



CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

VOL. VI.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JUNE 6, 1856.

NO. 43.

REV. WM. MILWAINE'S REPLY.

Continued from our last.

Belfast, April 25, 1856.

TO THE REV. DR. CAHILL.

Rev. Sir—Your reply to my letter of Tuesday last, as published in the *Ulsterman* of this day, is before me, and I claim permission to offer a few remarks on its contents.

To the puerility of your insinuation, as to my being unable to spell correctly a common English word of two syllables, I trust it is unnecessary that I should make any reply: the good sense of the people of Belfast, both Romanists and Protestants, among whom more than twenty years of my life have been spent, will know how to estimate this portion of your bombastic epistle. No, good Sir, this will not answer your purpose. I offered to you a fair challenge; you are preparing a retreat. Indeed, you have virtually run away already, and in close accordance with your old habits, you think to do so in a cloud of Billinggate and mystification. Let me tell you that you are too far north, at present, for the success of such attempts, as I hope to prove to the public and even to yourself.

It appears, then, that you decline to meet me in open, fair, theological discussion. At this I am by no means surprised. You dare not bring your new and false creed to the light of day and of God's Word. You prepare to ensconce yourself behind your earthworks of science, falsely so-called, rather than come out to the field of open controversy.—Dr. Cahill, you may mystify and abuse as you please, but you have run away, and this your co-religionists, as well as yourself, shall feel before I have done with you.

You condescend to tell us how you would have conducted the controversy, in case you had accepted my challenge. Thank you. "In the first place," you say, "in order to establish a peculiar advantage to myself in future positions between us, I would deny the inspiration, the authenticity, and the inspiration of all the Scriptures." (Sic.) To be sure you would. It is just the old trick of Rome, and you would, no doubt, have given it with effect. But what, I ask, will the intelligent members of the Church of Rome think of all this, and of the subsequent blasphemy against Divine truth with which you have swelled your runaway epistle? So, then, the peculiar vantage-ground of your Church against the Church of Christ is the denial of all that God has revealed to man, as most precious and necessary to salvation. Yes, there you are, on your own chosen and proper platform, alongside the scoffer and the infidel, in your miserable attempt to overthrow the foundations of the Christian faith.

Well, then, having declined the field of theological controversy, you entrench yourself, as you fondly dream, in the fortress of historical research. Dr. Cahill, in my opinion, you know as much about history as you do of science or of true religion either. You talk about Henry VIII., his plunder of your convents, and the revenues of eight millions and a half a year of the Church Establishment. If that execrable tyrant did plunder those nests of moral pollution, and hordes of Church cupidity, I leave you and him to settle accounts between yourselves, well knowing (as you ought also) that he lived and died, if not a thorough Romanist, at least something between that sect and an infidel. And before you undertake to ventilate your false exaggerations of England's Church, just go and study the history, the statistics, and the revenues of that awful system of which you are professedly a priest, and when you have done justice to the true character of that barlot Church, "arrayed in purple and scarlet color, and decked with the gold, precious stones, and pearls" of universal spoliation, then begin to throw stones at a sound branch of Christ's Catholic and Apostolic Church.

I shall not, however, waste any more time in the exposure of your fallacies, but return to the subject which originated the correspondence. It is quite plain that you fear to meet me on the ground proposed in my former letter. Perhaps the following may suit you better:—I undertake to prove, before any number of respectable witnesses, Romanists and Protestants of equal numbers—

1. That the creed of the present Church of Rome in Ireland is neither that of the ancient Christian Church, nor yet of the ancient Irish Church, but, on the contrary, a modern amalgamation of anti-Christian error.

2. That the Protestant Reformed Irish Church is a legitimate successor of the ancient Christian Church of this country, the Church of Patrick, and Columb, and Aidan; while the Romish hierarchy and priesthood in Ireland constitute a modern intrusion, their system being a corrupt importation of the Italian anti-Christian sect.

