

refuted by the facts given by Hallam in the third and fourth chapters of his *Constitutional History of England*; the former chapter "On the Laws of Elizabeth's Reign respecting the Roman Catholics," and the latter "On the Laws of Elizabeth's Reign respecting Protestant Non-conformists." No Roman Catholic was eligible to a seat in Parliament after the fourth year of Elizabeth's reign. Hallam remarks,—“The indulgence shown by Elizabeth, the topic of reproach in those times, and sometimes of boast in our own, never extended to any positive toleration, nor even to any general connivance at Romish worship in its most private exercise. She published a declaration in 1570, that she did not intend to sift men's consciences, provided they observed the laws by coming to Church; which, as she well knew, the strict Catholics deemed inconsistent with their integrity. Nor did the Government always abstain from an inquisition into men's private thoughts. The Inns of Court were more than once purified of popery by examining their members on articles of faith. Gentlemen of good families in the country were harassed in the same manner. One Sir Richard Shelley, who had long acted as a sort of spy for Cecil on the continent, and given much useful information, requested only leave to enjoy his religion without hindrance; but the Queen did not accede to this without reluctance and delay. She had, indeed, assigned no other ostensible pretext for breaking her own treaty of marriage with the Archduke Charles, and subsequently with the Dukes of Anjou and Alençon, than her determination not to suffer the mass to be celebrated even in her husband's private chapel. It is worthy to be repeatedly inculcated on the reader, since a false colour has often been employed to disguise the ecclesiastical tyranny of this reign, that the most clandestine exercise of the Romish worship was severely punished.”

I think the summary of facts adduced throughout this chapter, will satisfy every candid reader of the thorough Protestantism of Queen Elizabeth, and of the injustice and falsity of the oft-repeated imputation that she was as much Romanist as Protestant.

Mr. Neal—many of whose misstatements I have had occasion to correct in the preceding pages—makes the following admission and estimate, in the conclusion of his history of her reign: