

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON,
At the Office, No. 3 McGill Street.
TERMS:
To Town Subscribers. . . \$3 per annum.
To Country do. \$2½ do.
Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

All communications to be addressed to the Editor of THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, post paid.

**THE TRUE WITNESS
AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.**

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JAN. 16, 1852.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The *Dublin Freeman's Journal* assigns the following reasons for the resignation of Lord Palmerston. The late Secretary for Foreign Affairs, had openly expressed his determination of supporting the new order of things in France. Lord Normanby, Ambassador at Paris, on the other hand, made no secret of his opposition to Louis Napoleon, and of his ill will to the cause of the President; it farther appears, that when Gen. Caraignac was arrested, there were found amongst his papers several letters, written by Lord Normanby to the General, on the eve of the election for the Presidency in 1848, in which the character of Louis Napoleon was held up to ridicule, and strong hopes were expressed for the success of his opponent. Naturally indignant at this scurrily treatment, from one who had long professed a strong attachment to his cause and person, the President gave the English Cabinet pretty clearly to understand, that so long as Lord Normanby was allowed to remain in Paris, a cordial understanding between the two governments was impossible.

Lord Palmerston, in consequence, was well disposed to recall Lord Normanby, and to send Sir Henry Bulwer in his place; but the noble Viscount found strong opposition to this arrangement from his colleagues; and unable to carry his point he tendered his resignation, which has been accepted. This resignation will by no means tend to render Lord John's task of meeting Parliament less difficult; nor is it likely that the present administration will be able much longer, to hold together, after the loss of its ablest member, and most skillful debater.

The good people of England seem slow to understand that the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill of last session was intended, by its originators, to be, and must continue to remain, a dead letter; some of them still seem to fancy, that by some wondrous power—by some devilish magic—this Bill unconsecrated the Catholic Bishops of England, and that it is something, besides a monument of the folly and bigotry of the English nation in 1851; they will learn, if they have not yet learnt, that all Bills which trench upon the liberties of the Catholic religion, will be treated by Catholics as so much waste paper; and that Acts of Parliament which legislate against the Church, will always be violated and set at naught, by her dutiful children. We read in the *Times* the following amusing account of the ineffectual indignation of some worthy citizen, against a proclamation posted upon St. George's Church, in which it was announced that his Lordship the Bishop of Southwark, was to preach on a certain occasion:—

At the Southwark Police Court on Monday a person of respectable appearance, whose name did not transpire, but who was said to be a medical practitioner in the London-road, applied to Mr. Elliott for his opinion as to whether he should be justified in pulling down a placard which was posted up at the Catholic Cathedral in St. George's fields.

The applicant stated that the placard in question announced that a Grand Pontifical Mass would be celebrated on Christmas Day, and a sermon preached by the Lord Bishop of Southwark, and inasmuch as there was no such person known to the law, or legally recognised as the "Lord Bishop of Southwark," he wished to know whether he, the applicant, could be held criminally responsible, or subject to the payment of penalties by tearing it down?

Mr. Elliott—You allege, I suppose, that some person has illegally assumed the title of the Lord Bishop of Southwark?

Applicant—Yes, Sir. I hold that there is no such person known. That the placard is a misrepresentation, and I therefore want to know whether I would not be justified in pulling it down?

Mr. Elliott—I will read you the law on the subject. —If you are in a condition to prove that the title of "Lord Bishop of Southwark" has been assumed by any one, you can, on obtaining the permission of her Majesty's Attorney-General, take proceedings for the recovery of the £100 penalty.

Applicant—Your worship does not think I should be justified, under the circumstances, in pulling the placard down?

Mr. Elliott—Certainly not.
The applicant thanked his worship for the attention which he paid him, and left the court evidently dissatisfied with the result of his application, and declaring he should at once communicate with Lord John Russell on the subject.

It was a cruel piece of irony, on the part of the magistrate, to ask the complainant "if he was prepared to prove that some one had assumed the title of Bishop of Southwark." It is clear that there must be some more legislation against Popery; Catholics are becoming much too independent.