Now, Sir, you have told us what you would do, had you accepted my challenge; I tell you, here, what,

with God's help, I will do, if you continue to evade this my second proposal. During your stay in Belfast, I mean to invite the attendance of my fellow-townsmen in that very hall where you are now ostentatiously vending your scientific lore, and discuss before them, both Protestants and Romanists, the propositions from the discussion of which you are so shamefully skulking. A seat shall be set for yourself—and I shall, then and there, expose not alone the soul-destroying errors and unfounded pretensions of your false system, but bring into the light of the day, and before an intelligent assembly of the inhabitants of Ulster, the miserable mis-statements, the deliberate historical perversions, and the blood-thirsty appeals of those inflammatory addresses, past and current, whereby you have so long endeavored to stir up strife and rebellion in this country. If you choose to attend, you shall have a fair opportunity of reply; if not, the public will be the better able to form a judgment of your real character.—I remain, Rev. Sir, your obedient, &c.,

W. MILWAINE,  
Minister of St. George's.

To Rev. Dr. Cahill.

DR. CAHILL'S GREAT LETTER.

TO THE REV. W. MILWAINE.

Royal Hotel, Belfast, April 29.

Rev. Sir—The public voice of this town and this province declare that you make an annual exhibition, as in the present instance, of certain rancorous attacks against the creed and practices of your Catholic neighbors; it is even said that your weekly addresses are correct abridgments of the persecuting harangues of your ancestors of the sixteenth century. You are quite right always to select the month of April for these public lectures and letters; it is an appropriate time for your correspondents to reply to you. I do not think, however, that you are entirely so great a "fool" as some people think you to be; for, although you cannot spell well, as the Editor of the *Ulsterman* has again proved from your second letter to me, you have sense enough to evade the question which a literary opponent fairly puts to you, and which every reader in Belfast (who has read my reply to your challenge) sees you can leave unanswered; while in your usual empty braggadocio, you again challenge me to meet you before your jury.—But you are caught in your swagger; you are, as your species ever have been, a hollow bully, and, as a matter of course, a mean, ignorant, shrinking coward when your antagonist appears before you on the ground.

You have called me a maligner of your Church; I said no, no, *not a maligner*; and I gave you reference to the historians and pamphleteers from whom I took the extracts, and the facts of my public letter to Lord Carlisle. In the face of the scholars of Belfast, where there are many men of learning, I freely admit, and in the presence of the host of books, which I cited, you repeat your original falsehood with dishonorable contumacy. Shame on you, Sir, to make a charge of "malignity;" and then, when you are confronted with the evidence of forty-one historians, whom I have named, you degrade your name, and you lessen the eminence of your brethren in your profession, by reiterating your former unsupported and contradicted assertion. You, in fact, repeat a charge which you know to be a falsehood, and which is proved to be a falsehood; and I am now at liberty, if I please, to insult you; and with the consent of this entire city, of every denomination, to write on the door of the pulpit of Saint George's, that the preacher, before he enters it, ought to wash his mouth and wipe out the visible, the thick, the palpable stain of historical falsehood, before he can make any reasonable men of his congregation believe one word of his assertions, in his hebdomadal bigotry, against the inoffensive worship of his peaceful neighbors.

And, pray, why did you not reply to my second position, in reference to the inspiration of the Scriptures? Your religion, in the year 1856, and, indeed, these some years past, is confined to the sole point of "reading the Scriptures"—in fact, the Bible is your Church. And your Bible-readers, in their bribing the poor, call on these creatures to "read the Scriptures," but, invariably, never insist in their believing in them, or practising their injunctions. In all the Bible meetings of which I have ever read, I declare I have never seen the idea of "belief and practice" put forth; it is all to "read! read! read!" and the result is, that the great mass of these people think that the mere reading the Sacred volume, and that the mere belief in the historical existence of Christ, is the sum of Christian duty. I repeat, Sir, this book, without a Sacrament, without a Priest, without a Bishop, is your entire Church. There is no use in talking of English Church or of Irish Church, or of any Church. This sacred book is, in your creed, the one essential practice which saves the

soul. Now, Sir, this book being so important to you, I asked you, how could you, as a Protestant, prove to an inquirer—

Firstly—Whether this volume was a human invention or a revelation from God?

