

# THE STAR OF THE NORTH.

Truth and Right—God and our Country.

[Two Dollars per Annum]

R. W. Weaver Proprietor.

VOLUME 7.

BLOOMSBURG, COLUMBIA COUNTY, PA., THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1855.

NUMBER 3.

## THE STAR OF THE NORTH Is published every Thursday Morning, by R. W. WEAVER.

OFFICE—Up stairs, in the new brick building on the south side of Main street, third square below Market.  
TERMS—Two Dollars per annum, if paid within six months from the time of subscribing; two dollars and fifty cents if not paid within the year. No subscription received for a less period than six months: no discontinuance permitted until all arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the editor.  
ADVERTISEMENTS not exceeding one square will be inserted three times for one dollar and twenty-five cents for each additional insertion. A liberal discount will be made to those who advertise by the year.

## THE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE

### SPEECH OF HON. J. R. CHANDLER,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
January 11, 1855.

#### (CONCLUSION.)

"These important facts once proved, there is no difficulty in understanding how the Popes could naturally cite, in support of their sentences of excommunication and deposition against Princes, the divine power of binding and loosing, though not considering it as the sole title of that deposing power which they claimed. It is, in fact, evident that, at a time when constitutional law attached the penalty of deposition to excommunication or heresy, the Pope's sentence against such excommunicated or heretical Princes was grounded both on the divine right and on the human law. It was founded on the divine right, not merely in so far as it declared the Prince heretical or excommunicated, but still more in so far as it enlightened the conscience of his subjects on the extent and limits of the obligation arising from the oath of allegiance which they had taken to him. It was founded on human law, also, in so far as it declared the Prince deprived of his rights, in punishment of his remaining obstinately in heresy, or excommunication. It is obvious, also, why the Pope's sentence mentioned only the divine power of binding and loosing; for it was on that divine power that the sentence was really grounded, considered in its principal, direct and immediate object; for the deposition was effected by excommunication—its natural result, according to the constitutional law then in force."

While I have asserted, and with the little time allowed me, referred you to the authorities upon which my assertions rest, that the Popes of the middle age did not declare that their interference with the temporal powers of Kings and Emperors was authorized by their spiritual commissions, as Bishops of Rome; and that their antagonistic and summary proceedings towards offending sovereigns, with regard to their temporal powers of the latter, were authorized by a constitution formed by these sovereigns or their predecessors, I do not pretend to assert that the power was always rightly used. I do not deny ambitious or venal motives to the Popes. Nothing in my creed or their presents such a conclusion, and nothing in their conduct renders such a conclusion unreasonable. I only say that the spiritual power here is not in question, and there, and at that time, the power to depose—power humbly conferred—was never called in question by the deposed monarchs.

They admitted the constitutional right and power, though they may have called in question the justice of the act. With the justice of the proceeding I have nothing to do here, though I may be allowed to say that, however the Pope may have transgressed the rules of justice as between him and the deposed monarch, it is probable that, as between the monarch and the people, there was little occasion to suppose that any in justice had been done to the Prince, or much likelihood of hearing complaints from the latter. The Pope has struggled sometimes with sovereigns, but never with the sovereignty. He has exercised a power voluntarily placed in his hands by kings, and invoked by the people; and he has deposed the monarch, but not annihilated the subject. The Popes, in the fulfillment of what the consent of kings and the confidence of the people have made a duty, have released subjects from the oath of allegiance to the sovereign, but never have they released the sovereign from his coronation oath to respect, guard and rightly govern the people.

Because I have neither time nor space for such an inquiry, I do not pursue the subject in detail. I have taken the strongest case of the exercise of the power of deposing monarchs—which is now called the power of releasing subjects—and I have shown that the Pope did not rely upon the general spiritual power as head of the Christian Church for authority to depose the Emperor, but that he rested on, and was sustained by the constitution which authorized the election of an Emperor, and made orthodox one condition of holding the crown. And it would have been equally easy, generally less difficult, to have shown that every instance of such exercise of power by the Pope was authorized by the admitted constitution or acknowledged compact, provided that the offences of the prince had brought him within the operation of the laws, which all admitted to exist, and for the execution of which all turned to the Pope.