A remarkable instance of the manner in which justice is administered to Catholics in England, has just been afforded by a verdict given in the case—*Soltan v. De Held*. The action was brought against the Superior of the Convent of Clapham, for ringing bells, to call the faithful to prayers; but as it was a call to Catholic prayers—to that worship which three hundred years ago was universal in England—the Vice Chancellor has decreed that the call is to be

silenced, in order that for the future, the Protestant plaintiff be not annoyed by the sound of the "Church going bell."

His Grace the Archbishop of Armagh, has approved of the appointment of Mr. Wilberforce, as Secretary to the Catholic Defence Association.

Two men have been arrested for the murder of Mr. Bateson, in the county Monaghan; hitherto nothing has transpired to give a clue to the motives which led to the perpetration of this horrid crime.

"All that is yet known," says the *Northern Whig*, "is comprised in the circumstances that Mr. Bateson was a land-agent, that ejectments had been served on tenants, that a portion of a property was to be cleared of certain homesteads, and that this gentleman, while proceeding homewards, was assailed by assassins and shot. It is the old story; there is no outward proof; but we are so accustomed to these things that men instinctively trace a connexion between the circumstances; and when a man is murdered on the road side, his death is, as if by the soundest logical process, attributed to peasant evictions and peasant revenge. It is truly a fearful state of society to exist without change, age after age, within the limits of an empire famous for its laws, its arts, and its civilisation. There is nothing like it known in the most barbarous region in Europe. This fierce antagonism between tenant and proprietor—this war of the knife between the citizens of the same State—is known only in Ireland, living under the protection of the British Constitution. Here only are the two classes, which should be most friendly in their mutual dependence, set face to face, with all the bitter hatred of natural foes. So it has always been, spite of the blood that has been shed, and spite of the host of victims which the laws have sacrificed to offend justice. While this pestilential sore is festering in the bosom of our social life, our rulers and statesmen continue to disregard its existence until some outrage, like this which we now record, awakens them to momentary activity; and then the laws are enforced, the assassin, or accomplice is executed, and a short pause ensues, till some new landlord or agent is shot down, and another wretch is hanged, in assertion or vindication of justice." When will the Government awake to the utter folly of such a course as this? When will they learn that something else besides the strangulation of an occasional peasant is necessary for the cure of a vicious system, which has made the soil we live on the subject of internecine war? The remedy is to be found only in the alteration of a system which is depopulating our rural districts, which paralyses the energy of the industrious, and which is driving the wealthiest, most self-dependent, and most useful of our peasantry in thousands to seek better fortune in other lands and under other institutions.

The deceased was agent for Lord Templeton, and had been actively engaged, according to the *Dundalk Democrat*, in the work of eviction; this journal enumerates no less than two hundred and twenty-four persons driven forth, to perish perhaps, on the Templeton estates, since Mr. Bateson became agent; probably in this may be found the cause of this dreadful murder which has created such a sensation of horror throughout the United Kingdom.

From France the intelligence is all in favor of the President. The following is given as the latest by Submarine Telegraph:—

The following is the comparative result of the votes in the department of the Seine in 1848 and in 1851. On December 10, 1848, the number of civil electors was 287,829, of whom 168,484 voted for Louis Napoleon, and on December 21, 1851, the number of voters was 296,250, of whom 196,676 voted for Louis Napoleon. There is, consequently, a difference of 28,192 in his favor in the department of the Seine on the present occasion.

Paris, Wednesday Morning.

The *Constitutionnel* gives the following as the latest returns of the state of the Presidential election:—
Yes 5,109,540
No 500,900
M. Duvergier de Hauranne, M. Bixio, and General Leydet were yesterday liberated from the prison of St. Pelagie.

We copy from the *Times* the following not very flattering picture of the state of affairs at the Cape of Good Hope:—

"We can imagine no events more calculated to humble our national pride, to tarnish the reputation of our arms, and to cast an indelible stigma on our policy and good faith, than those of which the Cape of Good Hope is now, unhappily, the theatre. We are engaged in a double contest of arms as well as of arms, against our own subjects, as well as against a barbarous enemy; and it is very difficult to say in which of our two capacities, civil or military, we cut the more creditable figure. Battered by barbarism, Lord Grey revenges himself on civilisation, and wreaks on the offending British population of the Cape that vengeance which the Caffres elude or defy."

