

62

REFLECTIONS
ON THE APPOINTMENT OF
DR. MILNER,
AS THE
POLITICAL AGENT
OF THE
ROMAN CATHOLIC CLERGY,
OF
IRELAND.

BY THE REV. THOMAS ELRINGTON, D. D.

Late Senior Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin.

*La paix est dans ta bouche, et ton cœur en est loin :
Penses tu nous tromper ?*

VOLTAIRE.

Dublin :

PRINTED BY

JOHN BROOKE, 15, PARLIAMENT-STREET.

1809.

REFLECTIONS

ON THE APPOINTMENT OF

DR. WATSON

AS THE

MEDICAL AGENT

BY THE

ROMAN CATHOLIC CLERGY

IN

BY THE REV. THOMAS LAMONT, D.D.

LONDON: Printed by J. G. ALLEN, 10, Abchurch Lane.

1841.

Price 1s. 6d.

Edinburgh:

Printed by

JOHN BROWN, PARLIAMENT STREET.

1841.

1841.

REFLECTIONS,

&c. &c.

AT a period when the Roman Catholics of Ireland are with augmenting vehemence, urging, year after year, their pretensions to be admitted to share, equally with the Protestants of the Established Church, the political power of the State, it becomes of infinite importance to examine coolly and dispassionately their claims, and to consider whether the Philosophic liberality which is the boast of modern times, has really extended its influence to them in the degree which their advocates so confidently assert.

Allowing, for the sake of argument, that the *Alliance of Church and State* is not so strict as to be a perpetual bar to the admission of Sectaries to political power: that the determination, (granting it to be sincere in those who now

profess it), not to attempt altering the laws under which property formerly forfeited is held, or those which guarantee to the Established Church its possessions and its rights, might be relied upon as unalterable : that the continuance of the succession to the crown in the Protestant line would not be hazarded, but that Roman Catholics would join to exclude any claimant who might conform to their religion ; should such an event unhappily occur, as it did in the instance of James : admitting, in short, every thing that the advocates for the Roman Catholics can ask, it yet remains to be determined with what disposition towards Protestants that sect is now actuated ; for if that be a disposition to unkindness and uncharitableness, no possible advantage can be expected from granting power to those who will receive it with hostile minds, and whose cordial union cannot therefore be hoped for. If the philosophic spirit has not banished the narrow prejudices of former ages, the very ground upon which the advocates for the Roman Catholics now stand, is taken away, and they must themselves confess that the time for admitting them to power is not yet arrived.

To

To determine what are the real dispositions of men's minds, who may by the influence of present interest be themselves led into a temporary error with regard to their own sentiments, and whose professions certainly cannot be admitted as unsuspected evidence, is undoubtedly no easy task; but I cannot help thinking that in the present case a circumstance has occurred which removes much of the difficulty.

When a body of men appoint an Agent and Representative to conduct their business, and when they approve of the conduct of that Agent, and renew their appointment, it is not unreasonable to suppose that they approve also of the sentiments which that Agent has publicly expressed relative to the business in which he is to act, and to the questions essentially connected with it.

In the writings of *Dr. Milner*, therefore, it seems to me that the sentiments of the Roman Catholics of Ireland may fairly be sought; for on the first of July 1807, he was appointed, under the hands and seals of their Archbishops at May-

nooth, to be the Agent of their Clergy at the seat of Government,* and at a late meeting in Dublin, that appointment has been renewed, and his conduct unanimously approved.

And here let me premise, that when I attribute certain opinions and principles to *Dr. Milner*, I mean not personally to him any disrespect. I shall speak of him merely as the author of certain books to which I refer, and desire not to be understood as imputing to him the sentiments I censure in them farther than as an author he is answerable for what he has written. I know well that men may hold opinions very nearly contradictory, and that authors sometimes write what on reflection they disapprove.

But for those who, after reading what *Dr. Milner* has written, have made him their Representative, I make no such allowances: in adopting him, they adopt the principles which his writings contain, and by them their sentiments must be judged.

The

* Letter from Dr. Milner, Vicar Apostolic, &c. to a parish priest in Ireland, dated 1st August, 1808!

The publication which I shall principally notice is "*Dr. Milner's Tour in Ireland in the Summer of 1807*," the declared object of which is the vindication of the Roman Catholics of that country from the charges of superstition, ignorance and disloyalty.* This zeal for the character of those who are united to him by the ties of religion is undoubtedly laudable; happy were it that we could find proofs of an equal degree of charity for those from whom he differs. But charity to Protestants abounds not in the *Tour in Ireland*; in whatever quantity it may be treasured up in the author's breast, its overflowings reached not to his pen.

It was not for the purpose of conciliating Protestants, that all the Sovereigns of England who professed that religion, from the Reformation to the Revolution, are represented by *Dr. Milner* as objects of abhorrence: That he has asserted

that

* The real purpose of his journey was to assist at a consultation of the Roman Catholic Bishops at Maynooth, on the 1st July, 1807, as appears by the letter already referred to.

*that Perfidy, Treason and Rebellion were taught and practiced by every head of the Reformation in every country where it has prevailed; and that he has charged Protestantism with having immolated hosts of Catholic victims in the pure spirit of religious persecution.**

It cannot contribute to render Protestants and Catholics *kindly affectioned to one another in brotherly love*, to state that a cruel and almost uninterrupted persecution has, till within a few years, been carried on by the former in this country against the latter: that at the very present day their conduct in some instances is such as Turks would not imitate; and that it is even a proverb, *that in Ireland there is no law for a Catholic.†*

It cannot but weaken that union of sentiment, on which the preservation of these countries from abject slavery to a foreign tyrant depends, to represent it as **STRANGE** that the Irish should retain respect or affection for the English; to

talk

* See Tour in Ireland, p. 231.

† Ditto, p. p. 13. 69. 23.

talk of the *frequent and atrocious injuries* which Ireland has received from England, and then to quote from *Tacitus* a maxim, *proprium est humani generis odisse quem læseris*, which must, admitting the preceding assertion to be true, lead to the inference that the Irish are objects of hatred to the English.*

I object not to *Dr. Milner* for maintaining the learning and civilization of the ancient Irish, though I may smile when he talks of them as the preservers of the Bible, the Fathers and the Classics: like him I believe that St. Patrick did really exist, though I differ widely in my notions of the system of christianity which he taught†; nor am I anxious to question his catalogue

* See *Tour in Ireland*, p. 43.

