

## ROYAL SUPREMACY.

Concluded from our Last.

Let us observe further, that not only the Church, being repudiated by the Crown, but the Crown also, being opposed by the Church, is driven to do homage to the Pope. The Pope gains both ways, by the separation of the two. He has become the common referee for both parties; and has grown in strength and importance accordingly. Instead of prohibiting appeals to Rome, your State is now making them in its own behalf. Your most zealous Romanists deplored the recent suppression of the Jesuits in France, but they must have derived great consolation from the manner in which that measure was effected. The State said to the Jesuits, "We know you to be dangerous to our peace and safety, and we therefore wish you to be suppressed;" but it did not say, as was formerly the case, and as, if it were independent, it certainly would have done now,—"We know you to be dangerous, and, therefore, we exercise our own power, and we suppress you." No: Signor Rossi is sent to Rome, on a special mission to the Pope, to persuade him to use his influence with father Roothman, the General of the Jesuits, for their suppression; and they are withdrawn from France accordingly. What was this but a public announcement of the feebleness of the civil power, and of the superiority of that of the Pope? He might have been sorry to exercise this power, and probably he was in the present case; but then the appeal to him to exercise it, was a recognition of its existence on the part of France.

Nothing can be more gratifying to him, or more conducive to his aggrandisement, than such application as these from sovereign princes, that he would be pleased to vouchsafe them the benefit of his pontifical interference to keep their kingdoms quiet. Some assert that England will one day entreat him to govern Ireland for her, by a pacificating bull to the Romish hierarchy. He well knows, that in being called in by princes and states, to read these his irenical and ironical homilies, his universal power is acknowledged. How must he rejoice in such appeals as these! See, he must say, how necessary the papacy is to the world! How could you manage your people without me? You speak of me as a disturber of public tranquility; but the fact is, as your petitions to me show, I am the great pacificator of the world.

So it is now, my dear Sir; political storms are raised by winds let loose from the papal caverns, and then the Pope is implored by civil governments to allay them; and he even pretends to be angry (like the poet's Neptune) with the political Euri and Zephyri, which have broken forth from his own Æolia!—"Quos ego" (he exclaims).

—sed motos præstat componere fluctus." And he, the canonizer of Hilderbrand, will preach sermons on loyalty, forsooth, for the benefit of kings! Thus he did to the Polish bishops in 1832, and so again last year to those of Galicia, in his brief to the Bishop of Tarnów; and as he did a little while since to the titular prelates in Ireland; and as I doubt not, the man did to the stag, for the special benefit of the horse, in the apologue of Horace, with which the Pope is doubtless familiar; and once placed on the horse's request, he remains there firmly seated for ever—

"Cervus equum, pugna melior, communibus herbis  
Pelletat. donec minor in certamine longo  
Imploravit opes Hominis, itrenumque recepti;  
Sed postquam violens victo decussit ab hoste,  
Non equum dorso, non frænum duplit ore."

Let those sovereigns who humbly sue to the Pope for concordats, wherewith to keep their own subjects in order, bethink them betimes how they will be able to shake the Man from off their backs, and to get his bit out of their mouths.

Let, I say in sober sadness, both sovereigns and subjects reflect, that if they do not maintain and strengthen the one foundation on which governments can rest independently and immoveably, namely, true religion, the royal power is gone, and the safety, the happiness, and the liberties of their subjects are destroyed; and the world may shortly be prepared to see this fearful consequence—that the only surviving power claiming to exist by divine institution will be that of the Pope, and all thrones, which are not swept away by infidel fury, will exist only as feudatories of the papacy.

But to return. I have referred to the example of France in what I have now written; but you will not, I hope, imagine that what I have said is dictated by any unfriendly feeling towards your institutions, or that I think it may not be applied in a considerable degree, with equal justice to ourselves. Indeed, if the truth is to be told, many of us in England are much more deficient in the discharge of our duty to our own sovereign than you are to yours. You are, for the most part, Roman Catholics; and believing as you do—though, as we think, very erroneously—that the Pope is the father of the faithful, and the vicar of our Lord upon earth, you may regard the extension of his power without dissatisfaction; and considering the unhappy condition to which your monarchy has been reduced, you may feel more loyalty to the Roman see, than to the throne of the sovereigns of France.