Secondly—Whether the writers named in it really did or did not write it?

Thirdly—Whether the volume contains every word they originally wrote on the subject?

Fourthly—Whether additions or subtractions were made by any persons, during the lapse of all the past Christian ages.

Fifthly—Whether attested copies have been taken of the original autograph of these writers; and whether these copies have been kept, without any alteration, abrasion, interpolation, or interlineation?

And, sixthly—I asked on what proof do you rest the assertion, that the *Holy Ghost* inspired the writers to give it to mankind—as the immediate revelation of God!

I asked these questions in my reply to you. The entire city has read that reply, and has seen the questions which I put to you. I will venture also to add, that the entire population expected that the celebrated orthographist, preacher, elocutionist, controversialist, and April-exhibitionist of St. George's would say something in defence (not *defense*) of his Church—namely, the Bible. Although no human being ever heard of a book being a Church till lately, still such being the theory of the thing, we Catholics, and, as I am told, all your admirers (?), the Protestants? and, as it is further hinted, all your former friends, the Presbyterians—all, all expected that you would come forth, in your usual brilliant style, like the gorgeous sunrise of a May morning, to make a burning reply to me on this vital point of your creed; when, lo! you replied to me, like Paddy Blake's echo in Killarney—that is, when Paddy shouted out on the hills of Killarney, "How do you do, Paddy Blake?" the echo replied, "Very well, I thank you." Of course, this was a reply from the echo which the greatest admirers of the echo never expected.

In fact, Sir, so did you give to me an answer which no man living could have believed, if they did not read it from under your own hand. For the very fun of the thing, I shall quote this reply *in extenso*; and I undertake to say, that this unexpected response far surpasses the Killarney echo of Paddy Blake.—I should not wonder if the wits of this town called your sermons and letters, in future, "the echoes of Paddy Blake." Here, Sir, is your reply (?) to my questions, as every one in this town call tell with a smile:—

"You condescend to tell us how you would have conducted the controversy, in case you had accepted my challenge. Thank you. 'In the first place,' you say, (in order to establish a peculiar advantage to myself in future positions between us 'I would deny the authenticity and the inspiration of all the Scriptures.' To be sure you would. It is just the old trick of Rome, and you would, no doubt, have given it with effect. But what, I ask, will the intelligent members of the Church of Rome think of all this, and of the subsequent blasphemy against Divine truth with which you have swelled your runaway epistle? So, then, the peculiar vantage-ground of your Church against the Church of Christ is the denial of all that God has revealed to man, as most precious and necessary to salvation. Yes, there you are, on your own chosen and proper platform, alongside of the sceptic, the scoffer, and the infidel, in your miserable attempts to overthrow the foundations of the Christian faith."

This reply has not a word of an answer to my questions, as is evident; I shall, therefore, leave you to the sneers of the reader, and proceed to other positions of your Biblical character.

From an extract of a sermon of yours called—"Questions for Roman Catholics," your printed bill has the following words:—

"4. What must be the practice in that Church which sanction *Tax Books*, wherein tables are set forth, with rates regularly drawn up, at which crimes are to be paid for—as for example, 'For the murder of a father, mother, brother, sister, or wife, each,'—£4 1s 8d., while 'for striking a Priest,' it is £6 2s 2d., and 'for striking a Bishop or Archbishop,' £24 6s? And will any Roman Catholic deny the existence of such Books?"

"6. What must be the standard of practice in that Church which declares the Pope to be 'God's Viceregent on Earth,' and 'the Vicar of Jesus Christ,' and which yet has numbered among her Pontiffs, according to Cardinal Banonius himself, monsters, portents, thieves, robbers, assassins, magicians, murderers, barbarians, and perjurers?"

With great respect to the Protestant Bishop of Belfast, this sermon is a disgrace to his diocese; and when you once offend with impunity, truth, and com-

mon decency in these flagitious statements from a pulpit, you take a license to utter increased filth as you proceed in your missionary duties!