† See *Usher on the Religion of the ancient Irish*, in proof that they did not submit their faith to the decisions of the Pope. Indeed the bull of Adrian the third, bestowing the kingdom of Ireland on Henry the second for the purpose of promoting true religion among the people, and enforcing their subjection to Rome, is a sufficient proof that they did not pay much respect to Papal authority.

logue of Saints, particularly while he keeps *Virgilius* in the number, whom I respect as the first sufferer in maintaining the cause of philosophy against Papal Infallibility.* All this is suitable to *Dr. Milner's* professed purpose of vindicating the character of the Irish from the calumnies under which it has laboured: but how can that purpose, or any good purpose be answered by telling us that amongst the causes which led him to expect to find in Ireland instances of villains of the most hardened class was *the example shewn them, for ages past, by the English; the treatment they have experienced from them, and the laws to which they have been subjected by them.*†

Had

* He held the motion of the Earth, and was imprisoned as afterwards Copernicus and Galileo were, for maintaining that opinion. It is not, I believe, very generally known that the motion of the Earth has not yet been recognized by the Popes; at least when Jacquier and Le Seur published their comment on Newton they found it necessary to profess in a formal advertisement at the beginning of the third volume of their work, that they submitted to the *Decrees promulgated by the Pope against the motion of the Earth!!!*

† Page 65.

Had an author written thus whose design was to set the two nations at variance; to excite hatred in the one and suspicion in the other I should applaud him for the selection of topics so suitable to his purpose; but when I attempt to reconcile the selection of such topics to the professed object of *Dr. Milner*, I am really at a loss; and when I see the Roman Catholic Clergy employing *Dr. Milner* as their advocate with the English nation, after having thus libelled that nation, I am tempted to enquire whether Conciliation be seriously their object.

Let it not be supposed that from a book replete with kindness and charity and love, I have with industrious research picked out incidental expressions of a contrary tendency: Far from it. I complain not that accident has betrayed *Dr. Milner* into objectionable language, but that, uniformly wherever an opportunity offers to speak of the conduct of England towards Ireland, or of Protestants towards Roman Catholics, he does it in terms of reprobation. That when he exhorts to loyalty he couples it with *patience*,* as

c

if

if his chief object was to shew how little that loyalty was deserved. That, in his first letter he compares the former condition of the Roman Catholic with that of the *Helot*, the most degraded and the most oppressed of human beings, and in his last he calls their present state by the ignominious appellation of *Slavery*.*

That

* This *Slavery* consists in being denied a few of the chief offices of state, and seats in Parliament, the removal of which disqualifications is called by the high sounding name of *Catholic Emancipation*. On this subject the opinions of *Emmet* and *M'Nevin*, on their oaths before committees of both houses of Parliament ought to be known. The words of the former were, *as to Catholic Emancipation I do not think it matters a feather, or that the poor think of it.* *M'Nevin* gave his sentiments more at large, saying, *Catholic Emancipation, as it is called, the people do not care about : They know very generally that it would be attended with no other effect than to admit into the House of Peers a few individuals who profess the Catholic religion, and to enable some others to speculate in seats in the House of Commons.* NO MAN IS SO IGNORANT AS TO THINK THIS WOULD BE A NATIONAL BENEFIT.

I take these opinions from their own account of their evidence, published by them in America.

That, as often as he mentions the Army or the Militia, it is to give irritating descriptions (and as untrue as irritating) of the hardships under which the Roman Catholics in each labour from being compelled to attend on Protestant worship: That, when he notices the military establishment, it is to represent the barracks as resembling the castles by which the Normans, after the conquest, coerced and oppressed the English, and to refer us to horrible descriptions of their sufferings in consequence of those military Stations,* as if he wished us to think that the rod of iron with which England was ruled by the Norman conqueror, was at this day extended over Ireland; and that, persevering to the last in the same tone, he concludes his book with endeavouring to impress upon the Roman Catholics, that in them, should an invading enemy enter the country, LOYALTY would be FOLLY, *for in contending against him they would fight as Slaves, and if conquered, perish as Traitors!!!*

It is not of single sentences I complain, but of the spirit which uniformly pervades the whole work

work; and I hesitate not to say, that if it be the object of Dr. Troy and his brethren to reconcile the Protestant to the Roman Catholic, and the Irishman to the English, the author of "*The Tour in Ireland*," is the very last person they should have selected for their agent.

Hitherto I have noticed the general charges made by *Dr. Milner* without entering into any proof of their falsehood, it being my immediate object only to examine how far he may be fitted for a messenger of peace between contending parties, an office for which a propensity to criminate must totally disqualify, even were the accusations brought forward really founded in truth; but I shall now proceed to examine some of his particular charges, and to try whether his zeal has not *sometimes* misled him into such as truth must disown.

He tells us then, that in the reign of Elizabeth about two hundred Roman Catholics were put to death *for the confession or exercise of their Religion*.* Now I defy him to produce a single instance

instance of any Roman Catholic who was tried in that, or any other reign, as a Heretic. Many, I grant, were condemned as Traitors, and I believe *Dr. Milner* will not deny that many deserved to be so condemned; but the distinction between suffering as a Traitor and as a Heretic is obvious; and if an instance were wanted to make it clear, and to distinguish the dispositions of those by whom the punishment was inflicted, I would refer to the case of *Cranmer*, whom *Mary* pardoned when condemned as a Traitor, that she might have it in her power to burn him as an Heretic.*

As

* *Dr. Milner* wishes to represent *Mary's* persecutions as originating from the rebellions which he alleges to have been fomented by Protestants, but his assertion is directly contrary to known dates. He says that she never persecuted any of the Protestants till two years after she began to reign,* when they had excited *Wyatt's* rebellion. Now before she had been six months on the throne, the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of Exeter, London, and Gloucester, and the venerable *Latimer*, were thrown into prison,† and as soon as the disputes about her marriage were

* Page 230.

† Hume.

