

## The True Witness

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,  
PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY.No. 696, Craig Street, by  
J. GILLIES,  
G. E. CLERK, Editor.

TERMS IN ADVANCE:  
To all country subscribers, Two Dollars. If the subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the year, then, in case the paper be continued, the terms shall be Two Dollars and a-half.  
To all subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a-half, in advance; and if not renewed at the end of the year, then, if we continue sending the paper, the subscription shall be Three Dollars.

The True Witness can be had at the News Depot, Single copy 3d.

We beg to remind our Correspondents that no letters will be taken out of the Post-Office, unless pre-paid.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, NOV. 30.

## ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

NOVEMBER—1866.

Friday, 30—St. Andrew, Ap.

DECEMBER—1866.

Saturday, 1—Of the Immaculate Conception.

Sunday, 2—First of Advent.

Monday, 3—St. Francis Xavier, O.

Tuesday, 4—St. Peter Chrys., B. D.

Wednesday, 5—Fast and Abstinence—Sto. Barbara, V. M.

Thursday, 6—St. Nicholas, B. O.

## ROMAN LOAN.

THE PONTIFICAL LOAN BONDS are now being delivered to holders of receipts; and Subscriptions will be again received, and Bonds for \$25 may be taken at \$14.50.

ALFRED LAROCQUE.

[Montreal, Nov. 12, 1866.

## NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Mr. Gladstone has had, so it is reported, an interview with the Sovereign Pontiff. The Holy Father maintains an attitude of calm dignity; strong in the consciousness of his right, strong in his confidence on Him Who is ever in the barque with Peter, even when the storm rages most fiercely, he awaits the future without trepidation, and unalterable in his resolution to uphold his own rights, the rights of the Holy See, and the interests of the Catholic Church. There are rumors to the effect that the King of Prussia had written to the Pope offering him his protection; and it seems certain that, within a fortnight of this date, the French troops will have left Rome.

Amongst the many rumors of the week, there is one to the effect that Revolution in Spain is imminent, and that the Queen has already spoken of abdication. The reports from Spain, being for the most part circulated by the revolutionists themselves, must be received with much caution.

More certain is it that trouble is impending in Ireland, but the Government is on the alert, and is in possession of full information as to the designs and resources of the Fenians. There have been fresh arrests, and seizures of arms. A U. States citizen named McGillivray has been arrested in Dublin, and the authorities have it is said, got their eyes on others. Yet is it not impossible that an outbreak may occur, and if so, very sad will be the consequences to Ireland. Nothing to benefit the country therefrom can be expected: much bloodshed on both sides, and destruction of property there may indeed be; but the final result will be the renewal of the abominable scenes of '98, and the letting loose again on the brave but misguided and over-matched peasantry, of the savage Orangemen, and an infuriate yeomanry thirsting for blood. Every friend to Ireland will pray that this calamity may yet be averted.

The despatches received by the Atlantic Cable on Tuesday night state that an outbreak has taken place in Ireland, and that the greatest alarm is felt.

Again the report is current that Maximilian, the bogus Emperor of Mexico whom Louis Napoleon set up, has abdicated. As the collapse of the Mexican Empire involves merely a question of time, we see no reason for impugning the credibility of the report. A statement to the effect that President Johnson, convinced by the result of the late election, of the impossibility of carrying out his reconstruction policy, had signified his intention of accepting the policy of the Congress, or rather rump of a Congress which undertakes to legislate for the U. States—has met with a contradiction.

There has been much excitement about the alleged discovery of gold near Madoc in Upper Canada. There is still however, much uncertainty as to the truth of the discovery. If by some its authenticity is boldly asserted, by others it is insinuated that the whole affair is a humbug; and that no gold has been discovered, except that which had previously been hidden. The owner of the lot where the gold is said to have been found, has built a shed, over the hole or pit in which the precious metal is supposed to be; this shed is carefully locked, so that all access to the mine is cut off, and all means of testing the truth of the pretended discovery, are withheld from the public. We have no opinion of our own on the matter to offer, but in a few days the truth or falsity of the affair will be made manifest.

