

erty of speech," or "freedom of discussion." Recognising that these may, and indeed must, have their limits; else they degenerate into licence, we do not recognise in any Protestant, or in any *fallible* authority, the right of determining those limits. Street preaching, of course, is a nuisance, and should not be tolerated in any respectable community, because it causes the blocking up of the public thoroughfares, and tends to provoke to a breach of the peace; Stiggins, and his tub, are proper subjects for police interference. But we can see no reason why Gavazzi, or any other lecturer, should be prevented, either by Municipal, or Mob, Law, from saying what he pleases in a church or private house. If Protestants think fit to turn their churches into theatres for the display of "histrionic performances, far less respectable than those of the fiddlers and singers with which Italy supplies our theatres," (*vide Times*) they have a perfect right to do so, and no one has any right to interfere; the loss, the disgrace, is not ours, but theirs. To us it is a matter of perfect indifference what they do with their Meeting-houses; whether they profess to worship God, or the Devil, in them—whether they sing psalms, or obscene songs, therein. God will never hold us responsible for their actions; why then should we bother our heads what they do with, or in, their conventicles, so long as they do not compel us to attend, or to take part in their "worshipping?" If Catholics find "these histrionic performances" very disgusting, the remedy is a very simple one, and in their own hands; they have but to abstain from going near them; they need only stop away altogether. But if they will persist in going where Catholics have no business to go, and where no one compels them to go, they have no right to kick up a row, or to interrupt the performances.

Besides, if Catholics would but reflect, they would see that it is their best policy to abstain from throwing any impediments in the way of these Protestant missionaries. Not only is it out of their power to hurt the Church, but they do her, unconsciously of course, an immense deal of good. Next to being defended by the eloquence of a Bossuet, the very best thing for the Church is to be assailed by the ribald obscenities of a Maria Monk, a Gavazzi, a Leahy, or an Achilli. Filthy as these creatures are, and odious though they be, they have, like all creatures, even the lothliest, their uses in the moral order. They are the Helots, or rather the Yahoos, of Christianity; exhibiting in their persons low foul, how loathsome, a thing vice is. So far from dreading aught that these creatures can say, or do, against the Church, we look upon a Maria Monk, picking oakum in her cell, or a Gavazzi, Yahoo-like, ejecting his filth from the pulpit of a Protestant Meeting-house, as a sublime moral lesson; almost as powerful to restrain from the practice of vice, as are the admonitions of a St. Francis de Sale to attract to virtue. So far from prohibiting the Maria Monks, the Gavazzis, the Leahys, or other Protestant champions, we would rather feel inclined to import them from time to time, in order to use them as the Spartans did their Helots, or as the Houbynhlims did their Yahoos. However, from the following address of Dr. Bethune, who, in the absence of Dr. Fullford, the Protestant Bishop, presides over the Anglican congregation of this city, it will be seen that, amongst Protestants even, there are doubts, and strong doubts, as to the propriety of allowing the delivery of lectures calculated to lead to a breach of the peace. Having instituted a most absurd comparison betwixt Dr. Brownson, and Gavazzi, Dr. Bethune lays down the proposition that, "as aliens they had no civil rights here," and therefore no "right to come here to lecture without the direct permission of the local civil authorities."—Were this doctrine true, Dr. Raphael, the celebrated Jewish Rabbi, should have been prohibited—the Rev. Mr. Dimerson, a Protestant clergyman, and Mr. Lord, an anti-Popery lecturer, should have been prohibited—from lecturing in Montreal; and the Yankee ministers, who flock over at the "Anniversary Meetings" to blaspheme Popery, "through the nose," should be, by order of the civil authorities, sent back to the place from whence they came. We cannot agree with Dr. Bethune's exposition of the law, and think that Gavazzi had as much right to lecture as had Mr. Lord, or the Rev. Mr. Emerson; not that we would insult the latter reverend gentleman by insinuating that there is any similarity whatever, betwixt him and the Italian mountebank. Dr. Bethune concludes his address—an address which has given some offence to several Protestants—as follows:—

