapels *as objects of vengeance*, but that some of the Romish priests themselves have been denounced as *objects of vengeance* and put under *ban* and *anathema*, and held up to the abhorrence and execration of a savage and ferocious democracy, by the Roman Catholic hierarchy, because these priests would not become like the rest of their brethren, agitators and political partizans of Mr. O'Connell, and because they would not denounce *tithes* and the proprietors of that *odious impost*. I state the following facts, and if I assert any thing contrary to the truth, let me be contradicted.

In the year 1824, when Ireland was infected with the *mania* of the Catholic or O'Connell rent; when every Popish altar throughout Ireland became the arena of political agitation; when the wretched and deluded peasantry of Ireland were made the unhappy victims of the duplicity and cajolery of selfish and calculating demagogues, the worthy and respectable parish priest of Castleconnell was more

than once threatened to be denounced by the *Titular of Killaloe*, if he did not collect the Catholic or O'Connell rent, and become like the rest of his brethren, a political and agitating Priest. But, Sir, my worthy friend and near relative had the firmness and the honesty to tell the Titular of Killaloe that he would not collect the O'Connell rent; that he would do his duty as a Christian minister, but that politics made no part of that duty; and that his diocesan might suspend and denounce him as soon and as often as he pleased. For refusing to obey this arbitrary mandate, the parish priest of Castleconnell has been ever since pursued with the most rancorous animosity by the Titular of Killaloe and his priests, who together with Mr. O'Connell himself, are to this very hour his most bitter and implacable enemies.

I was present at a public dinner given by his priests to the Titular of Killaloe, in the town of Nenagh, in the year 1824, where, after the cloth was removed, an anonymous letter was publicly read by a priest of the name of O'Conner, which letter charged the parish priest of Castleconnell with being an enemy to the freedom of Ireland, because forsooth he refused to collect the O'Connell rent—that he wished to perpetuate the slavery of his native land, and maintain Protestant or Orange ascendancy, at the expense of the happiness and independence of his unhappy and long-persecuted country.

I then asked the Titular of Killaloe and his priests, as I do now, could the worthy parish priest of Castleconnell be called an enemy to the freedom of Ireland, because, forsooth, he did not preach rebellion from his altar, and precipitate an inflammable, superstitious, and priestridden multitude into certain ruin and inevitable destruction!! Could my worthy friend and near relative be called a renegade to the cause of his unhappy country, because, indeed, he did not halloo his flock to resistance to the laws of the land, and to the constituted authorities of the country? Was the respectable parish priest of Castleconnell a recreant to the cause of Ireland, because he did not fill the gaol and the gibbet and the transport, with thousands of his unfortunate and deluded countrymen, as the arch-demagogue did with the wretched and infatuated peasantry of Clare, where his diabolical agitation has made orphans and widows without pity or remorse, and where his name will be long remembered as the heaviest curse that ever was inflicted upon ill-fated and unhappy Ireland? Could the respectable parish priest of Castleconnell be said to wish to perpetuate the slavery of his native land and maintain Protestant and Orange ascendancy, who for forty years and upwards has been the happiness of, and lived a blessing to his flock, who has during a long life of difficulty and labour—cultivated a good understanding and lived in habits of social intercourse with the Protestants of his parishes, and who has invariably converted his intimacy and influence with the leading Protestant gentry of the county in which he resides into an instrument of real benefit and substantial service to his numerous parishioners, by saving them from the horrors and infamy of the gallows, and rescuing them from the privations and miseries of transportation for life from their wives and children? Could he be said to be an enemy to the freedom of

Ireland and a fugitive from the cause of the people, to whom the thanks of the House of Commons when Sir Robert Peel was secretary to the Irish government, were voted more than once for his active and praise-worthy exertions in maintaining peace and tranquillity in his parishes when the greater part of this unhappy country was in a state of anarchy and insurrection, little short of open and absolute rebellion—when there was no security for either life or property—when all law and order were trampled under foot, and the dagger of the midnight and ruthless assassin was reeking with the blood of its mangled victim, and during which period of terror and dismay, of trouble and confusion, not one of his parishioners was ever hanged or transported? Could he be said, Sir, to be an enemy to the liberties of his country, and an alien to the cause of the people of Ireland, who, when Sir Robert Peel asked him was it in his power to make him any return for the eminent and signal services he had rendered his country during a period of unexampled irritation and ferment, nobly but respectfully replied to the Secretary of the Irish government, that he derived an honourable and independent support from the resources of his incumbency, and that the best reward he could obtain for his services, and with which alone he would forever rest satisfied and content, was the consciousness of having done his duty to his King and to his country.

