

## THE VOLUNTEERS.

ST. JEAN BAPTISTE VILLAGE  
INFANTRY COMPANY.

THE MEMBERS OF THE ABOVE COMPANY

...WILL ASSEMBLE AT THE...

QUEBEC GATE BARRACKS,

(DALHOUSIE SQUARE),

To-morrow (THURSDAY) Evening,

At 7:30.

There are a few vacancies for recruits. Standard  
5 feet 9 inches.M. W. KIRWAN,  
Captain Commanding.

## NOW READY.

## "LA CAMPAGNE IRLANDAISE."

REMINISCENCES OF THE

FRANCO-GERMAN WAR,

By W. M. KIRWAN.

To be had at Dawson Brothers, Montreal. Price, in  
Paper, 75 cents; in Cloth, \$1.

## The True Witness

AND

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY,

AT

761 CRAIG STREET.

M. W. KIRWAN—EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

Terms—\$2.00 per annum—in Advance

MONTREAL, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 24.

## CALENDAR—APRIL, 1878.

WEDNESDAY, 24—Of the Octave.  
War between the United States and Mexico begun,  
1846.THURSDAY, 25—Of the Octave.  
Thomas Addis Emmet born, 1764. Daniel Mac-  
lise, the Painter, died 1870.FRIDAY, 26—Of the Octave.  
Attainder of the Earl of Desmond and his fol-  
lowers, 1586.SATURDAY, 27—Of the Octave.  
Carolus, the Irish harper died, 1738.

SUNDAY, 28—LOW SUNDAY.

MONDAY, 29—St. Peter, Martyr.

TUESDAY, 30—St. Catherine of Siena, Virgin.

Washington inaugurated as first President of the  
United States, at New York, 1789.Mr. Henry R. Benoit of Fall River Mass,  
is authorized to solicit subscriptions for this  
paper.

## ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENCE.

"A CONSTANT READER, OTTAWA."—We do  
not know any doctor of that name in Mont-  
real. The name is not in the city directory.

## MR. T. D. KING'S MONOLOGUE.

Curosity is excited about the way Mr. King will treat the subject he has chosen for his Monologue, namely Collins's celebrated ode on the Passions, illustrated by the various characters in Shakespeare's plays, in whom the subtle workings of the mind when labouring under the influence of the Passions, incident to human nature, are most faithfully portrayed. Of late years the poetical works of Collins have been justly classed among the finest and most perfect compositions in the language, and, beautiful as the ode in question undoubtedly is, yet it gives but a shadowy outline of fear, anger, despair, hope, revenge, jealousy, melancholy, joy, and love. These, when the spirit of Shakespeare is breathed into them, will be clothed with a beauty, a boldness and sublimity not to be found in any other author, for there is not another who has shown in such an eminent degree the same power of developing the Passions, and catching and representing the feelings of mankind and their motives to action.

With our knowledge of Mr. King's qualities as an ardent admirer and a keen student of the writings of Shakespeare, and also of Mr. Neil Warner's ability as an elocutionist, the entertainment on Wednesday and Thursday Evenings at the Synod Hall will we believe prove attractive. Those of our readers, fond of the Shakespearian drama, will have a great treat if they go to it. Our advice to them is—go.

## THE YOUNG BRITONS.

Those hopeful gallants the "Young Britons" are determined to raise a storm in Montreal. Some fine day we will all be alarmed at discovering riot rampant, incendiarism prevalent, as the "croppies" awaken to the efforts that are now being made to "make them lie under." Counting upon the natural forbearance of the Catholic youth of this city, the Young Britons are rushing to their destruction and they will only discover their mistake when they find themselves in trouble. Not satisfied with several attempts at cold blooded assassination, they must even stand upon the threshold of our churches, and pursue Catholics within the walls erected to God's Glory. This is going too far. It is more than the Catholics can be expected to stand, and while we would be very sorry to see disturbance in our thoroughfares, yet if those Bashi Bozouks of Britons do not keep themselves clear from the approach

to our altars, there will of a surty be wigs upon the green. The pent up feelings of the Catholic youth of Montreal will some day have its flag, if those demonstrations of hate and ascendancy on the part of the petful Britons do not cease, and it will be an evil day for our city, if the Catholics resolve to take the temporary administration of the law into their own hands.

