

against this religious freedom in any sect; should it command Methodists to become Presbyterians, Presbyterians to become Episcopalians, Episcopalians to become Catholics; should it forbid Baptists to baptize by immersion, or prohibit any sect from governing in all ecclesiastical and religious matters its own members, according to its own discipline, would the sect feel itself bound to obey? Would it not tell the State, you transcend your province, and meddle with that which is above your power, and independent of it? Most assuredly. Then every Protestant sect asserts the spiritual order as above the temporal, religion as superior to politics, and therefore a law higher than the civil law. Here, in principle, is the whole doctrine which is described as dangerous to the State and subversive of the civil allegiance of Catholics. What do honest Protestants think about it? Are they prepared to declare the State omnipotent, supreme in both spirituals and temporals, and submit their consciences to its keeping? We do not believe it, and we are sure that Dr. Campbell, and his pulpit abettors and accessaries, do them a foul wrong, and also wholly misrepresent themselves. They may wish to use the State as an instrument of propagating their religion, or of suppressing others opposed to it; but surely they would not suffer it to change or modify it.

Here as elsewhere, some Protestant clergymen, in their eagerness to raise objections to Catholicity, forget to examine whether the principles on which they must rest them, are not principles which they, no more than we, can consistently maintain. It is neither fair nor honourable, neither logical nor just, to assume principles of reasoning against us, which they reject the moment they are put upon their defence. Notwithstanding those periodic fulminations against "the Church of Rome," it is a settled conviction with all religious bodies that the spiritual is supreme, and