In a word, Sir, could he be called an enemy to the people of Ireland and to their freedom, who, when the leases of the greater part of one of his parishes were expired, and when these unhappy victims of rack-rents were just about to be scattered to the winds of heaven by the strong arm of an unfeeling landlord, stood like a guardian angel between the oppressor and the oppressed, procured the numerous tenantry of the parish of Ahane new leases, together with a very considerable abatement of their former rents—restored them to their mud walls and clay-built habitations, the humble but ancient abodes of their ancestors, with which their earliest recollections were fondly interwoven, and to which their warmest and dearest affections of their hearts clung with the grasp of a dying convulsion, and where they now live in the free and undisturbed enjoyment of the best possession upon earth—peace and plenty, and where not a day passes without offering up their prayers to the God of all bounty and beneficence, for the happiness and prosperity of their generous benefactor, through whose kind mediation they are indebted for the restoration to the hearths and sepulchres of their forefathers?

Yet this is the man whose pure and unsullied character the member for Dublin has vainly and impotently endeavoured to blacken and discredit, by saying that the charitable and benevolent parish priest of Castleconnell was offered the chaplaincy of Newgate by Sir Robert Peel, the secretary of an Orange government, as a compensation for his services to Ireland.

This is the father of the orphan and widow, whom Mr. O'Connell thought proper to denounce at the late Roman Catholic Association, by calling him a *government hack*.

But the use of character, Sir, is to be a shield against calumny; the good and virtuous parish priest of Castleconnell will, therefore,

remember that obloquy is a necessary ingredient in the composition of all true glory—that it is in the nature and constitution of things that calumny is an essential part of triumph. This thought will support a mind, that exists only for honour, under the burden of temporary reproach. The worthy and respectable parish priest of Castleconnell will remember that the Saviour of mankind was reviled and traduced by a wicked and sinful world; how, then, can the servant expect better treatment than the master? My worthy and respectable relative will remember that every independent and honest man in the community, who has dared to assert an opinion of his own, and to differ from Mr. O'Connell, has been made the victim of the virulent abuse of that unprincipled demagogue, who makes a trade of patriotism to promote the sordid interests of his family, and who misleads the honest and unsuspecting simplicity of his unfortunate and deluded countrymen, who, he well knows, are men of strong arms and quick feelings, and more remarkable for a determined resolution than clear ideas, or much foresight.

This, Sir, is the mock patriot who clamours for liberty, or rather demands licentiousness for the multitude, and yet would make slaves of individuals. This is the advocate of civil and religious liberty, and yet condemns me because I would not bend to ecclesiastical tyranny and despotism, and in the true spirit of passive obedience bow down before the molten calf of Popery and worship the image of the beast. This is the man who raises false hopes and expectations in the minds of his deluded and infatuated countrymen, which he knows in his heart he will never be able to realize—who boasts of the battles he has fought, and the bloodless, tearless victories he has won for *ould* Ireland from the base and bloody Saxons, and styles himself the conqueror of Peel and Wellington—*le vainqueur du vainqueur de la terre*. This is the man who says he hates factious ascendancy of any kind, and endeavours to dupe the Protestants of Ireland and Great Britain by professions of liberality, though, in conjunction with the present Whig-Radical Government, he is secretly undermining the Protestant Establishment, and hopes the day is not far distant when Popery will be raised upon the ruins and destruction of Protestantism in this country.