## THE SCOTTISH HIERARCHY.

Scotland has given the world some painful pictures of apostasy and persecution, of disloyalty to the creed of ages and brutality to its unchanging disciples. But the canvas has never been wholly dark; it has been relieved by gleams here and there of the light of constancy and devotion. Truth lingered amidst the hills or hid away in the valleys, and the few whose treasure it was transmitted it from sire to son till the birth of a more tolerant generation rendered possible the unfurling of the olden banner. Over a quarter of a century ago, the ranks of the native Catholics were recruited by multitudes of brethren in faith from across the Irish Sea—descendants of men whose fidelity had been so universal and so inflexible, as to defy the national massacres of Elizabeth and Cromwell, the confiscations of James, the perfidy of William, and the entire code of proselytism and plunder known as the Penal Laws. The newcomers infused a new spirit. They had grown up fighting for their convictions, always against odds, and never acknowledging defeat; and they carried with them their adopted home the defiant energy they had inherited from their fathers. The Church spread rapidly. Temples, convents, monasteries, and schools multiplied. The places of worship, which in 1833 numbered 73 had increased to 339 in 1877. Lanark alone acquired no less than 40 new churches in little more than as many years. There were in 1833 neither convents, colleges, nor schools, while, in 1876, there were 27 convents, 4 colleges and 65 schools. One might almost fancy, from so much progress, that the days of St. Ninian and St. Columba were about to dawn again, and we cannot wonder that prayers should go to the Vatican for a restoration of the National Hierarchy. The late Holy Father was not spared by God to bring the good work to a conclusion, but he had given it his august sanction and approval; and, as our Universal Mother the Church endures through her successive Pontiffs, Leo XIII. completed what his predecessors had so lovingly begun. Nothing is different in the plan from what we published a couple of months ago. For the present, the country will be divided into six sees, one of these [St. Andrews] being metropolitan, with four suffragans; and another [Glasgow] being archiepiscopal, without any suffragans. The arrangement, of course, is tentative, and subject to change or extension as the exigencies of the future may suggest. Our readers in and out of Scotland will be aware that some of the Presbyterians have been moving heaven and earth to avert what they believe to be a disaster to their creed and country. They have held meetings, lashed themselves and the populace into fury, and threatened to do something serious in the event of their failure to intimidate Rome. Some of the ministers have beaten the drum ecclesiastic with forty-parson power, to call their followers to arms. One of the arguments used on platforms, in pulpits, and in pamphlets, was that the Hierarchy as contemplated was illegal—clearly, manifestly illegal—a violation of the law undoubted and flagrant. This assertion was repeated and emphasised *ad nauseam*, and it was another illustration of the kind of client the individual has who will be his own lawyer. The easiest thing possible was to take the opinion of competent counsel on the point in the first instance, and by this means ascertain what the law had to say on the matter. This has been done at last, and it bears out the opinion—that the repeal of the Ecclesiastical Titles Act cleared the field. There were statutes passed in Scotland in 1560, in 1567, in 1690, and in 1707, all directed at the exclusion from the kingdom of Papal jurisdiction. They were penal measures, and imposed punishments for disobedience. The Ecclesiastical Titles Act was passed by the Imperial Parliament in 1851, and was repealed in 1871; and by its repeal it removed all pains and penalties. The position created was somewhat curious. The Legislature made declaration that "ecclesiastical titles of honor and dignity, derived from any see, province, or deanery, must come from her Majesty to be valid but added that it is not expedient to impose penalties upon those ministers of religion who may, as among the members of the several religious bodies to which they respectively belong, be designated by distinctions regarded as titles of office, although such designation may be connected with the name of some town or place within the realm." Two purposes were being served by this very peculiar legislation—the relief of Catholic ecclesiastics from an insulting, though

inert, statute, and the appeasement of some of the bigots who demanded the appearance, when they had lost the substance of ascendancy. As the law now stands the Hierarchy cannot be recognised officially; neither can it be assailed. His Grace the Archbishop of St. Andrews, Primate of Scotland, has therefore as much freedom in the use of his title and the discharge of his functions as he desires, and the angry agitators who have wasted so much oratory recently might have spared themselves so much exertion. If they wish the Ecclesiastical Titles Act to be re-imposed, and put into active execution, they ought to direct their attention to the practical mode of proceeding, and quit the vain rant with which they have vexed the air too long.