As to the persecution which *Dr. Milner* alleges to have been carried on by *Elizabeth* in Ireland, in which many Roman Catholics were put to death, he has afforded the means of reply by giving a list of those whom he asserts to have suffered for their religion, as to which, though I have

were settled, the sanguinary laws against heretics were re-enacted, and then after a regular discussion on the propriety of persecution, in which Gardiner and Pole took opposite sides, those laws were put in force, and the first victim to them was *Rogers*, a private clergyman, not on any charge of treason or of having abetted traitors, but simply for his religious faith, for not believing in *Transubstantiation*, for which he was burned. Nay in this persecution the sufferers generally were not even charged with teaching or dogmatising contrary to the Popish religion, but taken up on suspicion, and burned for not signing a recantation of the Protestant faith.—(*See Hume.*)—And I challenge *Dr. Milner* to shew any connection between any of those martyrdoms and the insurrection of Wyatt. Mary's not having carried on a persecution in Ireland is easily accounted for. The Reformation had made but a small progress there, and so little attention was paid to Ireland that she for a considerable time retained in that country the title of *Supreme Head of the Church*; nor was the Pope's bull for reconciling Ireland to the church of Rome read in Parliament till 1556.

I have not been able to trace the history of all the persons he names, yet what I have discovered must shew undeniably, that his account is not to be relied on.

Edmund Mc. Gauran, Archbishop of Armagh, obtained a commission from the King of Spain, and was killed in a battle with Sir Richard Bingham.* The fact of his being killed in battle is stated in the *Analecta*, as *Dr. Milner* must know, though he inserts him in the list of those *who were put to death by ELIZABETH for the profession or exercise of their religion!*

Dermot

* History of Ireland, in Modern Universal History, p. 173. This is not the only instance of the kind. *Eugene O'Hegan*, bishop of Ross, was killed in Tiroen's rebellion, at the head of a troop of horse; and *Nicholas Sanders*, sent in 1579 by Pope Gregory XIII. as nuncio, with a consecrated banner and some Italian and Spanish troops to invade Ireland, his troops being routed, perished in the woods of Kerry.

Dermot O'Hurley, Archbishop of Cashel, was hanged *for Treason*, in Dublin, in 1583. *

Cornelius O'Duane, Bishop of Down, was also hanged *for Treason*, under the government of Sir Arthur Chichester, in 1611; and the *Analecta* acknowledges this, and states the charge to have been assisting and abetting Tiroen in his rebellion; and yet *Dr. Milner* classes him as a martyr!†

As to Richard Creagh, archbishop of Armagh, the account given in the *Analecta* of his being poisoned in the Tower, (and why *poisoned*, if for his

* See Harris's edition of Ware's writers of Ireland.— That O'Hurley was tortured previous to his execution, *directly contrary to law*, cannot be believed but upon stronger evidence than that of two witnesses who explicitly contradict each other, as to the mode in which the torture was inflicted, (compare Dr. Milner's accounts with that in the *Analecta*) in such a manner as would utterly invalidate their testimony, in any court of justice, as being convicted of false witness out of their own mouth.

† See Harris's edition of Ware's writers of Ireland.

his religion he could have been tried and executed?) is too ridiculous to impose upon the most credulous. I quote it below,* and shall only remark, that the author who gives this minute detail, acknowledges that he does not know whether the event happened in the year 1585 or 1587.

O'Gallagher also, Bishop of Derry, appears from the *Analecta*, to have been killed by a party of soldiers in some skirmish; and thus are *five* out of *Dr. Milner's six* Martyrs, proved on authorities

* Quidam Culligius, e turris subcustodibus unus, caseum, quo illum a refectiunculâ vesci libenter noverat, veneno intinxit, & buccellam ita intinctam porrexit venerando Antistiti, de quo ille, nihil mali suspicatus, sumpsit, & mox incidit in tormina ventris & varia tormenta, & tum gulâ intumescente, & toto corpore perturbatus, altero die a sumptione toxici *Urinam* misit per puerum ad medicum in urbe illâ, Catholicum Doctorem nomine Arc-loum, quâ ille inspectâ, & facti indignatione percitus, matulam cum lotio projecit in parietem, exclamans Dominum Episcopum a sicariis interfectum, & *venenum tum ad vitalia grassatum nullâ ope humanâ posse medicari.*

How contemptible is the skill of modern physicians when compared with the sagacity of this Catholic Doctor!

rities with which he is well acquainted, not to have been put to death for their religion at all.

Of the remaining (alleged) Martyr, *O'Kelly*, I can find no particulars mentioned, and must only express my wish that *Dr. Milner* had enabled me to trace his history by quoting his authorities.

I am obliged to make the same remark upon the story of the fifty-one monks said to have been drowned in the Shannon by the orders of Elizabeth, of which I cannot find the least mention in any book I have had access to; and a learned and obliging friend who has made enquiries for me in Dublin has been equally unsuccessful.

I can only say that in the instances which I have been able to examine, I find *Dr. Milner's* statements destitute of any adequate proof, and therefore cannot in other cases give him implicit credit.

Had he referred to the authorities on which he relied for his accounts, it would have been less

less difficult to ascertain their truth: but enough has been stated, I trust, to shew that persecution for the sake of religion was not practised by Elizabeth.

The principles which governed her conduct and that of her successors are most justly set forth by *Walsh* in the dedication of his *History of the Irish remonstrance*, to the Roman Catholics of England, Ireland, and Scotland, in which he states it was neither the number of sacraments nor the doctrine of transubstantiation, nor any other of the articles of the Catholic faith which had occasioned all the evils that had befallen them for the preceding century, but certain doctrines and practices which many of themselves condemned as Anti-Catholic and Un-Christian, and which he there enumerates, viz. the deposing and absolving power of the Popes; the forfeiture of kingdoms by the heresy of the sovereign, &c. &c. acted upon in the Bull of Pius V. against Elizabeth, and those of Gregory XIII. and Clement VIII. in support of the Irish Rebels &c. And the account given by *Walshingham* of the conduct of

Elizabeth

Elizabeth towards the Roman Catholics most exactly agrees with this statement.*

As to the numbers who, *Dr. Milner* says, fell victims to their religion under the first Stuarts, and the usurpation, his statement may, I doubt not, be true, in *his* way of reckoning as such those who were killed in battle, or executed for treason; for at the storming of Cashel by Lord Inchiquin, twenty priests lost their lives, and in the slaughter at Drogheda by Cromwell, when 20,000 persons of every age and sex were butchered, it is probable that priests and nuns were of the number; but surely no man except *Dr. Milner*, will reckon those cases as *instances of persecution on account of religion*, or parallel them with the inhuman cruelties of Mary, who, in the space of three years, caused two hundred and seventy-seven persons, of whom fifty-five were women, and four were children, to be burned to death for their religion, without any other charge being even alleged against them.†

With

* Burnett's Reform, 3. 312.