Now, as this kind of secular power had its origin in the consent of the sovereigns, at a particular time, and long after the apostolic age, it follows that not only could it not be carried with it the *jure divino*, which belongs to the spiritual power of the Bishop of Rome, but that the proof of the existence of the real

spiritual power would have been weakened by attempts to prove the right of deposing to be divine. At that time, then—at a time when men were the most willing to yield assent to such species of usurpation, as released Kings from a bad Emperor, and released subjects from bad Kings—at that time the divine right was not claimed, and the whole power of deposing rested upon the consent, not merely of the Kings, but of the deposed Princes themselves.

But it is charged that Roman Catholics even now admit the right of the Pope to interfere between subjects and their allegiance and between citizens and their duties to the republic, in some other form, since the power to depose Kings is no longer possible. I deny it. I have denied it for myself, plainly, clearly, specifically. But in this House, it is said that, though I may be exempted from the general censure of harboring the seeds and means of treason to this government in my breast, and warning them into germination by devotion, yet others are liable to the charge, and especially the church, the Roman Catholic church itself.

But the Roman Catholic church is represented by her Bishops, and therefore I turn to the statement of those having the means of knowing, and the right to make known the doctrines of that church, and ask the attention of the committee to the following remarks of the Right Rev. Dr. England:

"God never gave to St. Peter any temporal power, and authority to depose kings, any authority to interfere with political concerns. And any rights which his successors might claim, for any of those purposes, must be derived from some other source. A Roman Catholic has no further connection with the Pope than that he succeeds St. Peter—Peter had none of these rights—as a Roman Catholic, I know nothing of them in the Pope. He is equally a Pope with or without them."

In the early part of my remarks, I took occasion to say that would be my course, if, by any remarkable (but really impossible) concurrence of circumstances, the army and navy of the Pope should invade the country. Hear now how the Bishop of Charleston sustains my declaration:

"The American Constitution leaves its citizens in perfect freedom to have whom they please to regulate their spiritual concerns.—But if the Pope were to declare war against America, and any Roman Catholic, under the pretext of spiritual obedience, was to refuse to oppose this temporal aggressor, he would deserve to be punished for his refusal, because he owes to this country to maintain its rights; and spiritual power does not, and cannot, destroy the claim which the government has upon him. Suppose a clergyman of England were convicted for some crime—for instance Dr. Dodd—and he was ordered for execution: must the law be inoperative because the criminal is a clergyman? Think you that no one could be found in a Roman Catholic country to sentence, or to execute a sentence, upon a clergyman who was a criminal? All history testifies to the contrary. So, too, does all history show that, upon the same principle, Catholic kings and princes, and peers and people, have disobeyed improper mandates of the See of Rome, and have levied and carried on war against Popes, and still continued members of the church."

Mr. Chairman, I have thus shown that the church, in the middle ages, did not claim for the Pope the authority to exercise temporal power over other sovereigns, by the divine right, even when the exercise of that authority seemed to be so great a blessing to the people that it would scarcely seem wonderful if the people should have hailed it as of Divine origin. And I have shown that the best writers of the Catholic church, of later days, and of the present century, have, in like manner, denied that it was part of a Catholic's belief that the Pope possesses any power to depose Kings, or release subjects, or to violate faith with those who are or are not of the Catholic church. I now offer other proof that the church sets up no claim to such power. And before I do it, I may be permitted to say that, in pursuit of information with regard to the Catholic church, it has been my chance to converse with every rank and degree of her hierarchy—Pope, Cardinal, Nuncio, Archbishop, Bishop and Priest, and I never heard one of them claim any such power, and never heard one of them speak upon the subject who did not disavow any belief of its existence.

