LETTER TO BLOUNT THERRY

Dr. Mitchell.

AN APPEAL

ON

BEHALF OF THE ROMAN CATHOLICS

OF NEW SOUTH WALES,

IN

A LETTER

TO

EDWARD BLOUNT, ESQUIRE,

M. P. FOR STEYNING,

FROM

ROGER THERRY, ESQUIRE,

Commissioner of the Courts of Requests in New South Wales;

OCCASIONED BY LETTERS ADDRESSED TO HIM

BY

CAPTAIN SIR EDWARD PARRY, KNIGHT, R. N.,

AND

THE VENERABLE ARCHDEACON BROUGHTON.

"Look here, upon this picture,
And on this."—*Hamlet.*

"As conducive to the object of promoting the prosperity of Ireland—blessed by Divine Providence with so many natural advantages—I must express the satisfaction which I have felt at the measures adopted for extending *generally*, to my people in that kingdom, the benefits of education."—*The King's Speech at prorog. Parliament, August* 16, 1832.

"The Lord Bishop of Clonfert has contributed £10, and his son, Archdeacon Butson, £5, to the subscription for repairing the Roman Catholic Chapel, Kiltormer."—*Freeman's Journal, May* 5, 1832.

By the 11th and 12th Wm. III. c. 4. it was enacted, That no person of the Popish religion should teach a school, under a penalty of £20 and three months imprisonment. The child who went abroad for education forfeited all goods, lands and chattels, to which he might become entitled by inheritance, and the father who sent him incurred the same forfeiture.

"It becomes my duty to tell them plainly, that they (the Protestant inhabitants of New South Wales) could not subscribe to build a Roman Catholic Chapel *without guilt.*"—*Letter of the Ven. Archdeacon Broughton.*

WITH AN APPENDIX.

Sydney:
PRINTED BY STEPHENS AND STOKES, KING STREET.

1833.

A

LETTER

TO

EDWARD BLOUNT, ESQ., M. P.

My Dear Sir,—

This letter relates to the well-being of a large portion of your Roman Catholic fellow-subjects—and therefore, I feel assured, will challenge your attention. The condition of the Roman Catholics of this Colony, from the strength and merit of their claims, will awaken in your mind a deep and active interest; yet this—I own—is not the sole inducement that has prompted me to select you as the medium through which to make this appeal on their behalf. I beg you will also accept it as a small, but sincere token, of the profound respect I entertain for your private and public worth; and I trust, too, it may receive some slight recommendation to your notice, as coming from one who was for some years associated with you, in a zealous, if not efficient co-operation, in the protracted contest that was waged for the restoration of the long-suspended rights and liberties of the Roman Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland—to the successful issue of which contest, I know no person, who, by wisely tempering perseverance and firmness, with moderation and forbearance, more usefully and eminently contributed than Yourself.

It may, perhaps, require some short explanation, my dear Sir, why this letter is addressed to You rather than to the Venerable Archdeacon Broughton, whose pastoral epistle has been one of the immediate occasions of it. There are not wanting cogent considerations assuredly, which point

out the propriety and advantages of this letter, assuming the form of a reply to the letter of the Archdeacon. The prospect it would present of provoking a second polemical dissertation from the pen of that Reverend Gentleman, is not amongst the least influential of these considerations. His last production rendered such good service to the cause it professed to oppose, that to induce him to render a similar service, by a publication of a like nature, is, I own, an object not unworthy of attainment.

It is with no small gratification, I assure you, that the letter of the Archdeacon produced a re-action most creditable to the liberality of the people of New South Wales. There was something so harsh in the tone of that publication—something so ungenial to the spirit of enlarged benevolence, which moderate men love to cultivate and cherish—something so little reconcileable with the meek precept of divine charity, "love one another," that it was attended with results and consequences the very opposite and contrary to those which it was the avowed object of the writer to accomplish.

What, you will ask, was this harsh doctrine?—what this revolting dogma, preached by the head of the Protestant Church in New South Wales? It was this—that when thousands of his Catholic fellow Christians solicited the aid of their more opulent Protestant Brethren, towards the completion of their Chapel—*the only Roman Catholic Chapel in New South Wales**—then, without a roof—or windows,—or any protection from the inclemency of the weather;—that when this aid was solicited in the tone and

* The following extract from the Sydney Gazette, pointedly illustrates the forlorn condition of the Roman Catholics of New South Wales, as to their urgent want of places of Religious Worship.

"It is impossible His Majesty's Government can be cognizant of the spiritual wants of the King's Roman Catholic subjects in this Colony. Where are their places of worship? Why, it is but a very few weeks ago, that we happened on a Sunday, to be at Parramatta—the second town in this rapidly rising Colony—and observing a number of persons assembled on a sort of common near the gaol, we asked a young gentleman who accompanied us, how it happened that the police permitted such a congregation to assemble on the Sabbath Day. The reply almost astounded us—"they are waiting for their Priest," he said. "Indeed! where is their Chapel?" 'Oh, there is none here—the Rev. Mr. Therry performs Divine Service in the open air, on that green where the people are waiting."—*Sydney Gazette, Jan.* 26, 1833.

attitude of respectful supplication, the Venerable the Archdeacon of New South Wales selected that very moment of our adversity, and our need, to check and restrain the flow of Protestant beneficence towards their Catholic fellow Colonists. "*It becomes my duty*," Mr. Broughton writes, "*as a Protestant Minister, to tell them plainly (the Protestant inhabitants of this Colony) that they cannot subscribe to build a Roman Catholic Chapel WITHOUT GUILT!!!* And again (p. 24), "*I maintain that the whole tenor of the Gospel is opposed to such a proceeding.* These sentences, variously expressed throughout the letter, comprise the pervading and prevailing sentiment of the publication.

To advance the erection of an edifice worthy of the glory of God's worship, and suitable to the wants and wishes of a community, comprising at least one-third of the whole inhabitants of the Colony,—to provide for the education of the poor, and humble, and unprovided Roman Catholic children of New South Wales,—to procure for them the means of religious and moral instruction—This—this, is the cause which the Venerable Archdeacon of New South Wales denounces as "*a cause, which if they (the Protestant inhabitants of the Colony) knew their own principles, they must think it worse than sacrilege in any degree to espouse.*"—(p. 5.)

It is not to be wondered at, surely, that denunciations measureless, such as these—like

> "Vaulting ambition, which o'erleaps itself,
> And falls on the other ——"

yielded contrary results to those it was the intended object of the author to attain. The generous and the good rallied round the standard of the Catholics,—They felt that the period of insult and degradation had gone by, and ought not to be revived;—and that, after the wisdom of the Legislature had removed the weight of the chain from the limbs of the Catholic, They ought not,—even at the bidding of the Archdeacon of New South Wales,—make him feel that a link or two was left behind, to remind him that he was once in fetters.

Subscriptions poured in upon our exhausted coffers. From the publication of the Archdeacon's letter to the

present hour, contributions to our Chapel exceeded the amount subscribed to it (within a corresponding period of time) since its foundation; and you will be glad to learn, that at the moment I am writing, by means of these subscriptions and a comparatively small assistance from the Local Government, our Chapel is protected from any serious injury from the inclemency of the weather. Surely, then, here is ample inducement to address this letter to Mr. Broughton, in the hope that he may again become our benefactor—however unwilling and unintending to be so—by the publication of a second proscriptive dissertation; but I willingly waive whatever advantages may accrue from a series of letters in the same tone and spirit that marked the character of the first letter of Mr. Broughton. For I am deeply impressed with a conviction—a conviction formed from the experience of some observation of such matters—that a controversial correspondence, on theological subjects, to which the Archdeacon would fain invite me, may easily be characterized by much angry discussion and much acrimonious criticism on both sides, without being attended by any compensatory advantage to either. The controversies of the middle ages, as well as those of modern times, appear to have been so characterized, rather than by any new lights shed upon the merits or demerits of the respective disputants, or by any solid accession gained to the cause of Religion or of Truth. There was some *naiveté*, I must admit, in the Venerable the Archdeacon inviting me to a polemical warfare of this description—whom (from my profession and pursuits) he must presume to be wholly unlearned in those branches of study in which he peculiarly delights. The wars of *Duns Scotus* and *Thomas Aquinas*,—in nineteen volumes folio,—I assure him have no charms for me. And I can further assure the Archdeacon, with as much truth as Mr. Canning assured Sir John Cox Hippesley, that "I have not even dipped into the very grammar—the accidence of theological policy which every controversialist should have at his fingers' ends:—of course, I mean '*Oceanus Juris Civilis sine Tractatus Tractatuum de Ecclesia*,' in twenty-nine volumes folio."

Believe me, my dear Sir, however, that my want of inclination is not inferior even to my want of qualification to

break a spear on the disputatious arena of theological controversy with the Archdeacon of Australasia. I am exceedingly disinclined to be regarded as one of those dogmatic controversialists who think they have discovered what God has concealed, and give their opinions as a supplement to Revelation. In the progress of their lucubrations, I have invariably observed, argument is soon superseded by invective. As the mysterious nature of the subject, and the imperfection of our faculties, would render the contest interminable, it is only the weariness of the parties that can end the dispute ; and then they retire from the contest only from fatigue of arguing and proving—not that they are satisfied with any thing that has been either argued or proved—like other tyrants,—the Diocletians and the Charleses,—who were rather wearied with governing than satiated with power—*lassati non satiati.*

It is, therefore, that I decline the polite invitation of Mr. Broughton to become a controversialist, even though my non-acceptance of the invitation should deprive the world of the future display of the abilities of so expert a dialectician as he is, on such edifying topics as the various changes of religion that were introduced in the sixteenth century—(according to Frederick of Prussia) by " a love of money in Germany—a love of women in England—and a love of novelty in France." And as to the Reformation of England, which the Archdeacon would fain merely regard as an episode in the grand epic of our contemplated controversy, if he be still prone to the pursuit of polemics I would take the liberty of referring him to a little work, entitled " *Cobbett's History of the Reformation.*" That work owes to the author, whose name is prefixed to it, little beyond the masterly vigour and energy of his style. The research—the learning—the vast store of political information and religious history with which it abounds (I speak from some knowledge of the fact), have been contributed by some of the most eminent and learned Catholic Divines of modern times. There may be some error, some exaggeration in that book—as in what book of controversy, or controversial history, may there not ?—but there is in it too, withal, a body of well authenticated facts and powerful reasonings, which, if Mr. Broughton satisfactorily answers and refutes, he will deserve to be re-

garded as the most distinguished champion of the Reformation, either of the present or of any former time.

For my part, and on behalf of the Catholics of this Colony, I protest against the principles which the Archdeacon of New South Wales has thought proper to attribute to us. It is not from an adversary that the exposition of our doctrines can in fairness be taken. I appeal from his statement of *what We are not*, to the statement of the Catholic Bishops of England of *what We are*. I appeal from his misrepresentations (unintentional ones I am willing to believe), and misunderstandings of the true tenets of our faith, to the dignified and temperate declaration of their faith by these venerable men. It exhibits a complete and triumphant vindication from the calumnies cast upon them as citizens, through the medium of aspersions on their faith, and contains a powerful and affecting appeal to the calm sense and kindly feelings of their countrymen.*

Let me not be misunderstood in the motive that has prompted me to this exposition of the faith of Catholics. Misrepresentation has extorted it from me. What I am anxious should be understood distinctly is, that whilst we Catholics, in communion with the See of Rome, believe, whether justly or not, that to our Church supreme authority in all matters connected with the law of God has been confided, we desire to live in the bonds of charity with the members of other Churches who claim a similar privilege. Our respective claims will probably remain undecided until we all appear before Christ, but until then each must be allowed to act upon his own conviction. The Catholics proceeding upon theirs, "justify the faith that is in them" in the temperate and well-measured terms of the annexed exposition. Far be it from us to denounce as *sacrilegious* those who may differ from us conscientiously in opinion; but what we do maintain—and what, I am satisfied, every candid man will believe who reads the annexed exposition of our faith on the points on which the Archdeacon has thought proper to attack it, is this:—that the Catholics hold no religious principles, and entertain no opinions flowing from those principles, that are not perfectly consistent with the sacred duties which, as Christians, they owe to Al-

---

* See Appendix.

mighty God—with all the civil duties which, as subjects, they owe their Sovereign—and with all the social duties which, as citizens, they owe to their fellow-subjects, whatever may be their religious creed.

Besides these points of doctrinal discussion, there are others scattered through the letter of the Archdeacon not altogether undeserving of attention. I shall confine myself to the notice of such of them as may afford an opportunity of bringing under your notice the condition of the Roman Catholics of this Colony;—and for that purpose I may as well proceed *at once* to the statement of the circumstances that have induced me to address this letter to you.

