

he would think there was more truth than poetry in the assertion—and without being irreverent—that the Roman Catholic religion was not only a matter between him and God but between him and the thumb-screw. He says again “To denounce opinions by law is as silly, and unfortunately much more tyrannical, as it would be to punish crime by logic.” Well, let some of these “opinions” get into concrete form, and see how soon this same advocate will look for a law or extemporize one to restrain practical opinions. It is said Solon, in his, made no provision for the punishment for parricide, treating it as an impossible crime; so there are some who use the word “religion” as though it were impossible for anything wrong to be done under that guise, forgetting that there is scarcely a crime we can name that at some time or another has not been committed under the name of religion. Among Roman Catholics I count (perhaps it would be taking too much liberty to call them friends, so I’ll say) acquaintances, to argue or reason with them is a delicate, difficult, if not dangerous experiment, for I have tried it, and where it was easy they were nearer infidelity than Popery. I meet these Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, and they, of course, do not believe that Popery is the bad thing I think it is. I do not think that they would do the terrible things of which I speak, but I do believe they would do many things, had they the power, to which I would very positively object, and then I do believe that with the original surroundings, influences and incentives their children’s children would do these terrible things to my children’s children. Why, in the literature under the control of Roman Catholicism is there discovered ever a sympathy with rebellion against political authority? Why in their newspapers to be read by the families throughout the length and breadth of the land, and in the reading books for the Separate Schools, and their seminaries, and convents, and colleges, do we find a large percentage of selections that have a tendency to engender restlessness and bitterness, not to mention hatred and rebellion against the Protestant Governments of the land of their birth? Why? We think and ask why? We remember that they are the most Conservative people on the face of the globe, not excepting the Chinese. Why then this anomaly? This phenomenon? I think the answer is in the one word, Popery. The real unadulterated doctrine of Popery is that the Pope is head of all—civil and religious. Am I right or wrong? I do not claim to be infallible, if His Holiness does. I appeal to history; I appeal to the formulated doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church; I appeal to the declared opinions of travellers, statesmen and philosophers; I appeal to the records preserved in the archives of different countries, if I am not correct. How is it that as I attended a “Fourth of July” demonstration five years ago in the City of Buffalo, in connection with the laying of the corner stone of “The Soldiers and the Sailors Monument,” by the fraternity that “Meet on the level and part on the square,” in connection with which the old custom of reading the “Declaration of Independence” was attended to by a Roman Catholic priest, and when he came to the part where very strong language relative to Great Britain is used, and while the audience in general, chiefly Protestant, looking upon this custom as a relic of the past, took little interest in the reading, if thinking at all, or if they did, remembering it was the daughter ‘gainst the mother, which is not always looked upon as the most creditable conduct for a daughter to whip a mother; the reader, however, brought all his elocutionary powers into play to throw the observable satisfaction with which he expressed his bitter feelings into the sentiments thus expressed against the great Christian nation. Why was it? Popery. Listen to the highest dignitary