But our case is very different. Publicly we know nothing of the Pope except as a foreign potentate, who has presumed to excommunicate us, and pretended to depose three of our monarchs, and

to send a Spanish Armada against us, and to place our country under an Interdict.

Besides, by the Divine goodness, we have still a Christian monarchy; and by the blessing of Heaven on the valour and wisdom of our ancestors, we have a constitution in which the supremacy of the sovereign over all persons in all causes is so happily established, that I venture to affirm that no nation in the world can show a framework of government so well adapted to secure the rights of the sovereign and the liberties of the subject from domestic and foreign usurpation, whether lay or ecclesiastical. Our only danger is from ourselves.

And it must be confessed with sorrow, that (notwithstanding the solemn warning which we have from your example) much has been done and much is now being done by some who bear the name of Englishmen for the disorganization and disruption of this well-concerted system; much for the destruction of the foundations of our throne, and for the disturbance of our domestic peace.

To speak briefly of particulars:—

I. You are aware that some persons in this country are desirous of legalizing the settlement of Jesuits in England, although it is notorious that their principles are destructive of public and private happiness, and that they take an oath of implicit obedience to the Pope; and are not and cannot be the subjects of any temporal sovereign, much less of a Protestant one. Here they outrun you in zeal for the papacy; you lately suppressed the order of Jesuits in France, this year they would establish them in England.

II. Secondly, some of us in England would take upon themselves to exercise the royal prerogative, and, indirectly, to confer titles by the removal of the present penalties for their assumption; and what titles, do you suppose, and upon whom? the titles of the sees into which they have irregularly intruded themselves, upon Roman Catholic ecclesiastics in England and Ireland! Not to say that such a deed as this would be one of flagrant schism, inasmuch as it would set up bishop against bishop, and altar against altar, from one end of Great Britain to the other, and an act of most unwarrantable injustice towards the present holders of those titles; it would also be an invasion of the rights of the Crown, and a destruction of the foundations of the British throne. All titles of honour are derived from the Crown alone: and the assertion of a right to share with the Crown in conferring them is an encroachment on the royal prerogative; and I would respectfully venture to express a doubt whether even deliberation upon it is not very like an unconstitutional usurpation of that nature. It would, I say, Sir, seem worthy of consideration, whether it is not an invasion of the Queen's rights for subjects to discuss the collation of titles at all, and, secondly, and much more so, to deliberate on the collation of them on Romanist bishops, as such; an act which I venture to affirm is not even within the power of the Crown to perform. If ecclesiastics, intruded on us by the Pope, consecrated by his sole appointment, and bound to him by an oath of vassalage, should ever be thereby qualified, ipso facto, to bear English titles, then the regalities of the English Crown would be annulled, and the protest that "no foreign prince, prelate or potentate, had any jurisdiction, power, or authority in this realm of England" would be void. "No bishop, no king," said King James; but put two bishops—one of them a subject of the Pope—into the same see, and then, "two bishops, and no king," would be at least equally true.

III. Thirdly, another proposition, to which I must here advert, is that of endowing the Roman Catholic Clergy of Ireland at the national expense. With many who would advise this course, the religious argument would probably avail little. It would, perhaps, be useless to say to them, that by endowing Romanism, the State would endow religious error of the most destructive kind, both as regards sacred and civil matters; and that, by erecting a co-ordinate Church, where there is a Church already established, which ought to be supported and strengthened both on religious and secular grounds, it would endow Schism and all its injurious consequences, feuds, factions, and confusions, and would render the restoration of peace almost unattainable in that country, under any circumstances.

Perhaps, however, it may be of no use to all to remember what you, Sir know to be the fact, that the Church of Rome is a very differently constituted Ecclesiastical body from the United Church of England and Ireland. We speak of endowing the Roman Catholic Clergy; be it so: there are 28 Irish Romanist Bishops, 1008 Parish Priests, and 1385 Curates, now in Ireland; these would require a large sum for their endowment: but this is not the main point; when they had been purchased by the Government, they would be worth nothing. It is to be feared that a great part of the influence of the Priests over the populace is due to the notion that they are like Tribunes of the People, its Champions against their rulers; and if the Priests were endowed by the State, it would be supposed by the people that their Priests had been bought by the Government not for any love of them, but in order that they might be subservient to it; and thus the influence of the Priests over them would become null; and then that other element of the Romish