There were also rumors to the effect that the

steamer *China* of the Cunard line had been captured by Fenians on her voyage to Liverpool. The announcement of her safe arrival at that port on the 16th has effectually and satisfactorily disposed of this canard.

The steamers of the Richelieu Company have ceased to run for the season, and have gone into winter quarters.

Mr. Bright has made a mess of it in Ireland, or in other words, he has, through his disregard of truth, brought himself into a very unenviable position. This is by no means a singular case, for regard for truth is not a weakness of which Mr. Bright is habitually guilty: but as the man's sense of honor is not very delicate, he feels the unpleasantness of the frequent exposures that are made of him, less acutely than would a man brought up with the feelings of a gentleman; and thus by a beautiful moral arrangement of providence, is the wind "tempered to the scorn-lamb."

Mr. Pope Hennessey, one of the best Catholic members of the House of Commons, was singled out as the especial object of Mr. Bright's malignity: for Mr. Bright has a natural aversion to real Papists, and an equally strong dislike to gentlemen. So at the banquet in Dublin at which The O'Donoghue presided, he, Mr. Bright's thought to do a good stroke of business in the way of damaging Mr. Hennessey's election, by holding the latter up to the audience as one who, though a warm champion of Catholic Poland, always sided in Parliament with those who sought to perpetuate the wrongs of Ireland. To this attack Mr. Hennessey triumphantly replied by reading a note that he had actually in his pocket, addressed to him by the chairman of the Bright Banquet, The O'Donoghue, and in which his (Mr. Hennessey's) services to Ireland were thus gracefully and gratefully acknowledged:—

"My Dear Pope Hennessey—I earnestly hope you are succeeding in your election for I found in the House of Commons that you always acted as a true Irishman should act. Always sincerely yours, 'O'Donoghue.'"

And not content with having repulsed his assailant, Mr. Hennessey carried the war into the enemy's camp; proving by facts that could not be gainsaid, that the Catholic Clergy, and the Catholic laity of Ireland have always found in Mr. Bright an opponent of their claims; that, as a manufacturer, and employer of many work people, he, Mr. Bright displays a spirit of exclusiveness as towards the Irish; and that he has always done all in his power to defend and uphold the infamous system of "White Slavery" of which in some recent numbers, we gave a few examples, taken by us from official documents, and the Protestant press. Mr. Hennessey's rejoinder was, in short, in every respect triumphant, and will, we hope, convince Catholics that they can but dirty themselves, and disgrace their cause by contact with Mr. Bright; whose Liberalism consists, as is usually the case with men of his class and antecedents, simply in a jealous hatred of gentlemen his social superiors, and an equally strong aversion to Popery and Papists. He has no love for the Irish tenant, and his only claim to the good will of the latter, is that he detests landlords, and all that savors of an aristocracy.

When we find that the office holders, and dignitaries of the Government Establishment in Ireland, are becoming awake to the absurdity of their position—that of shepherds without sheep, we may entertain hopes that the dawn of a better day is not far off. Now such is actually the case; and the London *Times*, always a little, even if but very little a-head of public opinion, by the tone in which it speaks out on the Irish Question, is as it were a herald of that dawn, of that better and brighter day about soon, we hope, to break on Ireland.

