

Jesus said to his disciples. Whom do you say that I am?

Simon Peter answered and said: Thou art Christ the Son of the living God.

And Jesus answering, said to him: 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 THAT THOU ART PETER: AND UPON THIS ROCK I WILL BUILD MY CHURCH, AND THE GATES OF HELL SHALL NOT PREVAIL AGAINST IT.

AND I SHALL GIVE TO THEE THE KEYS OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN. AND WHATSOEVER THOU SHALT BIND UPON EARTH, IT SHALL BE BOUND IN HEAVEN, AND WHATSOEVER THOU SHALT LOOSE ON EARTH SHALL BE LOOSE ALSO IN HEAVEN.—S. Matthew xvi. 15—19



"Was anything concealed from Peter, who was styled the Rock on which the Church was built, who received the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the power of loosing and binding in Heaven and on earth." —TERTULLIAN Prescrip. xxii.

"There is one God, and one Church, and one Chair founded by the voice of the Lord upon Peter. That any other Altar be erected, or any other Priesthood established, besides that one Altar, and one Priesthood, is impossible. Whatsoever gathers elsewhere, scatters. Whatever is devised by human frenzy, in violation of the Divine Ordinance, is adulterous, impious, sacrilegious." —St. Cyprian Ep 43 ad plebem.

"All of them remaining silent, for the doctrine was beyond the reach of man, Peter the Prince of the Apostles and the supreme herald of the Church, not following his own inventions, nor persuaded by human reasoning, but enlightened by the Father, says to him: Thou art Christ, and not this alone, but the Son of the living God.—St. Cyril of Jordan. Cat. xl. 1.

Calendar.

- Nov 18—Sunday—XXV after Pent 4th Nov
Ded of the Churches of SS Peter and Paul doub.
- " 19—Monday—St Pontianus P M doub
sup.
- " 20—Tuesday—St Felix of Valois C
doub.
- " 21—Wednesday—Presentation of the
B V Mary gr doub.
- " 22—Thursday—St Cecilia V M doub.
- " 22—Friday—St Clement I P M dou
com St Felicitas &c.
- " 24—Saturday—St John of the Cross C
dou.

FRANCE.

THE POPE AND THE ROMAN EXPEDITION.

Extracts from the Speech of Count Montalembert in the National Assembly.

M. DE MONTALEMBERT—I am asked to reply to M. Victor Hugo; it is my desire, my right and my duty to do so; and at the same time I am invited to observe that he is absent, and that I ought not to speak in his absence. It is, however, difficult to reply to a discourse so vehement, so impassioned, without being drawn onward, I will not say to attack the person of the orator, for nothing is so remote from my intentions, but to address to that orator questions, to which no one has a right to object that he is absent. I do not consider that a speaker so highly placed as he imagines himself, has the right to leave the Assembly under the impression of his words, and to obstruct their refutation, that he has the right to absent himself, and not to remain on the spot to hear the answer. (Approbation.) Allow me, gentlemen, to conclude what I was going to say, and you will afterwards judge whether there was anything in it of too personal a character. This is what I was going to say to M. Hugo.

I would say to him that one day perchance he would himself go to Rome, to that unrivalled city, there to seek for repose, calm, peace, dignity, solitude, retreat—for all those infinite advantages which for so many ages have been secured to that city by that clerical Government which he has just been insulting. Perchance a day may come when M. Victor Hugo will go to Rome to seek and to enjoy those benefits. Then it may be that he will bless heaven for having inspired Catholic nations with the thought of reserving that single asylum, safe from the storms, the calumnies, the violences of political life. Then he will repent of having made the oration which he has just delivered, and that repentance will be his

chastisement; I wish him no other. (Murmurs on the Left.) He will then repent of those calumnious words against France and against the revered Chief of our hearts and of our souls. Yes, he has calumniated France, for is it not calumniating her, to ascribe to her such intentions as he spoke of? Is it not calumniating the Pope, to ascribe to him for a single moment the thought of slaughter? Where, then, are the gibbets? Where, then, are the executioners? What are they, or rather, where have they ever existed, either under Pius IX. or under his predecessors? History is before you, gentlemen, and she tells you that for three centuries there has not been one Pope who has been hard, cruel, and tyrannical; that is what history says. The Pope always pardons; he is always obliged to pardon. (A Voice from the Mountain—When he is paid!) That is the reason why he is obliged in that amnesty which you calumniously call a proscription, not to deliver his adversaries to the executioners, but to keep them away from him, to repel them from the soil of Italy, from the very circumstance that he cannot repress them as other rulers do, as France herself does; he is driven to the preventive system, because the repressive system is more difficult for him, more impossible than it is for others.