If that day ever arrives, woe to the Protestants of Ireland! Then will the fires of Smithfield again blaze, and the persecuting times of bloody Mary be again revived. This is the man who arrogates to himself the privilege of attacking the character of every good and virtuous individual in the community, and yet shields himself from all personal responsibility by the immunity of a vow in heaven. This is the bigot who kept on his hat at the funeral of the late Mr. Cobbett whilst the clergyman read the burial service. Will the Protestants of England—will the Protestants of Ireland—ever forget this marked and studied insult to their religion and their clergy? Can the Protestants, after this, trust to the oath taken by the Roman Catholic members of parliament for the safety, integrity, and protection of the Protestant Church in Ireland? This is the man who, by his diabolical agitation, has kept capital out of Ireland; for what English or Scotch capitalist will venture to vest his money in a country where there is no security for either life or property?

This is the unprincipled demagogue, the base deceiver, the sly hypocrite, who denounces absenteeism and tithes as the shame and curse of Ireland, and yet does not blush to receive *twenty thousand* pounds a year from the squalid beggary of the most wretched and impoverished peasantry on the face of the earth. This is the man who will not allow the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland to be paid by a Protestant government, lest if he were deprived of the agency and influence of these *passive* tools whom he has fitted to his selfish and narrow purposes, he may again sink back to his original obscurity of a practising barrister in the Four Courts of Dublin. This is the man who to keep alive public attention agitates the impracticable measure of the Repeal of the Union, which he knows in his heart he will never be able to carry into effect without a dismemberment of the empire, and involving his unfortunate country in the horrors of a civil war. This is the man who, by his agitation, and by exciting the bad passions of the multitude, has reduced the Protestant Clergy of Ireland and their families to actual beggary and starvation, and now listens to the cries and agonies of so many of his suffering fellow-creatures, not only with insensibility, but with levity, with laughter!!!

By what mode of propitiation will this man and the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Ireland be able to atone to the God of heaven for the torrents of human blood they have been the means of shedding in this unfortunate country? I hope in God, an avenger will soon arise to plead the cause of his wronged and afflicted fellow-creatures. Yes, Sir, the arm of eternal justice is already uplifted in the powerful reaction that is now manifested throughout this great and mighty empire, and which falls, and will, I hope, continue to fall upon the devoted heads of these remorseless and unrelenting tyrants.

This great work Providence is now visibly carrying on against men, who, by every species of crime and delinquency, have ripened themselves for destruction.

I have the honour to be, Most Rev. Sir, your most obedient
humble servant,

MICHAEL CROTTY,
Parish Priest of Birr.

SPEECH OF THE REV. HUGH MCNEILLE,

Of Liverpool, England, before the Protestant Association, delivered in Exeter Hall, on the 6th May, 1837—at the great annual meeting of the society.