In the first place the *Times* virtually admits that the fable, current amongst Protestants, about the Reformation in Ireland has been torn to pieces by a late publication from the pen of a learned Protestant minister, and dignitary of the Establishment, the Rev. Dr. Brady, "a vicar and rector in the diocese of Meath"—we quote from the *Times*—"formerly chaplain to three Viceroys, and deeply read in Church history." Well! this gentleman, to whose testimony no Protestant can object, the impartiality of whose conclusions drawn from his deep historical studies, no Anglican can impugn, has given to the world the result of his researches into the origin of the Established Church of Ireland. But here again we will quote the words of the *Times*:—

"Some of the most zealous champions of the Establishment have recently been resting its defence upon the assumed facts, that the Protestant hierarchy in Ireland derives its succession from St. Patrick; and that the Bishops, as a body, confirmed in the time of Elizabeth, so that their successors at the present time rightfully inherit the national church property. But the Rev. Dr. Brady, a vicar and rector in the diocese of Meath, formerly Chaplain to three Viceroys, and deeply read in Church history, has examined the records of the time in the case of every one of the Bishops, and found that the assumption in question is without any historical foundation, and that the Irish Protestant Bishops must be content with their English descent through Archbishop Curwin."

And the practical result of the Rev. Dr. Brady's historical researches, the *Times* then gives in the reverend gentleman's own words:—

If the Church in Ireland is to be preserved, the

cannot be done by stifling and suppressing the truth, and by insisting that an admission of error should come from within the Church itself, than that the charge of its being rapped by falsehood should be hurled against it by hostile hands. Under these circumstances, the author hopes he may be pardoned for the part he now takes, in contradicting what has been described to him by perhaps the highest living authority, as "the most important falsehood in all history."

And yet this falsehood, impudent as it is, and as it is now admitted to be, has done staunch service in its day. It—the falsehood that the Protestant Bishops of Ireland derive their succession, through the Catholic hierarchy existing in the days of Elizabeth, from St. Patrick—has been the *cheval de bataille* of the defenders of the Establishment against the assaults of Romanists. What subterfuge will be resorted to now, when it is admitted by the best read men of the Establishment that the Protestant Bishops are interlopers, intruders, and that therefore the successors of St. Patrick, of such successors there be, are the Roman Bishops whom the others have ousted from their Sees whose title they have usurped, and of whose revenues they are in the enjoyment, it is hard to say: but that some subterfuge will be attempted, that some artifices to deaden the force of Dr. Brady's crushing blow will be resorted to, there can be no reason to doubt. In the emergency, Clippity or "Soapy Sam" as he is irreverently termed, is the man for the job.

But at all events one great forward step has been gained: and it is not Dr. Brady alone who is abandoning as no longer tenable the positions hitherto looked upon as the impregnable bulwarks of the Protestant Establishment. The very Bishops themselves are uttering a cry of despair; and though as yet they manifest no symptoms of readiness to capitulate, they by their language in their addresses to their Clergy, betray their uneasiness, and all but confess that they will soon have to surrender at discretion. The *Times* is again our informant.

Dr. Fitzgerald Protestant Bishop of Killaloe, whom the *Times* qualifies as "one of the ablest and most liberal of our Prelates," rules over four dioceses of which the total population is 335,079, and out of which only 15,905 souls or one in 23, yield to him their spiritual allegiance. For the care of these 15,905 muttons, the Established Clergy enjoy a net annual revenue of £20,154 or about \$100,000.

These are certainly startling facts, and though by no means unparalleled in Ireland, they tell upon non-Irishmen whether Catholics or Protestants. They furnish an argument, which no logic however subtle, no amount of eloquence however brilliant, can destroy; and Dr. Fitzgerald therefore like a sensible man in a charge to his clergy by him lately delivered, does not so much as attempt to refute it. All he can be said in defence of his position, and that of his much-receiving and little-doing brethren amounts to this. That he does not see,—

"how by anything less than a sweeping revolution which should break the English connexion, and invert the present relative position of Roman Catholics and Protestants, not in the Church merely, but in society generally, the sentimental grievance can be wholly removed."—*Times*.

