



CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

VOL. II.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 1851.

NO. 7.

DR. NEWMAN'S NINTH LECTURE.

(From the Birmingham Correspondent of the Tablet.)

The Very Rev. Dr. Newman terminated his lectures on Catholicism in England on Monday evening last in the presence of the Lord Bishop of Birmingham, many of the Clergy, and a considerable number of highly respectable and influential Protestants. The following is a mere skeleton of the most important of this extraordinary series of lectures, the effects of which will be felt throughout the length and breadth of England, and put to shame the hired defamers of the Church. The Rev. Doctor, in defining Protestants, proceeded to say:—"By Protestants I mean the heirs of the traditions of Elizabeth; I mean the country gentlemen, the Whig political party, the Church establishment, and the Wesleyan Conference. I cannot over-estimate their power; they and their principles are established. Yet I should be unjust, on the other hand, to whole classes in the community, if I made Protestantism, thus explained, synonymous with the mind and the philosophy of the country. Well, I say, we are menaced by this tremendous power. This is the condition of things: what must we do? Put ourselves on the defensive. This, then, has been my scope. I have not been aggressive, but on the defensive; and what is the first step of those who are getting ready for their defence against a foe?—to reconnoitre him. It is simply this that I have been doing in these lectures." The lecturer then recapitulated at some length the various subjects of his preceding lectures, as a survey of the position of one reconnoitering the field of operations. He then came more immediately to the subject of the present lecture, observing—"And now what are our duties at this moment towards this enemy of ours? How are we to bear ourselves towards it? What is to become of the survey we have taken of it? With what practical remark and reasonable advice am I to conclude this attempt to determine our relation to it? Protestantism is fierce, because it does not know you; ignorance is its strength; error is its life. Therefore bring yourselves before it, press yourselves upon it, force yourselves into notice against its will. Make it so clear what you are, that they cannot affect not to see you, nor refuse to justify you. Do not let them off with silence, but give them no escape from confessing that you are not what they have thought you were. They will look down, they will look aside, they will look in the air, they will shut their eyes, they will keep them shut. They will do all in their power not to see you; the nearer you come, will they close their eyelids all the tighter. They will be very angry and frightened, and give the alarm, as if you were going to murder them. They will do anything but look at you. Many of them are half conscious they have been wrong, but fear the consequence of learning it, and will think it best to let things alone. I know it is a most grave problem how to touch so intense an obstinacy, but observe, if you once touch it, you have done your work. There is but one step between you and success. It is a steep one, but it is one. You have but to aim at making men look steadily at you; when they do this, I do not say they will become Catholics, but they will cease to have the means of making you a by-word and a reproach, of inflicting on you the cross of unpopularity. Wherever Catholicism is known it is respected, or, at least, endured by the people. Your one and almost sole object, then, will be to make yourselves known. This is what will do. This is what will do everything for you; it is what your enemies will try might and main to hinder. They begin to have a suspicion that Catholicism, known to be what it really is, will be their overthrow. The post must be carried; in it lies the fortune of the day. They must be made to know us as we are; they must be made to know our religion as it is, not as they fancy it; they must be made to look at us, and they are overcome. As far as defamation and railing go, your enemies have done their worst. They have put you beyond the pale of civilised society; they have made you the outlaws of public opinion; they serve you in the way of reproach and slander, worse than the convict or the savage. Next, look at the matter more closely; it is not so bad as it seems. Who are these who so obstinately refuse to know you? When I say they have done their worst, what is their "worst," and who are "they?" Consider, then, that "they" means in the main, certain centres of influence in the metropolis; first, a great portion of members of both houses of parliament; next, the press; thirdly, the societies, whose haunt or home is Exeter Hall; fourthly, the pulpits of the establishment; and of a good part of the Dissenters. These are our accusers; these spread abroad their calumnies; these are meant by "they." Next, what is their "worst?" Whom do they influence? They influence the population of the whole of Great Britain and the British empire, so far as it is British, and not Catholic; and they influence it to believe that

