



CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

VOL. VI.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MAY 30, 1856.

NO. 42.

Dr. Cahill's letters to the Earl of Carlisle, three of which we have already had the pleasure of laying before our readers, have given rise to the following controversial correspondence betwixt a Protestant minister of the Parliamentary sect, of the name of Mr. Milwaine, and the learned Catholic champion. We are again indebted to the *Dublin Weekly Telegraph*—

TO THE REV. DR. CAHILL, & C.

Rev. Sir—You are at present assuming two different, and, as I hope to demonstrate, inconsistent and opposite characters. While the walls of this town are pompously placarded with your name as a lecturer on science, those of the metropolis are covered with advertisements of your lectures addressed to his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, on what you are pleased to designate the "spoliation, cruelty, banishment, woe, and blood" inflicted by the Church of which I am a Minister, on the people of Ireland.—It is, perhaps, unnecessary that I should remind you of certain other of your written statements, wherein you have appeared as the insulter of all that is worthy of respect in the Church and State of this land, and the apostle of sanguinary cruelty, in the strife between this country and her Continental neighbors, which you, at that period, seemed exultingly to anticipate. In a word, while professing to indoctrinate the people of this Protestant town with the truths of science, you are elsewhere known as the vender of the gross-est insults to Protestantism in general, as well as among the most insulting maligners of the Protestant United Church of England and Ireland in particular.

Permit me to tell you, thus publicly, that I consider such conduct as a *ruse*. You know, perfectly well, that the Romish system, whose Priest you are, is on its trial and defence in this country. Hence, your endeavor to divert public attention from the above important fact. So far as you are concerned, I purpose, with God's help, that this fact shall not be unknown or unfelt; and, in order that the *truth* of which I here state may be tested, make the following proposal.

It was my privilege, during the late season of Lent, as on many other occasions, to deliver, in this town, a series of public lectures, in which the following proposition was stated and maintained—viz., 'that the present Church of Rome is neither the Mother and Mistress of all Churches, nor any portion of the true Church of Christ.' This statement was sustained by proofs and illustrations drawn from her history, her new and false creed, her unscriptural and anti-Christian doctrines, her sinful and demoralizing practices, her absurd and superstitious formularies, her treatment of Holy Scripture, and, finally, from her latest unholy dogma—The Immaculate Conception. Now, Sir, I hereby undertake to maintain the affirmative of the above proposition, on each and all of the alleged grounds, and invite you to undertake the negative, before any number of respectable witnesses, selected equally from members of the Church of Rome and of the Protestant religion.

When a similar proposal was made to the priests of your Church in this town, by myself, on another occasion, it was declined, on the plea of want of time and inclination. I hope your scientific pursuits will not have so occupied your leisure as to preclude your complying with a demand which seems, to me at least, not only reasonable, but necessary, in order that you may be able to maintain a character for common consistency, as well with others as with the members of your own religion.

Waiting your reply, I remain, Rev. Sir, your obedient, &c.

WILLIAM MILWAINE,
Minister of St. George's.

Belfast, April 23, 1856.

REV. DR. CAHILL'S REPLY.

TO THE REV. W. MILWAINE.

Royal Hotel, Belfast,
April 24, 1856.

Rev. Sir—In your *badly-spelled* letter of yesterday you remind me of the conduct of the celebrated Paddy Byrne, the Irish schoolmaster. When Paddy was overcome in literary conflict with a neighboring Philomath, Paddy challenged his antagonist to fight; and thus settle at once, in the ring, the rules of double and single entry, in book-keeping, the doctrine of gunnery, in plain trigonometry, and the binomial theory in Algebra. Rev. Sir, you must have been carried away in a sublime reverie on those splendid Lenten Lectures you have delivered at St. George's, when you decided on inviting me to a discussion on the *doctrines* of religion, as an answer to my *historical* letters to the Earl of Carlisle; or, like the vanquished Paddy Byrne, you challenge me to fight you, on the *Gospel*, by way of meeting my quotations on the *history* of England. Surely, whether my