† *Dr. Milner's* hatred to *Elizabeth* leads him to bestow

With respect to Dr. Plunket, whoever reads his trial, will not, without great hesitation, pronounce him innocent; not so much from the direct evidence against him, which might have been perjury, as from the circumstance of a witness having endeavoured to conceal himself, the night before the trial, at the Spanish Ambassador's, and from the gross prevarication of his testimony at the trial, which caused him to be committed to prison; facts that cannot be accounted for consistently with Plunket's innocence. But to the question in discussion, it matters not whether he was innocent or guilty. His case is brought forward to prove, that a *purely religious persecution* was carried on against the Roman Catholics, and the fact is that he was tried for treason, and the chief witnesses against him were Popish priests, acknow-

upon her the most abusive appellations: he calls her, a *Tyrant, a Pirate, hypocritical, remorseless and sacrilegious*. It would have been *prudent* to have omitted the last of these epithets, bestowed upon her for assuming the title of *Supreme Governess of the Church of Christ throughout her Dominions*, since our present venerated Sovereign is liable to the same appellation for the like cause.

acknowledging themselves as such on the trial.—
The charge was, *Soliciting a French invasion, and
levying men and money to aid it.*

The trial is extant and *Dr. Milner* cannot be ignorant of it. Nor would the change of his religion have preserved his life : it was on condition of acknowledging the existence of a conspiracy against the state, that pardon was offered him, as he himself declared before his death ; which declaration *Dr. Milner* must have seen as it is published with his trial.*

Next to Elizabeth, King William appears to be the object of *Dr. Milner's* greatest dislike. He calls him the *Hero of Glenco, and the Pacif*
icator

* I respect the quiet and *unpolitical* character of the present Roman Catholic Primate, and am ready to exclaim, *O si sic omnes!* but I wish him in possession of relics less likely to excite irritation than the head of Bishop Plunket; and I lament to hear that *Pictures and Prints of that Prelate are now so common*: is it to promote concord that they are multiplied now?

*ficator of Limerick**; in order to represent him as bloody, treacherous, and perfidious!

The articles of Limerick have been much talked of, and little understood. A brief statement will satisfactorily clear the character of King William and of the nation, from the imputation of breach of Faith, so wantonly cast upon both.

The remains of James's party, after the defeat at Aughrim, were closely besieged at Limerick, and as they had no army in the field to afford them assistance, they could not reasonably entertain hopes of making a successful defence; they therefore surrendered the city upon certain conditions, the civil articles of which, it was engaged on the part of the besiegers, should be ratified by King William within eight months; and also that the *utmost endeavours should be used to obtain a ratification from Parliament.*

William ratified the articles, and supplied in favour of the besieged, an important omission in the

the original agreement ; and he engaged, as his officers had done, *to use his utmost endeavours to obtain a ratification of them from Parliament.* But the besieged well knew, at the time they surrendered, that the King could not answer with certainty for his Parliament ; and they knew that an application to Parliament in the preceding year to empower him to make such articles with the Irish as he should think fit, **HAD BEEN REJECTED :** what they did, therefore, was at their own risk, and after full warning ; and had Parliament totally annulled the articles, no charge of breach of faith or forfeiture of promise could have been grounded on that rejection. William seems to have been in no hurry to hazard the question in Parliament, and six years elapsed before the bill for confirming the articles was passed, and no sort of proof has ever been offered to shew that he did not sincerely endeavour to make that ratification complete ; and it is universally known that the great penal statute petitioned against by the Roman Catholics as infringing those articles, was not passed in his reign, but in that of his successor.*

* The Second of Anne.

By King William, therefore, the articles of Limerick were strictly observed, and *Dr. Milner*, in charging him with breach of faith, has been guilty of a mistake.*

As to Glenco, every man who has read the orders relative to the Highlanders, which were made the occasion of that massacre, must have seen that there was nothing in them to authorise the committing of that slaughter, and far less to warrant the manner in which it was committed.

The fact of *McDonald's* having taken the oath of allegiance on the sixth of January appears to have been unknown to king William when he signed the orders of the eleventh and eighteenth of that month, (those which were made the pretext for the massacre), for he expressly gives instructions in them with respect

E

to

* It is not my purpose here to enter into a history of the Articles of Limerick, but to defend the character of King William: I content myself, therefore, with a brief statement, founded on facts which cannot be denied.

to those who had not taken the oaths, mentioning the Glenco clan particularly as not having taken them ; and his orders were, that *lest they should think themselves desperate, terms and quarter should be given them, but so as that the chiefs should be prisoners of war, their lives only safe ; and that those who took not the benefit of the indemnity in due time, should be obliged to render upon mercy.**

Here we have an order to take prisoners, not to exterminate ; conditions of quarter, not instructions for treachery ; offers of mercy, not plans of massacre : we see William patient of disobedience and slow to punish : his confidence abused by a minister,† but his character free from reproach. ‡

That

* See the orders in Harris.

† He afterwards dismissed *Stair*.

‡ This massacre at Glencoe reminds me of the statement made by *Dr. Milner* of that in 1641, at *Island Magee*, which he mentions as a proof that the Protestants were the first to commit murders in that terrible rebellion,

That character it would have been wise in *Dr. Milner* to have shewn less eagerness to attack. The people of England feel strong and lively sensations of gratitude toward him to whom they owe the liberty they [at present] enjoy, and will not look favourably upon those by whom he is maligned ; nor is it the least of the imprudences into which the Roman Catholics of Ireland have fallen, to have chosen for their advocate with England the slanderer of William the third.