On my arrival in this Colony,—at the close of the year 1829,—my attention was naturally directed towards the Catholic portion of its inhabitants. I found them comprising at least one-third of the whole population of the Colony, which, at a moderate computation, furnishes the average estimate of their number at twenty thousand persons. For the most part, they belonged to the humble and subordinate classes of society;—and by reason of their number, and the inadequacy of their means, presented strong claims upon the local Government of the Colony for the extension of some portion of that munificence which provident Governments usually extend to the decent maintenance of religion, and the promotion of education. I found, moreover, that the only legal provision which had been made for this large portion of our Colonial community, scattered over a broad surface of territory—the parts of which are distant from one another, in some instances 200 miles and upwards—was one Roman Catholic clergyman, with a salary of £150 a-year—a sum unequal to his travelling expenses alone, presuming that he were only to perform a tithe of the duty which the exigencies of his flock required at his hands. But, that I may inform you of the present provision for these purposes, I transcribe for your information an extract from the Colonial Estimates of the year 1833, to show the extent of aid given by the local Government, in this year, towards the maintenance of the several Ministers, Missionaries, and Schools in the Colony:—

IV.—CLERGY AND SCHOOLS.

EPISCOPALIAN CLERGY AND SCHOOL ESTABLISHMENT.

The Venerable and Honorable the Archdeacon	£2,000	0	0
Fifteen Chaplains—one at £460, two at £360, and twelve at £250 each, per annum	4,180	0	0
Three Catechists, at £182 10s. per annum	547	10	0
Salaries of Clerks, Musicians, Pew-openers, and other Church Officers—in all, ninety-two individuals	789	9	4
Compensation for five Glebes resigned to the Corporation	500	0	0
Allowances to three Clergymen for performing Divine Service at Sydney Gaol, Phœnix Hulk, and Female Factory, at £50 each	150	0	0
Allowance to one Clergyman for performing Divine Service at Sackville Reach	45	0	0
Forage Allowance to eight Chaplains and two Catechists, at 2s. 6d. each per diem	456	5	0
Allowance for maintaining two Boatmen on the river Hawkesbury	40	0	0
Travelling Expenses on duty	150	0	0
Rent of six Parsonages	470	0	0
Ditto of two Houses for Catechists	90	0	0
Allowance for the Maintenance of twenty-four Glebe Servants	240	0	0
Compensation to the Rev. John Vincent, in lieu of 1,280 Acres of Land, after five years' service	320	0	0
and in lieu of a Glebe and Fees	100	0	0
Rent of Chapel at Narellan	30	0	0
Incidental Parochial Expenses	250	0	0
Salary and Allowance to the Rev. L. E. Threlkeld, employed on the Civilization of the Aborigines	186	0	0
Building Chapels at Bathurst, Goulburn, Illawarra, and Patrick's Plains, on condition of equal Sums being subscribed by the Inhabitants of these Districts—£125 each	500	0	0
Incidental Repairs of Churches and places of Worship; enclosing Burial Grounds, &c.	450	0	0
	£11,494	4	4

SCHOOLS.

KING'S SCHOOLS.

Salary of the Master	£100	0	0
House Rent for the Masters	60	0	0
Furniture and incidental Expenses	45	0	0
Building a new School-house to contain Boarders at Parramatta	1,200	0	0
	£1,405	0	0

PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS.

Salaries to thirty-three Masters of Parochial Schools, and fifteen Mistresses	£1,372	9	4
Lodging Allowance to eight of the Masters	222	12	0
Allowance of One Halfpenny, per diem, for each Child in actual attendance	300	0	0
Repairs of School Houses	187	0	0
Books and incidental Expenses	150	0	0
	£2,232	1	4

ORPHAN INSTITUTIONS.

Male Orphan School	£1,700	0	0
Female Orphan School	1,300	0	0
Expenses of the Herds of the Institution	100	0	0
	£3,100	0	0
Management of the Trust	£840	0	0

PRESBYTERIAN CLERGY, AND ROMAN CATHOLIC CLERGY, AND SCHOOLS.

Ministers of the Established Church of Scotland	£600	0	0
Roman Catholic Chaplains	450	0	0
Roman Catholic Schools	350	0	0
	£1,400	0	0
Estimated Charge of the Clergy and School Establishment	£20,471	5	8

The provision for the support of religion, and the spread of knowledge among the Catholic community, "hath this extent—no more!" It requires no illustration to prove how inadequate such provision is for such purposes: the mere statement sufficiently establishes its utter disproportion to the objects for which it is intended. I waive the comparative criticism for which it presents such pregnant materials.

We have chaplains but no chapel,—there is, 'tis true, an inconvenient room, which occasionally serves as a School-room—occasionally as a Court-house—and occasionally various other purposes—in which Catholic service is permitted to be performed; and even this permission is not free from some circumstances of annoyance,—but as yet *there is not one edifice in the Colony devoted and appropriated to Catholic worship.* It is right I should inform

you that there has not been wanting much exertion on the part of the Catholics themselves, as well as much liberality on the part of their Protestant brethren, to supply this desideratum. The history of their combined efforts in this behalf is so blended with the history of the Catholics of the Colony that I will present you with a brief narrative of them.

Among the many meritorious efforts made by the Rev. Mr. Therry—now twelve years the persevering Pastor of the Roman Catholics,—for the benefit of his flock, formed and kept together as a religious community in this Colony by his indefatigable zeal and pious exertions—the most distinguished of his services has been to provide them with a suitable edifice for the celebration of Divine worship. In this laudable undertaking, it is gratifying to observe, he met with very efficient co-operation from the local Government—then (1820) administered by General Macquarie—as well as from his successor, Sir Thomas Brisbane. Corresponding encouragement was afforded by Sir John Jamison, and many other leading and influential members of the Protestant community. In tracing, in this brief sketch, the outlines of our history, the point to which I am solicitous of directing your marked attention is that which relates to the repeated promises and assurances of support from successive Governments—promises and assurances as yet unfulfilled. And first, I will commence by citing a passage from the address of Governor Macquarie to the Roman Catholics of New South Wales, on the occasion of his laying the foundation-stone of the Roman Catholic Chapel. It is a passage full of true wisdom and practical benevolence. In it there is no little feeling to be found—no denouncement of an act of charity as "*an act of sacrilege;*"—no unworthy or captious criticism of the size of the edifice—which, of necessity, was commenced on a capacious plan, as there are five thousand Catholics in Sydney, and such a number surely requires a large and commodious place of worship:—

"It has been a great gratification to me," says General Macquarie, "to witness and assist at the ceremony now performed; and I have every hope that the consideration of the British Government, in supplying the Roman Catholics of this Colony with established clergymen, will be the means of strengthening and augmenting (if that be possible) the attachment of the Catholics of New South Wales to the British Govern-

ment; and will prove an inducement to them to continue, as I have ever found them to be, loyal and faithful subjects to the Crown."

The generous and benevolent sentiments which were then avowed by General Macquarie, were cherished and expressed by him up to the moment that closed his connexion with this Colony. When on board the vessel—the *Surry*—which was to convey him to his native land, he addressed the following letter to the Rev. Mr. Therry:

" *Ship Surry, Port Jackson,*
15th February, 1822.

" Dear Sir,

" I shall not fail to move Earl Bathurst, on my arrival in England, to instruct Sir Thomas Brisbane to extend further assistance towards completing the Roman Catholic Chapel at Sydney.

" I remain, in haste, dear Sir,

" Yours, very truly,

" L. MACQUARIE."

" *To the Rev. J. J. Therry,*
&c. &c. &c."

This was no hasty or inconsiderate promise: " it was not keeping the word of promise to the ear, to break it to the hope." The result proved that he had exerted himself according to his promise; for very shortly after the arrival of Sir Thomas Brisbane, in reply to a memorial presented to him for assistance towards the completion of the Roman Catholic Chapel, Hyde Park,—a memorial signed by the Judges of the Supreme Court, and by twenty-six Magistrates of the Territory—His Excellency Sir Thomas Brisbane made a promise on the part of Government, as strong and binding as the terms of it are plain, obvious, and unmistakeable. This is the concluding passage of His Excellency's reply:—

" After the anxiety so generally felt, the propriety of opening a fresh subscription for the consummation of that religious, political, and elegant undertaking, naturally suggests itself; *and, in any list that may be opened, I am directed by the Governor to enter the name of this Government for a sum equal to the* SUM TOTAL *of all such additional Donations.*

" I have the honour to be, Reverend Sir,

" Your most obedient Servant,

" F. GOULBURN, *Colonial Secretary.*"

Here, then, is a series of promises and assurances;—commencing with Governor Macquarie, on laying the foun-

dation-stone—continued at his departure—renewed and adopted by his successor—partially recognised by General Darling—and yet, to the present day, these assurances are unrealized. The letter of Sir Thomas Brisbane is so strong, and so explicit, as to give every man, who subscribed £10 towards the Chapel, a claim upon Government to the same amount, to be appropriated to the same purpose. While we urge this claim with earnestness, knowing that it does not admit of refutation,—at the same time we regard, with due gratitude, the appropriation of £500 towards the Roman Catholic Chapel in the last session of the Legislative Council. It at most, however, can only be regarded as an instalment paid in fulfilment of a deliberate and solemn promise made to the Roman Catholics. Making every liberal allowance for this instalment, and for any other assistance furnished by Government—whether in money or in kind of whatsoever description;—unless repeated written promises are to avail as naught—and

"Till thou canst rail the seal from off the bond"

of Major Goulburn's letter—for 'tis a pledge, solemn and binding as a bond—till this be done, it can be proved, with the certitude of mathematical demonstration, that the Catholics of this country are now claimants—just and legitimate claimants, on the plighted faith of Government—for a sum exceeding £3000.

I have stated these facts elsewhere, I repeat them here, my dear Sir, for your information, knowing your disposition, and your power, to make use of them for the benefit of those on whose behalf this appeal is addressed to you.

Seeing the condition of the Catholics to be such as I have described;—without Pastors—without Chapels—without the means of religious or moral instruction;—seeing, too, the children of those parents sent hither—in just expiation of crimes committed at home—moving 'mid scenes of vulgar vice and habitual profligacy, and unrestrained by education from the pursuit of evil courses;—seeing, moreover, that the direct and inevitable result of such a system must be to render them more degenerate than their sires—

"*Nos nequiores, mox daturos*
Progeniem vitiosiorem"—

I acted—I should take blame to myself if I had not acted —upon the principle, that it is the duty of every man to contribute his mite, whether bodily or intellectual, to the service of that community of which he is a member. Accordingly, I laboured, as far as my humble abilities and limited opportunities would permit, for the attainment of these three objects;—*First*, the increase of Roman Catholic Clergymen and the building of Roman Catholic Chapels in the Colony;—*secondly*, the augmentation of means for establishing Schools for the instruction of Roman Catholic children;—*thirdly*, the restoration of the Reverend Mr. Therry to the office of Roman Catholic Chaplain—as a mark of merited gratitude from his flock, towards one who had served them with fidelity and zeal for twelve years, and whose removal from that office, about six years ago, arose from circumstances in which the pursuit of advantages personal to himself, or the disregard of those of his flock, assuredly had no share.

This brings me to the letter of Sir Edward Parry, for it was in the furtherance of these objects that I wrote to the worthy Knight, soliciting his countenance and support of them. It was reasonable and natural to expect his sanction of these objects, for shortly after his arrival in this Colony he had contributed £5 towards the completion of the Roman Catholic chapel; and although I had not supposed, nor I am sure has any person observant of Sir Edward's career in the Colony supposed, that the great Polar Navigator had visited Australia on any such mission, or with any such motive as that which filled the generous bosom of the illustrious Howard—although I felt assured he had not come hither on "a circumnavigation of charity," yet until I had received the letter which I subjoin, I own I had not supposed he had come for purposes so directly different and adverse.

In introducing this correspondence to your notice, I do not think I deceive myself in anticipating the concurrence of your opinion, that a more unprovoked and unseemly aspersion of the religious creed of others, both as to the sentiments and the occasion that elicited them, than the letter of Sir Edward Parry presents, cannot be easily

imagined: or if there be any thing that exceeds it in extravagance and unsuitableness of assertion, it is the eulogy of Sir Edward by the Venerable the Archdeacon, for the "*manliness and intrepidity with which*, WHEN THUS ATTACKED, *he has expressed his sentiments. Thus* ATTACKED forsooth!! Pray, now read my miscalled attack, and judge of the intrepidity of Sir Edward!!

"*Sydney, April* 2, 1832.

"Sir,—As Secretary to a Meeting of Roman Catholic and other Subscribers to the Roman Catholic Chapel, Hyde Park, held at St. Joseph's Chapel on the 25th ultimo, I beg leave to invite your attention to a Memorial agreed to unanimously at that Meeting, and published in the Sydney Gazette of the 31st ultimo. I make this application by letter to you, as some time may elapse before I can personally solicit your signature to the Memorial—to which a very anxious desire is entertained that the most respectable signatures should be affixed.

