



CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

VOL. I.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MARCH 21, 1851.

NO. 32.

EXTRACTED FROM THE THIRD LETTER OF THE REV. DR. CAHILL.

TO THE RIGHT HON. LORD J. RUSSELL.

Moore's Hotel, Limerick, Feb. 16, 1851.

My Lord—Your fierce manifesto to the Bishop of Durham has not at all surprised me as much as the two late speeches reported in the newspapers to have been delivered by you in the House of Commons, on the introduction of your penal Bill. Your falsification of history, your suppression of truth, and your most bigoted recklessness of assertion in reference to Catholic principles, call for an indignant reply. Your lordship's case against Ireland is made up of a number of points, each of which I shall discuss separately.

Firstly, then, in order to show an undeniable precedent for your penal Bill against the Pope, you refer to the reign of James the Second, when you assert that even in those Catholic times of that Catholic monarch, England treated the Pope precisely as England treats him at present, and would not permit him in those days to change Vicars-Apostolic into Bishops. Now, in order, fully to contemplate this point of your lordship's case, I must remind you that, in the year 1533, Henry VIII. began to uproot the foundations of the Catholic Church in England; and afterwards, during the reign of his son, Edward VI., and during the reign of his daughter, Elizabeth, up to her death, in 1602, England and Ireland presented one uninterrupted, frightful, sanguinary spectacle of plunder, confiscation, banishment, assassination, torture, executions, and such other acts of thrilling persecution as have never been perpetrated or recorded in any country on the face of the earth, in the darkest days of human history. So far from even Vicars-Apostolic in these days, that the Priests were hunted like wolves, and hanged like dogs on the public highways.

This part of my narrative brings me to the reign of James the First, in 1603, who, so far from mitigating the sufferings of the Catholics, declared, in the first year of his reign, his determination to walk in the footsteps of Elizabeth, his predecessor. And, as if to add more terrors to the infliction of the Catholics, the plot of Guy Fawkes spread the flame of vengeance to such a pitch of blind fanaticism, that in the war which James undertook against the Emperor of Germany, the English joined him with joy, in the hope of exterminating the Catholics from the earth. This disastrous condition of Catholicity continued unmitigated to the reign of Charles the First, with whose death every one is familiar. The Catholics were almost extinct in his reign; and, during the eleven years that followed, it is a miracle how even one Catholic could have survived "the rampant cruelties of Oliver Cromwell, who said "he worshipped God by killing the men, women, and children of Catholics" on every line of his crimson march. I quote these facts from our historians, to whom I refer your lordship; but I have a more accurate record than even these Protestant authorities. I have the shattered walls and unroofed altars of the ancient churches, which to this hour in England and Ireland publish the faithful history of England's cruelties, and which still stand on their tottering foundations, like aged witnesses, to tell, in language stronger than books, that neither a Hierarchy, nor Vicars-Apostolic, nor altar, nor Clergy, nor people, were to be found in England on the death of Cromwell. And this date brings me to the reign of Charles the Second; and your historians will tell you (to whom I again refer you) that between the "conflagration of London," the plot of "Titus Oates," "the Meal tub Plot," and the expulsion of all Catholics in those days from London by "Act of Parliament," it is a question of singular astonishment how even the Catholic name could have been preserved in England at the death of Charles the Second, which took place in the year 1685. Thus we have a clear, undeniable record that, from the year 1533 to the year 1685 (a period of 152 years), one continued, ceaseless persecution raged against the Catholics; and the entire English Protestant population was leagued together in one confederated, frenzied band of loathsome bigots, and bound together by the most ferocious bond of deadly sanguinary hatred, to tear up and extirpate the very name of Catholic. And this is the year when James the Second (to whose reign you have referred) ascended the English throne! And these are the times which you have designated as "Catholic times," in order to make out your case against the Pope!