Much interest has been excited in Dublin by an extraordinary trial for false imprisonment. The plaintiff was a person named William Henry Matthew, a scholar of Dublin University, of considerable distinction, and the action was brought against Dr. Hartly of Dublin, a Physician 71 years of age, and proprietor of a Lunatic Asylum. The most singular feature in the case was, that the plaintiff was totally ignorant of his parents, his education having been paid for, and he himself supported by Dr. Hartly, against whom the action was brought. The mystery of his parentage was cleared up on the trial, the defendant confessing upon examination, that he was the father of the plaintiff, whose mother, though unmarried, was strictly a lady, and died about 20 years ago, leaving a small sum of money in his (the defendant's) hands, for the support of the issue of their criminal connexion. From the evidence it appeared that Dr. Hartly had done his best to atone for the sin of his youth, by giving the unhappy young man to whom he was father, the best education in his power. The reason for confining him in the Lunatic Asylum was stated to be, that Mr. Matthews had, on several occasions, evinced marks of considerable aberration of intellect. The jury found a verdict for the plaintiff—damages £1,000—the announcement of which was received with a general burst of applause from all parts of the crowded court.

PROTESTANT QUOTATIONS.

A little learning is a dangerous thing to its possessor, to the truth of which, an *Irishman*, writing in the *Montreal Witness*, bears ample testimony.—"But the danger is greatly increased, when the possessor endeavors to make a little learning go a long way, by means of second, and third hand quotations from *Text Books of Popery*, and similar evangelical, and mendacious publications. It is not enough, to know the name of an author, or to be acquainted with the title page of his works; a little knowledge of the contents is requisite, to enable a man to quote accurately, and confidently. Of the danger of second hand quotations, we have a striking proof in the case of the famous passage, dishonestly quoted by Mosheim from the writings of St. Eligius, Bishop of Noyon in the seventh century—translated by MacLaine, copied by Robertson in his *History of Charles V.*—and re-copied by Hallam in his *History of the Middle Ages: the falsity of the quotation, and the dishonesty of the original quoter, have been well exposed by Dr. Lingard, and confessed by Hallam, who, in the notes to his fourth edition, though he had not the honesty to correct the text, admits "that Dr. Lingard is perfectly correct," and that "upon the whole it affords a striking proof how dangerous it is to take any authorities second hand." *Irishman* would have done well to have taken warning by the example.*

We premise this much, because we will not accuse, because we do not even suspect, *Irishman* of deliberate falsification of the text of the authors whom he quotes; we believe him to have erred in good faith; through ignorance, rather than through malice; he has been relying—fond youth—upon the good faith of others; and, trusting to the veracity of their statements, has fallen into the gross errors, in quoting Gratian and Bellarmine—in *History—and Chronology*, which we intend to point out, and which, we believe, will be honestly acknowledged by *Irishman* himself, when made manifest to him.

We endeavored to show, that infallibility did not mean Impeccability, Omniscience, nor yet, Omnipotence, and that Catholics did not claim for the Pope, the peculiar attributes of the Deity. In reply, *Irishman* hurled at our heads, a long string of quotations, professedly from Canonists and Divines of the Catholic Church, with the object of proving that the aforesaid writers, have, with the cognizance and approval of the Church, claimed for the Pope, the power of God, and the right of declaring good, evil—and evil, good. It is with these quotations, that we intend, to-day, to deal.

We will begin, by frankly admitting, that our erudition is far less extensive than that of an *Irishman*; that we are perfectly unacquainted with the works of Phillip Decius, of Sylvester Prierias, or of Pighius; of the latter, we know that Cardinal Bona said—"Cavete legendus est, quod non semper solidum tradat doctrinam,"—"he is to be read with caution, for he does not always deliver sound doctrine." We have no means, therefore, of denying, or explaining the extracts from their writings, given by *Irishman*; divorced from the context, they appear absurd and blasphemous; but as we shall have occasion to show, the accuracy of *Irishman's* quotations, is not to be relied on; we call upon him then, to prove, from the authors themselves—and not from garbled extracts—that the passages do really occur, as he quotes them; when he shall have succeeded in so doing, our reply will be, that neither Phillip Decius—who was a Civilian and not a Canonist unless we are greatly mistaken, but, who was certainly, a mere layman—nor Pighius, nor yet Sylvester Prierias, have any binding authority upon the Church, or, upon the consciences of Catholics. We will now come to the quotations given by *Irishman*, as from authors, with whose works, we are slightly acquainted, because we have them in our possession.