"If, therefore, the objects of the Memorial, which are to return thanks to His Excellency the Governor for past favours—to solicit additional means of providing religious instruction and education for the present and rising generation—and to secure the re-appointment of the Reverend John Joseph Therry to his former situation of Roman Catholic Chaplain, meet your approbation, may I request that you will have the kindness to notify to me, at your earliest convenience, your permission to append your signature to it.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,

"Your most obedient Servant,

"R. THERRY."

"*To Captain Sir W. E. Parry, R. N.*"

"*Port Stephens, 5th May*, 1832.

"My dear Sir—In acknowledging the receipt of your letter of the 30th ultimo, it is a matter of sincere regret to me that I am unable to comply with your request of adding my name to the Memorial to which you allude.

"As I presume that the circumstance of my having subscribed towards the completion of the Roman Catholic Chapel, at Sydney, is a principal reason for your present application to me—and a very just and natural reason too—I feel it to be due to myself, no less than to you, and to the respectable body whose cause you so ably advocate—to offer a candid explanation of my present sentiments on this subject.

"It may be proper for me, first, to assure you that I am a Protestant—not merely because I happened to be born of Protestant parents, and in a country chiefly Protestant—but because I do, from my heart, most solemnly protest against the doctrines of the Church of Rome, as being, in my opinion, a system of idolatry, and superstition of human invention, and directly opposed to the One only standard of right and wrong which I can conscientiously recognise; namely, the inspired Word of God.

"Notwithstanding this, my solemn and deliberate conviction, I subscribed my mite towards the completion of the Chapel at Hyde Park, on the principle, that, as there *are* a great many Roman Catholics at Sydney, it was desirable that they should have a place for public worship according to the forms of their own Church, rather than none at all. You will not, I trust, be offended, when I declare to you that I did it in the sincere belief, that to build a Roman Catholic Chapel where there was none, and where thousands of Roman Catholics were already residing, was rather the least of two very serious evils.

"Further reflection, subsequently to that occasion—the first on which I was ever called upon to assist in an object connected with the Roman Catholic religion—has convinced me that, in this case I acted, to say the least, inconsistently with my Protestant profession and faith; and I have suffered much self-reproach in consequence. I need scarcely add, therefore, that I prefer acknowledging my first error to incurring a repetition of it—especially in these days of what is called liberalism in religion, which, judging from the infallible standard to which I have already alluded, I conceive to be an increasing disregard of *all* scriptural and vital religion whatsoever.

"Having thus candidly explained to you my sentiments on this subject, I ought perhaps to observe, that, although I by no means *wish* to obtrude my opinions upon any individual entertaining the faith of the Church of Rome, so as to create unnecessary pain, or to give unnecessary offence, yet, when thus called upon, I have no objection whatever, *on my own account*, to your making any use of this communication, which, in your official capacity as Secretary to the Meeting, you may deem requisite.

"Believe me, my dear Sir,

"Yours very faithfully and sincerely,

"E. W. PARRY."

"*To Roger Therry, Esq. &c. &c. &c.*"

What! does the Archdeacon deem it "*an attack*" to ask a rich man for the crumb that drops from his table to diminish the miseries of his Christian neighbour—to raise a temple "*ad majorem Dei gloriam*" required by the religious exigencies of a large portion of the people—to diffuse amongst them the blessings of education, which, next to the blessings of the redemption, and those consequent upon it, there is no gift bestowed by God equal in value, and unattended and unassisted by which Religion herself loses half her beauty and her influence? To do this,—in a Colony too, where both these blessings are so much needed, is "to aid a cause" which Sir Edward Parry, and Mr. Broughton, (who has become a sort of "*Defensor fidei*" to Sir Edward,) thinks it "worse than *sacrilege* to espouse!!"

Here is my letter, and Sir Edward's reply; "the bane and antidote are both before you." The reply of the gal-

lant Knight is entitled to the Archdeacon's " cordial respect and thanks;" whereas my humble supplication on behalf of the poor Catholics of the Colony, in his estimation, " carries a most offensive imputation," and " virtually tells a Protestant that he has no heart and no sincerity." Really this is what the late Lord Liverpool would call " too bad." I had hitherto thought it was a sort of sinister privilege awarded to the members of my profession, that we

——— " Lawyers might with ease,
Twist words and meaning as we please;"

but verily the Archdeacon of New South Wales has snatched the laurel from our brow, and has approved himself the very Proteus of language, assigning constructions to words, and import to sentences, not only different from, but directly opposite to their obvious sense and hitherto acknowledged meaning. In what part of my letter is to be found " the offensive imputation" Mr. Broughton speaks of? Where is the sentence, or fragment of a sentence, that bears the complexion of " attack?" I appeal from the exaggerated and improbable import which the Archdeacon assigns to my letter, to the plain and impartial sense of every man, whether, if I were studious to present my supplication with " bated breath and whispering humbleness," I could have chosen language more subdued, temperate, and utterly free from provoking the angry polemical asperites of Sir Edward Parry, than that in which my letter to him was couched. I cheerfully abide the decision of public opinion as to which side the demerit of the " *attack*" belongs.

It is in a corresponding spirit of just and fair animadversion, that the Archdeacon reproves me for " commenting on a private letter," as if Sir Edward did not court its publicity. That he would have felt mortified at its suppression, is manifest from the passage of it, which says, " I have no objection whatever, on my own account, to your making any use of this communication, which, in *your official capacity*, you may deem requisite." After this, with what grace can I be reproached for " commenting on a private letter?"

I first proceed to advert briefly to the dogma of the Archdeacon, " that no Protestant can subscribe to the building

of a Roman Catholic Chapel *without guilt.*" This proposition is peculiarly disgracious—considering the many Churches for the use of Protestants, which We, Roman Catholics, have erected at our expense throughout the empire—especially in Ireland. If the extension and perpetuation of the Roman Catholic religion depended, solely, upon the support which Protestants might afford it, perhaps, Mr. Broughton, speaking in the spirit of an Exclusionist in religion, may be deemed, in this instance, to adopt a defensible, or at least plausible doctrine, for the guidance of his congregation. But the experience of the past—the aspect of the present time—and the prospect of the future—but, most of all, their belief in the assurance of HIM who has promised "to be with his Church to the end of time," —convince Catholics that the "extension and perpetuation of their Church" are secured to them by that all-wise Power whose dispensations it as little behoves us to question, as it is beyond human power to influence or controul them. Suffice it to say, the experiment of exclusion has been tried, and has signally failed. The very effort to extinguish the Catholic religion in Ireland only imparted to it strength and permanence, and no laws ever contributed more completely to defeat the object of their enactment than the laws enacted for "*preventing the growth of Popery in Ireland.*" Persecution, and a spirit of Intolerance, furnished, in truth, the frame and groundwork of that execrable Code of which Religion was made the pretext and the scape-goat; for what concern could Religion have, or what part of the meek spirit of the Gospel is reconcileable with any part of this flagitious and sanguinary system?* "*Wives be obedient to your husbands,*" said the holy Apostle:—*Wives be* dis*obedient to your husbands*, said, in effect, the Code—for it tendered to the former a power over the property of the latter, if the former would become Protestant, while the husband remained a Catholic. "*Honour thy father and thy mother,*" says God: dis*honour thy father and thy mother*, said the Code; for if any son would but apostatize, cover his parents with shame, and bring their grey hairs with sorrow to the grave, it, in despite of his parents, rewarded the unnatural child with a large part of his pa-

* See Address of the Catholics of Ireland to the People of England.

rents' estate. "*Covet not thy neighbour's goods,*" says our Maker. *Covet thy neighbour's goods,* said the Code; for if any Protestant saw a Catholic have a horse worth more than five pounds, it gave him a right to take away the horse and make it his own, upon giving the owner five pounds; and if any Catholic had a lease yielding him a profit greater, in amount, than one-third of the rent, any Protestant might go, turn him out, and become proprietor of the lease in his stead: and all this—and a hundred times more than this—for no other cause, than that they—the forefathers of the Roman Catholics of New South Wales, remained firmly attached to the faith and worship of their fathers.

Now why do I cite this here? To show not only what little concern the interests of true Religion had in those enactments,—which were abuses and crimes perpetrated in her name,—but also to shew that the cruel experiment of persecution has been tried, and the trial has been a failure;—that civil restrictions imposed on men for a conscientious adherence to the faith of their forefathers, only augment their attachment to it, and make them, moreover, love the cause for which they suffer. A penal law may make proselytes—but it never yet has influenced, nor ever can influence a man's honest belief in so serious a concern as religion. It is therefore, that I complain of the proscriptive letter of the Archdeacon as being "out of joint with the time;"—as being an admonition, the propriety and policy of which History condemns—and which, in truth, only wants Legislative enforcement to constitute it a perfectly penal infliction. When you tell a man that he shall not, *without guilt,* contribute a portion of the fruits of his industry to relieve the wants of his neighbour, you virtually interdict the exchange of mutual kindnesses and reciprocal services between them. It partakes of the spirit and character of a law of non-intercourse among fellow Christians, who, hitherto in this Colony, have lived on terms of the friendliest interchange of the duties of social life; and who, despite of every effort, whether intentional or otherwise, to interrupt it, may long, I trust, continue in the bond of peace and concord in which they are now united.

It cannot be denied, however, that the conduct of those who enacted the Penal Code of Ireland was marked with

consistency. Their object was to proscribe the ancient religion of the land, and the perpetrators of this design admirably adapted their means to the end they had in view. They knew they could not proscribe religion without a proscription of education, by which it was sustained—and, in proscribing both, they resolved to extinguish freedom, and debase the nation. Hence the laws placing the Catholic in a situation in which he should not have the right of bequeathing his own property—of educating his own children—of exercising any of the rights,—I will not say of a freeman,—but of a manumitted slave. This was the mode adopted for tranquillizing the nation; and it must be granted, that the man in whom the best powers and faculties of life, civil freedom, and all the social passions, were extinguished, was likely to be quiet and tranquil enough.

But if *They* were consistent in their purpose who enacted those odious laws, in dooming a nation to ignorance and slavery—and in declaring, by Act of Parliament, that "*A People should not read*,"—so also have They been consistent in their purpose who repealed these detested enactments. No sooner did the Legislators of our time resolve upon restoring the people to the light of freedom and of knowledge,—by effacing from the statute-book those laws which had been too long preserved there, as an unnecessary guard against the shadows of past dangers,—than they resolved, too, to make an ample provision for education:—and, even amid the urgent and absorbing interest of the Reform Bill, during the last session of Parliament, "*the Irish Education Bill*" was passed, establishing a well-ordered system of education for the poor throughout the country—the leading principle of which is to afford the same facilities of education to all classes of professing Christians, without any attempt to interfere with the peculiar religious opinions of any; and, above all things, to promote Christian charity and benevolence,—a measure that may not be inaptly designated as the laurel of victory achieved over intolerance and misrule—and should be entwined in the never-fading garland which Great Britain and Ireland ought to join in weaving for the brow of Earl Grey.

It may not be generally known,—but is a well authenticated fact that,—with scarcely an exception,—all the

prison-ships from Ireland have been sent to New South Wales, and for the last seven years not one even has been chartered for the Sister Colony of Van Diemen's Land. Now, each transport averages 200 prisoners, of whom 130 usually are Catholics. Besides, many English Catholics arrive in the prison-ships from England, especially in those which convey the prisoners sent from Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool, and the principal towns in the northern counties of England. To these may be added a proportion of one-third of the free Emigrant Settlers, which altogether forms a population of Roman Catholics in this Colony exceeding 20,000. Surely, such a community presents fair and legitimate claims to the protection and assistance of Government. To resist those claims,—and to interdict the extension of the aid that the heart of charity may be disposed to dispense,—in plain parlance,—is positive *Persecution.* This term has usually been applied to tests and disqualifications by the greatest masters of language, and most enlightened advocates of British liberty; but its meaning was never more luminously defended, or pathetically enforced, than in a short explanation given by the good and venerable Bishop of Norwich, in his place in Parliament, on the 16th March, 1827. "He was taught," he said, "in early life, by better and wiser men than any now living, that every penalty—every restriction—every disadvantage—every inconvenience, imposed upon an individual on account of his religion, was *Persecution.*" How far the condition of the Roman Catholics of New South Wales is one of *crying disadvantage and inconvenience,* a reference to the extract from the Colonial Budget I have above inserted, and the other statements I have made, too powerfully and painfully illustrate. It is right it should be known, the schools mentioned in that extract; for instance, the Orphan Schools, the Female School of Industry, are endowed institutions, into which Roman Catholics are not admitted, except on the cruel condition imposed on the Roman Catholics of Ireland in the old exploded Protestant Charter Schools of Ireland—that of abjuring the faith of their fathers.