Secondly—Your next mis-statement is, that where you seek to establish a second precedent against the Pope by assuming that "in the time of William the Conqueror he would have no sees created by the authority of the Pope, but were all created by the authority of the King." Now, my lord, I take the liberty (without wishing to speak offensively) of giving to your words a flat, plain denial—your assertion is false. The facts of the case are these:—William having beaten Harold, and subdued England, returned

to his dominions in France; and in his absence a plot was laid by the English to murder all the Normans on Ash-Wednesday, while they attended, unarmed, the Catholic worship on that day. William discovered the plot in time to defeat the conspirators; and immediately conceived (from the circumstances of the day and the place where the massacre was to be executed) that the English Ecclesiastics were accomplices in this sanguinary plot, and hence, from that hour to the day of his death, he refused to admit the appointment of English Bishops to the vacant sees; but he admitted Frenchmen to these sees, according to the nomination of the Pope. Therefore, it is not true that William resisted the authority of the Pope; he resisted Englishmen, not the Pope's authority.

Thirdly—Your lordship asserts, as your third point against the Pope, "that her Majesty's Minister at Lisbon has informed us, that no Bull is permitted to be published or inculcated in Portugal, of which notice had not been previously given, or which had not received the concurrence of the ruling powers."

Now, my lord, will any man believe that the Pope cannot issue a Bull for a Jubilee, for an indulgence, for the nomination of a Bishop, for dispensation of marriage, for the beatification of a Saint, or for the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, "without giving notice to the Government of Portugal, and having their concurrence?"

There never was uttered such a farrago of nonsense as this letter of your minister. Will your lordship take the trouble to consult the work "Dictionnaire abrégé de Théologie," and there you will see in the appendix, on the article "Rescrit du Souverain Pontife," that there can be as many Bulls from the Pope as your decisions from your Court of Chancery in England; and that the Bulls which your inaccurate minister referred to must have been some few Bulls regarding "restitution" to be made to the Church arising from the injustice of the secular government towards the convents or other religious establishments. I shall give you a case in point:—When, in the year 1833, the Spanish Government plundered the Catholic Church, aided by the British Legion, and when every convent in Spain (with one solitary exception) was robbed; when Nuns and Friars were turned out on the highways to perish, and when the churches were turned into theatres, the Pope, on the restoration of partial order, was guilty of the insolent "aggression" of demanding from the Catholic Spanish Government the restitution of even a part of the plunder of the Church. What was the answer which this aggressive, this ultramontane request received from the Beaumonts and the Norfolks of Spain? Hear it, my lord:—They replied, "that what was done, could not be recalled." How exceedingly redolent of what your lordship calls "progress" was this ministerial reply!

Fourthly—You are reported to have stated "that the Church of Rome has in every age been opposed to literary progress and to intellectual advancement."

So, my lord, "Rome (you say) is opposed to all progress." If your lordship had said "the progress of English bigotry and English lies, we could understand you. But, will you give me leave to ask, what do you mean by this progress? Within the last few years a rage has seized the public mind (like the rage of the philosophical poets of England) that the Catholic Church discouraged chemistry, botany, geology, and several other branches of science; and these petty writers have, like your lordship, stigmatised the Catholic Church as opposed to literary progress. I am sorry to find your lordship in the company of those men; for a more contemptible race of creatures has never lived in any age or any country than the mindless, hair-brained beings who have made these insane remarks. In the wide world there is no such contemptible things as the half-bred modern chemist; the green, unripe, awkward geologist; the conceited botanist. These illiterate, wretched creatures, after having attended the lectures of one session, begin to devise a new plan of creating the earth and moon, and stars; it is no uncommon thing to read their new principles of reconstructing creation; and the first essay, in some garret in a lane, of these philosophers, is to deny the Scriptures, and to calumniate the principles, doctrine, and practice of the Catholic Church.

Fifthly—While your lordship indulged in this modern puerile invective against the progress of the Roman Church, you are reported to have used the following words:—"In recent times there have been put forth from the Church of Rome opinions abhorrent to every lover of civil and religious liberty; there were amongst the books prohibited to be read by the Church of Rome such books as Robertson's Works and Scapula's Lexicon!"