The vexed question of governing Ireland, and of granting to the people of that kingdom a part of the rights enjoyed by the subjects of Great Britain, has often led the British Parliament to inquire into the charges made against Roman Catholics, with reference to the asserted right of the Roman Pontiff to interfere with the internal affairs of other governments.

Three propositions were prepared and sent to the faculties of the principal Catholic universities in France and Spain; to the university of Paris, of Douay, of Louvain, of Acala, of Salamanca, and of Valladolid. I give the proposition and abstracts of the several answers.

Extracts from the declarations and testimonies of six of the principal universities of Europe, on the three following propositions, submitted to them at the request of Mr. Pitt, by the Catholics of London, in 1789:

#### THE PROPOSITIONS.

1. Has the Pope, or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, any civil authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence whatsoever, within the realm of England?

2. Can the Pope or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, absolve or dispense with his Majesty's subjects from their oath of allegiance, upon any pretext whatsoever?

3. Is there any principle in the tenets of the Catholic faith by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or other persons differing from them in religious opinions, in any transaction, either of a public or a private nature?

These propositions, honorable gentlemen will perceive, are skillfully drawn, and cover the whole ground of dispute; and the answer of every University addressed, is spread at large before the world. Solemn deliberation was had upon the propositions, from so respectable a source as Mr. Pitt, and all concur in declaring, that no man nor any body of men, of the Church of Rome, however assembled, has power to interfere with the affairs of other Kingdoms. I give the answers.

After an introduction, according to the usual forms, the sacred faculty of Divinity of Paris, answer the first query by declaring:

Neither the Pope, nor the Cardinals, nor any body of men, nor any other person of the Church of Rome, hath any civil authority, civil power, civil jurisdiction, or civil pre-eminence whatsoever in any Kingdom, and, consequently, none in the Kingdom of England, by reason or virtue of any authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence by Divine institutions inherent in, or granted, or by any other means belonging to the Pope or the Church of Rome. This doctrine the sacred faculty of divinity of Paris has always held, and upon every occasion maintained, and upon every occasion has rigidly proffered the contrary doctrines from her schools.

Answer to the second query.—Neither the Pope, nor the Cardinals, nor any body of men, nor any person of the Church of Rome, can, by virtue of the keys, absolve or release the subjects of the King of England from their oath of allegiance.

This and the first query are so intimately connected, that the answer of the first immediately and naturally applied to the second, &c.

Answer to the third query.—There is no tenet in the Catholic church, which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics or those who differ from them in matters of religion. The tenet that it is lawful to break faith with heretics, is so repugnant to common honesty and the opinions of Catholics that there is nothing of which those who have defended the Catholic faith against Protestants have complained more heavily, than the malice and calumny of their adversaries in imputing this tenet to them, &c., &c., &c.

Given at Paris, in the general assembly of the Sorbonne, held on Thursday, the eleventh day before the calends of March 1789. Signed in due form.

UNIVERSITY OF DOUAY, Jan. 5, 1789.

At a meeting of the faculty of Divinity of the University of Douay, &c., &c.

To the first and second queries the sacred faculty answers: That no power whatsoever, in civil or temporal concerns, was given by the Almighty, either to the Pope, the Cardinals, or to the church herself, and, consequently, that Kings and sovereigns are not, in temporal concerns, subject, by the ordinance of God, to any ecclesiastical power whatsoever, neither can their subjects, by any authority granted to the Pope or the Church, from above, be freed from their obedience, or absolved from their oath of allegiance.

This is the doctrine which the Doctors and Professors of Divinity hold and teach in our schools, and this all the candidates for degrees in Divinity maintain in their public theses, &c.