What, then, is the destiny of the Roman Catholic prisoner? I will attempt a portrait—not a finished, yet not an exaggerated one. No sooner has he touched the shore of Australia

than he is hurried into the interior of the Colony,—there to be assigned to a settler, 50,—or 100, perhaps 200 miles distant from Sydney. There, he is valued only for the quantity of labour he produces:—there, 'mid associates of profligate habits, and 'mid scenes of vulgar vice, his time rolls recklessly and joylessly on—there, too, (and it is of this I complain,) the voice of religion,—with its salutary advices and blessed consolations,—reaches him not. With him religion loses all sanction—morality all enforcement. Is it then to be wondered at,—that when temptation offers,—he should renew and continue in his career of crime—till he finally expiates his offences, either on the scaffold,—or by a doom almost as merciless as the scaffold,—by banishment to a penal settlement;—a community consisting of a *populus virorum*—the wretchedness and horror of which it is shocking to contemplate. If he escape both these dread alternatives, and happen to die during the term of his sentence,—no sympathizing spirit—no friendly hand is nigh—to soothe, or to console his parting hour. No Christian *requiem* is breathed o'er his tomb, and, as in life he was unfortunate and friendless, so in death he lies unhonoured and unmourned, deprived of those sad and sacred immunities which all Christian nations award to the repose and shelter of the grave. Such has been—such is the condition of the forlorn Catholic prisoner of the Crown in this Colony (with the exception of those located in and about Sydney), from its foundation to the present time. Upon the mind of such a man religious instruction may not invariably produce the gratifying result of changing him into a perfect man—but assuredly it will prove a powerful corrective to long-acquired habits of depravity, and in all instances it will be attended with salutary and beneficial effects. Moreover, I believe that religious instruction,—operating conjointly with kindly treatment on the part of their employers,—and protection from ill-usage on the part of the Government, constitute the only certain means of reclaiming and reforming the prison population of New South Wales.

Perhaps, without the imputation of impertinent curiosity, I may be permitted to ask, Whence does the Archdeacon derive his commission to be the arbiter of other men's property—to dictate to them when and in what manner they are to dole out their charity—when and in

what manner they are to withhold it—and, further, to affix the odious brand of "*guilt*" to the bounty that other men are pleased to dispense? This, indeed, is not even a mitigated—it is an aggravated version of the statute of the 11th and 12th of William III. which I have prefixed, not inappropriately, to this letter; for the penal law merely imposed the severity of the penal infliction, but the Archdeacon superadds the bitterness of a religious denunciation against those Protestants who subscribe to build a Roman Catholic Chapel! With him they are all *guilty* men. This is the verdict of the Archdeacon, pronounced, however, *coram non judice*, against the Judges of the land—against almost all the Magistracy, and Merchants, and Settlers, and Tradesmen of the Territory—for they have almost all, with generous friendship, contributed their mite towards the purposes on which Mr. Broughton has been pleased to breathe his anathema.

But higher personages, and more eminent authorities than any in this Colony, are involved in the extra-judicial verdict of *guilt* which the Archdeacon has pronounced. It reaches the Parliament of England, and the King upon his throne; for how grievous must have been their *guilt* to have established by law the Catholic religion in a Colony, if the mere voluntary subscribing to build a Catholic Chapel be so heinous an offence against religion as the Archdeacon would fain make the good Colonists of New South Wales believe it to be. Here, I wish to vindicate the Protestant religion itself from the doctrines of intolerance, and I propose to prove the position assumed by the Archdeacon, that the religious interests of Roman Catholics cannot be favoured by Protestants *without guilt*, is an unauthorized dogma of the Protestant religion. I appeal from the dictum of the Archdeacon to the acts of the Parliament in England, sanctioned by the King of England, the Head of the Protestant Church. The acts of Royal liberality, and legislative beneficence towards the Catholics, are attested by the large endowments annually voted at the recommendation of the King's Ministers to the College of Maynooth, in Ireland, for the education of the Roman Catholic priesthood, and to the various other seminaries and places of instruction in Ireland, and throughout the British dominions—but most of all—look to Canada, and

see the system established there. In reference to the danger apprehended to our late American colonies from the Catholic religion being established by the Parliament as the State religion of Canada, Mr. Burke remarks in his celebrated letter to Sir H. Langrishe, " It is true that some persons, and among them one eminent divine predicted at that time, that by this step we should lose our dominions in America. He foretold that the Pope would send his emissaries thither ; that the Canadians would fall in with France, declare their independence, and draw, or rather force, our other colonies into the same design. The independence happened according to his prediction, but in directly the reverse order. All our Protestant colonies revolted—they joined themselves to France, and it so happened that Popish Canada (whose inhabitants were naturally attached to France, their native country) was (with what Lord Liverpool would call their half-allegiance) the *only* place which preserved its fidelity—the *only* place where Catholic France got no footing—the *only* peopled colony on the Continent which now remains to Great Britain ; and last year when *we settled a Protestant Church there, conjointly with the Catholic*, we had no dread for that establishment, because we permitted the French Catholics, in the utmost latitude of the description, to be free subjects. They are good subjects I have no doubt, but I will not allow that any French Canadian Catholics are better men, or better citizens, than the Irish of the same communion."

Here, then, we see a Protestant King and a Protestant Parliament establishing the Catholic religion *by law*, in a large and important dependency of the British Crown, and thereby incurring (if the Archdeacon's dogma be sound doctrine) the ignominious epithet of *guilt*. It were an easy task to multiply arguments in refutation of Mr. Broughton's position, that it " is sacrilege for a Protestant to subscribe to the building of a Catholic Chapel ;"—but there is so much of true legislative wisdom and statesmanlike eloquence in the following passage of Sir George Murray's speech in the House of Commons, on the 5th of March, 1829, that you will, I am sure, pardon its insertion here. Sir George Murray, having been Secretary of State—and having filled that high office with distinguished honour to himself—and signal advantage to the empire, may be justly

regarded as an eminent authority on the subject on which he speaks. He marks, with admirable propriety and precision, the degree of support to which religious communities are respectively entitled, and the legitimate claims which they possess on the public fund for their decent and becoming maintenance. Happy, perhaps, would it have been for some of the long-settled and most civilized nations of Europe, had they acted on the principle Sir George here promulgates; and I am sure I wish no ill thing for the people of New South Wales when I say, I hope they may never have occasion to regret that they knew,—and that knowing it—they neglected the salutary lesson which the subjoined extract from Sir George Murray's speech eloquently inculcates :—

"With regard to the Church Establishment, I quite concur with those Honourable Gentlemen who hold that this country is bound to provide for the religious and moral instruction of her Colonies. We should recollect that 40,000 or 50,000 emigrants from this country are yearly arriving in Canada. Are they to be deprived of religious instruction?—Or, are we to say to the Canadians that they are to pay for the religious instruction of those who, impelled by want and misery, have emigrated from this country to their shores? I have always been disinclined to follow up the principle of carrying into these Colonies the system of an exclusive Church Establishment. I have ever regretted that, in the original construction of the constitution of Canada, a system was introduced, the effect of which was the allotment of a large portion of that country to the exclusive maintenance of the Protestant Church. The interpretation given by many to that clause in the Act, is, that it meant to apply exclusively to the Church of England. I can conceive nothing more likely to prove injurious to the Church of England itself, or better calculated to create feelings of religious dissension in these Colonies; and I have, therefore, always looked forward to the gradual extinction of that system, and to a just and suitable provision being made for the Clergy of all religious persuasions—not for one more than another. I am not friendly to the principle pursued in the States of America, of casting off the Church altogether and maintaining no connexion between the religious and civil establishments of the country; at the same time, I should be still more disposed to deprecate the exclusive establishment and endowment of one Church over all others. The system, however, has very properly not been acted upon in Canada, for provision has been made in that Colony for the Clergy of the Catholic Church, and I think it should be made for the Clergy of any religion comprising a large number of members."—*Mirror of Parliament, New Series, page* 3315.

Lord Howick, in the same debate, coincides in the sentiments thus eloquently expressed by Sir George Murray :—

"What has appeared to me one of the greatest objects in favour of the course which His Majesty's Government have adopted, is that which

the Right Honourable and gallant Gentleman, in the concluding part of his speech has so well stated;—namely, the necessity of accommodating our institutions to the feeling and spirit of the people among whom they are to exist."—*Mirror of Parliament, p.* 3316.

Lest an insidious distinction be drawn between measures of Parliamentary provision and acts of private munificence, there are not wanting proofs to show that individual liberality has corresponded and kept pace with measures of legislative bounty. Upon this point nothing can be more satisfactory—more consonant with the precepts of true Christian charity—more consistent with those just and natural sentiments which reveal themselves in the breast of every man, and which—as it were—he reads written in his heart, than the language of Dr. Law, late Protestant Bishop of Elphin, and brother of the great Lord Ellenborough :—" By far the greatest part of the population of my diocese are Roman Catholics. I know I cannot make them good Protestants—I therefore wish to make good Catholics of them—and with this intention I put into their hands the works of Gother, an eminent Catholic divine." He adds, that " speculative differences in some points of faith were of no account. His Roman Catholic brethren and himself had but one religion—the religion of Christians—and that *without justice to the Catholics* there could be no security for the Protestant establishment."* The practical adoption of the truly benevolent sentiments of this venerable Protestant Prelate, by many enlightened Protestants of Ireland, is testified with grateful acknowledgment in the evidence of the Roman Catholic Prelates of Ireland in their examination before the Committee of the House of Commons in 1825. The generous extent of Protestant bounty towards their Roman Catholic brethren in Ireland is thus attested by Dr. Kelly, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Tuam :—" I have been very much engaged in erecting chapels ;—of the chapels that have been erected in my diocese, most of them have been in my time :—I have been in several parishes myself, and have taken a part very frequently in the collection, and *I do not recollect auy instance of my being refused by a Protestant gentleman, when I applied to him, to contribute*

* Speech of Sir John Hippesley, Bart. Appendix, p. lxxix. London, 1810.

towards a chapel. Dr. Doyle, a distinguished member of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy of Ireland, speaking on the same point, pays this just and well-merited tribute to the liberal conduct of our Protestant brethren :—" Within my diocese we have not enlarged or built any chapel since my appointment to my present office, in doing which we have not been *assisted, and materially assisted, by Protestant gentlemen, to build the walls, and even to roof them in* ;—I myself have endeavoured, out of my small income, to contribute some forty or fifty pounds a-year, for the two or three last years, to the advancement of this work; but, from the extreme poverty of the parishioners, I have not till lately ventured to call upon them for any aid; and the building, though a beautiful one, remains in that unfinished state. *Sir Henry Parnell has been one of our most bountiful contributors towards this building.*"—Again, in the Freeman's Journal of the 15th of May of the present year, I find the following paragraph :—" The Lord Bishop of Clonfert has given £10, and his son, Archdeacon Butson, £5, to the subscription for repairing the Roman Catholic Chapel of Kiltormer."

Now, I will not allow that Mr. Broughton is a better Protestant, or a more authoritative expounder of Protestant doctrine, than the Bishop of Clonfert, or the late Bishop of Elphin—or that the Protestants of New South Wales deserve to be stained and stigmatized with the ignominy of *guilt*, and their conduct to be denounced as *sacrilegious*, for those acts which, by the Protestant gentry of Ireland, are regarded as the practice of virtues and the performance of duties.

It were a gratifying task, did it not encroach beyond the intended scope of this essay, to multiply instances of Protestant liberality, and to show with what warmth and sincerity those feelings of Christian benevolence are reciprocated by the Roman Catholic clergy and people. One beautiful expression occurs to me, which will serve to illustrate the general sentiment of Catholics on this subject:—it is the parting expression of the Roman Catholic Bishop of Bayeux to a respected Protestant Minister in Exeter.—" *Mon chere frere, pensez quelquefois à moi, car nous adorons le meme Dieu—nous prechons le meme Evangile—et nous nous rencontrerons (je l'espere) dans*

le meme ciel."* I have heard the following beautiful illustration of the same sentiment by Sir George Murray, and I have listened with delight to the enthusiastic cheers with which it was received by the first assembly in the world—the British House of Commons :—

" In the army there are no distinctions—no differences on account of religion. It is in civil society only that I have found such differences to prevail. In the army, the Protestant and Catholic soldiers dwell in harmony in the same tent—they march in the same ranks—they mount together the same breach—and the only competition known amongst them is the competition of emulation to excel in courage and in fidelity to their country ; and if they fall together in the same field, they are laid together in the same grave, leaving behind them the same feelings of regret in the breasts of their surviving comrades, and carrying with them to another world the same hopes in their common Redeemer.—Why is it that, in civil society, the same spirit of peace and harmony is not to be found ?—Why, but that under the Civil Magistrates, and, I lament to say, *even under those who should be the Ministers of peace,* fellow-citizens are arrayed against one another."—*Mirror of Parliament, p.* 434, *No.* 29—*March* 5, 1829.