Let me recall to the reader's recollection the purpose for which I have thrown together these

bellion. Now the rebellion began, as all know, on the 23d of October, 1640, and it appears that the Scotch Soldiers in garrison at Carrickfergus, destroyed the inhabitants of *Island Magee*, in January, 1641. (See *Leland*. 3. 129. and the depositions relating to the Co. of Antrim, from the middle to the end of the volume, in the MSS. of Trin. Col. Dublin.)

As to the 3000 persons said by *Dr Milner* to have been murdered in *Island Magee*, that district being but three miles long and one broad, and having at that time no town in it, could not have contained one twentieth part of the number.

remarks on *Dr. Milner's* writings: it is to discover the temper of the Irish Roman Catholics at the present time, from the character of the Agent who has been appointed to represent their Clergy at the seat of government; taking that character from such documents as the public are in possession of, and not meaning to impeach, in any degree, the private honor or private worth of *Dr. Milner*.

Hence, in whatever he says in defence of Ireland, though I may not exactly agree with him, yet gratified in my prejudices for my country, I am not anxious to dispute his statements; it is where for necessary defence of his friends he substitutes unjustifiable attack on those who have at any time been their opponents, that I think myself called upon for comment and for censure.

There is however one part of his defence upon which I must make a few observations; I mean his Catalogue of Irish writers. He begins that Catalogue with *Rothe*, whose *Analecta* he

he calls a most interesting account of Catholic affairs.

I am sorry he has chosen thus to commend a work which has been very justly censured as a most scandalous and lying book,* and is written in a spirit of great hostility to England.

Peter Talbot is the next commended.— That turbulent man, as Ware calls him, was the chief persecutor of *Walsh* and the loyal *Remonstrants*, of whom I shall have occasion to speak hereafter; and the writings which *Dr. Milner* celebrates were principally directed against those Irish patriots who at that early period appeared desirous to testify their loyalty while they preserved their religion: and this Bishop Talbot actually refused, in 1670 when lord Berkeley was Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, to give any engagement of his loyalty †

Of

* See Harris's edition of Ware, Vol. 2. p. 124. Rothe was answered by Ryves, in his *Regiminis Anglicani Defensio*.

† Ware. 2. 192.

Of O'Daly I know nothing; but Burke, the Bishop of Ossory, and his mischievous work, the *Hibernia Dominicana*, I do know, and am sorry that *Dr. Milner* should have characterised as *a learned and celebrated Historian*, without adding any qualifying expression, the man who in his history maintained the Pope's deposing power, and the right of the Popish claimants to the throne of England; and that too so lately as the year 1762.

Dr. Butler I also know, and am surprised that the writer of a single pamphlet should be thought of sufficient importance to occupy the fifth place in *Dr. Milner's* list.

But I shall be told that he was, the *Victorious* opponent of *Dr. Woodward*!

I should wish to know wherein his *victory* consisted. He defended the clause in the Roman Catholic Bishop's oath, *Hæreticos, schismaticos et rebelles eidem Domino nostro* (Papæ, sciz :) *vel successoribus prædictis, pro posse persequar et impugnabo*; and the consequence of the objections made to that clause by Bishop Woodward and those

those who wrote on the same side with him, was its being expunged from the oath, by order of the Pope.*

If that was a victory to Dr. Butler, I beg to know what would have been a defeat?†

Instead of pursuing this sort of inquiry through Dr. Milner's writers of the second order, let me add to their number one whom he has thought proper to omit, though it is impossible to conceive

* See Dr. Troy's Pastoral Instruction. p. 57.

† The late Dean Erskine of Cork published an edition of Dr. Butler's pamphlet, with very able remarks, in which he notices an admission of Butler's (p. 25.) that the Roman Catholics *had preserved for many years inviolate their allegiance to the FALLEN House of Stuart, under the sufferance of all the evils that obstinate honesty could bring upon them*, and infers from it that Dr. Butler acknowledges the Roman Catholics to have been *Jacobites* long after the abdication of James; and argues that the hesitation about the oath of allegiance shewed this sentiment to have lingered about their hearts even so late as the year 1774. This assigns rather a later date for Catholic loyalty than it is fond of claiming.

ceive that he could have forgot him : I mean the *Rev. Peter Walsh*, a Franciscan Friar, and Professor divinity at Lorrain, the very respectable author of the *History of the Irish Remonstrance*, and of many other works, the catalogue of which occupies in *Ware* a page and an half in folio.

After praising *Rothe* and *Talbot* and *Burke*, writers whose names sound harsh in the ear of loyalty, it would have been some compensation to find that man noticed whose life gave the best proof that has ever been given, that a Roman Catholic may unite steady loyalty to a Protestant King, with a zealous attachment to his religion, which even persecution could not weaken : for though pursued with unrelenting hatred by *Talbot* and his party, and though he knew that his fidelity and patriotism would have ensured him, had he conformed to Protestantism, great temporal advantages, Walsh yet remained unchanged, and died in communion with the church of Rome.

It were well that no other proof of this hostility to Walsh had been given, than the ambiguous one of omitting to name him in this catalogue ;

logue; but though I have been able to procure but one of *Dr. Milner's* publications relative to the controversy with the *Protesting Catholics* in 1791,* that one contains sufficient proof of enmity to Walsh, and shews clearly that the cause of it was his political conduct. He calls him there *a refractory, irreligious friar, living in open rebellion against his superiors*; and censures the Remonstrance as a *lay protestation*, and as the effect of the Duke of Ormond's intrigues.

This *Remonstrance* was copied exactly, changing only names, from the declaration of the Roman Catholics of England in the year 1640; and though at first not signed†, yet on that objection being made, was signed by all the Irish clergy who were then in London, whither it had been transmitted to Walsh, who had, some time before, been appointed *Procurator* by the Roman Catholic Primate, and their Bishop of Meath

F

(there

* Divine Right of Episcopacy.

† It is remarkable that the Remonstrance was brought over to Walsh by the Earl of Fingal.

(there being but one more Bishop then in Ireland and he bed-ridden), together with the Vicar Apostolic of Dublin, the Vicars General of Meath and Ardagh, and the superiors of the Capuchins, the Carmelites, and the Franciscans.