## A WONDERFUL "IRISHMAN"

Some ten or twelve days ago a mountain of erudition, signing himself "Irishman," was delivered of a pithy historical compendium concerning St. Patrick and various other interesting matters. We hope the clever gentleman is doing as well as can be expected and that the physicians are attentive. A relapse is what is most to be feared.

Aristotle, we believe, is considered the master of the syllogism, but with all his intellectual powers, we hold firmly that he could not demonstrate the following argument:

"Solomon was a wise man;  
But Sampson was a strong man;  
Argal, Cain killed his brother Abel."

This consummate fact was reserved for "Irishman." We congratulate him on his victory and would suggest a Testimonial in the shape of a Kerry cow or a chip from the Blarney Stone. Our age is too forgetful of its best benefactors.

We differ from "Irishman," though trembling at our own temerity. And we differ on grounds which few will suspect. The learned gentleman does not go far enough. He boldly approaches the frontiers of historical fiction,—he begins to reveal the hideous features of the monster, but, as if frightened at the sight, he incontinently takes to his heels and tumbles helplessly into a *non sequitur*—a sort of irrational Bog of Allen. Still, his intentions are so good—his love of truth so manifest,—that we applaud and forgive.

"I find no mention of St. Patrick, by Prosper," says "Irishman." Therefore, don't you see, St. Patrick never existed. For, it is an historical fact that Prosper was specially deputed—shall we say, inspired?—to mention St. Patrick and every man and woman of that ilk. But "Irishman" is too moderate; he should have driven the bolt in farther. St. Augustine is silent about St. Patrick. St. Jerome never mentions his name. Tertullian totally ignores the Irish Apostle. Philo. (*De Bello Judaico, passim*), speaks of Vespasian, Titus, John, Simon and various others, but—not a word about St. Patrick. Julius Caesar invaded Britain and built the tower of London, especially for recalcitrant Papists, but speaks not of St. Patrick. This is an historical fact, not wanting the unquestionable authority of a poet.

"Ye towers of Julius, London's lasting shame  
With many a black and midnight murder fed"

Moreover, Sakya Mouni, the founder of Buddhism, a man illustrious for his knowledge of Milesian history, says nothing whatever about St. Patrick! Peruse, at any leisure moment, the 80,000 sacred books of the Hindoos and—remarkable fact!—there is not one word about St. Patrick! The Zend Avestas of the Persians, though treating of antique lore may be valiantly waded through without finding a trace of St. Patrick. Herodotus says nothing about him. Sanconiaton knew him not. Xenophon was ignorant of his existence. Kong fu tau, otherwise Confucius, does not make the most remote allusion to St. Patrick. And, this is the more remarkable, as Confucius, being a philosopher, necessarily knew everything.

Therefore, we conclude, not only was St. Patrick not St. Patrick, but such a person never existed at all! If "Irishman" wish to expose effectually the falsifications of history, let him read up solid authors and the world will soon stand amazed at its own credulity. Let him pass beyond the puny records of Bede and Prosper, and the adjustment of history will be only a question of time.

But, contradictory as it may appear to plodding wits, "Irishman" admits the existence of St. Patrick, for he speaks of his "Confession." *Prius est esse quam Confiteri*, which translated, means: "We must exist before we can confess." "In his confessions," says "Irishman," "he mentions the clergy of Ireland, Britain and France, but never mentions the clergy or Bishop of Rome." In 403, St. Patrick was admitted a student at St. John of Lateran, at Rome, referring to which the Protestant writer says:—"In this place he signifies that he was skilled in sacred learning, and endowed with the knowledge of ecclesiastical rules and discipline." (Usher, c. 17-p. 835.) But, of course, this is an interpretation, for, as

a general rule, whenever a quotation favors the Papists it is, according to Evangelical canons, an interpolation. Protestant books have never been tampered with, nor has Protestantism ever corrupted any work, save and except a few hundred little changes in the Bible text, of no importance whatever, that Book being merely the word of God. The fact of the matter is, the "Confession" of St. Patrick is considered apocryphal by many grave authorities, hence deduction from it must be taken *cum grano salis*, though it is, doubtless, of venerable antiquity, as O'Curry, O'Donovan, Petrie and other Irish scholars prove.