To the third question, the sacred faculty answers: That there is no principle of the Catholic faith, by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, who differ from them in religious opinions. On the contrary, it is the unanimous doctrine of Catholics, that the respect due to the name of God so called to witness, requires that the oath be invariably kept, to whomsoever it is pledged, whether catholic, heretic, or infidel, &c., &c., &c.

Signed and sealed in due form.

UNIVERSITY OF LOUVAIN.

The faculty of Divinity at Louvain, having been requested to give her opinion upon the questions above stated, does it with readiness—but struck with astonishment that such questions should, at the end of this eighteenth century, be proposed to any learned body, by inhabitants of a Kingdom that glories in the talents and discernment of its natives. The faculty being assembled for the above purpose, it is agreed, with the unanimous assent of all voices, to answer the first and second queries absolutely in the negative.

The faculty does not think it incumbent upon her in this place to enter upon the proofs of her opinion, or to show how it is supported by passages in the Holy Scriptures, or the writings of antiquity. That has already been done by Bossuet, De Marca, the two Barleays, Goldastus, the Pitheciuses, Argente, Widrington, and his Majesty, King James the First, in his dissertation against Bellarmine, and Du Perron, and by many others, &c.

The faculty then proceeds to declare that the sovereign power of the State is in no wise, (not even indirectly, as it is termed,) subject to, or dependent upon, any other power, though it be a spiritual power, or even though it be instituted for eternal salvation, &c.

That no man, or any assembly of men, however eminent in dignity and power, not even the whole body of the Catholic church, though assembled in general council, can, upon any ground or pretence whatsoever, weaken the bond of union between the sovereign and the people; still less can they absolve or free the subjects from their oath of allegiance.

Proceeding to the third question, the said faculty of Divinity (in perfect wonder that such a question should be proposed to her,) most positively and unequivocally answers: That there is not, and there never has been, among the Catholics, or in the doctrine, of the Church of Rome any law of principle which makes it lawful for Catholics to break their faith with heretics, or others of a different persuasion from themselves, in matters of religion, either in public or private concerns.

The faculty declares the doctrines of the Catholics to be, that the divine and natural law, which makes it a duty to keep faith and promises, is the same, and is neither shaken nor diminished if those with whom the engagement is made, hold erroneous matters of religion, &c., &c.

Signed in due form, on the 18th of November, 1789.

UNIVERSITY OF ALCALA.

To the first question it is answered: That none of the persons mentioned in the proposed question, either individually or collectively, in council assembled, have any right in civil matters; but that all civil power, jurisdiction, and pre-eminence, are derived from inheritance, election, the consent of the people, and other such titles of that nature.

To the second, it is answered in like manner: That none of the persons above mentioned have a power to absolve the subjects of his Britannic Majesty from their oaths of allegiance.

To the third question, it is answered:—That the doctrine which would exempt Catholics from the obligation of keeping faith with heretics, or with any other persons who dissent from them in matters of religion, instead of being an article of Catholic faith, is entirely repugnant to its tenets.

Signed in the usual form, March 17, 1789.

UNIVERSITY OF SALAMANCA.

To the first question, it is answered: That neither Pope nor Cardinals, nor any assembly or individual of the Catholic church, have, as such, any civil authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence in the Kingdom of England.

To the second, it is answered: That neither Pope nor Cardinals, nor any assembly or individual of the Catholic church, can, as such, absolve the subjects of Great Britain from their oaths of allegiance, or dispense with their obligations.

To the third, it is answered: That it is no article of Catholic faith, nor to keep faith with heretics, or with persons of any other description, who dissent from them in matters of religion.

Signed in the usual form, March 7, 1789.

UNIVERSITY OF VALLADOLID.

To the first question, it is answered: That neither Pope, Cardinals, or even a general council, have any civil authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, in the Kingdom of Great Britain, or over any other Kingdom or Province in which they possess temporal dominion.

To the second, it is answered: That neither Pope nor Cardinals, nor even a general council, can absolve the subjects of Great Britain from their oaths of allegiance or dispense with their obligations.