IT is an evil to be lamented, that Popery has so long passed under the name of religion. (Loud cries of "Hear, hear") There is a general sympathy in the minds of Protestants with all that is connected with religious liberty—a sympathy which we would be sorry to attempt to disturb or weaken. But the Roman Catholic system is not religion, (hear, hear), it is a system so called, but it is used entirely to promote political views, and to gain temporal advantages. (Cheering.) It is a system acting by turns upon the hopes and fears of its votaries, leaving no means untried by which it may gain its ends, and every where spreading its baneful and malicious influence. It can shift and adapt itself to every passing circumstance. The Romish system has an iron creed, on the Procrustes' bed of which she can at any time impale her victims, adjusting its proportions to their various statures. This is the case with Popery at home, but abroad, seeking to enlarge her territory, she has no creed. If a sturdy Presbyterian be at the head of the democratic party, from whom she can expect nothing but hard words and hard blows, then she will fly the democrats, and strive to insinuate herself at the foot of the throne. But if a Liberal be in power, one who has no religion himself, and therefore supposes that no one else has any, then Popery throws off the mask of religion, and is at once a Liberal. No! Popery is not religion! (Cheering.) Look at her abroad, and she is seen in her true colours, with the stiletto and the cup of death. Then we are alarmed—then we are roused. But when, as among us, she disguises herself, and boasts of charity and liberality, our danger is extreme. (Hear, hear.) And let no one say that this is an Irish question merely. It has ceased to be even chiefly an Irish question, except that the well-being of England is inseparable from her union with Ireland, and that union is inseparable from the protection and preservation of Protestantism in Ireland; but it is a British question—it is the question of national Protestantism; (Hear, hear.) Popery is struggling as she always has done, to gain ascendancy. (Hear.) She claims supremacy and sovereignty in every thing. She interprets that passage most literally—"All things are yours." (Cheering.) I am here reminded of a touching incident in a narrative concerning the late Dr. Phelan. When he was a student, preparing for the Romish Church, a priest, whose immediate charge he was, took him one day to an eminence, from which he beheld the fruitful hills and fertile valleys of Ireland, and while the beautiful landscape stretched itself before his eyes, and his youthful mind glowed with ardour, the artful priest said, "All this is yours!" Nothing more was said, but the idea intended was insinuated, and for the moment, said Phelan, I was a rebel. The idea insinuated was, that all he beheld would have been his—would have been the property of his Church—but for British, for Protestant usurpation. He was a rebel only for a moment. But all have not minds like Phelan's. Few who have been trained for the service of that Church can say that they were rebels, but for a moment. Few who have been educated at Maynooth, but have felt the spirit of habitual and determined rebellion. (Hear, hear.) I know it will be said that the students, when they enter the College of Maynooth, have to take an oath that they are not connected with any rebellious society. But, the fact is, that such oath is withheld from the student till after he has been three months in the College. (Hear, hear.) Time is thus allowed him, that he

may learn how to deal with conscience and with oaths, and how to manage mental reservation. (Loud cries of "Hear, hear.") I will read you an extract in proof of what I have asserted, taken from the Parliamentary Inquiry, which was instituted as to the College of Maynooth. The Rev. Michael Montague was asked—

"Can you state whether the provisions of the statute, which requires the oath of allegiance to be taken by the professors and students of the house are strictly complied with?—That statute is complied with by the professors who come from the Continent, in a short time after their appointment, and by the students at the next quarter-sessions after coming to college. They generally arrive in September, and comply with that statute at the quarter-sessions held in Maynooth in the beginning of the following January. They cannot comply with it sooner without considerable inconvenience."

"They take the oath at the ensuing quarter-sessions?—It is possible that some may not take the oath at the next quarter-sessions. The sessions are held during the Christmas vacation; and some of the Dublin students, who go home during that vacation, either take the oath in Dublin, or afterwards in Maynooth, the following year. I know no student there who has not complied with the statute."—*Maynooth Inquiry*, page 111.

From this testimony it is plain that the oath is not administered till it is convenient. Some are made ready sooner—others take longer. Those who cannot be made ready at all, are ejected, and others take the oath as soon as they have been taught how to break it. (Long-continued cheers.)—Sir, wherever supremacy is in her possession, and there remains nothing earthly to be sought by her, there the Romish system may rest, as it does in Italy, in all the exclusiveness of her tyranny, the pomp of her pride, and the stagnation of a painted sepulchre; but where supremacy is not her portion, and where there exists a hope of her regaining it, there her feelings are ambition, her principle rebellion, and her whole practises those of conspiracy. (Hear, hear.) Why has quiet existed in England? Because here Popery has had no hope of gaining by agitation. And why is it that there is not quiet in Ireland? Because, Sir, there she still retains the hope, the expectation, of regaining her supremacy. (Hear, hear.) I shall appeal to history; and it is a singular fact, when in the present age appeals are made to the working and the phenomena of nature, and when it is argued that from similar causes similar effects must be produced, and when we are referred to precedents as the grounds from which we are to deduce warnings for the future, history is sneered at as no better than an old almanac. (Hear.) But, Sir, I allege that the comparison between these is a just one, although, perhaps, the sense in which it is so did not occur to the Noble Lord who is the author of the phrase; for, examine an almanac, no matter how old, and one of recent date, you will find the principles laid down in both, the same—the same changes of the seasons, the movements of the heavenly bodies, and the rising of the tides the same, and that there is nothing altered but the date; so it is here. (Hear, hear.) So it is in this history—the principles are the same now as they have been laid down here in reference to the subject of our discussion, and I invite your attention, not to the opinion of Protestant calumniators, as Protestant histories and Protestant speakers are termed, but to the opinions of a Roman Catholic historian—to the language of Wolfe Tone, on the subject of the elective franchise—of that which has been the beginning of all the mischief which now exists. ("Hear, hear," and applause.) Some of the companions of Wolf Tone, about the time at which he wrote what I shall presently quote to you, urged the people of Ireland to refuse the Ministerial grant which was about to be offered them. What, then, were the observations of Tone in reply to those instigations? Here are his words:—