In fact, you have been permitted for a long time to run riot in this town, maligning the creed of Catholics in your foul speeches from your pulpit; and because you knew that no priest could accept the challenge of any modern novelist in religion, or expose his old legitimate title—possessed upwards of eighteen hundred years—to be scrambled for by a set of Evangelical Revolutionists, without a name, a religion, or a church; because no priest here, or elsewhere, could leave his holy sanctuary to meet an insane Swaddler in the streets calling for fight outside our churches, you have at length assumed a maniac phrenzy, akin to insolence, towards all creeds, as well Presbyterian and Unitarian, as Catholic. And while your former bearers have left you, and your former friends are ashamed of you, and the different religionists of this city are disgusted with you, you have compelled me, a stranger, to brand you with ignorance, and to treat you with my contempt and my scorn; firstly, for having gratuitously and malignantly assailed me; and, secondly, for having shifted in an ignorant subterfuge from the plain questions which I put to you—viz., "Whether your scriptures are a human invention, or the revelation of God?" No one can injure the creed to which you belong more than you can by your loathsome epistles; and I feel quite assured that your bishop could render no greater service to the interests of his profession, or to the good feeling of the city, than to keep you at home, at Windsor, for some time, till you have recovered from the dream of your absurd pretensions. In the meantime, if you would apply yourself to Walker's Dictionary, and learn to spell common English, you would not in future be made the butt of public ridicule to the composers of your manuscript, or have your letters and bad spelling carried about the town as a jibe among the Catholics. Everything seems to go wrong with you. Spelling, logic, theology, history, charity—all turn sour, once they enter your literary laboratory; your creed, too, must undergo a foul alteration while it escapes from your exposition. The words of the celebrated Pope to Dr. Dunne, the Milwaine of his day, may be well applied to you—

Faith passed through him, no longer is the same;  
As food digested, takes another name.

So, Sir, without replying to my questions, fairly put, you send me a second challenge to meet you before your jury, where, you say, you will prove "that the Protestant Reformed Irish Church is the legitimate successor of the ancient Christian Church of this country, the Church of Patrick, and Columb, and Aidan." You will soon see my letters to the English Reform anti-Church, "Protestant Association," in which I undertake to prove to demonstration that you have no Church, no Christian worship, no ministry, no Christian creed, in fact, no one mark of the essential Christian Revelation. For your instruction, and for the advantage of Catholics, I shall here state the grounds on which I shall join the labors of this powerful, rising party in England, which party will leave the Protestant preachers in Ireland something to do besides maligning the Catholics, bribing the poor, teaching perjury, and spreading discord amongst all classes of Irishmen.

Firstly—Then so far from your Church being the successor of any Church heretofore in existence, you have no Church. A Christian Church, according to all definitions, is "a congregation of Christians, professing the same doctrines, under the government of God, and instructed and led by lawful pastors on earth." If this definition be correct, you have not at present, or, indeed, never had, a Church. In the first place, you never had a congregation professing the same doctrine. In fact, the thing is morally impossible on your principles. Your essential proposition, as Protestants, is to leave every man to follow his own private judgment in the interpretation of Scriptures; with this first principle, as a Protestant axiom, you cannot have any one Protestant congregation in all mankind, who will believe the same doctrine. The license of all the congregation to believe as each man wishes, essentially excludes unity of belief; unity in any abstract principle, except the truths of mathematics, necessarily requires a governing principle, to coerce individual opinions; this principle being removed, and individuals being left to their opinions, it follows, as a matter of course, that the ignorance of some, the prejudices of others, the vicious bent of a third class, the want of grace, in a fourth, the obstinacy of a fifth section, the natural opposition of a sixth, and so on through all classes, will ultimately have the effect of producing a variety of opinions which clearly excludes the idea of "a congregation believing the same doctrine."

And the history of your creed proves the truth of this primary position. You never had a congregation united in the same doctrine. Within the three hun-