Catholicism, and all Catholics, are professed and habitual violators of the moral law, of the precepts of truth, honesty, purity, humanity. If this be so, you may ask me what I can mean by saying that the "worst" is not so bad as it looks, but, after all, things might be much worse? Think a moment: what is it to me what people think of me a hundred miles off, compared with what they think of me at home? It is nothing to me what the four ends of the world think of me; I care nought for the British empire more than for the Celestial in this matter, provided I can be sure what Birmingham thinks of me. The question is, what does Birmingham think of me?—and if I have a satisfactory answer to that, I can bear to be without a satisfactory answer about any other town or district in England. This is a great principle to keep in view. Popular opinion only acts through local opinion. The opinion of London can only act on an individual through the opinion of his own place; metropolitan opinion can only act on me through Birmingham opinion. London abuses Catholics. "Catholic" is a word: where is the thing?—in Liverpool, in Manchester, in Birmingham, in Leeds, in Sheffield, in Nottingham? Did all the London papers prove that all Catholics were traitors, where must this opinion be carried out? Not in the air; not in leading articles; not in editors' studies; but in Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds, Sheffield, and Nottingham. So, in order to carry out your London manifesto, you must get the people of Liverpool, Birmingham, Manchester, and the rest, to write their names after it; else, nothing comes of its being a metropolitan opinion, or an imperial opinion, or any great idea whatever. You must get Birmingham to believe it of Birmingham Catholics, and Manchester to believe it of Manchester Catholics; so you see these great London leading articles have only done half their work, or, rather, have not begun it, by proving to the world that all Catholics are traitors, fill they come out of their abstractions and generalities, and for the word 'world' substitute Birmingham, Manchester, and Liverpool, and for 'all Catholics' substitute Catholics of Birmingham, Manchester, and Liverpool; and get each place, in particular, to accept what the great metropolis says, and the empire believes, in the general. You see, then, brothers of the Oratory, where our success lies, and how you are to secure it. Never mind the London press; never mind Exeter Hall; never mind perambulating orators or solemn meetings; let them alone; they do not affect local opinion. They are a blaze amid the stubble; they glare and they expire. Do not dream of converting the public opinion of London—you cannot, and you need not. Look at home—there lies your work; what you have to do, and what you can do, are one and the same. Prove to the people of Birmingham, as you can prove to them, that your Priests and yourselves are not without conscience, or honor, or morality; prove it to them, and it matters not, though every man, woman and child within the London bills of mortality were of a different opinion. Such, then, is that defensive system which I think is especially the duty of Catholics at this moment. Men may attempt other weapons, and the more serious you are will make the greater efforts to pour contempt and ridicule upon you. But ridicule will not hurt you, as it hurts other religious bodies; they hate and fear Catholicism—they cannot really laugh at it. They may laugh at individuals, or details connected with it, but not at Catholicism itself. Indeed, I am disposed, in one sense, to allow the maxim of the unbeliever, which has before now given rise to so much discussion, viz., that ridicule is the test of truth. Methodism is ridiculous, so is Puritanism; it is not so with the Catholic religion; it may be, and is, maligned and defamed; ridiculed it cannot be. This may not be the age of saints, but all times are the age of martyrs. The arrow is on the string, and the arm is drawn back, and 'if the Lord give the word,' great will be the multitude of His champions. Oh, my brothers, it is difficult for you and me to realise this; it is difficult for us to believe that we have it in us, being what we are—but we have. And it is difficult for us to believe that this can be a time for testing it, nor do I say it is; I think it cannot be. I only say, that if it were to be a time for calling out the martyr's spirit, you and I, through God's grace, have it in us. It would be well for our opponents to recollect, that there is a certain principle, which we call zeal, and which they call fanaticism. Let them beware of awaking what they would in scoffing call the fanatical spirit of the Catholic. For years and years the Catholics of England have borne personal slander, and insult, and injustice. They have borne, and they bear an ill-usage which in its mildest and most amiable form has never risen higher than pity and condescension. So it has been up to this hour, but let our enemies remember that while they have their point to honor we have ours." The lecturer then thanked his brethren, and "those not of our communion," for having honored him with their at-