Our opponent states that Gratian—*Dist. 93, c. 1*,—asserts that, "*Papa canonicus electus, est Deus in terris*—The Pope, canonically elected, is God on earth." To this statement of *Irishman*, we give a point-blank, and unqualified contradiction; we have carefully searched Gratian, at the chapter quoted, and we declare, that no such sentence, nor any, which, by any possible ingenuity, can be tortured into bearing a similar meaning, occurs; we are also pretty confident, that *Irishman* never detected any such passage, and that he never opened Gratian in his life, for, had he done so, the following words, with which c. 2, *Dist. 93*, commences, could not have failed to have met his eye—so should we have been spared the remarks about St. Cyprian's denial of the authority of the See of Peter,—"Quis Cathedram Petri, super quam fundata est ecclesia, deserit, in Ecclesia se esse non confidit." Let us now turn to *Irishman's* quotations from Bellarmine:—

"Bellarmine says"—at least, the correspondent of the *Montreal Witness*, makes Bellarmine say—"Should the Pope enjoin the practice of vice, and prevent the observance of virtue, the Church is bound to believe, that vice is virtue, and virtue vice, under pain of mortal sin (de Rom. Pont. lib. 4, c. 5)." In the same way, the Bible has been quoted by the Atheist, to prove that "There is no God," a blasphemous principle asserted by the Psalmist; if we leave out the preceding passage—"The fool hath said in his heart"—perhaps *Irishman* will admit, that this mode of quoting, is more remarkable for its ingenuity, than for its honesty; and yet, it is the very mode adopted by *Irishman*, in his quotations from Bellarmine. To make this clear, let us see what Bellarmine really does say, and for this purpose, we will give—Firstly—a liberal translation of our author—the substance, rather than the words—and Secondly, the whole of fifth chapter, in the original, so that the accuracy of our interpretation, may be easily ascertainable.

Having, in the third chapter, of the fourth book, laid down and maintained the proposition, that, in

matters of faith, propounded to the *Universal Church*, the Pope is infallible, and, that his decisions, are to be received by the Church—"Summus Pontifex cum totam Ecclesiam docet, in his quæ ad fidem pertinent nullo casu errare potest,"—Bellarmine proceeds to show, how it follows, as a necessary consequence, that the Pope must be equally infallible (in certain cases), when deciding questions of morals. The proposition, with which the fifth chapter commences, is—Not only, the Sovereign Pontiff cannot err in decrees of faith, but neither can he err in such decisions, upon questions of morals, as are, by him, propounded to the *Universal Church*, and which treat of matters essential to salvation, or, which are, by their very essence, (*per se*) either good, or evil. He next lays down the following conditions, under which, alone, infallibility can be predicated of the Papal decisions; in the first place, the Pope must be addressing the *Universal Church*, and the questions upon which he decides, must be such, as treat of matters, necessary to salvation, or, by their very essence, (*per se*) either good, or evil. By way of more clearly explaining his meaning, Bellarmine continues: that it cannot happen, that the Pope should err in questions of morals, either, by enjoining the practice of vice,—as for instance, Usury—or, by prohibiting virtue,—as for instance, Restitution—because, these things, are, by their very essence, (*per se*) good, or evil. Nor can it happen, that the Pope should err, by enjoining something inimical, or, by prohibiting something necessary, to salvation, as for instance, Baptism and the Eucharist. Such, in substance, is the thesis, which, in the fifth chapter, Bellarmine undertakes to defend, and the form of argument which he adopts, is the *reductio ad absurdum*.

He argues that the Pope cannot err when deciding upon questions of morals—*necessary to salvation*. Firstly, because if he could so err it would happen that the Church might be grievously injured, and should be in error, on things necessary to salvation; but this is impossible, because contrary to the promise of the Lord.—St. John, 16.—"*But when he, the spirit of truth, shall come.*" Secondly, because, in that case, God would then have been wanting to His Church—in things necessary—which also is impossible.