To the third, it is answered: That the obligation of keeping faith is grounded on the law of nature, which binds all men equally, without respect to their religious opinions; and with regard to Catholics it is still more cogent as it is confirmed by the principles of their religion.

Signed in the usual form, February 17, 1789.

Can anything be more explicit than the responses of these Universities? Ought they not to be satisfactory? I, perhaps, ought to rest here. Laymen, Priests, Bishop, Cardinal, and faculty of Divinity sustain my assertion, give a negative response to every query that involved an implication upon the patriotism of Catholics, or an inadmissible claim to intervention in natural policy by the Catholic Church.

So entirely satisfied was the British Parliament with these and similar responses, that the different concessions made to Roman Catholics by that body are mainly due to such testimony.

And, let it be remembered, that this was in Great Britain, in a British Parliament, where the members were of the established church, and also that, without special permission, no man in that Empire had a right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and none, not acknowledging in the monarch (man or woman, King or Queen) both temporal and spiritual sovereignty, could hold an office under Government, or sit in the parliament of the nation.

We, Mr. Chairman, are legislating for a country where even toleration may be deemed intolerant, where perfect equality of rights is the theory of the Government, and where, until now, no one has ventured to manifest a hostility to author's creed, by denying to him the right of national office, and of enjoying all the rights which full and perfect citizenship confers.

But the honorable gentleman from Massachusetts seems to have provided himself against such proof as I have adduced. He admits my fealty to the country, but denies my adherence to the Roman Catholic Church.

He admits that France and Spain have disclaimed the doctrine against which he speaks and which he imputes to the Roman Catholic Church. France and Spain, the titles of whose monarchs are most Christian and most Catholic. The honorable gentleman surely cannot be ignorant that such Universities—great theological colleges as those, are repositories of records of faith, and of the arguments and decisions concerning them.

But let us hear the honorable gentleman: "Mr. Banks. I plant myself upon the ground that the Pontiff of Rome has never, in any authoritative form, so disavowed the right of control the members of the Roman Catholic Church in secular matters. I know the universities of France and Spain have disclaimed it to him. So my Catholic friends have disclaimed it to me. But they have not the right to private opinion, much less the right to determine the faith of their church. That is the right of Protestant. The Roman Church has never disclaimed it."

I pass over the slur about judgment; it is undeserved and ought to be retaliated. The honorable gentleman then suspecting that Laymen, Priests, and Bishops, would declare that the church had no such articles of faith as he imputes, and being informed of the existence of those responses of the French and Spanish Universities, throws himself upon the Pope. "I plant myself," says he, "on the ground that the Pontiff of Rome has never, in any authoritative form, so disavowed the right to control the members of the Roman Catholic Church in secular affairs. Very well. He plants himself on what he calls a fact. Let us proceed upon Layman to Priest, from Priest to Bishop, from Bishop to Archbishop, from Archbishop to Universities. These are against the honorable gentleman, and, accepting the invitation or challenge of the gentleman from Massachusetts, let us plant ourselves upon the Pope himself, the Pope and his conclave of Cardinals."

Mr. Chairman, the same circumstances which induced that great statesman, Mr. Pitt, to address the six Catholic Universities, led the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Ireland to address the Pope himself on the subject, and the answer was as clear and explicit as those of the Universities. Solemn deliberation was given in the congregation of Cardinals, and the response was made in the most formal manner, as declaring the doctrine of the Catholic Church on the subject involved in the question. I copy from an authentic report:

"The Roman Catholic Archbishops of Ireland, at their meeting in Dublin, in 1794, addressed a letter to the Pope, wherein they described the misrepresentations that had been recently published of their consecration oath, and the great injury to the Catholic body arising from them. "After due deliberation at Rome, the congregation of Cardinals appointed to superintend the ecclesiastical affairs of these Kingdoms, returned an answer (of which the following is an extract) by the authority and command of his holiness:

"Most Illustrious and most Reverend Lords and Brothers: "We perceive from your late letter, the great uneasiness you labor under since the publication of a pamphlet entitled *The present state of the Church of Ireland*, from which your detractors have taken occasion to renew the old calumny against the Catholic religion with increased acrimony; namely: that *this religion is, by no means, compatible with the safety of Kings and Republics; because as they say, the Roman Pontiff being the father and master of all Catholics, and invested with such great authority, that he can free the subject of other Kingdoms from their fidelity and oaths of allegiance to Kings and Princes; he has it in his power, they contend, to cause disturbance and injure the public tranquility of Kingdoms, with case. We wonder that you could be uneasy at these complaints, especially after your most excellent brother and apostolic fellow laborer, the Archbishop of Castile, and other strenuous defenders of the rights of the Holy See, had evidently refuted and explained away these slanderous reproaches in their celebrated writings. In this controversy, a most accurate discrimination should be made between the genuine rights of the Apostolic See, and those that are imputed to it by innovators of this age for the purpose of calumniating. The See of Rome never taught that faith is not to be kept with the heretic; that an oath to Kings respects the Catholic communion, can be violated; that it is lawful for the Bishop of Rome to invade their temporal rights and dominions. We, too, consider an attempt or design against the life of Kings and Princes, even under the pretext of religion, as a horrid and detestable crime.*

"At the very commencement of the yet infant Church, blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, instructing the faithful, exhorted them in these words: *Be ye subject to every human creature for God's sake, whether it be to the Kings as excellent, or to governors as sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of the good; for so is the will of God, that by doing well you may silence the ignorance of foolish men.* The Catholic Church being directed by these precepts, the most renowned champions of the Christian name replied to the Gentiles, when raging against them, as enemies of the Empire, with furious hatred: *we are constantly praying (Turkish in Apology, chap. XXX) that all the Emperors may enjoy long life, quiet government, a loyal household, a brave army, a faithful Senate, an honest people, and general tranquility.*

The Bishops of Rome successors of Peter, have not ceased to inculcate this doctrine, especially to missionaries, lest any ill will

should be excited against the professors of the Catholic faith in the minds of those who are enemies of the Christian name. We pass over the illustrious proofs of this fact, preserved in the records of ancient Roman Pontiffs, of which yourselves are not ignorant. We think proper, notwithstanding, to remind you of the late admonition of the most wise Pope Benedict XIV., who in his regulations for the English missions, which are likewise applicable to you, speak thus: *The Apostolic are to take diligent care that the missionaries behave on all occasions with integrity and decorum, and thus become good models to others; and particularly that they be always ready to celebrate the sacred offices, to communicate proper instructions to the people, and to comfort the sick with their assistance; that they, by all means, avoid public assemblies of idle men and taverns.*"

*The vicars themselves are particularly charged to punish, in such manners as they can but severely, all those who do not speak of the public government with respect.*

"England herself can witness the deep-rooted impressions such admonitions have made on the minds of Catholics. It is well known that, in the late war, which had extended to the great part of America, when most flourishing provinces, inhabited by persons separated from the Catholic church, had pronounced the government of the King of Great Britain, the Province of Canada alone, filled, as it is, almost with innumerable Catholics, although artfully tempted, and not yet, forgetful of the French Government, remained most faithful in its allegiance to England. Do you, most excellent prelates, converse frequently on these principles; often remind your suffragan prelates of them; when preaching to your people, exhort them, again and again to honor all men, to love the brotherhood, to fear God, to honor the King."