tendance, beseeching the latter to think over what he had said, and entreating them to believe that he had uttered nothing at random, but had reasons both for what he had said and his manner of saying it. At the close of the lecture the Rev. Dr. was most enthusiastically applauded, after which the Very Rev. Dr. Moore, President of Oscott College, rose and said a meeting of the Catholics of Birmingham would be held on Friday evening next in that hall, the Lord Bishop in the chair, for the purpose of expressing their approbation and appreciation of the lectures recently delivered by Dr. Newman. The meeting will be held in pursuance of this notice, when the Catholic body will have an opportunity of expressing the deep debt of gratitude which they owe to the Rev. Father Superior of the Oratory for his powerful advocacy of the Church against her unscrupulous assailants.

TRUE BASIS OF CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

(From the Dublin Nation.)

"The case and opinion of Counsel" on the operations of the Penal Law, is likely to produce a graver impression than even the Aggregate Meeting. It puts the question in a position where it must not rest, and where all the power of Great Britain cannot maintain it. If the doctrines it lays down be correct, we have seen but skirmishing hitherto; the battle is still to begin. A great public meeting is among the worst possible places to look for the true bearing of a great public question. You are not shown its true bearing, but all its bearings together; "you cannot see the wood for trees." Every speaker is ambitious to take up unoccupied ground, and taxes his faculties to say something new; and, in the chaos of ingenious speculation, it is nearly impossible to preserve single and exact impressions. We doubt, therefore, if the Catholics of Ireland at this moment know their real position, as it is laid down in this momentous document.—There is great indignation—a vehement spirit of resistance; but scarcely, we apprehend, a unanimous conviction of where the danger lies, and where the battle must be fought. The majority of even educated Catholics still look upon the contest as a defence of the right of Catholic Bishops to use their titles in public. They overlook the incomparably graver fact that experienced lawyers have declared the children of Catholic parents illegitimate—the title to Catholic Churches and burial grounds, in a multitude of cases, void; and the marriages of all Irish Catholics null, as far as the law of England is concerned! This is the gravamen of the whole case. Here we take our stand; the interpretation put upon the bill by English and Irish lawyers of high characters is, that it illegitimatises our children, and robs us of the bones of our fathers. While this interpretation stands, it must be resisted in every shape, and at every risk. There are no human spaniels tame enough to submit to it. If the interpretation is not correct, if it is overstrained, what lawyer has denied it? We know of none. It stands at present on the authority of men eminent in their profession, and speaking in their professional capacity; and it is unimpugned. The opinions of the lawyers, indeed, are extremely clear and definite. Mr. Vincent Scully, Q.C., having a case submitted to him to raise this identical question, says:—"I am clearly of opinion that all acts of jurisdiction or authority which any of the present Catholic Prelates of Ireland shall hereafter exercise under their bulls, briefs, or rescripts, will, in legal contemplation, be unlawful and void, although of a mere episcopal character and having no reference to any temporal right or matter such as the ordination of a Priest, and although the episcopal title of the Catholic prelate may be one that has not been used by any archbishop or bishop of the Protestant church. "Such was, in fact, the legal construction placed by Sir Fitzroy Kelley, and Messrs. Brodie and Badelay, in May last, upon that clause of the bill, which in substance corresponded with the second section of the bill as now passed. "Since then a recital was added, extending the act to all briefs, rescripts, or letters apostolic, by which the episcopal title and authority was conferred upon the PRESENT PRELATES of Ireland, and an additional clause was introduced (section I.), enacting in the plainest terms that:—"All such briefs, rescripts, or letters apostolic, and all and every the jurisdiction, authority, pre-eminence, or title, conferred, or pretended to be conferred thereby, are and shall be, and be deemed, unlawful and void." "Those subsequent alterations appear to have altogether removed any legal doubts which might possibly have arisen; had they not been inserted." Observe: the Ordination of a Priest is rendered illegal for the future; and also for the past, by the

recital which extends the Acts to the briefs, &c., constituting the existing Bishops.

