

forget that He who knows what is in man, to whose eyes futurity was opened, has marked that dark and damnable apostasy upon her forehead, with the name of "MYSTERY." Mystery is not that which is observable to the eye of the superficial observer—mystery is not that which is seen by a passing glance—mystery requires pains, close attention, and difficult examination to detect it. But it can be detected when brought unto the light of honest truth and God's eternal word. Let me remind you, or rather let me tell you—and do you lay it up in your memories,—on what the great principles of Papal intolerance and persecution rests. It rests on one fundamental principle, which is this, that all persons who have ever been baptized in any Church, or in any country, are by baptism brought into slavish subjection to the Church of Rome. They become thereby, they say, subjects of the Church; but there is only one Church, and that is the Church of Rome, and therefore whenever those who have ever been baptized dare to revolt from the Church—whenever they dare to become heretics, that is, to choose, as they call it, a religion for themselves, and not to submit to the religion of the Pope, they are rebels against the Church, and the Church has the right, whenever she has the power, to bring them back again. Therefore it is no matter what the rank be which a man holds, King, Lords, Commons, high and low, they are all subject to the Pope. Why?—Because they are all subject to God. And who is the Pope? What is the blasphemous assumption of this accursed man of sin?—It is this, that he is the Vicar of God upon earth; the Vicar of the Lord Jesus Christ; he places himself in the seat and authority of God, and therefore on the principle that man is to be subjected to his God, on that principle the Pope asserts that man must be subjected unto him. Therefore, whenever you hear a Popish priest talk of liberty of conscience, I say he bears the brand of his apostasy upon his brow—"speaking lies in hypocrisy." And whenever you hear a Roman Catholic layman talk of liberty of conscience, either that man is, as I believe multitudes are—and if I address any here, I would speak with kindness and faithfulness to them—I say they are either dupes of a system, the villainy of which they do not know, or else they are, as some are, knaves, and accomplices with the tyrant that enslaves his fellow men. Such a man will prate, perhaps of "civil and religious liberty all over the world." But pursue the knave to the working of his system. Let a poor, honest, Roman Catholic stand up to give his vote as he pleases, to his landlord or his friend, and then the tyrant and the Jesuit breaks out, and the death's head and cross-bones are placed over his door. Now recollect the principle I have told you, that the great point is, that a man, by baptism, becomes a slave of the Church of Rome. This point you will find in the class-books of Maynooth, which the scholars are obliged to purchase, and which being open to the public inspection of the visitors of the College, I would that those visitors had sifted those books, and had faithfully done their duty to their country or their God. But this principle is not carried out in them. You do not see it sufficiently—it is not manifest in all its length and breadth. There is the veil of the mystery, thrown over it to hide it. I now present to you Bailly. One great point is, they allow the baptism of heretics to be valid. They will hardly allow anything else we do to be valid. But they admit this with regard to baptism, because that is of great use to the Church—it brings a vast army of subjects to the Pope. Here is the proposition in a treatise on baptism by Bailly (vol. v. p. 62,) in which it is said—"A traveller, even a layman, or a woman, or a heretic, or even an unbaptized infidel, can baptize validly, nay lawfully in cases of necessity."

We have nothing to do with women and laymen, our question is as to heretical baptism; of this he says as follows:—

"Of heretics now nothing remains to be said, since in our treatise on the sacraments in general we have demonstrated by many arguments that the Sacrament of Baptism is truly administered by them." That is the principle laid down here, that may be safely read by the visitors of the College, or any other gentlemen who please to go there: for there is nothing very bad in it. But then there is the inference that is drawn from that, as we have it here, in the article on laws in Bailly—still a class-book, (vol. i. p. 179):—

"Hence heretics are bound by the Ecclesiastical law;"—mark the reason—"because by baptism they are made the subjects of the Church, nor are they more delivered from the laws, than rebellious subjects are from the laws of their Princes." Observe, you are made by baptism subjects of the Church, and you can no more shake off her authority than rebellious subjects can shake off the authority of their rulers. There is another class-book, Delahogue's, in which we have the same principle. In his *Tractatus de Ecclesia*, p. 404.

"The Church," saith he, "retains her jurisdiction over all apostates, heretics, and schismatics, though they do not now belong to her body, as the leader of an army has a right to punish the deserter, although his name be not upon the roll."

The volume from which I am now about to read is not given as one of the standards of the College of Maynooth, but it is the universal standard of the Church of Rome. This was declared by Dr. Doyle before a Parliamentary Committee, when asked what books contained the principles of the Church. It is the Catechism of the Council of Trent. Hear its language on the 9th Article of the Creed:—

"Heretics and schismatics, because they have revolted from the Church, no more belong to the Church than deserters belong to the army from which they have run away. But it is not to be denied that they may be called into judgment by the Church, punished by her, and denounced with her curse."

When the question is asked—What do they mean by the power of the Church over heretics? they say, "Oh, merely that the Church exercises a spiritual authority over them, and pronounces the sentence of exclusion from her communion." That she exercises her authority in that way with a spiritual severity, but at the same time gently, and kindly, and tenderly, of which we shall speak presently. We now come to another of the standards of Maynooth, recommended by the professors; here is one of them—*Dea Conferentia D' Angers*. In this we find it said on this subject—"If heretics could escape the obligation, it would be either because they had ceased to be of the Church, i. e. that they had broken off the yoke, or lived in a country where this authority was not recognised, and where custom had abrogated ecclesiastical law."

As to the first reason (that is having broken off the yoke of authority,) it can have no weight—they are no longer *de facto* confessed members of the body of the Church, but they are all members *de jure*, by right, because the Church after their revolt preserves all her rights over them, in the same way that a master preserves his right over his runaway slaves, and a sovereign over his rebellious subjects. The second reason (this is, recollect, that the heretics live in a country where the authority of the Church is not recognised,) "can no longer be pleaded, the Church has no particular territory, her empire has no bounds but those of the universe, and comprehends even those places where her authority is not recognised, in short a custom contrary to this introduced into places where heretical sects are de-