nolic religion ligion of the er being ex-

as been laud-Catholic counng should be their own sev-

is false that s, and the full d publicly dewhatever, coning the plague

II. is so clear. any difference he Allocution

it is perhaps somewhat remarkable, that no express censure of the proposition is to be found therein; though such censure is, of course, implied throughout.

As regards Prop. LXXVIII., it has been argued that a Catholic may ascribe to it the very widest sense which its words can possibly bear. The proposition, on this view, eulogises a permission given in some country for all immigrants without exception, - immigrants whether present or future,-to practise their religious rights; however atrocious those rites might be, or however openly offensive to public morality. And it is contended that, by rejecting this truly monstrous oninion—an opinion, indeed, which no one has ever dreamed of he morals and maintaining—a Catholic will satisfy the Holy Father's requirement. But we must submit earnestly that no such interpretation is tenable In the original Allocution for a moment. Pontiff can (4 Ascerbissimum," September 27, 1852) the nonize himself Pope comments severely on a decree enacted by d with modern the Republic of New Grenada, permitting to immigrants the free exercise of their respective worships. He does not profess, nor has it ever been alleged, that such permission extended to any such outrageous length as that above mentioned. It was neither more nor less than such liberty of conscience as is granted to immi-55), on which grants in the great majority of European counto Spain: and tries; the only difference of the two cases