It is not unworthy of remark, moreover, that if the subscribing of a Protestant to build a Roman Catholic Chapel be a *sacrilegious guilt* (which I, with regret, own appears to me to have been the favourite and leading object of Mr. Broughton's letter to establish), the assumption of such a position would lead to consequences by no means beneficial to the interests of the Protestant Church—especially in Ireland. Mr. Broughton, I presume, will admit, that what is reprehensible in one Church cannot be commendable in another. Suppose, then, a conscientious Catholic—suppose him an Irish Catholic too—(and, if suffering be a test of sincerity, we surely have suffered much for conscience-sake)—suppose, further, application to be made to this Catholic for the payment of the tenth portion of the fruits of his industry to support the Rector, with what an admirable argument has the Archdeacon supplied the recusant tithe-payer ! Upon the principle of the Archdeacon, that " no man can lend his sanction, encouragement, and assistance, to obtain the means of

* " Adieu, my dear brother ; think sometimes of me, for we adore the same God—we preach the same Gospel—and we shall meet (I humbly hope) in the same Heaven."

propagating what he acknowledges to be a religious error, and yet escape the guilt of prevarication," the Roman Catholic may be permitted to adopt the eloquent language of Mr. Broughton, and to say, "Such an application addressed to a Roman Catholic carries a most offensive imputation." When thus *attacked*, he may surely be pardoned for taking a leaf from the book of Mr. Broughton, and addressing the Rector thus,—"Reverend Sir, this application to me *to pay you tithe*, implies that the person addressed has no conviction at heart of the truth of his professions. By asking a Catholic to aid you in such a cause, you virtually tell him that he has no heart and no sincerity, but that you believe him to be a person prepared to sanction contradictions. If I know my own principles, I must think it worse than sacrilege to espouse such a cause, and I tell you plainly I cannot do so *without guilt*." Positively, these are the very terms—this is the very speech which, if Captain Rock could speak with the same eloquence that Mr. Broughton writes, he would teach his followers, combined in a resistance to the payment of tithes. Never did I expect, among the strange alliances of modern times, to witness so unexpected a coalition as that which the sentiments of Mr. Broughton,—if consistently acted upon,—virtually and unequivocally establish between Captain Rock, in Ireland, and the Venerable the Archdeacon of Australasia. Armed with such a speech as the Archdeacon has taught him, depend upon it

> "Through Leinster, Ulster, Connaught, Munster,
> Rock's the boy to make the fun stir."

It is a matter of regret that Mr. Broughton should have selected for such a publication as his recent one, the present time, when the spirit of calm inquiry is abroad, and men seem anxious to resign those prejudices through which they viewed the doctrines of others. Would that he had availed himself of the dispassionate tone of the public mind—of the prevailing disposition to merge all *sectarian* feelings and invidious distinctions in the comprehensive pursuit of the general happiness of all, and the real welfare of the State. What wise or beneficent purpose can be answered by fighting o'er again the battle of the Reformation, or of provoking the inquisitive criti-

cism of that event, by those who may be disposed to trace its source to the amorous tastes of the Eighth Henry? Or, as Gray with infinite gallantry expresses it,

> " 'Twas love that taught this monarch to be wise,
> And Gospel light first beamed from Boleyn's eyes."

What are the troubles, the passions, and the prejudices of that period to the people of New South Wales?—Wherefore should they be invited to discuss and to denounce the mysterious points of the faith of the oldest church in Christendom. The principle of the Reformation and of the Revolution, 'tis true, was the proscription of Roman Catholics, but even to that proscription they were not doomed in the spirit of controversy. The Parliament of that day did not pretend to act as a convocation of Divines, but as an assembly of Legislators. " When the Legislature," says the eloquent and illustrious Canning, " selected these points—transubstantiation and the like, as tests, and as the foundation of their provisions against the admission of Roman Catholics into the State, it was surely not in the spirit of religious controversy—not as intending to dispute with Priests and Bishops upon the mysteries of their faith. It was not intended by those who originated the Catholic disqualifications to decide on abstract points of theology. They took these articles of religious creed as the signs of political opinion—as the distinguishing characteristic of a supposed faction in the State—acting under a foreign influence—connected with a banished dynasty—and hostile to the government and constitution of their country. They were the marks by which the presumed criminal was designated—not the crime for which he was punished—* * *. But it would surely be idle to contend, that a transitory dissension required, or could justify a permanent and irremoveable system of coercion. And it would be false in point of history as well as in reasoning, to affirm that the religious struggles which naturally grew out of such an event as the Reformation, must be considered as common to all times, and as arising out of causes inseparable from our nature."

It is not in the vehement passions, that agitated men's minds at the period of the Reformation, or of the Revolution, that we shall find the principles of toleration under-

stood or recognized. In those times no denomination of Christians was willing to grant an indulgence to others; and each deemed the toleration of *error* positively sinful. Each virtually claimed infallibility for their own tenets, and the common obligation to extirpate heresy, established a principle of mutual destruction. The eloquent continuator of *Rapin's History*, in a very clever treatise on the state of the Church from the Reformation to the Revolution observes, " Hence it appears that both parties agreed in the necessity of the uniformity of public worship, and of calling in the sword of the civil Magistrate for the support of their several schemes, but differed about the standard of this same uniformity: one party asserting it was the Queen's supremacy and the laws of the land; the other the decrees of provincial and national synods, allowed to be enforced by the Magistrate. *Neither party thought of admitting liberty of conscience, and freedom of profession, which seem to be the right of every man as far as is consistent with the peace of the government.*" —*Continuation of Rapin's Hist. Vol. III. p.* 227, 8*vo.*

It is not for you or me, my dear Sir, to investigate the merits of different religious persuasions, or to define what degree of wilful and obstinate error to revealed truth, as taught in what we believe to be the Church of Christ, excludes from the kingdom of God. Who may, or may not, be guilty of this, or any other fault, it is not our province to judge. The same God who has taught us to love our neighbour, whether Jew or Gentile, Greek or Barbarian, as we love ourselves, has also commanded us saying, " Judge not, and you will not be judged; condemn not, and you will not be condemned, for in the same measure in which you will mete to others, it will be measured to yourself, and judgment without mercy to him who hath not mercy." Moreover, we should ever remember, that all who bow in the name of Christ are Christians—we should be disposed to concede, that it is the legitimate province of each class of Christians to mark the limits of its own discipline, whether the discipline of each be wise or not, is a question into which it is not our province to enter;—it is enough that by respecting it, you can promote the interests of all, and that by infringing on it, you do violence to their consciences—

you put their Pastors in opposition to you, and thoroughly defeat your own object. To educate the people is a great blessing—to provide them with religious instruction is a still greater—but to revile their religion, by declaring it *sacrilege* to assist them in their virtuous endeavours to obtain a knowledge of it—and to shut them out from the benefit of places of public worship, on the pretence that aid cannot be afforded to them *without guilt*, is to excite the religious feelings of the community, and to unite them with the prejudices of all parties to create public discontent, and,—mayhap,—to disturb the public peace.

This letter, I fear, has grown tedious on your attention. I have interwoven with the immediate and avowed object of it—namely, an appeal on behalf of the Catholics of New South Wales—some remarks which have been suggested and provoked by the letters of Sir Edward Parry and Mr. Broughton. Taunted and branded as an idolater by the former—and all those Protestants who would assist me or mine being denounced, by the latter—as covered with the sin of *sacrilegious guilt*, it would ill become me to succumb in silence to such measureless and merciless denunciations. There is too much bitterness in these sentiments to be softened by the suavity of Sir Edward's assurance of his kind regards for my two children—*my young idolaters*,* as Sir Edward condescends to consider

* I have reserved for this part of my letter the concluding passage of Sir Edward Parry's letter to me. I published the letter originally, omitting this passage on account of the compliment, personal to myself, which it contained. As Sir Edward, however, afterwards deemed it expedient to send it to the *Sydney Gazette* for publication, and in order to avoid the imputation of any improper anxiety on my part to suppress any thing, the passage is here inserted, and upon it I have no remark to offer beyond the single sentence which introduces it to your notice.

" I cannot, however, conclude without assuring you how much satisfaction I derive from the circumstance of this application having been made to me by one, whose principles as a gentleman and man of honour I cordially esteem,—whose talents command my sincere respect,—and whom I shall always hope to be permitted to include among the number of my friends. I rejoice, I say, at this circumstance, because it will at once preclude the possibility of the imputation of my having been actuated by any personal, and therefore unworthy motives, under the cloak of performing a sacred duty.

" Lady Parry desires to unite with me in best regards to Mrs. Therry and yourself. We are happy to hear such good accounts of your little ones, and I am thankful to be able to give equally good accounts of our *trio*."

them—or to be counterbalanced by the sweet precept of the Archdeacon, " God forbid that we, as individuals, should not live in harmony and peace;"—of the observance of which precept, however, the other parts of his letter afford no very practical illustration. It is in the same forbearing spirit of consistency, and Christian meekness, that the ingenious author of the "*Pursuits of Literature*" denounces (p. 198) the practices, doctrines, and opinions, of the Roman Catholic religion, as superstitions and tyranny; which he,—good-natured soul!—declares he does, " not as an anathema, but as a warning, in the *spirit of mercy, moderation, and the most reflecting policy.*" Sentiments such as these can deceive no person;—the device is too shallow—the subterfuge too weak—to conceal the latent hostility which the mind wages against those to whom it assumes the external aspect and outward show of friendship. To invite a man to live in harmony and peace, and in the same breath to insult him with the odious epithet of idolater,—and to taunt, and to taint all those who may be disposed to assist him, with the deep disgrace and dire denouncement of *sacrilegious guilt,* is a doctrine in which I can discover neither sagacity,—nor prudence,—nor charity,—nor consistency,—nor any one of the whole tribe of religious or moral virtues. If I have expressed any sentiment with warmth upon this subject, it is because I feel the letter of the Archdeacon is written not merely in a tone far short of the liberality that pervades the King's Councils, but it breathes the spirit of retracting former relaxations and re-enacting former disabilities. The verdict of "*Guilty*" that the Archdeacon is pleased to record against any subscriber to a Roman Catholic Chapel, is a plain and positive recommendation of the re-enactment of the harshest of the Penal Laws, repealed in the early part of the reign of George III. If acted upon in this Colony it would place the Roman Catholics of New South Wales a century behind the position at which their brethren in Great Britain and Ireland have arrived. It is to avert this possible calamity that I invite your attention, and, through you, that of the friends of the Roman Catholics, to their condition. You will not wonder at my anxiety, and the need there is for my reliance on your and their exertions in our behalf,

when you consider what a formidable foe we have in the Gentleman filling the office of Archdeacon of this Colony;—not only the Head of the Protestant Church, but also the first Commissioner for managing the affairs of the Church and School Corporation—whose estates comprise one-eighth of the whole territory of the Colony. Add to this the influence he must command as a Member of the Executive and Legislative Councils of the Colony—*into neither of which Councils has a Roman Catholic been admitted*—so that in this, as in most other respects, Roman Catholics are as yet strangers to the enjoyment of equal privileges and rights, which the great measure of Catholic Emancipation was presumed to have accomplished for His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects throughout the British dominions.

I am unaccustomed to the language of complaint—but I have been constrained to use it. Even now, I would fain invite the Archdeacon to the contemplation of the many points on which we agree, rather than to an acrimonious criticism of the few on which we differ—and in the contemplation of these few, to be guided by sentiments of mutual forbearance and reciprocal indulgence. Happily the days, as well as the spirit of proscribing men, on account of religion, have passed away. The Inquisition, with its pale, criminal, and jaded rack—as well as the statute *de hæretico comburendo*, are both now obsolete—and we live at a time when all good men agree in opinion that a security to Governments can only be attained in that common affection which a full participation in all the benefits and privileges of the Constitution can produce. The perpetual contention—the restless jealousy—the irritating pretension to ascendancy on the one hand, and struggle for equality upon the other,—which have so long embittered private life, and divided the Empire,—have perished, and, I trust—for ever. Let us then cultivate the habits of more intimate association—let us discharge the duties and cherish the friendships and charities of a common career—the *necessitudo sortis*, according to the ancients—a kind of affinity which it was sacrilegious to disregard—and thus may we hope to dissolve the elements of mutual antipathy, and to consolidate our fellow-citizens, of every denomination in New South Wales, under the comprehensive appellation of an equal and united people.

I am sure, my dear Sir, that neither you nor I have any disposition to interpose the arrogance of human opinion between God and the dispensation of his mercies towards any of our fellow-creatures;—but, whilst we are unwilling to molest others, we claim for ourselves exemption from molestation, and from unseemly aspersion, "for looking for that life which God will give to those that never changed their faith from him."—Tob. ii. 18.