“Those who argued in the affirmative, stated that the people out of doors would disown them if they were, after bringing the question thus far prosperously, now to refuse purchasing a bill conveying such solid benefits at so cheap a price. That the Minister did not say the Catholics were to acquiesce for ever under the measure intended, but only that the public mind should not be controlled: that every accession of strength enabled them the better to secure the remainder; that what was now offered might be accepted, and, under the terms of the stipulation, application might, in two or three years, be made for what was withheld; that no man could deny that the present Bill afforded substantial relief; that the Members who might suffer by what was refused were very few in comparison with those who would be satisfied with what was granted; that taking the Bench as an example, few Catholic lawyers could be, even in point of standing, fit for that station in many years—long before which time, it was presumed, all distinctions would be done away; that, as to seats in Parliament, if all distinctions between the sects were at that moment abolished, no Catholic gentleman was prepared, by freeholders or otherwise, for an immediate contest; so that, in case of a general election immediately, the Protestant gentry must come in without opposition; but that a few years would alter this, and enable the Catholics to make their arrangements so as to engage in the contest on equal terms;—that what was given by the Bill, and particularly the right of elective franchise, was an infallible means of obtaining all that remained behind. It was again and again pressed, and relied on that the people would not be with them who would reject it; and, finally, it was asked, under those circumstances, were they prepared for the consequences of a refusal? That is, ‘were they ready to take the tented field?’”

(Hear, hear.) This was the language of Wolf Tone in 1792; but this was not all, there was a calculation made by him, also, as to the ability of Ireland to maintain her independence of England, and to this effect the Irish reader was then asked to consider the following propositions:—

“1st. Whether Ireland, in her physical capacities of position and of form, exterior and interior, be not a natural fortress of the first order.

“2d. Whether Ireland, in her moral capacity, conjunctly with her physical powers, possess not a garrison of the first order of military population, of sufficient number to man all her defences, together with a power within herself of perpetually recruiting and maintaining such a garrison.

“3d. Whether in every country there be not a distinction necessary to be taken between a military and a numerical population? And whether it be not necessary to examine such a distinction negatively as well as affirmatively?

“4th. Whether it be not necessary to examine the powers of Ireland relatively to the power of other nations?”

(Hear, hear.) These were the doctrines to which the attention of the people of Ireland was invited at a time when a struggle with England was utterly hopeless, and now, Sir, at the present moment the tactics are altered, the date is altered, but the doctrines are the same. (Loud cries of “Hear,” and applause.) Now, Sir, those men have obtained a footing in England, and the Roman Catholics postpone the repeal of the Union in order to humble her the more; they have laid their grasp upon her which they will not relinquish, and they are now honest in postponing the repeal of the Union, because it is more gratifying to them to humble England than to exalt or to liberate Ireland. (Loud cries of “Hear.”) They see the ultimatum of power in the House of Commons for the power of granting the supplies is vested there—there they have the majority with them, and they wish to retain it, in order to humble that House and to coerce the other branch of the Legislature, and thus, Sir, they have gained the ramparts of the Constitution, they have spiked some of the guns, and

turned the others upon the garrison, and nothing will now satisfy them but Romish supremacy and British degradation. (Loud cries of "Hear," and renewed applause.) What then, Sir, is to be done? (Hear.) Let us not attempt to restrain the desire to procure knowledge, let us not attempt it, but instead of succumbing to the charge which has been made against us, that we are the enemies to knowledge and the foes to the spread of education, let us endeavour that education and knowledge shall go forth throughout the land subservient to God's word; let philosophy be studied, not as the mistress, but as the handmaid of religion, but let us not succumb to the declaration made by a Noble Peer that natural religion is sufficient, for this is nothing less than to refuse to bow down to God's word till man finds what portion of it is consistent with his own philosophical discoveries.