"With regard to those who brought Mr. Gavazzi here, or who countenanced and supported and protected him, if they did not bring him, they should surely have considered whether such lectures as he had been delivering elsewhere, on the same subjects, could possibly be of any service in promoting the objects which we must suppose those gentlemen had in view; and whether such lectures, and so delivered, could have any effect in shaking the faith of Roman Catholics or in confirming that of Protestants. This I will venture to affirm, is not the way to effect these objects. The only proper and peaceable mode, of doing so, is by Missions and Tracts, and such like means, in the former case; and by the Sermons of the Clergy in their respective churches, and their conversations with their flocks, in the latter case. Such Lectures then as those of Mr. Gavazzi could do no good, but they were sure, especially in this community, to do much evil, by enflaming whatever feeling of animosity might exist between Roman Catholics and Protestants, or by creating it, if it did not exist, and thus leading to such disastrous scenes as have been witnessed.

But supposing that they who invited Mr. Gavazzi had an unquestionable, legal right (which I strongly doubt) to bring Mr. Gavazzi or any other alien to lecture on any subject they might choose, was it consistent with prudence, or a Christian spirit to do so, under the circumstances of the case? I think not. The

consequences of his lecturing at Quebec were known here, and similar consequences were expected to attend his lecturing in this City. Riot was apprehended, because the Chief Magistrate was applied to for protection. It was also apprehended that protection could not be afforded without bloodshed—nay, an organised party attending the Lecture, were armed with fire-arms. I will concede that persons assembled for any lawful purpose have a right to protection, as well as to defend themselves against any attack that may be made upon them. But it is the part of prudent Christian men, not to resort to such means of protection, nor to give occasion for their use, unless it be for some object which is, not only lawful, but of paramount and indispensable value. Now, let any candid, dispassionate persons ask themselves whether Mr. Gavazzi's Lectures were, or could be, expected to be of that character. I am persuaded that the universal response must be that they were not—that they were more of a political than a theological character—that they savoured more of the histrionic demagogue than of the Religionist—and were calculated to inflame the passions of men, but not to carry the conviction of any great or valuable truth to any mind. But even if they did convey such conviction, there are other, and peaceable means of attaining the same end, more effectually, and without any such risk of such direful consequences as we have seen to arise from those unfortunate Lectures.

But there is yet another point of view in which the matter should be considered by every prudent Christian man, who knows that "Political or civil liberty, is natural liberty so far restrained by human laws as is necessary and expedient for the general advantage of the public." Such a person would feel it his bounden duty not only to abstain from having anything to do with the getting up of any exhibition which he feared might lead to a breach of the peace, but would rather encourage and assist the Magistrate in the discharge of his duty, which would be the forbidding and preventing such exhibition from taking place at all, and thus applying the remedy to the root of the evil.

Dear Brethren, your faithful servant in Christ,
JOHN BETHUNE,
Rector of Montreal."

The above Pastoral address, which certainly does honor to the heart of its author, fully corroborates the statement made by the editor of the *Pilot*—That Gavazzi—"the histrionic demagogue," as Dr. Bethune justly styles him—reckoned amongst his admirers only the "scum" of the Protestant population of Montreal.

CONSECRATION OF ST. PETER'S CHURCH.

On Sunday last we witnessed the Consecration of this handsome and extensive edifice, by his Lordship, the coadjutor Bishop of Montreal, assisted by a large number of clergymen. The ceremony was attended by a vast assemblage of our Catholic population, among whom we observed several of our most respectable fellow-citizens. Pursuant to pre-arrangements, the St. Jean Baptiste and the Temperance Societies, assembled at an early hour opposite the ruins of the Bishop's palace, and thence proceeded with their two bands to the Church. At the head of the St. Jean Baptiste Society, we noticed the Mayor and C. S. Cherrier, Esq. The street was tastefully decorated with young pine trees, and over the entrance to the Church was a lofty arch surmounted with flags and appropriate devices.