What does "Irishman" mean when he asserts that "St. Patrick founded an independent Church in Ireland?" What is an independent church? Independent of God? But, surely, the learned historian does not pretend that there was Protestantism in those days. Independent of Rome? Either St. Patrick received his mission from Rome or he did not. If the latter horn of the dilemma be held, whence or from whom did he receive it? In his days men did not send themselves,—were not their own authority. We suppose St. Patrick's visit to Rome during the pontificate of Leo the Great, had for its object the conversion from "Romanism" of that illustrious Pope.

We are told "Rome claimed no supremacy then." Generally speaking, "Irishman" is right for once,—unconsciously so, of course. Rome did not claim, she asserted supremacy. Those who questioned her rights were cut off—if contumacious—from the Church. The erudite Scribe strives to illustrate his absurd position by observing that St. Augustine was not recognized as superior by bishops, priests and deacons in England, thus insinuating that the supremacy of the Pope, who sent him, was an open question. History informs us that a deputation of the clergy refused to receive St. Augustine because he did not rise from his seat when they approached him. Gregory had not made the consent of the Britons a necessary condition for the exercise of metropolitan rights by his envoy, but, in the consciousness of power, with which he was clothed by Divine appointment, he bade him use them freely for the interests of piety:—"We commit the care of all the British Bishops to you, brother, that the unlearned may be instructed, the weak strengthened by advice, and the perverse corrected with authority." (Ep. lxi.) The authority of St. Augustine was soon acknowledged on all sides.

The fact of the matter is, the British clergy had fallen into a bad state as to morals and discipline, though their faith in general remained pure. Arianism, under Constantius, gained a slight foothold, but was soon stamped out. When Pelagianism appeared St. Prosper informs us that Pope Celestine invested St. Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre, with legatine powers, in his own stead, in order that he might drive out the heretics [Pelagians etc.] and guide the Britons to the Catholic faith." (In chron. ad an. 420.) We see the Pope destroying nascent heresies, rebuking the excesses of the clergy, the existence of which Gildas amply shows, and sending legates to remedy abuses. Moreover, at the Council of Arles, 314, the Bishops of London, York and Lincoln were present together with the prelates of Sicily, Campania, Apulia, Dalmatia, Italy, Gaul, Spain, Mauritania, Sardinia, Africa and Numidia. This Council calls Sylvester:—"The most beloved, most glorious Pope, Sylvester," in terms of deserved reverence, denoting his apostolic authority. It continues:—"Would to God, most beloved brother, you had been present at this great spectacle! we feel convinced that a severer sentence would have been passed upon them, (the Donatists,) and you sitting in judgment with us, our assembly would have experienced greater exultation. But you could not leave those parts where the Apostles sit (in judgment) and their blood (the memory of their martyrdom) attests the Divine glory." [Epis. 2. Syn. Arelat.] The fathers made known to the Pontiff their decrees on various points, that they might be communicated to all the churches; and his office, as successor of the Apostles, is clearly marked as the source of his authority. [Ancient Ex. of Pap. Auth. Kenrick.]

Again; St. Prosper says of Pope Celestine: "With no less solicitude he freed Britain from this disease [Pelagianism] when he banished from that remote island certain enemies of grace, natives of the country, and, having ordained a Bishop for the Scots [Irish] whilst he labors to preserve a Roman island in the Catholic faith, he made even a barbarous island Christian." [Contra Cassian, c. xli.] Ireland is called "barbarous," because all which they could not subjugate were considered barbarous by the Romans, just as the independent Hindoo princes are looked upon, in our day, by the English. Now, in the face of all this can anyone say that Britain "was independent of Rome," that "Rome claimed no supremacy then," and all the rest of those