Mr. Badeley, of the English Bar, concurs in Mr. Scully's opinion, and declares:—

"Whether, therefore, they confer holy orders, or grant faculties, or consecrate Churches, or hold visitations, or impose censures, or perform any other acts which are strictly official, though merely spiritual, those acts must directly emanate from, and be parcel of, that jurisdiction and authority which they possess under, and by virtue of those very instruments which the 1st section of this statute renders directly unlawful."

He then proceeds to affirm that the functions of a priest—the functions, for example, by which he may legally marry two Catholics, cannot be recognised in a court of law, because the jurisdiction and authority of the Bishop who created him a priest is declared unlawful:—

"I certainly do not see," he says, "how any court can give effect to an episcopal act or proceeding which depends upon a jurisdiction or authority declared to be unlawful and void. It will be easy to enumerate many instances in which questions of this nature may occasion very serious difficulties, such, for instance, as the granting of faculties, or the maintenance of necessary discipline amongst the clergy of a diocese by suspension or deprivation, &c., matters which may very probably be brought in various ways before the temporal courts; and though these courts may be willing in many cases to allow such episcopal acts, where an objection is not raised, or not supported by formal proof, yet in those which are sufficiently resisted, according to the rules of law, it seems to me that the objection must prevail, and the proceedings be treated as invalid."

A priest is a priest by right of his ordination; if the ordination be an unlawful act, it vitiate, as far as the law is concerned, every result flowing from it. "For" says Mr. Badeley, "there can be no doubt that if a statute positively declares that certain things shall be, and be deemed unlawful, it forbids the doing of these things; and if it forbids the things themselves, it forbids everything which is necessarily connected with them—Quando aliquid prohibetur, prohibetur omne per quod devenitur ad illud." (3 Co. Just., 158).

To these interpretations of the law, we repeat, no exception has been taken. The opinions of the Attorney and Solicitor General in Parliament were delivered before the insertion in the act of the recital extending it to existing bishops. It stands unanswered. If there be any answer, we demand it. While the law is presented to us in this aspect by competent authority, there is no one will presume to say that resistance is not a duty and a necessity. Whatever English or Irish Protestant denounces Catholic agitation while it stands so, virtually declares that we ought to submit to see our wives and children wronged in the most vital point that the law can reach.

It will be said Parliament intended nothing so monstrous as this. It is very likely. But what was intended was not of the smallest consequence; the law can only take note of what is done. And Messrs. Scully and Badeley tell us precisely what is done.

It is plain enough that this must be set right. Unequivocally, it must. However painful and degrading the operation may be, England will have to retrace her steps.—For there are scarcely anywhere we fancy, men made in God's image who will endure to see their wives and children disgraced while they have two arms each to protect them. We set aside for a moment the unjust and unprovoked attack on the Prelates of the Church, and take up the quarrel at the extreme point to which it is carried.—From this point England must fall back. It is maintainable neither by reason nor by force. Every family is a garrison against it. How far she will fall back remains to be seen, but a retreat or a collision is plainly involved in this new position.

The day may be postponed, but it cannot be evaded.—Suppose the middle classes look on in sullen silence for the present—let one act of injustice be done under the sanction of this law—let one Catholic marriage be declared invalid, for example, and it will soon be seen it was the stillness of gunpowder before the spark.

(From the Morning Chronicle.)

The principle of religious toleration presents a tolerably large and extensive front. There can, one would think, be no very great difficulty in recognising it at first sight: fine and imprisonment for doing a thing which is inherent in, and necessary to, the life of any given form of religious belief, requires a good deal of talk and explanation before it can be made to appear consistent with any intelligible theory of toleration. Toleration itself may not be right—persecution and compulsory religion may not be wrong.