The ceremony commenced with the consecration of the exterior; and on that of the interior being concluded, the clergy took their place in the sanctuary, after which the immense assemblage pressed into the body of the Church: Then Mgr. LaRocque commenced a Pontifical High Mass, at intervals of which, the two bands performed several pieces of sacred music. His Lordship, the Bishop of Bytown, preached a most eloquent sermon, in the course of which, he proved the special providence of God in watching over His Church, in guiding and directing her onward course; in seconding, and sustaining her acts and energies, and raising her glorious and triumphant over every opposition, privation and persecution. He dwelt at considerable length on the wonderful triumphs of Religion, which, by means, humble, and apparently impotent, achieves results the most marvellous and stupendous. The Right Rev. Prelate beautifully illustrated his thesis by an affecting allusion to the Church in which he then preached; and contrasted its grandeur and magnificence with the limited resources of its venerable founders. The erection of such an edifice by means so humble, could no otherwise be accounted for, than that "The Lord had willed it." He reminded the congregation of their having met in that place just three years ago, when he told them they would ere long, behold on that same site, unpromising though its appearance then was, a church dedicated to the worship of the living God. And had they not now before their eyes the literal verification of his prediction? They had now a church which, for chasteness of design, and beauty of execution, was unsurpassed, perhaps unequalled in North America: a church which reflected the highest honor on the architect who directed its erection, and of which not only the suburbs, but the entire city might feel justly proud. His Lordship concluded by congratulating the Rev. Peres Oblats on the success of their noble undertaking; and encouraged them to rely on the benevolent co-operation of a generous public, in erecting side Altars and other appendages still wanting.

After leaving the church, the Mayor and C. S. Cherrier, Esq., addressed the congregation, which separated highly pleased, and no doubt edified with the solemn and impressive ceremony they had witnessed.

A wooden building at Port Hope, used as a temporary Catholic Chapel, has been burned to the ground by the act of an incendiary. It is fortunate for the peace of the community that it is a Catholic, and not a Protestant, place of worship that has been thus destroyed; otherwise we should have had no-

thing but denunciations of Popish mobs, and Popish violence against Protestant churches. As in the case of the Methodist chapel in Griffintown, unscrupulous and mendacious Protestant editors would have sworn that the act was the act of Catholics; and some of them, like our cotemporary of the *Montreal Herald*, would no doubt have added, that a whole congregation, minister and all, whilst engaged piously singing the Doxology, had perished in the flames. There would have been no end to the lies that would have been circulated, by the Protestant press, if the misfortune had happened to a Protestant meeting house; the "occasion would have been improved," admirably no doubt by the *Gazette* and the *Herald*. However, thank God, it was only a Popish Mass-house, and there is no danger that Papists will be so dishonest as to accuse their fellow citizens of any participation in, or approval of, an act of incendiarism; although the evidence that the Port Hope chapel was fired by a Protestant mob, is just as strong as that the Methodist chapel in Griffintown was assailed by Papists—in both cases there being no evidence at all.

We regret to have to announce the death of Mr. Adams who was wounded on the evening of the 9th ult. Mr. Stevenson is, we are happy to say, considered out of danger; as is also the poor man Donnelly, who was shot through the body by a discharge of fire-arms from Zion church.

Communication from the Trustees of the Separate Catholic School at Prescott received. We will endeavor to comply with the request therein contained in our next.

To the Editor of the True Witness.

Sir—I was a little surprised at your Editorial remarks on my letter of last week. I did not wish to give the names of persons, and charge them with the commission of a crime of which they have not been proved guilty. I named several persons who left here as a body-guard for Gavazzi; and I do not see any impropriety in this, as they glory in it. At least some of them have given so glowing an account of their individual prowess, that they have received as testimonials—or are about to receive them, which is the same thing—gold chains, rings and lockets, containing the hair of lady-admirers of the ex-Monk whom they so gallantly defended. They were marshalled and led by two public servants, and an employe of the Corporation of Quebec, and the other of the Crown Lands Department. How comes it, then, that while Catholic gentlemen have been arrested and sent to jail on a charge of felony for having been seen in a pew in Chalmers' church—while the Police Magistrate is stigmatised and denounced at a Protestant meeting, and his dismissal demanded, merely because he is a Catholic, and an Irishman,—while a Chief Constable of Police is also sent to jail on a charge of felony, for refusing to strike an inoffensive man, at the bidding of a grossly ignorant, and partisan magistrate—that these two servants of the public are to be allowed, with impunity, to absent themselves from their duties, without leave, to go on this excursion to Montreal? Justice should be even-handed, and not all on one side. The Courts of Law are even perverted, as well as the whole Press of Canada, to the acquisition of Protestant ascendancy.

