

REMITTANCES TO ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND AND WALES.

DRAFTS from £1 upwards, payable at sight, free of charge, at the Bank of Ireland, Dublin, and all its branches; Messrs. Fylen, Mills & Co., Bankers, Lombard-street, London; the National Bank of Scotland, Glasgow; Messrs. Bowman, Grinnell & Co., Liverpool.

HENRY CHAPMAN & Co.,
Montreal, March 1853. St. Sacramento Street.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, APRIL 8, 1853.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

With the exception of the second reading of the Jewish Emancipation Bill, little business of general interest has been transacted in Parliament during the past week. The time of the House of Commons has been chiefly taken up in bringing to light the fearful system of corruption that universally obtains throughout the English constituencies. Every fresh disclosure verifies the startling assertion made, before the St. Alban's commission, by Mr. James Coppock—"That if, instead of going through the register of voters, as Mr. Edwards had done, and marking down—*so*ld his vote—I were to go through the list of boroughs, beginning with the first letter on the list—say Abingdon—and to the last letter of the alphabet, and put opposite the names of members—*bought their seats*—I should make quite as extraordinary a list as Mr. Edwards has made for his Borough." Mr. Peacocke has moved that Mr. J. Coppock be called to the Bar of the House to explain this assertion; we may expect some startling disclosures of corruption, bribery, and other malpractices at elections.

On St. Patrick's Day, Mr. Napier moved for several papers, connected with the Six Mile Cross massacre, and in so doing took occasion to censure the conduct of the Attorney-General for Ireland, in not proceeding against the Catholic Clergy, who, and not the soldiers who fired upon a flying mob, were the guilty parties. Mr. J. D. Fitzgerald was in favor of an enquiry; but that enquiry should include the conduct of Mr. Napier himself, whose duty it was to have ordered an immediate investigation. Sir J. Young contended that the law had been impartially administered by the present Irish government; and unadvisedly very strongly on the course pursued by the late Attorney-General throughout the whole business. He was of opinion that there was no case against the two Priests, to send before a jury; and that the law officers of the crown had done well in quashing the indictments. After a desultory conversation, in the course of which angry words were bandied to and fro, Mr. Napier's motion was agreed to. It will be seen that the petition against Mr. Lucas has been withdrawn.

The County Meath Assizes has been taken up with the trial of a number of assault cases, excited by the insulting conduct of the Kells "Jumpers." The first case—that for assaulting the Rev. Mr. Bickerdike, a "Jumper," and his deputy, J. Sharrock, resulted in the acquittal of the defendants; the Chief Justice expressing a strong opinion against the offensive and irritating conduct of the complainants. Upon another trial of the same nature, the judge administered a severe rebuke to another of these "Jumping" gentry—the Rev. Edward Stopford, who calls himself the Archdeacon of Meath. This gentleman would get on the table to give his evidence; the following conversation ensued:—Chief Justice—"Who is this?" Mr. Hinds—"The Archdeacon of Meath, my Lord." Chief Justice—"What does he want?" Mr. Hinds—"To give evidence on the disturbed state of Kells." Chief Justice—"We know quite enough about the disturbed state of Kells; it is evident, from the proceedings, that the town of Kells is in a very deplorable condition. It is to be hoped that these discreditable scenes may be put an end to; they are only calculated to excite animosity, and keep alive the bitterest feelings amongst the people." Hereupon the discomfited "Jumper" looked very foolish indeed, and sneaked away with what is called "a flea in his ear." The complainants against the Catholics were all dismissed, a "Bible-reader" was fined, the unjust conduct of the Protestant magistrates severely condemned by the Chief Justice—and so ended the "Jumper" Assizes.