You draw from the amnesty an objection against the Holy Father; but you forget that it is a weapon which acts two ways. You forget that the Government of the Republic declined to grant an amnesty which was solicited for other culpable persons by the men who applaud you now. You speak of an amnesty. But you forget that Pius IX. had already given one. What then was the first act of his Pontificate? An amnesty the most complete, the most extensive, the most universal. The very day after Pius IX. placed the tiara on his brows, he granted an amnesty to men who swore to reverence him, to men who communicated from his hand in taking that oath, and who have odiously violated that oath! Oh, I will say thus much for the French demagogues and revolutionaries, they would never have allowed themselves in an act so sacrilegious! (Hear, hear.) And you dare to reproach him for not having granted a second amnesty, when he had reaped such fruits from the first!

Bossuet has spoken of a kind of finish and completeness which misfortune adds to virtue. Well, Pius IX. has known misfortune; he has

known that which is yet more cruel than misfortune, ingratitude! I do not grieve over him for it, I honour him for it; I envy him for it. Let who will, avoid making ingrates. To make them, it is necessary to have intended to do good, and very great good. No, it is not granted to everybody to make ingrates! Happy are those who make ingrates, but unhappy are those who are such! (Hear, hear.) And how numerous the ingrates are! Gentlemen, allow me to say that there are such, not only in Rome, but there are such in all Europe, there are such even here; for what is it to be an ingrate if not to be insensible to his services, to reply to the purity of his whole life by gross injuries, of which the severity of the President will exact a penalty one day, and which the *Moniteur* preserves for the justice of futurity. (Hear, hear.) Yes, there is there an ingratitude such, that I must be permitted to oppose to it a solemn tribute of gratitude and homage. (Renewed applause.)

The *motu proprio* guarantees the secularisation of the administration in such a sense that it does not imply the exclusion of ecclesiastics, but the admission of laics. It is well to state at the outset that this admission of laics, is already at this moment, under the Pontificate of Pius IX., so general, that according to a statistical table of all the public offices in the Papal States, which has just been published at Naples, from the official tables of all the employments and charges in the political, judicial, and administrative departments, and of the salaries assigned thereto respectively in 1848, there are in all only 109 ecclesiastics, and 6,059 laymen. You see what is the actual proportion.

A MEMBER OF THE COMMISSION.—There are 243 of them.

M. DE MONTALEMBERT.—Yes; but that number includes 134 almoners of prisons.

Now, I think it cannot enter into anybody's head to desire to exclude ecclesiastics from the small number of distinguished places they at present hold. I say distinguished, because the Sovereign himself being an ecclesiastic—unless perhaps you want the Pope himself to be a layman—(laugh of approbation on the Right)—it is absolutely necessary he should have about him, as principal Ministers of his Sovereignty, ecclesiastics like himself, and this you will feel. To pretend to impose on the Pope the obligation of excluding ecclesiastics from the principal offices of his States, this

would be like your imposing on the Emperor of Russia, a sovereign essentially military, the obligation of governing by lawyers. (Laugh of approbation on the Right.)

Instead of that, what does the Emperor of Russia do? He invariably places at the head of his ministerial departments and principal administrations military men like himself, and he has long had as his Minister of Finances a General of Infantry, and his finances have not been badly managed for all that—quite the contrary. (Laughter.)

A VOICE ON THE LEFT.—He had not the title of General.

M. DE MONTALEMBERT.—Yes; he had! It was General Canrolier.

If the Romans had been willing to content themselves with moderate liberty, they would have now been in possession of the two Chambers, the Civic Guard, the freedom of the Press, and all the liberties which Pius IX. had given. They would none of them; they preferred to the concessions of Pius IX. the agitations of some demagogues or other, titled or not titled; they preferred revolution to liberty, and now they suffer the penalty of the choice which they have made; they lose political liberty because they chose to confound it with the arbitrary and unjust exercise of the sovereignty of the people. (Hear, hear)

But there has yet another trial been made; that by Pius IX. himself. Did he not give to his country, as I just now said, all the liberties which were asked of him, and yet more? He gave them the liberty of the press; he gave them the civic guard; he gave them the two Chambers, the constitutional statute. Well, what was the result of all that to him? The press overturned him morally before he was overturned really. The civic guard besieged him in his palace of the Quirinal. And the two Chambers remained mute and impassible when his Minister was assassinated; and it was the chief of the then constitutional party, Mamiani, who made himself the successor of the assassinated Minister, and the gaoler of the Holy Father. That was the trial which the Pope made of Constitutional Monarchy.

Some say that the Pope has changed; others would willingly say that he deceived himself. I think neither the one nor the other. No, Pius IX. has neither changed, nor erred; he has neither deceived nor transformed himself. He did not deceive himself in attempting to give liberty to his country