Church be right or wrong in her belief of the Mass, the Supremacy of the Pope, and the Seven Sacraments, this faith of ours can have no connection with the plunder of her convents by Henry VIII., the revenues of eight millions and a half a year of your Church Establishment, or the incredible lies of your Souper emissaries (in reference to Catholicity) all over Europe. These are the subjects on which I have already several times professed to write to Lord Carlisle, and I have more than once disclaimed in these letters any intention of discussing the *doctrines* of your church. If you think that the people of Belfast do not set a just value on your pulpit discourses, or, if you fancy that they are forgotten by an indiscriminating congregation, you should have devised in your cleverness some other more plausible pretext of keeping your fame alive, and of stimulating the public dormant taste of this city, than by forming the thin, gauzy plan of republishing your religious controversy, by way of an appropriate, pertinent reply, to extracts taken by me from the history of England.

It appears you intend, during this Gospel conflict of yours, to bring me to an account for some sentence written by me some years past, in reference to the feelings of France towards England. By this statement of yours, I find that the minister of St. George's, who implores God's help to meet me, can read and believe a calumny of me, but has no time to spare from these sacred duties of his, to read my answer to this palpable slander, or to examine the English journals of the time alluded to, which journals acknowledged *their mistake* in their meaning of the sentence referred to. In that sentence I warned the Prime Minister of England to make friends of the Irish as France was hostile to England; and I raised a warning voice against the danger, not an exulting one in its future reality, as the reverend minister of Saint George, of *orthographical celebrity*, would fain impress on the Protestants of Belfast. Remember, reverend sir, you have commenced your most gratuitous and most unwarrantable correspondence with me; and rely upon it you will not add much to your prestige by its publication. Now, Sir, what will the Protestants of this city think of their champion when I assure them that, since my ordination, I have never, either directly or indirectly, uttered in the pulpit one word of disrespect, either to the personal character or the conscientious belief of Protestants. In fact, the Irish Bishops of Ireland would not tolerate this conduct; if I were so disposed, I dare not do it; and I hereby challenge a contradiction, *even in one instance*, to this statement.

'True, I have written, in public letters, the appalling disclosures made at the Oxford commission since Prince Albert became the Chancellor of the University. I have often repeated the evidence given on that occasion by ninety-seven ministers, fellows, ex-fellows, and bishops, in which evidence it is stated that the moral character of the University is reduced to the lowest standard of vice; that the divinity students have had no theological training; and that their professional learning is so limited as to excite the contempt of society. And, Sir, judging from the specimens which we behold every day in Ireland of the same professional class, one feels himself, as it were, thrown back to the days of Swift, who said (himself a Protestant clergyman) that the young Protestant gentlemen in Ireland, who had not sufficient talent for the learned professions, were in large numbers "fortunately admitted into the Church."—At this point I make a distinction between the clergy of the state and the ministers of the Presbyterian and Unitarian denominations. I believe it is admitted in this province that the latter are men of sound and extended learning, while it is asserted with confidence that the former seem to be the exact originals who sat before Swift when he painted the copy, which I have just now presented to you for your appropriate acceptance.

In the course of my life, and in all the letters I have written on political and polemical subjects, I have never—as I can now recollect—penned, in these letters, taken in the aggregate, a sentence of *personal acerbity*; and when the public of Belfast, of all denominations, will read the letter of the Minister of St. George's, in which he applies to me—without a proof—the words, "*vender* of the grossest insults—the most insulting maligner"—I fancy that your admirers—however they may forgive your other faults of style—will blush for shame when they see you *cease to be a gentleman*; and will refuse to acknowledge you an instructor from the pulpit, when they behold you descend from your clerical eminence to indulge in my regard in what I denominate—firstly, an unchristian malignity; and, secondly, an unqualified falsehood. If this be, Reverend Sir, the mode of Gospel argument which you assert you will adopt, with the help of God, in your discussion with me, I presume there are no twelve gentlemen in Belfast who

would consent to be the arbiters on your side, and listen to such foul and unmerited personal vituperation.