Now, my lord, as these words leave you completely in my power, I will say, in charity to you, that I firmly believe you have never read these works of Robertson. They contain the most foul, filthy statements in reference to Catholic morality, bearing on

the very front of the assertions their own palpable contradiction; and as these works put forth principles even hostile to the obedience to the Throne, I feel satisfied you have never read these volumes, or you would not have hazarded these reckless, untenable statements.

In whatever way the contemplated penal measure will terminate, my case is this, viz. —Ireland has not, either directly or indirectly, given the smallest offence, or the least shadow of a pretext, for being visited by penal insult; and my next position is, that in your speeches before your followers in the House of Commons, you founded your case upon a set of facts which I have proved before an impartial public to be one continued reckless, bigoted mis-statement from beginning to end. These two positions being conceded as being undeniably proved, my next point is to say, that so unjustifiable an insult as your contemplated Bill has not been offered to the Catholics of Ireland since the days of Elizabeth. Having committed no offence against you, you have broken the faith which you pledged to us in 1829; and if you can impose on us a chain of even one grain in weight, without an offence on our part, you can, on the same principle, inflict any other penalty you please. Our liberties and our lives are now placed at the mercies of a British Minister who can command a majority in his Parliament to inflict any penalty or carry any measure of insult or cruelty which he may think proper to propose. And this, my Lord, is the time when you have thought proper to insult and to degrade us; and, in place of feeding every poor countryman whom your cruel legislation has stripped naked, and has starved—in place of consoling Ireland for her fallen children, who dropped dead of hunger by the wayside, to be devoured by dogs, or shovelled into a shroudless, coffinless grave—in place of giving shelter to the thousands and tens of thousands of the poor unprotected Irish whom your anti-Christian laws have expelled from their country, have buried in an ocean grave, or designed to untimely death in a foreign land—in place of relieving, sustaining, and encouraging the bone and muscle which has given strength to your army and navy, you come forth in a season of profound peace (and while we are steeped to the lips in national woes) to plunge your unprovoked dagger in our hearts, and traitorously rob us of the last bitter dregs of our wretched existence.

But if Ireland tamely submits to this persecution—if you can degrade the Catholic people into willing slaves—if you can put an extinguisher on the plundered city of Dublin, by robbing her of the last resources of her trade—if you can convert her poor tradesmen into paupers, and fill the north and south workhouses with the honored wives and the virtuous daughters of the men who pay your taxes and fight your battles—if you can chain down all Ireland, and unemancipate and enslave us at one blow, there is only one resource left, which is, that the whole Catholic population come forward, and with one voice—the voice of men—proclaim our wrongs to the whole world; and if we are to be made the victims of insult, injustice, and tyranny, let us at least prove to mankind that we shall not yield without a struggle, nor be subdued without marking our tyrants with the brand of public shame, ungrateful dishonor, and national perfidy. We, the Clergy, have stood by the laity when their liberties required our assistance. We now call upon them, in turn, to take their place by our side, when the liberties of religion are threatened by the most unprovoked and perfidious tyranny—I am, my lord, your lordship's obedient servant,

D. W. CAHILL, D.D.

THE PERSECUTION BILL.

(From the Times.)

With every disposition to make the fullest allowance for the immense difficulty of framing a measure which might satisfy the demands of public opinion without compromising the rights of private conscience, we cannot regard this Bill as a satisfactory solution of the difficulty. It is framed on the principle of extending a clause which, although notoriously violated in Ireland, and more recently in England, by the appointment of a Roman Catholic Bishop of St. David's, the Government has never thought fit to put in force. To what purpose, then, are we to extend a provision which has hitherto proved wholly inoperative? and, if the Papal Hierarchy have infringed the common law, why seize upon that particular moment and occasion to mitigate its strictness in regard to such aggression? We are unable to discover in what respect the Ministerial Bill will curb the powers of synodical action, which it is so desirable to restrain. The Attorney-General tells us that it will, but we cannot conceive how. It is not at all necessary to synodical action that the Bishops forming the Synod should assume territorial titles. Witness the Synod of Thurles, in which, with the exception of Paul