"Those duties of a Christian are to be cherished in every Kingdom and State, but particularly in your own, of Great Britain and Ireland, where, from the benevolence of a most wise king, and other most excellent rulers of those Kingdoms, towards Catholics, no cruel and grievous burden is imposed, and Catholics themselves experience a mild and gentle Government. If you pursue this of conduct unanimously, if you act in the spirit of charity; if, while you direct the people to the Lord, you have nothing in view but the salvation of souls, adversaries will be ashamed (we repeat it) to calumniate, and will freely acknowledge that the Catholic faith is of heavenly descent, and calculated not only to procure a blessed life, but likewise, as St. Augustin observes, in his one hundred and thirty eighth letter, addressed to Marcellinus, to promote the most lasting peace of this earthly city, inasmuch as it is the safest prop and shield of Kingdom. Let those who say (the words are those of the holy doctor) that *the doctrine of Christ is hostile to the Republic, produce an army of soldiers as the doctrine of Christ is required; let them furnish such multitudes of provinces, such husbands, such wives, such parents, such children, such masters, such servants, such Kings, such judges, finally, such payers of debts and collectors of the revenue, as the doctrine of Christ enjoins, and then they may dare to assert that it is inimical to the Republic; rather not let them hesitate to acknowledge that it is, when practiced, of great advantage to the Republic.* The same holy doctor, and all the other fathers of the church, with one voice, most clearly demonstrate, by invincible arguments, that the whole of this salutary doctrine cannot exist in the Catholic society, which is spread and preserved all over the world, by communion with the See of Rome, as a sacred bond of union, divinely connecting both. From our very high esteem and affection for you, we earnestly wish that the great God may very long preserve you safe. Farewell."

As your lordship's most affectionate brother."

L. CARDINAL ANTONELLI, Prefect.

A. ARCHBISHOP OF ADEN, Sec.

Rome, June 23d, 1791.

While on the disavowal of the Pope, I may as well make an addition to assist in the testimony. The following document was drawn up by the Roman Catholic committee in Dublin, and published by them on the 17th of March, 1792, after it had been submitted to the archbishops and bishops of Ireland, and received their entire sanction—To give it greater weight, the same instrument was put into the form of an oath, retaining, as far as possible, the very words. It was then submitted to the Pope and Cardinals, who solemnly declared that it was consonant to, and expressive of, the Roman Catholic doctrine; and then it was taken by the Catholic archbishops, bishops, priests, and laity of Ireland.

"We the Catholics of Ireland, in deference to the opinion of many respectable bodies and individuals among our Protestant brethren, do hereby, in the face of our country, of all Europe, and before God, make this, our deliberate and solemn declaration: "We adjure disavow, and condemn the opinion, that Princes excommunicated by the Pope and council, or by any ecclesiastical authority whatsoever, may, therefore, be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or by any other persons. We hold such doctrine in detestation, as wicked and impious; and we declare that we do not believe that either the Pope, with or without the general council, or any prelate or priest, or any ecclesiastical power whatever, can absolve the subjects of this Kingdom, or any of them, from their allegiance to his Majesty King George III., who is, by authority of Parliament, the lawful King of this realm."

"We the Catholics of Ireland, in deference to the opinion of many respectable bodies and individuals among our Protestant brethren, do hereby, in the face of our country, of all Europe, and before God, make this, our deliberate and solemn declaration: "We adjure disavow, and condemn the opinion, that Princes excommunicated by the Pope and council, or by any ecclesiastical authority whatsoever, may, therefore, be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or by any other persons. We hold such doctrine in detestation, as wicked and impious; and we declare that we do not believe that either the Pope, with or without the general council, or any prelate or priest, or any ecclesiastical power whatever, can absolve the subjects of this Kingdom, or any of them, from their allegiance to his Majesty King George III., who is, by authority of Parliament, the lawful King of this realm."

"Mr. Chairman, one more word and I will

"2. We, injure, condemn, and detest as unchristian and impious, the principle that it is lawful to murder, or destroy, or in any way injure any person whatsoever, for or under the pretense of being heretic; and we declare solemnly before God, that we believe no act in itself unjust, immoral, or wicked, can never be justified or excused by or under the pretense or color that it was done either for the good of the church, or in obedience to any ecclesiastical power whatsoever."