Let it not be said that the illegal combinations and societies, which Protestant journals, both in Quebec and Montreal, now so unblushingly call for, on the pretence of self-protection, are the result of any new idea, called forth into existence as a consequence of the late riot here. I myself heard one of the individuals, composing Gavazzi's committee here, say in Chalmers' church after the riot was over, in answer to a gentleman who condemned Gavazzi's visit to this place, "That it was well; that they knew there would be a row; that they were now on the eve of a religious war in Canada; and the sooner it came the better." Who will dare say after this that Gavazzi's friends were within the law, and entitled to the protection of the law? They conspired to create a riot to serve their own horrible purposes. They assaulted peaceable Catholic citizens without any provocation; and if, by their cowardice, they allowed the tables to be turned on them by a dozen individuals, chiefly boys, (for there were no more) how dare they attempt to stigmatise Irish Catholics, as they have done, as lawless vagabonds and church-breakers? What proof is there that a single stone was thrown at Chalmers' church by an Irish Catholic? or that any Catholic forcibly entered the said church with intent to injure it, or to murder or harm Gavazzi? None whatever. Gavazzi's friends, it is now proved by his own admissions, invited him here; they wanted to begin the religious war, and they sought but a pretext. They knew that the Catholic religion inculcates submission and charity to all men, and that their best chance of securing Protestant ascendancy was to adopt the usual means by which Protestantism is advanced—violence and bloodshed. The vagabond press throughout the Province is doing its part of the work bravely; it must be admitted; and, to those at a distance, have, no doubt, completely succeeded in establishing the fact, that the Catholics of this city made a most unprovoked and cowardly attack on Chalmers' church, and the ex-monk Gavazzi.—Tides, however, will set the matter in its true light before the public. It is only to be regretted that the very newspapers which owe a great part of their support to the Irish people of Canada, should be so ready to defame them. I hope Irishmen will take a lesson from this.—I am, Sir, yours,
Quebec, June 27, 1853. A CATHOLIC.

The circumstances to which our correspondent alludes must yet become the subject of judicial investigation. He will therefore appreciate our motives for abstaining from any remarks.

EPISCOPAL VISIT TO RAWDON.

To the Editor of the True Witness.

Sir,—It is with pleasure I have to inform you, that we have had, last week, the happiness and blessing of a visit from His Lordship, the Bishop of Montreal. He arrived here on the evening of the 23d, from the Parish of St. Alphonse,—where he had been the two preceding days—accompanied by the Rev. L. L. Pominville, our much respected Parish Priest, and His Lordship's Secretary, the Rev. Mr. Leblanc. He was met by a large number of the inhabitants of this Par-

ish, who received him with that devotion and *cead mille a falthe* which Irishmen are ever ready to give their beloved and devoted Prelates and Pastors. On the following day His Lordship offered up the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, after which he administered the Holy Sacrament of Confirmation to about a hundred of both sexes. His Lordship's instructions to the children (in French and English) before and after Confirmation, was truly affecting and edifying. He took his departure from here on the 24th, for the Parish of St. Julienne, carrying with him the heartfelt prayers of every one in the Parish for his spiritual and temporal welfare, and that he may long be spared to guide and govern this portion of Christ's Church. Your readers will be glad to learn that His Lordship appears to be in excellent health and spirits. Hoping you will give this an insertion in your valuable Catholic Journal, I remain Sir,
Your obedient servant,
Rawdon, 27th June, 1853. J. R.

CORONER'S INQUEST CONTINUED.

The Court met on Thursday, and continued the cross-examination of Sir James Alexander. In answer to several questions, the witness deposed that when he went to Zion Church he saw knots of people, all about the Haymarket Square, but all perfectly quiet. Saw, previous to the firing of the troops, a shot fired in front of the church.

John Consin—private soldier in the 26th—deposed that he formed one of the lower division on the night of the row—that he heard the regular orders given—"carry arms, ready, present"—by Lieut.-Col. Hogarth. Saw the Mayor read the Riot Act, and heard him cry out "Fire, fire," about two minutes before the troops fired. Was quite certain that the order "Ready present" proceeded from Lieutenant Col. Hogarth.

