

Also the Deux Conférences D'Angers. Here are two vols. of twenty.

Then there is Antoine. Here are two vols. of six.

Then in canon law there is Van Espen. Here are two vols. of fourteen (quarto).

Then Devoti. Here is one vol. of three.

Also Rietsensuel. Here are two vols. of five. (folio.)

Then, as returned by the Professor of the Sacred Scriptures, there is the Commentary of Cornelius a Lapide. Here are two vols. of ten.

Again, the Commentary of Maldonatus. Here it is.

Then Bellarmine. Here he is.

Then, as returned by the Professor of Logic, the *Secundæ Secundæ* of Thomas Aquinas. Here are the books. To this book I wish most especially to call your attention, as by and by I shall show you the important place it holds among the standards of the College of Maynooth. You will now recollect that these books are different from the class-books which the students are obliged to purchase. That they are the standards of the professors to which authorities they refer the students, these books being returned, as we find them in this Parliamentary record, by the President of the College of Maynooth himself, we certainly cannot be charged with bringing false accusations against them when we merely lay before you the principles of their own authenticated books. There are two more to which I must refer, though not returned in this catalogue, yet universally known as the standard authorities not only of this College, but of the whole Church of Rome, one is the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, (the body of the Canon Law,) which is so stated here too in this Appendix, p. 211, by the Professor of Canon Law in the course of his examination; the other is the Catechism of the Council of Trent, returned by Dr. Doyle to the Committee of Parliament in 1825, as the chief standard of the doctrines of the Church of Rome. Though you see such a number of books, I am not about to read from them all; but I am obliged to bring all with me, that it may not be said that I have picked out from odd volumes a single passage just to answer my purpose, but that I lay fairly before you this day the principles plainly contained in the class-books and standards of the College of Maynooth, bringing before you the most ample specimens from their ethics, their divinity, and their canon law.

Now, the first subject to which I call your attention is this—I say that the candidates for the priesthood in this College are trained in a system of awful perjury; they are trained in a system that opens the door wide as the gates of the College of Maynooth for the violation of every oath that man can take to his fellow-creature. I first call your attention to Bileley's Moral Theology. This is one of the books which every scholar is obliged to purchase at his own expense. It is stated here as a proposition, vol. iii. p. 117:

"A promissory oath obliges, under the penalty of mortal sin, to do that which is promised in the oath." Well, that is very sound; then follows—"unless legitimate cause excuses." Well, there may be causes, certainly, that preclude the observance of a promissory oath. We turn now to consider some of these causes; and we find, p. 119, a chapter with this title—"Of the causes which prevent or take away the obligation of an oath." On this you will observe, that some causes will prevent an oath from imposing any obligation, so that though a person takes an oath, yet he never was bound to keep it. Some causes, again take away the obligation after it has been imposed, so that a man is bound by the oath after he

takes it, but then some cause arises which delivers him from the obligation. Now I shall first mention some of the causes that prevent an oath from imposing any obligation. There are seven causes enumerated—but I must select certain passages only—it would be impossible to trespass on your patience by reading them all. Some of these seven causes are just and right, as, for instance, the defect of liberty—that is, that a person has no right to take an oath: a child has no right to take an oath to do a thing his parent will not allow him to do. A third cause mentioned here is the hindering of a greater good which is opposed to the thing promised by the oath. So that if a man takes an oath, and then there is some greater good that might result if he had not taken the oath, the oath involves no obligation at all. The word of the living God says, "He that sweareth to his neighbour and disappointeth him not, though it were to hinderance"—the Church of Rome says, "The hindering of a greater good prevents the obligation of an oath." The seventh cause excusing the obligation of an oath is, the limiting—either the expressed, and even tacitly and silently understood—of the intention of the swearer. For in every oath certain general conditions are, from justice and use, included. One of them is, unless you accept, unless you remit; another is, salvo jure alieno—that is saving the right of another. You shall hear by and by what that limitation is. Every Roman Catholic must take this oath—saving the right of his Superior—saving the right of the Pope, of his bishop, or his priest.

Again,—there are five causes that take away the obligation of an oath after the oath has imposed an obligation. One of them is, if the thing sworn becomes impossible, or unlawful on account of the prohibition of any Superior, "illicita ob superioris prohibitionem." So that if a man takes an oath, and then his Superior is pleased to prohibit the observance of it, according to the Church of Rome the obligation of the oath is entirely taken away.

The fourth cause is, the making void of the oath by him to whom the person of the swearer or the matter of the oath is subject. See how this is illustrated. "Thus the Superior" (that is, the General) of all the orders of the monks can, without any cause, make void the oaths of all its subjects." One of these men, Dr. Anglade, Professor of Divinity, is asked, in this Report of the Commissioners, Where does the Superior of the Dominicans reside? At Rome.—Where does the Superior of the Franciscans reside? At Rome.—Where does the Superior of the Jesuits reside? At Rome. You have here, on the oath of this man, that the Superior of these orders of monks every one of them—resides at Rome. So, while you have monks spreading themselves through every quarter of your country, you have a man residing at Rome who can make void with a word—lawfully make void, as they assert—every oath of allegiance, or every other oath, which all the monks in the British empire take to their Sovereign or their fellow-man.

The next cause is a dispensation or commutation made by the Superior. St. Thomas says, there are four cases in which an oath, accepted by another, can be made void without the consent of that other; but is, you take an oath to your neighbour, and he believes you intend to do what you swear: but according to St. Thomas, there are four cases in which it can be made void. One is, when there is any doubt whatever whether the oath is valid or not valid, lawful or unlawful; another is, when the public good is concerned, which ought always to be preferred to private good. Now let me entreat your attention to this, and let me ask you, what possible security can a man have for the preservation of any oath