This celebrated document being much less known than it deserves, I shall here insert it, omitting only the beginning which consists of general complaints of the Roman Catholic Clergy; after which it proceeds in the following words.

“ We know what odium all the Catholic
 “ Clergy lie under, by reason of the calumnies
 “ with which our tenets in Religion, and our
 “ dependance on the Pope’s authority are aspers-
 “ ed : and we humbly beg your Majesty’s pardon
 “ to vindicate both, by the ensuing Protestation
 “ which we make in the sight of Heaven, and
 “ in the presence of your Majesty, sincerely
 “ and truly, without equivocation or mental
 “ reservation. We do acknowledge and con-
 “ fess your Majesty to be our true and lawful
 “ King, supreme Lord and rightful Sovereign of
 this

“ this Realm of Ireland, and of all other your
 “ Majesty’s Dominions. And therefore we ac-
 “ knowledge and confess ourselves to be obliged
 “ under pain of sin to obey your Majesty in all
 “ civil and temporal affairs, as much as any other
 “ of your Majesty’s subjects, and as the law and
 “ rules of government in this kingdom do require
 “ at our hands. And that notwithstanding any
 “ power or pretension of the Pope or See of Rome,
 “ or any sentence or declaration of what kind
 “ or quality soever, given or to be given by
 “ the Pope, his Predecessors or Successors, or
 “ by any authority, Spiritual or Temporal, proceed-
 “ ing or derived from Him or his See, against
 “ your Majesty or Royal Authority, we will still
 “ acknowledge and perform to the uttermost of
 “ our abilities, our faithful loyalty and true alle-
 “ giance to your Majesty. And we openly dis-
 “ claim and renounce all foreign power, be it
 “ either Papal or Princely, Spiritual or Temporal,
 “ in as much as it may seem able or shall pre-
 “ tend to free, discharge, or absolve us from this
 “ obligation, or shall any way give us leave or
 “ license to raise tumults or bear arms or

“offer any violence to your Majesty’s person,
 “Royal authority, or to the State or Government:
 “being all of us ready, not only to discover
 “and make known to your Majesty and to
 “your ministers, all the treasons made against
 “your Majesty or them, which shall come to
 “our hearing, but also to loose our lives in
 “defence of your Majesty’s person and Royak
 “authority, and to resist with our best endea-
 “vours all conspiracies and attempts against your
 “Majesty, be they framed or sent under what
 “pretence, or patronised by what foreign power
 “or authority soever. And further we profess
 “that all absolute Princes and supreme Governors,
 “of whatsoever Religion they be, are God’s
 “Lieutenants on Earth, and that obedience is
 “due to them, according to the Laws of each
 “Commonwealth respectively, in all civil and
 “temporal affairs. And therefore we do hereby
 “protest against all Doctrine and Authority to the
 “contrary. And we do hold it impious, and
 “against the word of God, to maintain that
 “any private subject may kill or murder the
 “anoointed of God, his Prince, though of a
 “different

“different Religion and belief from his. And
 “we abhor and detest the practice thereof, as
 “damnable and wicked.”

“These being the tenets of our Religion, in
 “point of loyalty and submission to your Majesty’s
 “commands, and our dependance of the See of
 “Rome no ways intrenching upon that perfect
 “obedience, which by our birth, by all laws divine
 “and human, we are bound to pay to your Majesty,
 “our natural and lawful Sovereign, we humbly beg,
 “prostrate at your Majesty’s feet, that you would
 “be pleased to protect us from the severe perse-
 “cution we suffer, merely for our profession in
 “Religion; leaving those that are, or hereafter
 “shall be, guilty of other crimes, (and there have
 “been such at all times, as well by their pens as
 “by their actions), to the punishment prescribed
 “by the law.”

Signed by Oliver Darcy, Bishop of Dromore,
 and twenty-three others of their Clergy; besides
 which original subscribers, Walsh gives a list of
 forty

forty four others who afterwards put their names to the Remonstrance.*

This evidently was no *Lay Protestation*, as Dr. Milner erroneously denominates it; and the expressions made use of in it are such as to justify the English *Protesting Catholics* of 1791 in calling it, *as harmless and as free from objection as a profession of allegiance can be.*† Yet what was the consequence to those who signed that remonstrance? *They were excommunicated, and several of them perished from want!*‡

The opinions of *Dr. Milner* upon this subject of the *Remonstrance* merit some further observations.

He

* The Nobility and Gentry of Ireland, then in London, to the number of ninety-seven, presented a Remonstrance to the same effect; and two hundred and thirty more afterwards signed it in Ireland.

† See Original Papers, published by the *Protesting Catholics* in 1791, p. 15.

‡ Ibid. This fact shews what a terrible instrument of mischief a Roman Catholic Excommunication may be made.

He tells us that "the Roman Catholic Clergy
 "drew up an Anti-Remonstrance, which was as
 "explicit in point of loyalty, and as clear a re-
 "nunciation of the deposing power as words can
 "express.*"

In reply to this I shall notice a few of the variations observable on comparing the two, and which *Dr. Milner*, who appears to have read Walsh's book, knew, at the time he passed this judgment, to have been observed.

The *Anti-Remonstrance* does not style the King, *Rightful King*.

It only promises, *to be as obedient as any subject ought to be to his Prince*; a promise which *Belarmine* or *Thomas a Becket* would have made, but which is not *explicit in point of Loyalty*.

It only promises, *to be as obedient as the laws of God and nature require*, instead of the truly loyal promise of the *Remonstrance*, which engages for such obedience *as the Laws and Rules of Government in the King-*

* Divine right of Episcopacy, p. 105.

Kingdom do require. Will Dr. Milner call these expressions equally explicit?

It states, that it is not the doctrine of the Subscribers that *Subjects may be discharged from performing their duty of true allegiance to their Prince*; but so might the most violent maintainers of the Pope's deposing power, understanding *true allegiance* with a reserve of the rights of that paramount authority.

It reprobates the doctrine that *any private subject may kill his Prince*, but it puts no guard between the Prince and the sword of any subject receiving commission from a foreign power, who by such commission would cease to be a *private* subject; and it says not a word of the case of a Prince declared to be deposed by the Pope, and who thereby might be conceived to have lost the denomination of *Prince*, and to be no longer under the protection of this promise.