We hope the Bishop's view of the case is incorrect, since if a correct view, it furnishes an unanswerable argument in favor of "a sweeping revolution," of which there are many in Ireland who will avail themselves. They will argue thus: The Irish Protestant Establishment is a grievance, even if only a sentimental grievance; but as a grievance it must be removed: and if this can be effected only by means of a "sweeping revolution," if right cannot be done, and wrong redressed by fair means, and constitutional processes, then "a sweeping revolution" we must have. If Dr. Fitzgerald may assume as his premise that the Protestant Establishment, grievance, or wrong though he admit it to be, must be maintained, since it cannot be got rid of without "a sweeping revolution," his opponents are, by all the laws of logic justified in assuming as their major premise the necessity of getting rid of the wrong or grievance, and thus concluding to the necessity of a "sweeping revolution." There are however, we hope many Catholics who differ from both of the disputants, and who believe that justice to Ireland can be brought about by means of existing constitutional machinery, and that thus the necessity for, nay the certainty of a "sweeping revolution" may be dispensed with, and averted.

The Protestant Bishop of Kilmore is another dignitary who out of the fulness of his heart surcharged with anxiety as to the prospects and fate of the Establishment, has lately been delivering himself on the subject. He also has tried to ease his mind by a Charge; and though of course like his brother of Killaloe, he sees or feels the absurdity of his position, and recognises the anomaly of a Protestant Established Church and a richly State endowed Protestant Clergy for a people almost entirely Catholic, who cannot be brought within the pale of the one; and who reject with scorn the ministry of the other—he but found therein an argument for maintaining the *status quo*. Because the Protestant Church in Ireland is weak; because it has no hold on the respect or affection of the people, because if left to itself it would inevitably collapse, or come to grief, therefore argues the learned Protestant

Doctor, is its strong sister England bound to help it. The greater the abhorrence felt for it by the Irish, the greater the reason, according to the Bishop of Kilmore, why Great Britain should uphold the abuse, perpetuate the wrong, and do violence to the people of Ireland. Well may the *Times* say:—"Such an argument reads like a plea of desperation."

And whilst Bishops in their Charges are thus revealing the weak places of the citadel, other dignitaries of the Establishment, sign more hopeful still, are earnestly deprecating the incessant insults and outrages offered to the Catholics of Ireland by the Agents of the Irish Church Missions. Again we copy from the *Times*:—

"Another learned incumbent of the diocese of Meath, Dr. Orlando T. Dobbin, has put forth a 'Plea for Tolerance towards our Fellow-Subjects in Ireland professing the Roman Catholic Religion. After 13 years' residence among the peasantry, he declares his conviction that they are among the most worthy people that England rules, and observes:—

"Most of the class who present themselves to my observation are marked by a sobriety and honesty, a truthfulness of speech, a kindness and helpfulness to one another, a patient, uncomplaining endurance of bitter poverty and privation, a thankful willingness to labour at any employment when employment can be had, and a submissive, trustful dependence upon Providence, with a habitual respect for the ordinances of religion, that are pleasing in highest degree."

With regard to their clergy he says:—"They are, for the most part, a very unobtrusive class—neither politicians, nor proselytizers, nor meddlers in any way with their neighbours of other creeds. They wish to hold their own—a very natural and not blameworthy wish. They look after their flock, after their dues, and, if lucky enough to have one, look after their farm, and give as little trouble, if not causeless assailed, as any other class in the community. As a kind of spiritual police over the *naumais* subjects of their own communion, I believe their services to be invaluable to the peace of society. The loyalty of the Irish priesthood, with the exception of a few factious priests here and there (usually soon silenced by their own bishops), admits of no question."

Dr. Dobbin very earnestly deprecates the insulting attacks made upon the religion of the mass of the people by the agents of the Irish Church Missions. He asks how would other denominations like to be treated in the same way? How would the Irish Protestants feel if those who are thus assailed should retaliate? Why is "Popery" the only evil to be "driven away" by such means? Why do not temperance agents plant themselves at the doors of publichouses, and thrust their tracts into the hands of the customers? It goes farther, and gives another illustration of the inconsistency which marks the proceedings of these partisan religionists, remarking that:—