niaiseries so common to champions of the "Irishman" stamp? What is applicable to Britain, in this case, is equally applicable to Ireland. Pelagius was a Briton of very little position or consequence, yet when he began to dogmatize against the necessity of divine grace the whole church arose against him, and Agricola, a disciple of the heresiarch, who strove to spread the poison of his master's teaching in Britain, was put down with a firm hand by the authority of the Roman Pontiff. St. Patrick, a bishop, sent by Rome as Metropolitan of Ireland establishes, according to our "Irishman" an "independent church" and his defection is passed over in silence! Ah! those rascally falsifiers of history; let us proclaim a crusade against them, valiant "Irishman." Perhaps St. Patrick established an independent "invisible church" which he skillfully conformed, in things visible, to the church of Rome. From the Gnostics of the second century, whom St. Irenaeus opposed, down to their brethren of the nineteenth century, that "invisible church" affords a handy refuge to baffled heretics. Because your "invisible church" may be twisted into any shape or doctrine,—may be made to teach everything, anything or nothing. A nice, vague, foggy sort of an establishment which hates definitions, and plays the devil with Popery. In fact, a mixture of Oxford and Jean Paul with a spice of Proteus, or a species of underground railway from Jerusalem to Geneva and London. Well, you see, it was this invisible, primitive concern which was "independent of Rome for 1000 years." Popery came over to Ireland with Strongbow and the "independent church" was compelled to put on kilts and immigrate to the Scottish lowlands where, in course of time, it budded into a "Solemn League and Covenant" and was made to sing psalms to the sharp accompaniment of John Graham of Claverhouse.

That "all the Irish bishops took the oath of Supremacy to Elizabeth," and that "the Roman Catholics in general, resorted to churches in which the English Service was used," we emphatically deny. They prove that "Irishman" is not, speaking euphuistically,—prejudiced in favor of truth. The hired scribblers, Fox and Hooker said so but those authors made their living by lying. They would have been "at the town's end" begging, if they had told the truth. The Sees of four or five Catholic Bishops were usurped, but the majority remained. One simple fact will demonstrate the falsehood. If the Irish Bishops had all apostatized it would have been necessary to re-establish the Hierarchy in Ireland, as His Holiness is doing to-day in Scotland. After years of horrible persecution, about one in every five hundred was Protestant the day that Elizabeth lay dying in despair on the floor of her chamber. If the Bishops and people of faithful old Erin abandoned the church, will "Irishman" inform us how it happened they are all back again, leaving no record of their defection?

"Father Riley's religion" says "Irishman," "is not the religion of St. Patrick." You are in the right, good Sancho Panza. Father Riley's religion is the religion of Jesus Christ and so was St. Patrick's.

As "Irishman," is a lover of and a stern opponent of historical falsification, we beg to set him right on a matter of great importance. It is commonly supposed St. Patrick drove the Snakes into the sea. This is an utter falsification. He planted them in Ulster, and, in course of time they sprang up a valiant crop of true-blue Orangemen. They have changed their form but not their original nature.

## ENGLAND.

## ENORMOUS SECESSION FROM ANGLICANISM TO ROME.

The *Herald's* Paris correspondent says, from a person who professes to have an intimate acquaintance with the Vatican. "I hear that a movement is on foot which promises to be the most important event in the religious history of the century. This is nothing less than the secession in large bodies of members of the English Church to Roman Catholicism. The number of seceders is placed at 2,000,000. Included in this exodus from the Church of England are bishops, rectors, curates, and deacons. Authorized delegates are, it is asserted, now in Rome negotiating the conditions upon which the secession will take place. The acceptance of the Catholic faith is promised on the following conditions. First—The acceptance of all the doctrines of the Catholic Church. Second—To solve the difficulties among Anglicans relative to orders, bishops, ministers and deacons consent to receive fresh orders in the Roman Catholic Church under certain conditions. Third—All new priests undertake to observe celibacy. Fourth—Ministers already named shall not be asked to quit their families, but shall be debarred from hearing confessions. Fifth—The new Catholics to be placed for a period of twenty years under a special episcopal hierarchy in order to smooth any differences of opinion that may arise during the transition. This plan is modelled on that adopted by the Church in the East. In Armenia for instance every city has its special hierarchy."

SIR BRYAN O'LEIGHEN has been appointed Attorney General of Victoria.