Let this subject, then, be grappled with by our champions of literature, by those who have not so much to do as we have, for we, the working clergy, have not time to devote to the purpose, called, as we are liable to be by day and by night from our studies to minister to sickness and misery in the cottage and the hovel, and glad are we to obey those summonses of destitution. (Applause.) We have not time to devote to this purpose, but let the champions of the Church who are endowed for it, and who rest in its high places—and long may they so rest—(loud applause)—let them take up the defence of their religion and of Christianity.

Now, Sir, in regard to the theology of the present day, I regret that I am compelled to set forth its doubtfulness. Yes, and the feebleness which rests upon that doubt, which in its turn rests itself upon mere negatives. Let us then have in their stead a renewal of the strong, bold, uncompromising system of dogmatic theology. I want, Sir, the renewal of those sound and strong theological statements for which the old reformers went to the stake. (Applause.) Instead, Sir, of a silken deference to public opinion that waits upon the decisions of philosophical inquiry, which has paralyzed our pulpits, I want the declarations, if a man will bear or forbear; and if his religion be in the Bible, let him not consider it so much according to the reasoning or the opinions of other men, as to the mind of that God who commanded it to be proclaimed as his word. (Applause.) As the ambassadors of a Monarch, we are not the judges of the message with which we are entrusted, but the proclaimers of what our King hath spoken; and if we dare to judge of that message, and to dispute with ourselves that there are statements in it which will offend the court to which we are sent, and if we suppress this and give to the monarch to whom we are sent only that portion of our message which we think will not offend him, then shall we have compromised the duties of our high office; and shall we not, therefore, incur the judgment of our King? (Hear, hear.) But, Sir, is not that the result of philosophising upon revelation? And why? On the false assumption that the entire object of revelation is to win souls to salvation. And is it so? Sir, it is not so; for it is not written, "in them that are saved, and in them that shall perish?" Oh, Sir, we need that this truth shall be brought forth, and that we should proclaim always that triumph in the Gospel; and that if any man be so fallen as to recoil from the exhibition of it, the justice of God will be vindicated in his everlasting confusion. ("Hear," and loud applause.) I am aware of the cry of harshness which is ready to be raised against the voice of truth; I am aware of the too prevailing spirit of temporising which dictates it; But, Sir, let us look to the pages written by those men who wrought that work which is now to be wrought over again; let us look to the language of Luther and of Calvin; does it speak in a weak and cringing tone, in order to coax men to become Christians, or is it the lofty declaration of God's truth, or of the power of God's Spirit, to sway the feelings, to temper the words and to regulate the conduct of his creatures? (Hear, hear.) Sir, we want this bold, this sound and uncompromising spirit in our theology again, or Popery will be too much for us.