John Connor—Lance Sergeant same regiment—heard the cry "Fire;" then heard the words of command given—"Carry arms—ready"—did not hear any other words. It was his conviction that Lieut. Col. Hogarth gave the word of command. Captain Cameron, the officer in charge of his division, never reproved him for allowing the men to fire.

On Saturday the investigation was resumed. James McCulloch, private in the 26th regiment—distinctly heard Lieut.-Col. Hogarth give the words of command—"Carry arms—ready, present." Did not hear the commanding officer find fault with any one for firing without orders.

James H. Goodfellow, Sergeant—was doing duty in the lower division. Was of opinion that the orders—"Carry arms, ready"—were given by an officer, and thinks they were given by Lieut.-Col. Hogarth. The voice was quite familiar to him. Heard the Mayor cry out "Fire, fire," after reading the Riot Act; heard no one blamed for firing that night.

John Hinde, Sergeant in the same division, heard no word of command except "Fire" given, but cannot say by whom it was given; it might have been either by an officer or a civilian; believes that the troops fired upon that word. Did not know that any of the men had been reprimanded for their conduct, as they would have been if they had fired without orders. Believes that the men would have come from "Stand at ease" to the "Present" without orders from an officer. He took no means to prevent the men from firing. There was much noise when the word "Fire" was given.

On Monday, the Court resumed its sittings. William Wylie—private in the 26th—deposed that he was one of the soldiers in the upper division, facing Zion church. Heard no command to the lower division, but heard Captain Cameron, the officer in command of his division, give the words of command, "ready—present," in consequence of which the division discharged their muskets. Heard the Mayor cry out, shortly before the discharge, "Fire, fire; there is no time to be lost." Did not hear any word of command from Lieutenant-Col. Hogarth.

Thomas Briggs—private in the same regiment—deposed that he was one of the upper division on the night in question; and that he heard the words of command given by Captain Cameron, "ready—present." Heard no one reprimanded for firing without orders. Heard also the voice of Lieut.-Col. Hogarth, but could not distinguish the words.

John Dougherty—private same regiment—was one of the lower division. Heard the words of command, "attention—carry arms—ready—present," given by Lieutenant-Colonel Hogarth. Was perfectly certain the command came from the said officer; did not hear any civilian give orders to fire.

William Watson—private same regiment—was in the lower division. Previous to firing, received the regular military words of command, Lieut.-Colonel Hogarth gave the word—"attention;" Lieutenant Quartley gave the words—"carry arms—ready—present." Was positive that he heard Lieut. Quartley give these orders. Was not reprimanded for discharging his musket. Heard a civilian, the Mayor, cry out—"fire, fire; there is no time to be lost." Knew it was the Mayor by hearing him addressed as Mr. Wilson. Immediately after the cry—"fire," heard Lieut.-Colonel Hogarth give the word "attention." Might not have heard his voice even if he had given the other words of command; but is certain he did not hear him—Lieutenant-Colonel Hogarth—give the words—"carry arms—ready—present."

The Court then adjourned till Tuesday.

On Tuesday, Walter Miller, bugler, present on the night of the 9th of June, was examined. He deposed that he was close to Lieut. Col. Hogarth all the evening, and that he never heard any command given to fire: to this the witness swore most positively.

Town Major McDonald; saw the troops on the ground; heard no military word of command to fire, given; though he was so close to the troops that he did not think it could have been given without his having heard it.

Lieut. R. White, of the 26th; swore that he heard no orders given to fire; heard no military words of command, such as "carry arms—ready—present." The troops seemed to come suddenly from the "slope arms" to the "ready;" was much surprised at the firing. Men and officers were all perfectly sober. James Fleming—was the next witness; but his evidence was of no importance. The Court adjourned until Thursday; Wednesday being a Festival of obligation.

Died.

In this city, on the 26th inst., at the residence of her brother-in-law, T. F. Miller, Esq., after a long and painful illness which she bore with Christian fortitude, Anna Maria Connelly, relict of the late R. F. Coleman, Belleville, C.W.

* Soup and stirabout are far more effectual in Ireland. The P. C. M. Society recommend in their last "Report" pork and flour, all very good in their way.