Still continuing the same mode of reasoning, the *reductio ad absurdum*, Bellarmine next argues, that the Pope cannot err when deciding upon questions of morals, which are by their essence (*per se*) good or evil. Firstly, because if he could so err, the Church would no longer deserve to be called Holy, as she is called in the Apostles Creed. Secondly, because it would then follow, as a necessary consequence, that the Pope might err also in matters of faith (*circa fidem*), which, in his preceding chapters, the writer has shown to be impossible. Now, the Catholic faith teaches that all virtue is good, all vice evil; but if the Pope could err, by enjoining vice, or prohibiting virtue, then it would also happen, that the Church might be held to believe vice good, and virtue evil, which is contrary to her own teaching, and therefore impossible. Hence Bellarmine draws the conclusion, that the Pope cannot err upon questions of morals, any more than he can upon questions of faith. We now give the original:—

"de decretis morum."
"Terlia propositio huic esse potest. Non solum in decretis fidei errare non potest summus Pontifex, sed neque in præceptis morum, quæ toti Ecclesie præscribuntur, et quæ in rebus necessariis ad salutem, vel in his quæ per se bona, vel mala sunt, versantur.
Dicimus Primum, non posse errare Pontificem in iis præceptis, quæ toti Ecclesie præscribuntur, quia ut supra diximus, in præceptis, et iudiciis particularibus, non est absurdum Pontificem errare.
Addimus Secundum, quæ in rebus necessariis ad salutem, vel per se bonis, aut malis versantur, quia non est erroneum dicere, Pontificem in aliis legitimis posse errare, nimirum superfluum legem condendo, vel inius discretam, &c.

Ac ut rem totam exemplis declaramus; non potest fieri ut Pontifex erret, præcipiendo aliquid vitium, ut usuram; vel prohibendo virtutem, ut restitutionem, quia hæc sunt per se bona, vel mala; nec potest fieri ut erret præcipiendo aliquid contra salutem, ut Circumcisionem, vel Sabbatum, vel prohibendo aliquid necessarium ad salutem, ut Baptismum aut Eucharistiam, ut autem jubet aliquid quod non est bonum, neque malum ex se, neque contra salutem, sed tamen est inutile, vel sub pœna nimis gravi illud præcipiat, non est absurdum dicere posse fieri, quoniam non est subditum de hac re dubitare, sed simpliciter obedire.

Probat jam propositio, et Primo, quod non possit Papa errare in præceptis morum ad salutem necessariorum; quia tunc tota Ecclesia graviter læderetur, et erraret in rebus necessariis, quod est contra promissionem Domini—Johan, 16, cum venerit ille spiritus veritatis, docebit vos omnem veritatem. Quod intelligitur (at minimum) de veritate necessaria ad salutem.

Secundo, quia Deus tunc deesset Ecclesie suæ in necessariis quandoquidem præcepit illi, ut sequatur Pontificem, et Pontificem permittit errare in necessariis. At certe si Deus nulli rei deest in necessariis, quanto minus Ecclesie suæ?

Quod autem non possit Pontifex errare in moribus per se bonis, vel malis probatur. Nam tunc Ecclesia non posset vere dici sancta, ut in Symbolo Apostolorum vocatur. Nam sancta dicitur potissimum ob sanctam professionem, ut alibi ostendimus, quia nimirum legem et professionem sanctorum profitetur, quæ nihil docet falsum, nihil præcipit malum.

Secundo, quia tunc necessario erraret etiam circa fidem. Nam fides Catholica docet, omnem virtutem esse bonam, omnem vitium esse malum; si autem Papa erraret, præcipiendo vitia, vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur Ecclesia credere vitia esse bona, et virtutes malas, nisi vellet contra conscientiam peccare. Tenetur enim in rebus dubiis Ecclesia acquiescere iudicio summi Pontificis et facere quod ille præcipit, non facere quod ille prohibet, ac ne forte contra conscientiam agat, tenetur credere bonum esse quod ille præcipit, malum quod ille prohibet."

Should *Irishman* doubt our accuracy, or be desirous to verify the quotation given above, we shall be most happy to afford him every assistance in our power. But if it turns out, that we are right, and that