("Hear," and loud applause.) We want this, Sir, in our theology, and then in the political world what is to be done? That question has been already answered by my friend, and I shall not repeat the arguments which he so admirably adduced in support of this portion of the resolution, but I shall suggest this step as one which should be looked at as of weighty import, as well by Protestants as by Roman Catholics and by Liberals. I would suggest that this course should be adopted by them and by you. You have all had laid before you, on evidence which cannot be controverted, that there are in existence, in practical operation now, the persecuting canons of the Romish apostacy of the middle age. You have had in evidence here that this book, containing those canons, has been recommended by the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, as the best subject for the study of its ministers. These canons have not been denied to be in existence now; there has not been a refutation of the evidence which has been produced to you of their existence. Certainly the Liberals, as they term themselves, state that it is bigotry, that it is a calumny to say that the Catholic priests hold by those canons. But there has been no public disclaimer of them put forth by the Roman Catholic Church—they are the rules for the church, sanctioned by her infallible councils, sanctioned by her Popes, and in those canons it is declared, that the lives of heretics shall be sacrificed, and their property confiscated; and they thus involve us all within their grasp. (Hear, hear.) What, then, is to be done? I propose that all those canons shall be collected and compressed into as short a compass as possible, and that all the self-styled Liberals and all the Roman Catholics in the empire shall be invited to sign a denial of the statements set forth in those canons, and to repudiate them without equivocation. (Hear, hear.) Let us put them forth with an anathema branded upon them, and send them thus throughout the country. (Loud cries of "Hear, hear.") Will these Liberals refuse to sign such a document? (Hear, hear.) Let them, I say, sign this declaration, that it is false, that they disclaim that these canons are in use, that they were, but that they are not now, that they only exist now in the ravings of Protestant fanatics. Let every man, I say, Sir, sign this as a preliminary to his return to Parliament. (Loud cries of "Hear.") Will they object to this test, do you think? (Hear.) They deny the doctrines in the abstract principle; but give them the words in which they are enrolled as canons; give them the *ipsissima verba*, and will they cast Trent overboard? (Loud cries of "Hear.") We will give them the opportunity of stating, that these canons are not on record; we will give them the opportunity of pledging themselves that they are no longer in force; and we shall then see how they will shrink from the pledge. ("Hear," and applause.) Oh yes, Sir, you will see how the Liberals will then fall back and declare, "No pledges for us!" (Hear, hear.) No, Sir, you will not get them to pledge themselves that the Council of Trent was wrong—no, nor that the Bible is right. (Hear, hear.) But let these canons be condensed, and let them be sent throughout the country, as the basis of Petitions—let the Protestants of the empire put their names to them; and let us compare these signatures with the amount of the population, and we shall find who are the disclaimers of tyranny, and who are not. Let every Liberal, who is not a Papist at heart, sign them, and every Papist who wishes to be thought a Liberal, and we shall then know whether these canons are in practical operation or not. (Hear, hear.) But it is vain to hope that they will be thus disclaimed. Let, then, the repeal of the Emancipation Act agitate the country throughout. (Loud and continued applause.) This step has already been announced in several of the large towns in the north of England; and I had myself the gratification to utter this sentiment in a large meeting held in Liverpool: the effect was instantaneous—electrical; all who were present were on their legs the moment the words

were uttered, as if they had been fixed by wire-work, and with their hats off, cheered the announcement. (Loud applause.) I must apologise to the meeting for having so long trespassed upon your time. (No, no.) But let your acts correspond with the sentiments you have applauded, for I am satisfied that talking can otherwise do no good, and that cheering is cheap. Let, then, your acts declare your sincerity. I speak to men who are able to act, and who, if honest, are pledged by their cheers to do so. (Hear, hear.) This is no child's play, my friends; mine is no declamation to catch the applause of a multitude, who are all of one mind. It is far, far different, involving, as the subject does, the highest interests, not only of the religion of the land, but all the outward privileges by which it is circulated through the empire—the free circulation of the Bible, the power to worship God according to our consciences, for Christianity is tolerant, its principle is toleration, and Popery is directly the reverse. (Loud applause.) Yes, Sir, this matter involves, indeed, the highest interests—it involves the application of sound instruction to the infant mind in the schools established through the country; for Christianity begins with the Bible, and Popery begins and ends against the Bible.

ADVERTISEMENT.

This is an original work, devoted to the advancement of Knowledge, Liberty, and Religion.

It is published in the city of Baltimore, on the first day of each month. It contains forty eight pages in each number—and is furnished to subscribers at \$2 50 per annum, which may be discharged by \$2, paid at the beginning of each year, or on subscribing. The year of the Magazine begins with January.

The most liberal terms to active agents; travelling agents always wanted.

Address the Conductors, POST PAID, Baltimore: and money can be remitted by mail at their risk.