In my letters to the Earl of Carlisle I quoted the facts of authenticated history. I do not remember having uttered a sentiment of my own. I have been a faithful copyist of the writings of a host of historians and pamphleteers of the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries; and I explained to the Lord Lieutenant (who has been my correspondent with great kindness, in London, on a question of great public interest), that the object of my letters was to abate the malignity of sectarian rancor, and to heal the wounds of Ireland. If you were a scholar, which I have reason to believe you are not, from your letter, you would have asked and demanded the authorities from which I wrote; and if you found me quoting falsely, I would then deserve your foul speech; and the public would applaud you, in place of crying shame, which is, on this day, as I am informed, the scolding exclamation of every impartial man of the population. Now, in order to brand you with falsehood, I shall give you the names of the historians from whom I have taken my extracts; and I then leave the historians of Belfast and of the empire to judge of the honor and the learning and the good breeding of the minister of St. George's; and they cannot fail to be convinced who is the "*vender* of gross falsehood," and who is the "*insulting maligner*."

The historians and writers referred to are—Tanner, Whethamsted, Mallet, Drake, Turner, Bates, Archdall, Spelman, Collier, Whitaker, Dalrymple, Fennel Saunders, Harding, Stapleton, Reynolds, Bristow, Allen, Kellison, Worthingham, Champney, Talbot, Ward, Hatton, Dodd, Challoner, Milner, Fletcher, Baker, Heylin, Collier, Fuller, Mason, Strype, Rymer, Bramhall, Stowe, Fuller, Lingard, Higgon, Cobbett. I wish to inform you that I have visited no library in this town. I believe there is no library here which contains these historical references. I have endeavored to *recollect* the books which I have read in my preparation for my forthcoming series of letters; and, although I may not have placed their names in the order of the times they lived, nor have stated which are the Protestants and Catholics here quoted, I pledge myself to the main case of my reading in these books every fact which I have adduced, or intend to adduce, in my future letters on the subject. The public of Belfast, who know you, and many of whom are acquainted with the depth of your literary pretensions, will stamp you a mean coward, an unprincipled libeller, and as a hollow braggadocio, if you cannot contradict, on historical grounds, the position which I have taken. You have maligning me before this city; I have given you my authorities, Sir, on what I have said; and I demand from you the proof of your assertions, or a retraction of your foul ungentlemanly expressions; or your friends will brand you with a name which I shall forbear to utter.

So you invite me, too, to a public discussion, where a jury, made up of Catholics and Protestants, will decide between us, on the superior merits of our respective creeds. Upon my word, Sir, I had no idea of the learning of the Protestants of Belfast being so extensive, till I had read this part of your erudite composition; I feel quite convinced, from the essential nature of the task, that no jury of Catholics could be found in this city equal to the task.

In the first place (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. I could not be prevailed on to believe them, till your Protestant jury would swear that they saw *Moses write* the Pentateuch, and that they were *present* when Jehovah called Aaron, and ordered Moses to lead the Israelites out of Egypt. They should also swear that they saw Saint Paul write all his epistles, and that they knew his handwriting; that they were intimately acquainted with the four Evangelists, and were living on the island of Patmos when Saint John had the vision of the Apocalypse. As the Scriptures contain a great portion of the law of God, and their inspiration must be established by infallible evidence before any reasonable man can risk the salvation of his soul on their contents, no other argument can be taken as an evidence in its defence. Some *living men* must bear testimony in its favor—a clever thing this, Sir, for your jury to accomplish.

Secondly—After having proved the signatures of Moses, the Prophets, and the Evangelists, and Saint Paul, they must swear, that, from the time of Moses up to April the 24th, 1856, the day of the receipt of your accomplished letter (being a period of about 3,000 years), no man living, either Jew, Russian, Ninevite, Babylonian, Egyptian, Greek, Roman, Mahomedan, or Hun, or any succeeding class of men in Europe, Asia, Africa, or America, could introduce *one line* or word of alteration in case, in mood, in

tense, in interpolation, in substitution, or in translation—a hard task this, rev. sir, for your assistants.