"Houses of ill-fame and publichouses are evils in the estimation of the pure and sober members of society, yet never heard we of any agents being employed to stand opposite the doors of places of ill-repute to distribute tracts to those going in warning them against sin; nor of temperance societies seeking to put down publichouses in the same way. Such a mode of interference with the indulgences of loose livers would be disposed of in the most summary manner, and the authorities would, doubtless, throw the blame on the original aggressor, the person whose indiscreet zeal provoked the breach of the peace. On the same principle, is it to be borne that those who show themselves too prudent to attack directly the gross infringement of morals of which we speak, shall visit, with their insulting admonitions, respectable persons entering quietly their own places of worship to bow before the God of their fathers, after the manner their conscience dictates?"

Well certainly here is another and a most important step in advance gained, one which encourages us to hope that with patience, and a reliance upon the divine blessing upon constitutional means, the great grievance may be removed without a "sweeping revolution"—without violence, or shedding of blood. Yes—it is now admitted that the Establishment is in itself a grievance, even if only a "sentimental grievance;" and it is also admitted that the maintenance of this "sentimental grievance," entails the necessity of subjecting the Catholics of Ireland to other, and more substantial grievances: to obscene insults, such as these alluded to by Dr. Orlando T. Dobbin, and to the penal laws whose effects still survive, and which bitter memories still rankle in the hearts of the Irish people. Of these penal laws in connection with the Established Church, the *Times* thus expresses itself:—

"No words, indeed, can be too hard for the penal laws; and those who are surprised at the rooted antipathy to England which is still shown by some parts of the Irish nation would do well to refresh their memories by a perusal of Burke's Tracts on the 'Popery Laws,' the facts detailed in which are certainly sufficient to explain a great deal of hereditary bitterness of feeling. But Dr. Fitzgerald appears to suggest that it was these laws which the edge of offensiveness to all English institutions, and to the Irish Church in particular; and that, as they are now abrogated, we may expect that when the Church is presented to the people apart from such repulsive accompaniments, it may meet with a more favorable reception. We are afraid experience has already pronounced against any such hope; and, even if it had not, Dr. Fitzgerald would have overlooked an important consideration. The Established Church is itself the creation of the very spirit which in its extreme development, gave birth to those infamous enactments. It is not, indeed, a penal law; but it is, in a manner, a gigantic confiscation. It seizes the whole of the ecclesiastical endowments of the country, and appropriates them to the use of a small minority, to a large extent of a foreign race and of an alien religion. In its theory, at all events, it is the chief remaining relic of the old intolerant policy. Such is the aspect in which, under its present condition, it must necessarily be viewed by Irish Roman Catholics. A practical grievance, as we have repeatedly urged, it is not; but it is, as Dr. Fitzgerald puts it, a sentimental grievance; and the sentiment inseparably connected with it is, unhappily, the same which was so deeply implanted by the penal laws. As matters now stand, the Establishment divested of its character of a grievance would be a knife without a blade. It was designed as a thorn in the sides of Roman Catholics, and the design has been abundantly successful."—*Times*.

Can the Irish then be blamed if they seek to pull out that thorn from their sides? Can they be greatly wondered at, or righteously blamed if, the gentler processes known to political surgery failing, they should seek to deliver themselves by more summary methods, such as the Fenian scalpel knife, and the revolutionary cauter?

Remittances in our next.

**PATRIOTISM AND THE CONFESSIOAL.**—Garibaldi is quoted by the Protestant press with much applause, and as an incontrovertible witness against Romanism. "Never," this in substance is the testimony of Garibaldi—"never enter the Confessional, never allow your children to set foot therein, if you wish to keep alive within your own breast, and the breasts of your children, the flame of patriotism."

More sound advice never did mortal man give. The Confessional, and that which, in the mouths of Garibaldi and the partisans of the Revolution, the word patriotism signifies, are irreconcilable; the revolutionary patriot cannot be a practical Catholic: the Catholic who is faithful to his religion, cannot but hold the principles of the Revolution in abhorrence, and regard its votaries with disgust.