"3. We further declare, that we hold it as unchristian and impious principle, that 'no faith is to be kept with heretics.' This doctrine we detest and reprobate, not only as contrary to our religion, but as destructive of morality, or society, and even of common honesty; and it is our firm belief, that an oath made to any person not of the Catholic religion, is equally binding as if it were made to any Catholic whatsoever."

"4. We have been charged with holding, as an article of our belief, that the Pope, with or without a general council, or that certain ecclesiastical powers, can acquit or absolve us before God from our oaths of allegiance, or even from the just oaths or contracts entered into between man and man."

"Now we utterly renounce, adjust, and deny that we hold or maintain any such belief, as being contrary to the peace and happiness of society, inconsistent with morality, and above all, repugnant to the true spirit of the Catholic religion."

Here, then, is another clear, explicit disavowal on the part of the Pope and his Cardinals of the doctrine imputed to the church, and another full and complete response to the challenge of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Chairman, the Roman Catholic church neither holds nor inculcates a doctrine of power in its head to interfere in the affairs of temporal Governments, to disturb the monarch, or release the subject. It never has taught that its professors were to be influenced by its doctrines, to combine against the Government, and Catholic citizens have been as faithful to the Government under which they lived as those of any other denomination of Christians. In this country, Mr. Chairman, where, by the nature of our institutions, no creed is allowed to be molested, and where by constitutional provision, no advantage can be allowed the professor of a creed on account of that profession, how unjust is it to the public, how cruel to the confessors of a creed, to create and keep alive an excitement which involves in obnoxious a large class of citizens invested with every right that any American citizen can claim, who are able, by their talents, character attainments and patriotism, to do honor to the citizenship which they are not allowed to enjoy. I must not be told that 'all the rights of citizenship are open to Catholics, when office is denied.' The man who asserts that, is ignorant of the first impulse of republicanism—ignorant, I venture to say, of the strongest motives of his own action.

The right of suffrage is connected with the right to office, and the freemen's privilege of voting for the man whom he would elect, would not be worth the exercise, if it did not include the right of presenting himself for votes for any office whose functions are not beyond his faculties.

From a class of citizens, air, in this country, with any disability not imposed upon others, and you create a dangerous party in the Commonwealth. Inequality of political condition can only be maintained in a Republic where there is inequality of mind talents, and attainment. Allow to any class in this country the rights of education, the attainment of wealth, the right of social equality, of suffrage, and it will not be long before that class will demand the boon that freemen seek, and denial will be unsafe.

"It is mean, it is cowardly, as well as false, for any man, or set of men, to assert that in combining to exclude all Catholics from office, they do no more than exercise the right not to vote for individuals, which is as clear as the right to vote for them."

"Sir if the opposition seen and felt abroad, and heard here, in this Hall, means anything more than a miserable, beggarily appeal to law prejudices, with a view of holding office, it means that Catholics ought to be excluded from all offices; and if they are because they are Catholics, ineligible to place, then, those who assert it are bound to change the Constitution, or openly violate its provisions. Will that be done?—Will they have courage to do it? They must do it to be consistent. They must forbear to be honest—a much more difficult effort."

"Will that be done, and the question of the constitutional rights settled? or shall the Catholic Christian hear himself insulted, as he has been more than once here, with the offensive imputation which I have endeavored to refute? Shall the heart of the American Catholics be wounded with stale rumors—rumors revived for party action—uncredited tales to their dishonor, or hypothetical charges of concealed treason, which, while they return upon no specification, disturb the public mind, awaken slumbering prejudices, sharpen religious animosities, and give occasion for the mean, the ignorant, and the vulgar ambitious to rise in power, by the combination of their own class with those who, falling in other combinations, hide their disgrace, and avenge their former defeat by such associations as make minorities contemptible in themselves, and render majorities dangerous to the Republic."

"Mr. Chairman, one more word and I will