Elizabeth was attempted, as in 1572 by Story, again in 1583 by Somerville, again in 1585 by Parry, stimulated by the Pope's nuncio, and in 1586 by Savage, having plenary indulgence from the Pope, as appears from the letter of a Cardinal di Como, dated Rome, 30 Jan., 1584, again by Moody in 1587, again by Patrick in 1594, by Lopez and York in the same year, again by Squire in 2598, by Winter in 1602, from all which traitorous designs, set on foot by the arts and arms of Rome, she was delivered by the merciful inter- or hindrance, and be recognized as having legal validity. Those who know Rome best—Spain, Austria, Portugal, and France, all Roman Catholic countries,—will not allow a single Papal bull to be introduced, before it is carefully examined by the civil power; and you, my dear Sir, must smile at the temerity and self-conceit of some of us who appear to consider themselves much wiser than all European nations, since they propose that we, a Protestant people, should admit freely from Rome what Roman Catholics states carefully exclude.

What, Sir, may be asked, would then become of our love for our sovereign? what of our loyalty for the monarch who is alive? what of our reverence for the dead? Surely it would be an insult to the living and to the departed kings and queens of England, to legalize the admission of these papal edicts, when we know what has been, and still is, their language toward the holders of the English crown. As long as those impious, sanguinary, and treasonable anathemas, which were pronounced by the Roman pontiff against Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth, so long as that tissue of curses against all Protestant princes and people, contained in the bull *In Cænâ Domini*, remain in the pages of the *Roman Bullarium*; so long, I say, it would appear to be a treasonable act against the Crown, an act of outrage against the Divine Being, Whose Minister the Queen is, and one of contemptuous scorn towards her subjects, to propose to legalize the admission of bulls from Rome into England.

V. Fifthly, it is proposed to relieve English Romanists from all penalties for asserting the Pope's Spiritual Supremacy in these realms, in opposition to that of the Queen; and for extolling and maintaining his pretended and usurped power over her subjects.

What is this but to call upon the State to legalize a public profession on their part, that they are not subjects of the Crown; and to make this non-subjection of theirs the occasion, groundwork, and reason for legislative innovations and aggressions against the Crown and the Constitution? or, in other words, because it is true that some persons are disloyal enough to deny the independence of the Crown, and to pay little regard even to the personal safety of the monarch (for the Pope affirms that deposed sovereigns may be murdered; and what sovereign of England—indeed, what Protestant sovereign—is not ipso facto deposed by the Pope?)—therefore the rights of the Crown, instead of being more vigorously asserted, are to be sacrificed! and the person of the sovereign, instead of being more carefully guarded, is to be put in more imminent peril!

But, Sir, you may desire to know on what grounds such propositions as these are made.

I. First, then, it is alleged that the laws which these propositions would repeal are "the offspring of a dark age." A dark age! The age of Shakespeare, of Spenser, of Ben Jonson, of Burleigh, and Salisbury, and Raleigh, of Bacon, and of Coke, of Jewell, and Hooker, and of Andrews! A dark age! Dark indeed, in a certain sense, it was, when those deeds of darkness were performed under the authority and with the approval of the Papacy, which rendered those laws necessary:—dark indeed it was, when on the night of the 24th of August, 1572, St. Bartholomew's day, about five thousand Protestants were butchered at Paris, and when within a few days after it, in six towns of France, five-and-twenty thousand more were slain:—dark it was when as soon as he heard of this dreadful massacre, Pope Gregory XIII. went in procession to the Church of St. Louis, at Rome, to give God thanks, and when, to commemorate this event, he ordered a medal to be struck, which represents the savage work as performed by an angel of heaven, with a sword in one hand and a cross in the other, and which bears the inscription, VGNOT-TORVM STRAGES, THE MASSACRE OF THE HUGUENOTS:—dark it was, when on the 1st of August, 1589, the friar Jaques Clemon, having learnt from theologians whom he had consulted, that a tyrant might lawfully be put to death, went and assassinated his own sovereign, your King Henry III.:—dark it was, when on hearing the intelligence of that King's death, Pope Sixtus V. summoned a consistory of his cardinals, and in a set speech ascribed the murder of the king "to the providence of God," and spoke of it as a pledge that "the Almighty would still protect France";—dark it was, when on the 14th of May, 1610, Ravaillac the Jesuit effected what, in 1594, Jean Chastel the Jesuit had attempted, and murdered your sovereign Henry IV., and after the deed was done, freely confessed that it was the book of Mariana the Jesuit which encouraged him to that design:—dark it was, when at several times after the publication of the Papal Bull against her in 1567, (Feb. 24,) the life of our gracious Queen

Ecclesiastical body would come into play, I mean the Regular Clergy, the Monks and Friars, who even now amount 300 in Ireland, and who would succeed, in increased numbers and power, to the place of those who are pensioned, and would exercise more than all their influence for evil in the case of agitation. This proposal, therefore, appears to be very short-sighted, even as one of mere political expediency.