What manner of men are these Italian patriots, these heroes of the Revolution, these first fruits of the Protestant Reformation, these liberators of Italy! In a few lines the correspondent of the *London Times*, their admirer, and flatterer, shall tell us; and certainly if to have thrown off the restraints of Christianity, of natural morality, and of common decency as well as of Popery, be a subject of rejoicing, Exeter all may well raise its shouts of praise, and exult in its "*Te Diabolum Laudamus*."

It was on the occasion of the rejoicings in Venice, consequent upon its annexation to Piedmont, that the events narrated by the writer in the *Times* took place. All the "patriots," male and female, were assembled in the Opera House to celebrate the event:—

"Then the corps de ballet trooped in, but did not satisfy the gazers except when the queen of them all executed a series of graceful bound, and less graceful, but more wonderful contortions; and again, when a crowd of damsels, dressed to outward appearance in ordinary modern costume, danced before them, and pleased them with gestures that would have caused indignation in an English theatre."

Garibaldi was right in his advice. The Confessional, and the frequentation of the Sacraments of the Church, would soon give a mortal blow to "patriotism," as he understands it, and to the Revolution. The latter thrives under an "open bible," but it would quickly be stifled in the atmosphere of Popery.

**Times Coa.**—"On that day the Lord Mayor (of Dublin) will give a banquet to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, to which he invited the heroes of the Atlantic Cable who have received honors from the Queen; and other gentlemen who have distinguished themselves in the cause of scientific and social progress, which has been so often anathematized by the Pope."

When an experienced cook wishes to tickle the palate of a Dutchman he throws into his bill of fare a dish of "saur kraut"—for a Frenchman frogs' legs—for an Englishman plenty of raw beef and red gravy—for an Icelandeer train oil with a dash of candles; and when a *Times* Cor. wishes to be particularly happy and acceptable to the bigotry of his readers, he throws into even the most out-of-the-way subjects a smart rap at the Pope. There is no accounting for tastes. "Sour kraut," frogs-legs, raw-beef, and train-oil with candles, may be all very acceptable to the different nationalities, but for a quiet bit at the Pope and Popery commend us to a *Times* correspondent. As with a Low Church Parson, when all other subjects fail to draw the attention of his drowsy congregation, a stray bit at Popery is sure to arouse them; so with a *Times* correspondent, there is no nostrum of his wallet so acceptable to the English public as a hit at the Pope. One would think that a contemplated dinner to the Cable projectors would hardly afford a hook whereon to hang a left-handed compliment to the Papacy; but no! the subject of cables, though naturally a watery one, is becoming dry and uninteresting, and must be relieved by the Attic (*attic*) salt of Papal misrepresentation. There is no abuse of logic so acceptable to the school boy as the "undistributed middle." A pike-pie is a jack-pie—a jack-pie is a pie-John—a pie-John is a pigeon-pie; therefore, a pike-pie is a pigeon-pie—such is the admirable logic of your school-boy, *Times* correspondent. Because the Holy Father has anathematized a spurious kind of "social progress," and because the laying of an Atlantic cable is social (!) progress, therefore the Holy Father has anathematized Atlantic cables—such is the sound logic of your *Times* Ignoramus, and such the disreputable weapons wielded against Catholicity by "modern civilisation," and English fair-play. It is difficult to determine which is more to blame—the correspondent who writes such twaddle, or the readers who require it at his hands. It has long been a vexed question whether demand begets supply, or supply demand; but whether it be a case of supply or demand, it is little creditable either to the *Times* correspondent, who will deign to cater to such a depraved taste, or the reader who demands such depraved catering.

The Holy Father has denounced that "modern civilisation" which, under the name of "social progress," "expediency," and "orthodox nineteenth-century Protestant-Englishman" robs the sanctuaries of God's Church, turns holy monks and nuns out into a depraved world, and leaves the abomination of desolation standing in holy places; and forthwith foregoth, a poor miserable scribbler dares to insult the venerable