In spite of the prognostication of his enemies, Napoleon III. manages things well in France; public credit is restored, and a general confidence in his government, as the triumph of peace and order over Socialism, irreligion and demagoguism, is everywhere expressed. Intent upon the regeneration of France, the Emperor disregards the clamors of a few factious at home, and the warlike preparations on the other side of the Channel. An interesting correspondence from Mons. Ducos, on the peace question, will be found on our sixth page. A "fusion," or reconciliation between the two branches of the house of Bourbon is again spoken of as "*un fait accompli*." Advances, it is said, have been made by the Orléanists to the Count de Chambord, in which the latter is recognised as head of the Bourbon family. Rumors were current that the coronation would take place at Rheims. The war steamer Napoleon was to be superbly fitted up, and, it was said, would be dispatched to convey the Pope to France.

The revolutionary party in Lombardy are being kept down with a strong hand; and, contrary to her usual policy, the Austrian Government has at last determined to treat the insurrectionary faction with the rigor it deserves. This severity is very displeasing to the friends of Mazzini, who are also much shocked and surprised that their crimes against society, should be no longer allowed to pass unpunished. The *Times*,

for one, is quite astonished at the harsh measures adopted by the present Austrian Government, and contrasts them with its clemency—its mistaken clemency—in the years '49, and '50.

"Capital punishment was only inflicted in Hungary, in '49, on military men who had desecrated their colors in the field, or who were convicted of the crime of murder, with the one shocking exception of Count Louis Batthyany. In Lombardy no executions followed the campaigns of Charles Albert. Even in Vienna, Robert Blum as a foreign instigator caught in the fact, and the murderers of Latour, were the only persons who suffered death."—*Times*.

Mazzini, the cause of all these disturbances, is still at large. With too much truth the *Trieste Lloyd* calls "London the free-port of all the murderers of Europe—the workshop of the assassin—where are laid up, and sharpened the knife of the demagogue."

Father Gavazzi delivered his first lecture at New York on the 23rd ult.; a good many Protestant reverends, of the Maria Monk and Leahy stamp, attended; but the discourse seems to have been a failure. Barnum, it is said, has seen the ex-monk, but don't think him worth while hiring; and the Yankees generally have had so much experience of political and religious humbugs, they have been made so supremely ridiculous in the eyes of Europe by their Kossuth mania, that they seem inclined to fight rather shy of the apostate Padre, in spite of his magnificent costume, and his "tall and massy form set off to the best advantage in the flowing drapery of his black stuffed cassock, which he folds from time to time in the style of a Roman toga." In spite of all these accessories—in spite of his "dramatic action"—in spite of "a small tricolor crucifix on his left shoulder, and another larger one, with a medal on his left breast"—in spite of all these fixings, or "gettings up" the speech itself was felt to be a failure. Gavazzi's English, we are told, is very imperfect, nay unintelligible, "but he makes up for it by the impetuosity of his manner," and damns the Pope in the most exquisite pantomime. As it is not improbable that, with the opening of the navigation, when circuses, clowns, Ethiopian minstrels, monkeys, and barrel organs do infest our streets, this itinerant buffoon will pay us a visit, we will endeavor to give our readers a specimen of his style. His mission, he said, was to give liberty to the Irish, and to overthrow the Pope. He was no Protestant, but a Roman Catholic, and even to gain the sympathies of the Americans he would not become a Protestant. From the Pope, and the Woman of Babylon, the rev. mountebank started off quite unexpectedly to the state of the pavements in New York, which, said the great Gavazzi, "are muddy in rainy weather—dirty in dry—and fit only to suffocate people in storms." He begged therefore of his audience, whilst waiting the coming of Christ, to reform their pavements to resist the Pope, and to sympathise with him—Gavazzi—with his toga-like robe—his flowing drapery—his little tricolor crucifix on the left shoulder, and his big tricolor crucifix and medal on his breast. "This was what he expected from the American people." Warned, however, by the failure of Alexander Smith, Gavazzi prudently abstained from any demands upon the purses of his audience.