And in a word, it guardedly omits all direct mention of the Pope and his pretensions, thereby leaving it free to conjecture that they
who

who were in words so fearful of giving him offence, would not, if called upon to act, be very ready to disobey him.

Are the Roman Catholic clergy aware that by appointing *Dr. Milner* their agent in transacting affairs precisely of the same nature with those to which the *Remonstrance* related, they signify an approbation by no means equivocal, of the sentiments he has expressed on that subject; and can they doubt that in doing so, they give occasion to distrust and suspicion?

These opinions of *Dr. Milner* on the *Remonstrance* of 1660, lead me to notice what he has said of the attempt, made by the Roman Catholics of England in 1791, to satisfy the government by an unambiguous oath of allegiance.

At that period a declaration was drawn up of the sentiments of the Roman Catholics on all questions connected with their allegiance. The four Apostolic Vicars and their coadjutors, and almost all the clergy and laity of the English

Catholics

Catholics signed that declaration* It was then changed into an oath of allegiance, and the Apostolic Vicars prohibited from swearing it those very persons whom, just before, they had encouraged by their example to sign it !†

And *Dr. Milner* approved their conduct !!!

The Apostolic Vicars prohibited the Roman Catholics from taking any oath, or signing any instrument *wherein the interests of Religion are concerned*,† without the previous approbation of their Bishop; but *Dr. Milner* goes much farther, for he puts

* Original Papers, p. 45.

† On this occasion the Apostolic Vicars declared that the words of an Oath are to be understood in the sense which they bear in the writings of the Schoolmen! ex. gr. that *Persons* meant *Souls* or *Consciences* ! A dreadful doctrine, destroying all reliance upon oaths, and the express denial of which should be made a part of every oath framed for those who may be suspected of holding it.--- See Original Papers, p. 11.

† See Orig. Papers, p. 4. where the *monstrous latitude* of this expression is noticed.

puts the conscience of the layman, *directly and implicitly*, into the hands of his priest; telling him that if in so obeying his spiritual guide he should fall into error, he is provided with an excuse: *Lord, if I have been deceived, it has been by listening to those Pastors whom thou hast commanded me to hear.**

Do the Roman Catholic clergy approve of these sentiments?

Are they wise in declaring such approbation,

G 2

by

* See *Divine Right of Episcopacy*, p. 117. Well suited to this plan of making the laity entirely dependent on their priests, is the wish of restraining them from the free use of the sacred Scriptures, expressed by *Dr. Milner* in the 18th letter of his *Tour*, which he concludes by saying that the object of the *Associators*, and other persons who distribute Bibles among the people, is not to enlighten, but to obscure their minds; not to communicate religious knowledge, but to deprive them of what they have, and to unsettle their belief!!!

by choosing as their Agent with Government, the man who has proclaimed such sentiments?*

Let us follow *Dr. Milner* to the transactions in which he has been engaged during the past year, and see whether his conduct in them encreases his qualifications for the office to which he has recently been re-appointed, or justifies the general approbation which he has received from the Roman Catholic clergy.

When applied to for information during the last session of Parliament, he gave it as his opinion, that in the appointment of Bishops it probably would be agreed, that the ministry should be consulted to know whether they had any objection to the person elected, as to his civil or political

* As the Layman depends on the Priest, so does the Priest on his Bishop, *by whose authority alone he teaches*, (according to *Dr. Milner*) It follows pretty clearly, that the Bishop depends on the Pope, in whose power, consequently, are the consciences of all men!

This is the doctrine of which, most especially, the Roman Catholics are concerned to declare their abhorrence. The belief that they hold it has been the cause of every coercion to which they have been subject in these countries. Will they make, then, the man who declares that he holds it, their Representative?

political conduct; which would, in effect, give the Crown a *negative*: but that an unrestrained negative would not be given, as that would amount in reality to a positive power; but only one restrained to a reasonable number of times, as two, three or four.*

When this proposal, perhaps not *totidem verbis*, but certainly according to the ordinary meaning of the expressions, was mentioned in Parliament, and it came to be reported that *Dr. Milner* was the authority for it, he, in a publication signed with his name, declared that he would shed the last drop of his blood rather than suffer the King to have any influence, *direct or indirect*, in the appointment of Roman Catholic Bishops.†

And yet, in the *Letter to a Parish Priest*, already quoted, he states the resolution agreed to in 1799 by the four Roman Catholic Archbishops

* This is his own account, given in his *Letter to a Parish Priest*, already quoted.

† This letter was published in the *Morning Chronicle*.

bishops and by six Bishops, *That, in the appointment of Prelates of the Roman Catholic Religion to vacant Sees within the kingdom, such interference of Government as may enable it to be satisfied of the loyalty of the person to be appointed, is just, and ought to be agreed to*; and he vehemently exhorts them not to rescind that resolution!

These seem to be not *indirect* but very *direct* contradictions.

And lest any doubt should remain as to *Dr. Milner's** opinion that some interference of Government in the appointment of Roman Catholic Bishops is admissable, he states the plan proposed in 1799,† which was, *that the name of the person elected should be returned to Government, and if in a month they had any proper objection to him, then they were to inform the President of the election*

* I have already said that I know nothing of *Dr. Milner* but from two or three of his books, and that I disclaim all personal imputation in what I say of him. It is merely the author of the *Tour in Ireland*, &c. that I speak of.

† Letter to a Parish Priest.

election, who should convene the Electors and proceed to a new choice ; and to this plan he tells us he had an implied consent from the Propaganda ; and he argues that, as the schismatical sovereign of Russia, and the heretical sovereign of Prussia, have always been consulted in the appointment of Bishops, nay exercise a power in that respect far exceeding what has been offered by the Irish Bishops to the King, and have accredited agents at Rome for the purpose, it would be absurd to depart from the plan which had thus actually been offered.*

Who will pretend to reconcile this with the declaration, *that he would shed the last drop of his blood rather than suffer the King to have any influence, direct or indirect, in the appointment of Bishops ?*

Have the Roman Catholic clergy appointed an Agent of such various opinions on the important business in which he is to be employed, for the purpose of reminding us of the *variations* which have taken place in the sentiments of their Bishops

* Letter to a Parish Priest.