Believe me, my dear Sir,

Your very faithful and most obedient Servant,

R. THERRY.

To Edward Blount, Esq. M. P.
&c. &c. &c.
London.

APPENDIX.

THE Archdeacon enumerates summarily in page 24 of his Letter, those tenets of the Roman Catholic Church, the maintenance of which appears to have been with Him the motive for promulgating as a dogma of Christain Faith, for the Protestant Inhabitants of this Colony, "*That they cannot subscribe to build a Roman Catholic Chapel*, WITHOUT GUILT;—and, "*That if they know their own Principles, they must think it worse than sacrilege to aid such a cause.*" Objections to Roman Catholics, founded on these tenets, have no novelty in them. I may here introduce the fair exposition of these tenets, not inappropriately, by citing a passage from the Speech of the Reverend Sydney Smith, Rector of Lanesborough in Yorkshire, addressed to the Archdeacon of the East Riding, on an occasion not very dissimilar to the present:—

"If you enter into a parsonage house in the Country, Mr. Archdeacon, you see sometimes a style and fashion of furniture which does very well for us, but which has had its day in London. It is seen in London no more; it is banished to the provinces; from the gentlemen's houses of the provinces these pieces of furniture (as soon as they are discovered to be unfashionable) descend to the farm-houses, then to cottages, then to the fagot-heap, and the dung-hill. As it is with furniture, so it is with arguments. I hear at country meetings *(what we hear now in New South Wales)* many arguments against the Catholics, which are never heard in London, their London existence in Parliament is over—they are only to be met with in the provinces *(and the Colonies)*, and there they are fast hastening down with clumsy chairs and ill-fashioned sofas to another order of things. But, Sir, as they are not yet gone where I am sure they are going, I shall endeavor to point out their defects, and accelerate their descent."

(Extract from the Letter of the Venerable Archdeacon Broughton.)

"They who think seriously of their obligation to obey God rather than man, will not fail to remember that all the corruptions (as we esteem them) of the pure doctrines of God, have arisen from a desertion of his word. To the equalization of tradition with the Scriptures, we trace the rise, and attribute the maintenance, of those opinions

which Protestants abjure:*—the infallibility of your single Church; the suppression of the right of private judgment; the reception of seven Sacraments; the tenet of transubstantiation; the denial of the cup to the laity; the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass; purgatory; prayers for the dead; the invocation of saints; the veneration of relics and images; the power of indulgences; the supremacy of the Pope as Universal Bishop; prayer in an unknown tongue; restrictions upon reading the Scriptures; and the denial of our justification by faith alone."

DECLARATION OF THE CATHOLIC BISHOPS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

The Catholics of Great Britain have to lament and to complain, that the doctrines and religious rites which, as Catholics, they are taught by their church to believe and observe, have been long grossly misconceived and misrepresented in this country, to the great injury of their religious character and temporal interests.

They have to regret, that some grievous misconceptions, regarding certain points of Catholic doctrine, are, unhappily, still found to exist in the minds of many, whose good opinion they value, and whose good-will they wish to conciliate. To their grief they hear, that, notwithstanding all their declarations to the contrary, they are still exhibited to the public as men, holding the most erroneous, unscriptural, and unreasonable doctrines—grounding their faith on human authority, and not on the word of God—as enemies to the circulation and to the reading of the Holy Scriptures—as guilty of idolatry in the sacrifice of the mass, in the adoration, as it is called, of the Virgin Mary, and in the worship of the saints, and of the images of Christ and of the saints; and as guilty of superstition in invoking the saints, and in praying for the souls in purgatory;—as usurping a divine power of forgiving sins, and imposing the yoke of confession on the people—as giving leave to commit sin by indulgences—as despising the obligation of an oath—as dividing their allegiance between their king and the pope—as claiming the property of the church establishment—as holding the uncharitable doctrine of exclusive salvation, and as maintaining that faith is not to be kept with heretics.

We are at a loss to conceive, why the holding of certain religious doctrines, which have no connexion with civil or social duties, whether those doctrines are taken in the sense in which they are misconstrued by others, or in the sense in which they are uniformly understood by Catholics, should be made a subject of crimination against British Catholics, by those who assume to themselves liberty of thinking what they please, in matters of religious belief. It is difficult to understand, why doctrines purely religious, in no wise affecting the duties which Catholics owe to their Sovereign or to civil society, should be brought forward at all, when the question relates

---

* It is one thing, Mr. Archdeacon, to abjure opinions;—another to declare it *guilt* to assist those who think proper to espouse them.

only to the civil rights and privileges, which they claim as British subjects. It is much to be wished that those who declaim against what they call the errors and superstitions of popery, would first learn from Catholics themselves, by enquiry, what their real doctrines are, on the points above alluded to, and in what sense Catholics understand the terms by which their doctrines are expressed. They would perhaps find, that they have been hitherto contending, not against the Catholic Faith, but against the fictions of their own imaginations, or against their own misconstructions of the language of the Catholic Church.

Though we might refer to former expositions of the faith of Catholics, which we deem amply sufficient to correct the misconceptions, and to refute the misrepresentations of our doctrines; yet, it having been stated to us, that by publishing at the present time, a plain and correct declaration of our real tenets, on those points which are still so much misrepresented, or misconceived, a better understanding may be established among his Majesty's subjects, and the advancement of religion and charity may be effected; hence, we, the undersigned Catholic Bishops, the Vicars Apostolic and their Coadjutors in Great Britain, have thought it our duty to publish the following declaration, in the hope, that it will be received by all who read it, with the same love of truth, and the same good-will, with which it is given.

SECTION I.

On the General Character of the Doctrines of Faith professed by the Catholic Church.

The doctrines of the Catholic Church are often characterized as *erroneous, unscriptural, and unreasonable.*

All those doctrines, and only those doctrines, are articles of Catholic Faith, which are revealed by Almighty God.

Whatsoever is revealed by God, who knows all things as they are in themselves, and who cannot deceive us, by teaching falsehood for truth, is most true and certain; though it may entirely surpass the comprehension of created minds.

On the authority of divine revelation, the Catholic believes, as doctrines of faith, that in one God there are three distinct persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; that Jesus Christ, who died on the cross for the salvation of all mankind, is the second person of the Blessed Trinity, true God and true Man; that there is no remission of sin, nor salvation but through him; that the sacraments of baptism and and penance are divinely appointed means for the remission of sin; that in the mass, a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice is offered to God for the living and the dead; that the souls detained in purgatory are helped by the suffrages of the faithful; that the Saints reigning together with Christ, are to be honoured and invocated; that at the last day our bodies will be raised from death, and that Christ will come to judge all men according to their works; that eternal happiness will be the reward of the good, and eternal misery the punishment of the wicked.

If these, and other doctrines of Catholic Faith, are really revealed by Almighty God, they are not erroneous, but most true and certain—they

are not unscriptural, but agreeable to the true sense of the written word of God—the belief of them is not unreasonable, because it is reasonable to believe whatever is true, and taught by the God of truth.

The Catholic is fully persuaded that all the articles of his faith are really revealed by Almighty God.

Is he not at liberty to think so, as well as others are to think the contrary; and in this empire especially, where liberty of thought is so loudly proclaimed and lauded? Is it reasonable or charitable to condemn him for thinking so, when he may have good and solid grounds for his conviction, and may feel that his eternal salvation depends on his firm belief of all the doctrines which Christ has taught?

SECTION II.

On the grounds of the certitude which a Catholic has, that all the Doctrines which he believes, as articles of Catholic Faith, are really revealed by Almighty God.

Catholics are often charged with grounding their faith *on mere human authority, and not on the word of God.*

Catholics deny this, because they are convinced, that their faith is grounded on the word of God, proposed to them by the authority of that ministry, which Christ established, and appointed to teach his revealed doctrines to all nations.

The Catholic believes all those doctrines, which God has revealed.

The question, *what* are those doctrines, which God has revealed, is a question of FACT. It appears reasonable that the existence of a *fact* should be ascertained by the evidence of *testimony.*

The body of the doctrines, precepts, and institutions, which were delivered by Christ to his Apostles, constitutes the new or the Christian law; as the body of the doctrines, precepts, and institutions, which were delivered by the Almighty to Moses, constituted the old law.

The true and certain knowledge of what is commanded by any law, is generally communicated and obtained by the authoritative *promulgation* of the law.

By the ordinance of God, the doctrines and precepts of the old law were made known to the Israelites and Jewish people, by Moses, and the Priests in succession, till the end of the law.

By the ordinance of God, the doctrines and precepts of the new law were to be made known to all nations, in all ages, by the Apostles and their successors, to the consummation of the world.

On the spiritual authority of the Apostles and their successors, who were divinely commissioned to promulgate and teach the law of Christ to all nations; and on the uniform and universal testimony, belief, and practice of all Christian Churches from the beginning, the certitude of the Catholic is grounded, that all the doctrines which he believes, as articles of Catholic Faith, and all the sacred precepts and rites, which he observes, as the ordinances of Christ, were really revealed and instituted by Almighty God; and are the same as were originally delivered by Christ to his Apostles, and by them promulgated over all nations.

The Catholic is fully satisfied, that this method which he follows, for ascertaining *what* are the revealed doctrines of divine faith, is the right rule and that it leads him to the unity of truth.

Is he not at liberty to follow a rule which gives such satisfaction and security to his mind?

Is it fair for others who, by following a different rule, are led into a countless variety of contradictory doctrines on matters of Christian belief, to disturb the tranquillity of the Catholic on this head, or to condemn him, for his submission to the authority of a ministry, which he is convinced was established by Christ for the purpose of bringing all nations to the certain knowledge of his law, and to the unity of faith? Is not this rule perfectly natural and reasonable? Can any human legislator condemn the principle and rule of the Catholic in this regard?

SECTION III.

On the Holy Scriptures.

In England the Catholic Church is held out *as an enemy to the reading and circulating of the Holy Scriptures.*

Whereas the Catholic Church venerates the Holy Scriptures as the written part of the word of God; she has in all ages been the faithful guardian of this sacred deposit; she has ever laboured to preserve the integrity of these inspired writings, and the true sense, in which they have been universally understood, at all times from the Apostolic age.

The Catholic Church has never forbidden or discouraged the reading or the circulation of authentic copies of the sacred Scriptures, in the original languages. She binds her Clergy to the daily recital of a canonical office, which comprises a large portion of the sacred volume, and to read and expound to the faithful, in the vernacular tongue, on Sundays, the Epistle or Gospel of the day, or some other portion of the divine law.

As to translations of the Holy Scriptures into modern languages, the Catholic Church requires that none should be put into the hands of the faithful but such as are acknowledged by ecclesiastical authority to be accurate, and conformable to the sense of the originals. There never was a general law of the Catholic Church prohibiting the reading of authorised translations of the Scriptures; but, considering that many, by their ignorance and evil dispositions, have perverted the meaning of the sacred text to their own destruction, the Catholic Church has thought it prudent to make a regulation, that the faithful should be guided in this matter by the advice of their respective Pastors.

Whether the Holy Scriptures, which ought never to be taken in hand but with respect, should be made a class-book for children, is a matter of religious and prudential consideration, on which the Pastors of the Catholic Church have a right to decide with regard to their own flocks; and we hold that in this manner none have a right to dictate to them.

The Catholics in England, of mature years, have permission to read authentic and approved translations of the Holy Scriptures, with explanatory notes; and are exhorted to read them in the spirit of piety, humility, and obedience.

Pope Pius VII., in a Rescript dated April 18, 1820, and addressed to the Vicars Apostolic in England, earnestly exhorts them to confirm the people committed to their spiritual care, in faith and good works; and for that end, to encourage them to read books of pious instruction, and particularly the Holy Scriptures, in translations approved by ecclesiastical authority; because, to those who are well disposed, nothing can be more useful, more consoling, or more animating, than the reading of the sacred Scriptures, understood in their true sense—they serve to confirm the faith, to support the hope, and to inflame the charity of the true Christian.

But when the reading and the circulation of the Scriptures are urged and recommended as the entire rule of faith, as the sole means by which men are to be brought to the certain and specific knowledge of the doctrines, precepts, and institutions of Christ; and when the Scriptures so read and circulated are left to the interpretation and private judgment of each individual: then such reading, circulation, and interpretation, are forbidden by the Catholic Church, because the Catholic Church knows, that the circulation of the Scriptures, and the interpetration of them by each one's private judgment, was not the means ordained by Christ for the communication of the true knowledge of his law to all nations—she knows that Christianity was established in many countries before one book of the New Testament was written—that it was not by means of the Scriptures, that the Apostles and their successors converted nations, or any one nation to the unity of the Christian faith—that the unauthorised reading and circulation of the Scriptures, and the interpretation of them by private judgment, are calculated to lead men to contradictory doctrines on the primary articles of Christian belief; to inconsistent forms of worship, which cannot all be constituent parts of the uniform and sublime system of Christianity; to errors and fanaticism in religion, and to seditions and the greatest disorders in states and kingdoms.

