

clergy. Nay; we are quite content to be excluded forever from even advising his majesty with respect to any matter relating to or concerning the Protestant Church—its rights, its properties, or its privileges. I will, for my own part, go much farther; and I do declare, most solemnly, that I would feel and express equal if not stronger repugnance to the interference of a Catholic with the Protestant Church, than that I have expressed and do feel to any Protestant interference with ours. In opposing their interference with us, I content myself with the mere war of words. But, if the case were reversed—if the Catholic sought the control over the religion of the Protestant—the Protestant should command my heart, my tongue, my arm in opposition to so unjust and insulting a measure. So help me God! I would, in that case not only feel for the Protestant, speak for him, but I would fight for him, and cheerfully sacrifice my life in defence of the great principle for which I have ever contended—the principle of universal and complete religious liberty." These are utterances characteristic of Daniel O'Connell and of Roman Catholicism. We know Daniel O'Connell; we are familiar with his life and character; we have great respect for this man of wonderful powers; we sympathise with him, to some extent, in his efforts on behalf of his country; we recognise his wonderful genius and tact in his life work; but we have too much confidence in his general knowledge, and knowledge of Roman Catholicism, its principles, its history, its aims, its efforts, its tactics, its use and abuse of power, its dictation to its members, and to governments, its secret intrigues, its persecutions, its inquisitions, its Bartholomews, and its frequent rebellions and outrages in his own Emerald Isle; we say we have too great respect for his genius of mind to give him credit for it being his sincere, absolute opinion that Roman Catholicism was the harmless, inoffensive, non-interfering institution that he would have us believe it was. What a wonderful system it is! No matter what it does; no matter what ground it takes; no matter what covenant it breaks; no matter what promises it leaves unfulfilled; no matter what deceptions it may use; no matter what doctrines it may promulgate at one time and deny at another, or advocate in one place and deny in another; no matter how it may advise, instruct, yes, compel its dupes to vote for one political party this time and another political party at another time, or for this political party in one section of country and another political party in another section of country; no matter how solemnly, sacredly and honestly it may bind itself to a certain public position, and yet puts all her wonderful machinery into operation to give her faithful followers to understand privately that her real sentiments are the very reverse; no matter what it does it is always consistent, for with it, "the end justifies the means." I have regard for it, because of its zeal and efforts to encroach on the world. I have no sympathy with the advocacy of going through this world and making no efforts to impress the world with the value of the principles to which we are attached; if they are worth anything they are worth advocating; if they are worth what we claim for them, would it not be the basest selfishness to neglect trying to get others to have participation in the advantages. Yes, with O'Connell, we believe in a zealous attachment to the principles of our glorious Protestantism and to the earnest advocacy of its claims, its privileges, its benefits and its blessings—"The principles of universal and complete religious liberty." Shade of O'Connell! is that what I hear you say? "Yes." Why, sir, you have stolen, or taken without leave that principle out of the heretics' calendar, out of the Protestants' Catechism! Why, sir, that is the very essence of Protestantism, and I