

career. How keenly do we now feel the great loss sustained in the death of Sir Robert Peel. Never was contrast so glorious to one statesman--so humiliating to the other. It is more than Iulus by the side of Aeneas.

My Lord, at the conclusion of your letter, you think proper to designate the religious practices of the Roman Catholic Church a "superstitious mummerly." Unfeignedly, my Lord, I am sorry that you have done so. On the subject of the practices and doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, the greatest and best of men have differed. With reverence, and judgment, and learning have these points been examined. Still was there difficulty--there was still disagreement. But with you, my Lord, it is otherwise. You seem to experience no difficulty in determining the practices of the Roman Catholic Church to be a "superstitious mummerly." Give me leave to ask, by what authority do you sit in judgment upon so momentuous a subject? What power has constituted you a tribunal of appeal? What are your Lordship's qualifications for the office? An aptitude for the employment of political stratagems that libel the religion of the largest body of Christians in the Universe--an aptitude which concentrates into a common focus the incarnate bigotry of the country, and the mindless warfare of your favorite Scotch Presbyterian. But your qualifications end not here. In the dramatic world you are known for the signal failures of laboured bombast, and in the political world for the discomfiture of a "finalty" of policy. In the one not even your name and position could command success--whilst in the other you are tolerated by the satellites that revolve around you for place and emolument. There is scarcely an index in the political thermometer, at which you have not arrived, from the burning heat of reducing the number of our Bishops, to the frigid policy of "Bibles and claymores." Yet you are the man, my Lord, who presumes to judge the religion of two hundred millions--that has, in hostility, arrayed class against class--that has termed the religious practices of our Jeromes and Austins, of Charlemagne and Sainted Edward, of the heroes of Poitiers and Cressy, a "superstitious mummerly." My Lord, Protestant though I be, and sincerely attached to my church, I hesitate not to avow that you have grievously injured her. The intolerant spirit evoked--the angry feelings aroused--the persecuting power, and assumed infallibility of our Church, which are the direct consequences of your letter, will lead to greater defection from the Church of England than the writings of the Tractarians, or the preaching of Rome could ever effect. How have you, my Lord, strengthened the argument of the Infidel, who believes the differences of Christian churches to be the inherent weakness of their religion. How have you encouraged that latitudinarian policy, which inundated France at the close of the last century? It is true, my Lord, that Infidelity is nobly combatted--and that the results are evident in the progress of Christianity. It is no less true that the honour of the struggle belongs not exclusively to us. If the practical results of Infidelity be no longer visible amongst the evidences of revealed truth, compiled from the rocks, and floods, and fields, its standard of moral rectitude, we must thank the Roman Catholic Church equally with our own. If that edifice of every unclean passion, of learning without religion, and genius without principle, be razed to the ground--if the name of its architect, the greatest genius of modern philosophy, revive the remembrance of the conflict of Christianity with the infidel school of Voltaire, D'Alembert, and Diderot, we must thank the Roman Catholic Church equally with our own. An undivided glory is not ours: but be ours the moral courage to acknowledge it.