Thirdly—Your jury must be finished in Hebrew, Syriac, Chaldaic, in order to prove that they know every word of the Old Testament, and cannot be imposed on by the manuscript writers, from the time of Moses up to the time of printing, in the fourteenth century—a great amount of knowledge this, Sir.

Fourthly—They must be minutely acquainted with Greek, in order to bear testimony whether the English version be correct; whether the difference of our translation and yours is in our favor or not; and whether your metaphorical meaning in some instances, or our obvious interpretation is to be preferred—a nice point this, Sir.

Fifthly—They must also decide whether at the time of your separation, in the sixteenth century, there were *two true Churches*, or only *one*, or *no Church*—because if there were two, then, of course, we are both right, and you ought not to abuse us; if there was but *one*, then, in that case, we had possession of it, and your ancestors were wrong to leave it; and if there was *no true Church* at all on earth at that time, it is inconceivable how a new Church could rise out of no Church, or where the materials of this new Church could be procured, when the entire old fabric of the old building had totally disappeared from the earth. I assure you, Sir, each one of your Belfast jury must be nearly equal to yours in talent and erudition in order to decide those knotty points.

Sixthly—If your jury cannot prove that they saw Moses, the Prophets, and the Evangelists write, they must demonstrate that the attested copies of their writings and signatures have been transmitted through ages and endorsed by unsuspected testimony through all time up to the present day. Will you say, Sir, where is this unerring testimony of unbroken, transmitted evidence to be found. It cannot be found in your redoubted Protestant panel referred to; neither can it be discovered in their predecessors in faith, because that faith was not in existence till within some few years ago. Hence your jury of St. George's cannot prove to any inquiring Christian, whether your Bible is a human invention, or the Word of God; and your mouth is shut, your "*pulpit silent*," and your "*occupation gone*," the moment a scholar asks you to point out to him in *inspired Scripture*. In fact, you have no such chain of evidence in your Church; you must kneel at our feet to beg the proof of this primary point, from the unbroken chain of our permanent speaking authorities; and when you parade your Bible in your meetings and your churches, you should write on the title page—"We receive this volume on the sole authority of the Catholic Church, and we are insane not to follow its authority in the interpretation of the *meaning* of its contents, when we follow that same authority, on the higher evidence, of the inspiration of its divine revelation."

Seventhly—Your jury must state what is Protestantism before they can decide whether you have triumphed over me. They must know precisely what doctrines you believe. This part of their duty seems to me, Sir, the most difficult of all. Your doctrine is exceedingly like "*the longitude*," differing as one goes East or West, all over the world. In the time of Bossuet it had put on two hundred and forty-four changes; at the present time it has gone so high in the scale of progressive development as to be at this moment in its six hundred and fifty-first variety. If the successive generations of men, who have believed in this creed were assembled together, and were to proclaim their respective forms of belief, the confusion of tongues at the tower of Babel is the only illustration that can be given of your palpable departure from the original Gospel, and your *endless* discrepancies from the one true law.

Every man of sense, who reads this letter, will see at a glance the naked absurdity of your challenging me to a discussion on religion in the presence of a *jury of the men of Belfast*. But, in addition to the absurdity of your letter, there is an ignorant childishness in it. Surely you could not think that I would or could place the title-deeds of my old legitimate faith (which are in our possession for ages) in a public market-place, to be disputed for, by a stranger and a Revolutionist, in the gospel legislation. As well might a minister of the Crown consent to argue the title of the Queen of England to the throne of her ancestors with a Laplander, as to expect that I should abandon my ancestral rights of our long inheritance, and agree to argue with you your revolutionary pretensions to my legal and long-established heirship of the true faith.

But when you were writing your challenge, you knew, as well as you do at this moment, that no priest could consent to meet you and your jury. You knew, too, that your jury would be incapable of deciding the question. Your letter and its motives, cannot therefore deceive any one. Your object is