SECTION IV.

On the Charge of Idolatry and Superstition.

Especially recommended to the perusal of Sir Edward Parry!

Ignorance or malice has gone so far as to charge the Catholic Church with IDOLATRY, *in the sacrifice of the Mass—in the adoration* (as it is called) *of the Virgin Mary, and in the worship of the Saints, and of the images of Christ and of the Saints;* and with SUPERSTITION, in *invoking the Saints,* and *in praying for souls in purgatory.* Now idolatry consists in giving to any creature that supreme adoration, honour, or worship which is due only to Almighty God.

The Catholic Church teaches that idolatry is one of the greatest crimes that can be committed against the majesty of God: and every true member of this Church shudders at the idea of such a crime, and feels grievously injured by so horrid an imputation.

But it is said that Catholics adore the elements of bread and wine in the Mass: that they adore the Virgin Mary; that they adore the cross; and that they worship the saints and the images of Christ and of the Saints. Before we repel these horrid imputations, in the sense in which they are

made, we must explain the different meanings of the words *adoration*, *honour*, and *worship*, that the calumnious charge, and its denial, may be understood in the same explained sense.

We find that in the language of the sacred Scripture, in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin,* as well as in the language of the ancient liturgies of the Christian Church, these words, "adoration, honour, and worship," are ambiguous terms, and are used in different senses, according to the nature of the object to which the act, implied by the term, is directed, and according to the intention of him, who performs the act. Hence we find them used as relating, sometimes, to God, and sometimes to creatures. Although, in modern times, the exclusive idea of that supreme homage, which is due only to God, is attached by some to the words *adoration* and *worship*; yet these words may still be retained by others, in a different meaning, without affording the remotest cause for the imputation of idolatry. In this different meaning they are still retained, in the unchanged language of the ancient liturgies used in the Catholic Church.

The words *adoration* and *worship* are equally referred, sometimes to God, and sometimes to creatures, as in the word *honour*. Now because we are commanded in scripture to *honour* God, and to *honour* the King; and children are commanded to *honour* their parents: it does not follow that the honour due to the King, or to parents, is the same as that which we owe to God. To God we owe supreme and sovereign honour, such as it would be a crime to pay to any creature. To the King, we owe the highest civil honour. To parents, children owe the honour of filial respect and obedience. How unjust would it be to say, that because a subject honours his King, he pays him that supreme and sovereign honour which is due only to God! The same is to be said of the terms *adoration* and *worship*, as used in former times, and sometimes used at present in the language of the Catholic Church. To *adore*, even according to modern usage, often means no more than to express extreme affection or respect. To *worship* (in the translation of the Bible, published at Oxford) is therein used to signify inferior as well as supreme worship. In the first book of Chronicles, xxix. 20. we read in that edition, that the assembly *bowed down their heads and* WORSHIPPED *the Lord* (Jehovah) *and the King*. Did they worship the King with the same supreme worship which they paid to God? Certainly not. When a man says to the woman he takes to wife, "with my body I thee *worship*," can this be called idolatry? Surely nothing can be more unfair than arguments drawn from ambiguous terms, construed in a sense disavowed by those, against whom the arguments are employed.

We answer therefore, that if by the terms *adoration*, *honour*, and *worship*, be understood that *supreme* adoration, honour, and worship which is due only to God; Catholics do not adore, nor honour, nor worship any other, than the one, only, true, and living God, the Creator and Sovereign Lord of the universe: they do not, in this sense, adore, nor honour, nor worship the Virgin Mary, nor any of the Saints, nor the cross, nor images, nor any other creature whatsoever.

---

* See in Hebrew (Prov. iii, 9, and Exod. xx, 12), (Deut. xxviii, 47 and 48), (Ps. xcvi, 9, and 1, alias 3d Kings i, 23). In Greek, Gen. xxiv, 26, and Gen. xlix, 8. In Latin Adorare, Ps. xxviii, 2, and Gen. xxiii, 7, and 4th alias 2 Kings ii, 15.

In the Mass, Catholics do offer supreme adoration, not to the elements of bread and wine, which they hold not to be present after the consecration; but to Jesus Christ, the Son of God, whom they believe to be truly, really and substantially present, under the appearances only of bread and wine, after the consecration, and change thereby of the elements into his body and blood. To adore Christ, by an act of supreme adoration, is no idolatry; because he is truly God, and consequently a legitimate object of supreme worship.

But if Catholics, using the ancient language of the Christian Church, are said,

1st. To *worship* the Saints; this worship must be understood to be only an *inferior* worship, honour, and respect paid to them proportionate to the limited perfections and excellences with God has bestowed upon them, but this worship is infinitely below that supreme worship which they pay to God. Catholics acknowledge no perfection or excellence in any Saint, not even in the Blessed Virgin Mary, which they do not profess to be the work and gift of God in them. So that in honouring the Saints, they celebrate the works of God, and consequently give glory to him. Whatever act of religious veneration we pay to the Saints, is ultimately referred to God.

2nd. To *adore* the cross: this word, if applied to the cross itself, means no more than an inferior and relative respect paid to the instrument of our redemption; but if in view of the cross it be applied to Christ himself, then it means, as it ought to mean, an act of supreme adoration.

3d. To *worship* the images of Christ or of the Saints: the word is here again understood by Catholics only of an *inferior* and relative respect shewn to images, in consideration of the respect due to the objects which they represent, and to which the respect shewn to the images is referred. In this sense respect is shewn to the statue or to the throne of the King, in consideration of the majesty of the personage to whom they relate. An insult offered to his statue would be considered as intended to be offered to the King himself. In this sense a son respects the image or picture of his parent; a parent that of his child; a friend that of his friend; not for any intrinsic virtue in the material substance or work of art, but because it relates to, and brings to his mind, the object of his respect and affection.

To condemn this relative regard for images, or pictures, would be to condemn the very feelings of nature. To charge the Catholic with idolatry, because the term *worship,* meaning only an *inferior* and *relative* regard, is found in the ancient and modern liturgies of his Church, is not consistent with candour or charity.

The charge that the Catholic Church sanctions the praying TO images, is a calumny, and carries with it an imputation of stupidity too gross to be noticed. Catholics sometimes pray BEFORE images, because they serve to collect their thoughts, and fix their attention in their meditations and prayers; but they are not, on that account, to be supposed to be so void of reason and sense as to pray TO the image: for they know that in it there is no virtue or power; and that it can neither see, nor hear, nor help them.

Catholics do solicit the intercession of the Angels and Saints reigning with Christ in Heaven. But in this, when done according to the principles and spirit of the Catholic Church, there is nothing of superstition,

nothing which is not consistent with true piety. For the Catholic Church teaches her children not to pray to the Saints, as to the authors or givers of divine grace; but only to solicit the Saints in Heaven to pray for them, in the same sense as St. Paul desired the faithful on earth to pray for him.

Catholics, according to the faith and pious practice of the Christian Church from the age of the Apostles, do pray for the release and eternal rest of departed souls, who may be detained for a time in a state of punishment on account of their sins, but in this we cannot discover even the shadow of superstition.

By invoking the intercession of the Saints in Heaven, and by praying for the suffering souls in purgatory, Catholics exercise acts of that communion of charity, which subsists between the members of the mystical body of Christ: the principle of which communion they profess to believe, when they say, "I believe the holy Catholic Church, *the communion of Saints.*"

After this explanation and declaration, we hope that our countrymen will never be so unjust or so uncharitable as to charge Catholics with idolatry or superstition, nor be so illiberal as to attempt to give a colour to these injurious charges, by fixing an exclusive meaning to terms, which, in the language of Scripture, Christian antiquity, and common usage, bear different senses, in different circumstances.

SECTION V.

On the power of forgiving Sins and the precept of Confession.

The Catholic Church is charged with impiety, *in usurping the power of forgiving sins*, and with spiritual tyranny, in imposing on the people *the yoke of confession.*

The Catholic Church cannot be charged with impiety, for exercising powers given by Christ to his Apostles and to their lawful successors; nor with tyranny, in enforcing the observance of the precept of Christ.

Catholics believe that Christ granted to his Apostles, and to the Priests of his Church, power to forgive sins, by the administration of the sacraments of baptism, and penance, to those who are duly disposed to receive this grace. They believe that the sacrament of penance is an institution of Christ, no less than the sacrament of baptism. The belief of both rests on the same foundation.

In both these sacraments, sin is forgiven by the ministry of man. *Be baptized every one of you, for the remission of sins*, Acts ii, 38; *whose sins* YOU SHALL FORGIVE, *they are forgiven*, John, xx, 23. But no actual sin can be forgiven at the mere will of any Pope, or any Priest, or any person whomsoever, without a sincere sorrow for having offended God, and a firm resolution to avoid future guilt, and to atone for past transgressions. Any person who receives absolution without these necessary dispositions, far from obtaining the remission of his sins, incurs the additional guilt of hypocrisy and profanation.

The obligation of sacramental confession to a Priest is not an imposition of the Church, but a precept of Christ. Without the voluntary

confession of the penitent, the power of forgiving, or retaining sins, could not be exercised with discretion and judgment, by the minister of the sacrament of penance. The confession of sins could never have been introduced, had it not been received from the beginning as a divine ordinance for the remission of sin. It has been practised from the earliest ages of christianity. It is attended with the most salutary effects. Besides being a means of obtaining the remission of sin, it affords relief to the troubled conscience, and opportunities of reclaiming deluded sinners from mischievous projects, and of causing reparation to be made for injuries done to persons, property or character. It may be ridiculed by such as *blaspheme those things which they know not* (2 Pet. ii, 12), but will be ever cherished as a merciful and salutary institution, by those who are sincerely sorry for their sins, and earnestly sue for pardon.

SECTION VI.

On Indulgences.

The Catholic Church is charged with encouraging guilt, by *giving leave to commit sin, and granting an anticipated pardon for sins to come by indulgences.*

The Catholic Church rejects with abhorrence the imputation, that by granting an indulgence, she grants permission to commit sin, or a pardon for sins to come. An indulgence, in the sense of the Catholic Church, is no pardon for sin at all ; it is only a remission of the whole or of a part of the temporal punishment, which the justice of God often reserves to be undergone by the sinner, after the guilt of the sin has been remitted. The power of granting the remission of this temporal punishment was given by Christ to St. Peter and his successors, and has been exercised from the earliest ages. An indulgence, so far from exempting sinners from works of penance and piety, is an encouragement to the performance of such works, since they are prescribed as conditions for gaining the benefit of an indulgence.

Surely, therefore, the doctrine of the Catholic Church concerning the sacrament of penance, confession and indulgences, does not tend to relax Christian morality, nor to encourage guilt, nor facilitate the commission of crime, but rather to put an end to sin, and to promote the exercise of every Christian virtue amongst men.

SECTION X.

On the doctrine of Exclusive Salvation.

Catholics are charged with *uncharitableness, in holding the doctrine of exclusive salvation.*

Catholics are taught by their Church to love all men, without exception: to wish that all may be saved; and to pray that all may be saved, and may come to the knowledge of the truth, by which they may be saved.

If the Almighty himself has assigned certain conditions, without the observance of which man cannot be saved, it would seem to be an act of impiety to attempt to annul those divinely-established conditions; and an

act of great uncharitableness towards a fellow-man, to tell him, that he may be saved, without complying with the conditions prescribed by the Almighty.

The doctrinal principle of exclusive salvation belongs to the law of Christ.

Has not Christ, who commands the belief of his revealed doctrines, pronounced, that he that *believeth not shall be condemned?* (Mark xvi, 16.) Has not Christ, who instituted baptism for the remission of sins, declared that *except a man be born again of water and of the Holy Ghost, he* CANNOT *enter into the Kingdom of God?* (John iii, 5.) Has not St. Paul enumerated a list of crimes, such as adultery, idolatry, hatred, seditions, heresies, murders, drunkenness, &c. of which he declares that *they who do such things shall not obtain the Kingdom of God?* (Galat. v, 21.) Are not these exclusive conditions?

Whoever professes the law of Christ must profess the *principle* and doctrine of exclusive salvation. It is not the Catholic, it is God himself who will exclude from Heaven those who are not duly qualified for it by faith and good works.

But the Catholic, whilst he is bound to admit, and with firm faith to believe, this doctrinal *principle*, is bound also by the divine commandment not to judge. He is not allowed therefore to pronounce sentence of condemnation on individuals, who may live and die out of the external communion of the Catholic Church: nor to pronounce sentence of condemnation against those who may die in an apparent state of sin. All those he leaves to the righteous judgment of the great searcher of hearts, who at the last day will render to every man according to his works.