IV. Fourthly, it is proposed by some, that bulls from Rome should be introduced without any interference of Divine Providence; and dark it was, when in the year 1605, a conspiracy was made to destroy the king, royal family, lords and commons of England, and when Bulls from Rome were ready to give complete effect to what was then decreed: dark, I say, the age may well be called, when such acts as these were concerted and executed. But in another sense that age was one of light. Wisdom guided the councils of England, and sound laws were enacted, by which, under the Divine blessing, these dark designs were defeated, and the light of peace and liberty and public safety were diffused throughout the realm. But, if in a spirit of presumptuous contempt for the wisdom of that age, and of arrogant confidence in our own sagacity, we abolish these laws, who shall say that we shall not bring back in all its gloom the thick darkness which they dispersed?

In the mean time, if we desire to prove that we are ourselves in darkness, we have only to be guilty of the folly, as far as regards England, of calling that age a dark one. If that age was a dark one, would that we had more such darkness and less of our own light! Would that we had more of its loyalty and piety, more of its steadiness of purpose, more of its faith in fixed principles, and more of its courage in carrying them into practice!

In further justice to these laws, I shall content myself with referring to the character which is given of them by three of our greatest statesmen and lawyers, Lord Treasurer Burleigh, Lord High Chancellor Bacon, and Lord High Chancellor Clarendon.

II. But, secondly, it is alleged that these laws ought to be repealed, on the great principle of religious toleration; that none of "Her Majesty's subjects" ought to suffer penalties for "religious opinions;" and that our Most Gracious Sovereign ought "to be the Queen of all her subjects."

Now, first of all,—as to the point of repealing laws against the Pope, I should be very glad to be informed whether he has ever repealed any one of his laws against us? Has he ever erased a single line of his canon law in which, as I have shown, he claims the power of deposing princes and absolving subjects from their allegiance? Never. Has he ever revoked one of his unchristian anathemas against us and our princes? Never. Has he ever ceased to impose his own oaths of allegiance and supremacy on Romish ecclesiastics who are subjects of the Queen of England, and to teach them that all their civil oaths to their sovereign, to the prejudice of his own interest, are perjuries? Never. Has he ever allowed a word to be breathed in favour of our oaths of allegiance and supremacy, or permitted our books in its favour to be admitted into his dominions, as some of us would admit bulls from Rome into England? Never. And yet we are, forsooth, to be called upon to repeal our laws against his unjust and unholy usurpations and aggressions against the rights of the British crown and the liberties of the subject, and to give free admission and even titles of distinction to Jesuits and other Romish ecclesiastics, who are bound to him by a most solemn oath of obedience, and who are obliged by that oath to teach the doctrine of the Pope's supremacy, and by consequence to subvert that of the Queen! And all this on the "sacred principle of religious Toleration! O most blessed Toleration, which would tolerate every thing but that which ought most to be secured and encouraged! which would tolerate sedition, and discountenance loyalty; which would tolerate Jesuits and the Pope, but would not tolerate the Queen: which would sacrifice the Crown, and boast of its liberality; which would talk of "civil and religious liberty," and degrade its sovereign to a slave!

## Advertisements.

DR. BOVELL,  
John Street near St. George's Church,  
TORONTO.  
Toronto, January 7th 1852. 23-1f

MR. S. J. STRATFORD,  
SURGEON AND OCULIST  
Church Street, above Queen Street, Toronto.  
The Toronto Dispensary, for Diseases of the EYE, in  
rear of the same.  
Toronto, January 13th, 1837. 5-1f

WILLIAM HODGINS,  
ARCHITECT AND CIVIL ENGINEER,  
LONDON, CANADA WEST.  
February, 1852. 28-1f

MR. CHARLES MAGRATH.  
OFFICE: Corner of Church and Colborne  
Streets, opposite the side entrance to BEARD'S Hotel.  
Toronto, February, 1852. 27-1f