... I will not judge those laws that any one shall impose on the face of it. There is a religious establishment of civil law, and of Church, and a law of Jesus Christ among the laws in that legal Church, Religion. That this, I will follow. Let us take the argument in my 2nd point of political rights to the represented, to become civil. If we deprive some one of civil political interests, then from the civil political interests of their own become nothing right to be represented. I will have again to be sure that to believe without is a civil political right or interest. If it is a right a right interest at all it is in the other order of religious and political laws. And there that the civil political interests of unbelievers must be separately represented is as logical as to say: "This house for open meat being of 1st part," civil political interests may be represented by the same. Christian, of course, of the interests of the represented be identical with the interests of the represented. If they be considered justified by Christianity, or else political matters. Religion is excluded by the definition of the representation of the represented. The constitution here does not need an unbelieving member to represent its civil political interests, for religion does not give up any religious interest for any one reason. Yet see this confession lies hid in the argument in those who contend for the absolute separation of religion from politics.

These however are inconsistencies with which we must not write our time. The man of true Grace is this. Does the law of England at this moment require religious belief of any kind as a condition for the office of other publics?

The existence of the oath and affirmation excludes two religious bodies above are admitted as a sufficient foundation. They differ from but not in objection. They do not imply any responsibility and a belief in a supreme being. They require that the law, of God, namely, at this moment, at least they religious belief of Roman Catholic, and as an end to make our laws...
repealed; or if the same continues to be the law, let that of the civil law of

political matters. Religion is excluded from the representation
the representative. An indication that does not need an unbelieving member
to represent the civil or political interests of religion, is one of the
minds left those religious interests for they have none.

Yet too often compulsion lies hid in the argument of those who contend for the
absolute separation of religion from politics.

There however are circumstances with which we are not quite one time. The main
time is this. Does the Law of England at this moment require religious belief

of any kind as a condition a qualification for the office or duties of a legislator?

The existence of the Oath, at an affirmation without any religious belief, alone

are admitted of a sufficient qualification for it. They differ from that condition. They

are not religiously required as the law is framed at this moment. Was not least that religious belief of

another man's, nor as a condition thereby making no law.

But the one word that Catholics take the oath on in the law affirmation

therefore we ought to abolish, or require only a promise of civil allegiance when

conform to the Law.

I will suppose that the oath religious affirmation was all abolished, and a civil

promise only to exist. Let us appreciate the change.

First, all isolated religion is entirely excluded.

does not all isolated religion is like wise excluded.

by the law is the true law. As in so, as they are called, by the law is the

declaring, as by the law of the land, being declared new officially declare that without can fit

laws for Catholics, Christians, & Jews.

If it were said that the laws they make will not touch religion, but only civil or such

interior laws, they will teach education, marriage, divorce, and morals, crimes,

against morals, in a moral frame.