But surely charity, as well as truth, must forbid one Christian to deceive another, in a matter of such infinite importance as the eternal salvation of his soul. He who should persuade his neighbour, that no condition for salvation is required on the part of man, would deceive him. He who admits that any one such condition is required by the Almighty, admits the *principle* of exclusive salvation *

SECTION XI.

On keeping faith with Heretics.

Catholics are charged with holding the principle *that they are not bound to keep faith with Heretics.*

---

* The same doctrine is thus expressed, essentially to the same effect, in a similar declaration of the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland:— "Catholics hold that, in order to attain salvation, it is necessary to belong to the true Church; and that heresy, or a wilful and obstinate opposition to revealed truth, as taught in the Church of Christ, excludes from the kingdom of God. They are not, however, obliged to believe that all those are wilfully and obstinately attached to error, who, having imbibed it from their parents, seek the truth with a cautious solicitude, disposed to embrace it when sufficiently proposed to them; but leaving such persons to the righteous judgment of a merciful God, they feel themselves bound to discharge towards them, as well as towards all mankind, the duties of charity and of social life."

As Catholics, we hold and we declare, that all Catholics are bound by the law of nature, and by the law of revealed religion, to observe the duties of fidelity and justice to all men, without any exception of persons, and without any distinction of nation or religion.

British Catholics have solemnly sworn, that " they reject and detest that unchristian and impious principle, that faith is not to be kept with heretics or infidels."

After this, the imputation of their holding this principle, cannot but be felt by them as grievously injurious to their religious and moral character.

CONCLUSION.

Having, in the foregoing declaration, endeavoured to state, in the simplicity of truth, such doctrines of our Church as are most frequently misrepresented or misunderstood in this country, and to explain the meaning in which Catholics understand the terms by which these doctrines are expressed in the language of their Church; we confidently trust, that this declaration and explanation will be received by all our fellow-subjects, in a spirit of candour and charity; and that those who have been hitherto ignorant of, or but imperfectly acquainted with our doctrines of faith, will do us the justice to acknowledge, that, as Catholics, we hold no religious principles, and entertain no opinions flowing from those principles, which are not perfectly consistent with our duties as Christians, and as British subjects.

This declaration we, the undersigned, approve, and publish, as an exposition of our principles and doctrines, on the subjects to which it refers.

✠ William, *Bishop of Halia, Vic. Apost. in the London District.*

✠ Peter Bernardin, *Bishop of Thespiæ, Vic. Apost. in the Western District.*

✠ Thomas, *Bishop of Bolina, Vic. Apost. in the Northern District.*

✠ Thomas, *Bishop of Cambysopolis, Vic. Apost. in the Midland District.*

✠ Alexander, *Bishop of Maximianopolis, Vic. Apost, in the Lowland District in Scotland.*

✠ Ranald, *Bishop of Aeryndela, Vic. Apost. in the Highland District in Scotland.*

✠ Peter Augustine, *Bishop of Siga, Coadjutor in the Western District.*

✠ James, *Bishop of Usula, Coadjutor in the London District.*

✠ Thomas, *Bishop of Europum, Coadjutor in the Northern District.*

✠ Alexander, *Bishop of Cybistra, Coadjutor in the Lowland District in Scotland.*

Besides the exposition of the doctrines of faith professed by the Catholic Church, contained in the above Declaration, I deem it right, in the same spirit and motive that I have expressed in p. 8 of this letter, to add a short explanation of the three other tenets of the Catholic Church, to which the objections of the Archdeacon extend, viz. :—" The Supremacy of the Pope, as Universal Bishop—Prayer in an unknown tongue—and the denial of our justification by faith alone."

" THE SUPREMACY OF THE POPE AS UNIVERSAL BISHOP.

(From Dr. Milner's End of Religious Controversy, p. 131.*)*

" We arrive now at the question itself, which is, whether the Bishop of Rome, who by pre-eminence is called Papa (Pope, or Father of the faithful) is, or is not, entitled to a superior rank and jurisdiction, above other Bishops of the Christian Church, so as to be its Spiritual Head here upon earth, and his See the centre of Catholic unity? All Catholics necessarily hold the affirmative of this question; let us begin with consulting the New Testament, in order to see whether or no the first Pope or Bishop of Rome, St. Peter, was any way superior to the other Apostles. St. Matthew, in numbering up the Apostles, expressly says of him; 'the first Simon, who is called Peter,' Matt. x. 2. In like manner, the other Evangelists, while they class the other Apostles differently, still give the first place to Peter. In fact, as Bossuet observes, ' St. Peter was the first to confess his faith in Christ—the first to whom Christ appeared after his resurrection—the first to preach the belief of this to the people—the first to convert the Jews, and the first to receive the Gentiles.' Again, I would ask, is there no distinction implied in St. Peter's being called upon by Christ to declare three several times that he loved him, and even that he loved him more than his fellow Apostles, and in his being each time charged to feed Christ's lambs, and at length, to feed his sheep also, whom the lambs are used to follow? What else is here signified, but that this Apostle was to act the part of a shepherd, not only with respect to the flock in general, but also with respect to the Pastors themselves. Is there no mysterious meaning in the circumstance marked by the Evangelists of Christ's entering into Simon's ship in preference to that of James and John, in order to teach the people out of it; and in the subsequent miraculous draught of fishes, together with our Lord's prophetic declaration to Simon: ' Fear not, from henceforth thou shalt catch men?' Luke v. 3. 10. But the strongest proof of St. Peter's superior dignity and jurisdiction, consists in that explicit and energetical declaration of our Saviour to him in the quarters of Cesarea Philippi, upon his making that glorious confession of our Lord's divinity: ' Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.' Our Lord had mysteriously changed his name at his first interview with him, when Jesus, looking upon him, said, ' Thou art Simon, the son of Jona; thou shalt be called Cephas, which is interpreted Peter,' John i. 42; and on the present occasion, he explains the mystery, where he says: ' Blessed art thou Simon Bar Jona: because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in Heaven: And I say to thee, thou art Peter (a Rock), and upon this Rock I will

build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it: And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed also in heaven.'—Matt. xvi. 17, 18, 19. Where now, I ask, is the sincere Christian, and especially the Christian who professes to make Scripture the sole rule of his faith, who, with these passages of the inspired text before his eyes, will venture, at the risk of his soul, to deny that any special dignity or charge was conferred upon St. Peter in preference to the other apostles? I trust no such Christian is to be found in your society. Now, as it is a point agreed upon, at least in your Church and mine, that Bishops, in general, succeed to the rank and functions of the apostles; so, by the same rule, the successor of St. Peter, in the See of Rome, succeeds to his primacy and jurisdiction. This cannot be questioned by any serious Christian, who reflects that when our Saviour gave his orders about feeding his flock, and made his declaration about building his Church, he was not establishing an order of things to last during the few years that St. Peter had to live, but one that was to last as long as he should have a flock and a Church on earth; that is, to the end of time—conformably with his promise to the apostles, and their successors, in the concluding words of St. Matthew:—'Behold I am with you always, even to the end of the world.'—Mat. xxviii. 20.

"PRAYER IN AN UNKNOWN TONGUE."

(From Dr. Milner's End of Religious Controversy, p. 143.*)*

"The first point of chargeable discipline which the Bishop mentions, or rather declaims upon, throughout a whole chapter, is the use of the Latin tongue in the public liturgy of the Latin Church. It is natural enough, that the Church of England, which is of modern date, and confined to its own domain, should adopt its own language, in its public worship; and, for a similar reason, it is proper, that the Great Western or Latin Church, which was established by the Apostles, when the Latin tongue was the vulgar tongue of Europe, and which still is the common language of educated persons in every part of it, should retain this language in her public service. When the Bishop complains of 'our worship being performed in an unknown tongue'—and of our wicked and cruel cunning, in keeping in darkness by this means, under pretext, that they reverence what they do not understand'—he must be conscious of the irreligious calumnies he is uttering; knowing, as he does, that Latin is, perhaps, still the most general language of Christianity, and that where it is not commonly understood, it is not the Church which introduced a foreign language among the people, but it is the people who have forgotten their ancient language. So far removed is the Catholic Church from 'the wicked and cruel cunning of keeping people in ignorance,' by retaining her original Apostolical languages, the Latin and the Greek, that she strictly commands her pastors everywhere, to inculcate the word of God, and the lessons of salvation, to the people in their vulgar tongue, every Sunday and festival throughout the year, and to explain to them the nature and meaning of her divine worship, as frequently as possible.

In like manner, we are so far from imagining, that the less our people understand of our liturgy, the more they reverence it, that we are quite sure of precisely the contrary; particularly with respect to our principal liturgy, the adorable sacrifice of the mass. True it is, that a part of this is performed by the Priest in silence; because, being a sacred action, as well as a form of words, some of the prayers which the Priest says, would not be proper or rational in the mouths of the people.

Thus, the High Priest of old, went alone into the tabernacle, to make the atonement; and thus, Zachary offered incense in the temple by himself; while the multitude prayed without. But this is no detriment to the faithful, as they have translations of the liturgy, and other books in their hands, by means of which, or of their own devotion, they can join with the Priest in every part of the solemn worship; as the Jewish people united with their Priests, in the sacrifices above-mentioned. The very reason alleged by St. Paul, for prohibiting extemporary prayers and exhortations, which no one understood—namely, that all things should be done decently, according to order, is the principal motive of the Catholic Church, for retaining in her worship, the original languages employed by the Apostles. She is, as I before remarked, a Universal Church, composed of all nations, and tribes, and tongues, and these tongues constantly changing; so, that instead of the uniformity of worship, as well as of faith, which is so necessary for that decency and order, there would be nothing but confusion, disputes, and changes, in every part of her liturgy, if it were performed in so many different languages and dialects; with the constant danger of some alteration or other in the essential forms, which would vitiate the very sacrament and sacrifice. The advantage of an ancient language, for religious worship, over a modern one, in this and other respects, is acknowledged by the Cambridge Professor of Divinity, Dr. Hay. He says, "that such a one is fixed and venerable, free from vulgarity, and even more perspicuous." But to return to Bishop Porteus's appeal to the judgment of St. Paul, concerning 'the Romanists' practice, in retaining the language with the substance of their primitive liturgy; I leave you, dear Sir, and your friends, to pronounce upon it, after I shall have stated the following facts:—First, that Saint Paul himself wrote an epistle, which forms part of the liturgy of all Christian Churches, to these very Romanists, in the Greek language, though they themselves made use of the Latin: Secondly, that the Jews, after they had exchanged their original Hebrew for the Chaldaic tongue, during the Babylonish captivity, continued to perform their liturgy in the former language, though the vulgar did not understand it—and that our Saviour Christ, as well as his Apostles, and other devout friends, attended this service in the Temple and the Synagogues, without ever censuring it: Thirdly, that the Greek Churches, in general, no less than the Latin Church, retain their original pure Greek tongue in their liturgy, though the common people have forgotten it, and adopted barbarous dialects instead of it: Fourthly, that Patriach Luther maintained, against Carlostad, that the language of public worship was a matter of indifference. Hence, his disciples professed, in their Augsburg confession, to retain the Latin language in certain parts of their service: Lastly, that when the establishment endeavoured, under Elizabeth, and afterwards under Charles I., to force their liturgy upon the Irish Catholics, it was

not thought necessary to translate it into Irish, but it was constantly read in English, of which the natives did not understand a word: thus furnishing the papists with an excellent argument against themselves," as Dr. Haylin observes.—*Milner's End of Religious Controversy, p.* 135.

" JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH ALONE."

'Tis true! We Catholics do deny the doctrine of Justification by Faith alone, if by the Justification by Faith *alone* is meant, that a man is made just, exempt from sin, and an heir to the kingdom of heaven by faith *alone*, to the utter exclusion of good works— that is to say, without the practise of charity, and the observance of the commandments. And, indeed, unless the Archdeacon would reject the Homilies of his own Church with the same facility that Luther rejected the epistle of St. James, which assures us, that " Faith without good works is dead," he will find it difficult to reconcile the doctrine of justification by faith *alone* with what is expressed in the third Homily " *of the Salvation of mankind.*" In the third part of this Homily we are told, " That faith " which bringeth forth without repentance either evil works, or *no good* " *works* is not a right, pure, and lively faith, but a dead, devilish coun- " terfeit, and feigned faith, as St. Paul and St. James call it." This is surely more consonant to Revelation as well as reason, than the pert and contumelious apothegm of Luther, " That the road to heaven was too strait for us to pass along it, loaded with bags of good works." But the twelfth Article of the Thirty-nine Articles, which declares " good works to be pleasing and acceptable to Christ, and to spring necessarily of a true and lively faith," quite abashes the buffoonery of the above expression, and reduces the difference between the two churches on this point to little more than a theological subtlety, with which, having no controversial taste, I have no ambition to grapple.

Stephens & Stokes, Printers, King-street, Sydney.