Archbishop of Armagh, and John of Tuam, the Fathers were content to style themselves by their surnames. What they did in Ireland they can do here, and Dr. Wiseman may yet hope, for anything the ministerial measure says to the contrary, to preside over the first Anglican Roman Catholic Synod since the Reformation, and exercise with impunity in his Church a liberty which we deny to our own. We fear it must be confessed that we are making war on names and titles rather than on realities. The reality is the power of the Pope to send his emissaries into this country to apportion it among them, to form them into organised bodies, and to give them the means by such organisation to force upon the laity a law repugnant to our feelings and institutions. With none of these things, as we understand it, does the Bill deal. But, on the other hand, by assuming as the basis of legislation the 24th section of the Emancipation Act, it serves to give an excuse to the disaffected in Ireland for the commencement of an agitation contemptible in point of influence, but still to be dreaded, as tending to open anew the scarcely cicatrised wound of civic strife and religious discord. The tocsin is sounding anew from the one end of this devoted island to the other, and the rival religions are ranging themselves again under their ancient party banners. Surely it was not worth while, for the sake of symmetry and uniformity—to cast a firebrand amongst such combustible materials, to give to a nation ever prodigal of her energies, when they can be employed in self-immolation, an excuse for wasting her little remaining strength in this endless and profitless contest. By extending to Ireland the defence against the attack which was only intended for England, we unnecessarily give to the Pope the triumph of knowing that, in the midst of his weakness and dependence, he has been able not merely to rouse the indignation, but seriously to affect the internal tranquility and material prosperity of the British empire.

(From the Morning Chronicle.)

The clause which provides for the forfeiture of trusts and bequests will be entirely inoperative in England. An institution which cannot be safely "intituled, or in anywise designated or described," as a local Archbishopric, or Bishopric, will, of course, not be so intituled, designated, or described, even by the most orthodox conveyancer. Even at present there can be no legal or corporate successor to any such unrecognised dignity. All endowments must have been vested in individual trustees, with more or less discretion in the disposal of them.

The case, however, is different in Ireland. The deliberate policy of the Legislature has conferred on the Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of that country a quasi-corporate character, with a view to secure the succession of their Ecclesiastical property. Funds vested in the Commissioners under the Charitable Bequests Act are expressly secured for the "maintenance and endowment of Bishoprics and Deaneries, 'intituled designated, and described'" as districts in which Ecclesiastical functions are exercised. The simple evasions which the framer of the Bill has carefully provided, will be as available in Ireland as in England; but they are not likely to be as readily adopted. Indications are not wanting that the Government are only waiting for some friendly violence which, after the mischief has been done, may compel the exclusion of Ireland from the new measure. But, in the meantime, Lord Stanley is waiting with a more comprehensive and consistent scheme to outbid the feeble hunters of popularity, who cannot even commit injustice with energy. In any case, the measure is doomed; and the Government will probably share its fate.

THE TOTTERING OF THE IRISH CHURCH.

(From the Weekly News.)

It would be hard to speculate on the nature of the countless various thoughts that at this strange crisis must be agitating the breasts of the different statesmen, who have, or who fancy that they might have, the seals of office in their grasp. Yet there is one topic, on which, if we could make the rival politicians take a walk with us through the Palace of Truth, and there reply to our questioning, we should find them all thinking alike. That thought, thus common to them all, is the thought, "What a nuisance is the Irish Church!" Lord John and Lord Clarendon would probably tell us so openly even before they reached the vestibule of the truth-compelling shrine. Lord Aberdeen, also, would, like a staunch Presbyterian, say so at the first interrogatory. We do not think that the aspiring Benjamin would take much trouble to disguise a similar opinion. Puseyite Gladstone would strive to the utmost before he owned it; and the memory of their ancient secession from Lord Grey's Ministry, on account of the appropriation clause, would compel Lord Stanley and Sir J. Gra-