Bishops upon the same subject, who having made the proposal already noticed (p. p. 48, 49.) to government, did recently come to a resolution, that *it is their decided opinion that it is inexpedient to introduce any alteration in the canonical mode hitherto observed in the nomination of Irish Roman Catholic Bishops* ?*

On what *Basis* is *Dr. Milner* expected to treat with those to whom he is deputed by the Roman Catholic clergy ?

That laid in the resolution of their Bishops in 1799, or, in their Resolution in 1808 ?

On the ground of his own approbation of the former of those resolutions, or of his declaration which contradicts it ?

On

* This Resolution has been the subject of a letter from a very respectable meeting of Roman Catholics in the county of Louth, to Dr. O'Reilly their Primate, whose answer contains a most extraordinary passage in which he states that the danger of the concession in question is, *in his opinion, and that of several other Prelates, of a temporary nature, resulting from existing circumstances.* An explanation of this passage must be very anxiously looked for,

On his letter in the Morning Chronicle, or that addressed to a parish Priest?

Will the appointment of such an Agent conciliate the confidence of those with whom he is to negotiate, or will it not rather make them exclaim,

“ *Quo teneam vultus mutantem Protea nodo ?*”

I have designedly avoided noticing the very offensive language which *Dr. Milner* uses in “*his Tour*,” uniformly, towards the Protestant clergy and gentry of Ireland: his unfair statements of the events that took place previous to the Rebellion in 1798, and during its continuance: his unrestrained abuse of loyal and respected individuals: his misrepresentations of the nature of useful public establishments, and of the manner in which they are conducted: * his want of gratitude to

H

Lord

* One of these I must notice. He says, that the University of Dublin is not a fit place to send Roman Catholics to, as the students are obliged to attend the established service. I have known that University for 33 years,

Lord Redesdale, for the advantages obtained by the Roman Catholics in 1791, and his want of candour in stating the plan of that nobleman* for diminishing the causes of discontent in Ireland: every thing, in short, which might be considered as

(twenty-six of which I passed within its walls,) and I do say, that nothing can be more untrue than this statement: that, from my earliest recollection, long before the act admitting Roman Catholics to take degrees, not one of them who applied to be excused from attending chapel was refused: and I cannot conceive it possible for *Dr. Milner* to have sought for information as to a fact so universally notorious, without getting it. His charge of relaxed morals and want of discipline is equally unfounded.

* I should rather say, *which he attributes to that Nobleman*, I know not whether rightly or not. It is evident that the author of "*Thoughts on the Catholic Question*" considers the disturbed state of Ireland to arise from a Roman Catholic Hierarchy existing in that country, and claiming the actual Archbishopricks and Bishopricks bestowed by law upon Protestants. This evil might be removed without reducing the Roman Catholic Church to a Presbyterian form, barely by putting it under the same government which has so long existed in it in England; a certain number of Apostolic Vicars, consecrated to Bishopricks *in partibus Infidelium*.

as of temporary interest or of inferior importance, or might lead to lengthened detail; it being my object to rest my argument upon a few plain, incontrovertible facts, which no man who opens *Dr. Milner's* book can fail of finding, and the inference from which is too obvious to be denied. I shall conclude by a brief statement of the argument and inference.

If *Dr. Milner's* writings are replete with whatever is calculated to irritate the Protestants of England and of Ireland, his appointment as Agent for the Roman Catholic clergy must be considered as most unlikely to conciliate past differences, and as indicating in those who have chosen him, an hostility similar to his own.

If he has disapproved the conduct of the Roman Catholics in the two greatest attempts made to give unequivocal assurance of their loyalty*, we must clearly perceive, that they who have now made him their agent are influenced by principles unlike those of the loyal and liberal-minded

* In Ireland in 1660, and in England in 1791.

Remonstrants of Ireland in former times, and their late imitators in England, so justly respected in 1791.

If he has declared that the Roman Catholic Laity must implicitly submit their moral conduct to the direction of the Priesthood, (a doctrine suited to the most unenlightened ages, and particularly obnoxious to the reformed churches,) they, whose representative he has been appointed, must expect to have the same opinion imputed to themselves, nor hope to be considered as yet free from the prejudices they are so anxious to disclaim.

If he has taught, that Bishops cannot be restrained in the exercise of their episcopal jurisdiction by any mere human right or authority*, we must conclude that they who have selected him as their Negotiator, claim that exemption from control which will make them independent of the State, and establish them an *Imperium in Imperio*, obviously inconsistent with its safety.

If,

* Divine right of Episcopacy, pref. p. iii.

If, finally, the person to whom the Roman Catholic clergy entrust the management of their interests, be a man who has, at different and not distant periods, declared opinions relative to the principal subject now to be discussed, decidedly inconsistent with each other, they cannot be surprised if such conduct, aided by their own unsteadiness on the same question, should bring to our recollection what the Great Duke of Ormond said (with one exception) of their predecessors in 1666.

“ As I am a Christian, these twenty years I had to do with those Irish Bishops, I never found one of them either to speak the truth, or to perform their Promise. ”*

Such

* Perhaps those Bishops held with respect to promises the principle which one of their successors, Dr. Lanigan of Ossory, has recently professed and acted upon; viz. that the obligation arising from a promise ceases, *when before the promise is fulfilled, the circumstances become so changed that the person promising, had he foreseen those circumstances, would never have made the promise !*

Such

Such are the reflections which have occurred to me on considering the appointment of *Dr. Milner* as the Political Agent of the clergy of his communion in Ireland, at the present important crisis ; and I think they fully warrant me in the inference that under *existing circumstances*, whatever abstract opinion may be entertained on the subject), the Concession sought by the Roman Catholics would be attended with consequences dangerous to the State.

Such a reservation destroys all confidence in promises, and renders them utterly nugatory ; and the case to which *Dr. Lanigan* applied it is a proof of this. He had promised to sign a certain *Address*, and afterwards refused to keep his promise ; alleging that he had discovered the *Address* to be displeasing to persons whom he did not wish to differ from, and that when he made the promise he had not foreseen such a consequence !!!

I thought the principles of the Jesuits had been extinct with the order !

Finis.