The news by the *Arctic* is of little interest. Parliament had adjourned for the Easter holidays. The Madiahs had embarked for Marseilles. Fresh disturbances were dreaded in Lombardy.

"PUTNAM" AND THE BOURBON QUESTION.

The Yankee Protestant Parsons have lately started another wonderful mare's nest, though with what design, it is as yet impossible to determine. In the person of the Rev. Mr. Eleazar Williams, a Protestant missionary amongst the Indians in the northern part of the State of New York, they profess to have discovered a real live Bourbon, the son of the unhappy Louis XVI. and the lovely Marie Antoinette, who was falsely supposed to have died, at the age of ten years, in the Temple prison in Paris, in 1795; but who in reality was, in some mysterious manner not explained, and for some mysterious reasons not assigned, spirited away from his prison house by nobody knows whom, conveyed to America nobody knows how, and consigned to the care of an Indian woman at Caughnawaga, by whom he was brought up as her own child. Of course, the writer of the above romance, the Rev. J. H. Hanson, a Protestant minister, of "worth and ability" at New York, gives his readers to understand that the Indian woman "has been tampered with by the Romish Priests, and her mouth hermetically sealed"—and that the Romish Bishops of Montreal, or Quebec, are somehow or other implicated in this mysterious plot to defraud a Protestant minister of his birth-right; thus does he account for the silence of the reputed mother, an old woman of ninety, living at St. Regis—"who is of course entirely under the control and influence of the Priests." Now, by his own account, Mr. Eleazar Williams was an idiot until about 13 or 14 years of age—when, bathing in Lake St. George, he suddenly was restored to reason; he has therefore no recollections of his childhood prior to the year 1799. After this miraculous recovery of his reason, Mr. Williams was sent to Massachusetts for his education, where his expenses were unaccountably defrayed, and he himself became a Protestant; ultimately he developed into a full blown Evangelical minister, in which capacity he labored amongst the Indians, as a missionary, until the history of his mysterious origin was, still more mysteriously, divulged to him by the Prince de Joinville, in the autumn of 1841; and was finally laid before the intelligent American public, by *Putnam's Magazine* for February and April 1853.

The direct testimony, adduced in support of this wonderful romance, consists solely in the assertions of Mr. Williams himself. His story is—that, on the 18th of October 1841—(it is as well to remember the dates)—he—Mr. Williams—embarked at Mackinac on board a steamer bound for Green Bay, on board of which were the Prince de Joinville, and

suite; that, previous to the arrival of the steamer at Mackinac, the Prince, had made anxious enquiries after him, and immediately upon his coming on board desired to be introduced to him; that he had long conversations with the Prince on board the steamer, and that the Prince, upon their arrival at Green Bay, at 3 p.m., October 19th, insisted upon his taking up his quarters at the hotel where the Prince was stopping; that he—Mr. Williams—had another long interview with the Prince on the night of the day on which the steamer arrived at Green Bay, during which the Prince revealed to him the history of his origin, and, having exacted a solemn pledge of secrecy, placed before him a parchment document containing a full renunciation of his—Mr. Williams—claims to the crown of France, which the latter refused to sign, because he felt that it did not become him, a Bourbon, to barter away his birth-right, even for the princely establishment that was offered to him as a reward for his compliance; that, having pledged himself, and signed a written promise, not to reveal the Prince's secret, the interview, after having lasted for four or five hours, was brought to a close; and that the next day, the Prince started for St. Louis, leaving the inward soul of Mr. Williams in inexpressible trouble.

This story, published in *Putnam's Magazine* for February, attracted the attention of the Prince de Joinville, from whom it also elicited an explicit denial. On the 9th of February, the Prince writes from Claremont, giving his version of the events, conversation, and interview, of the 19th and 20th October, 1841. He admits that, at the date specified, he was on a tour through the United States—that he met Mr. Williams—"rencontra sur le bateau"—who seemed to be well informed on the several points on which the Prince was chiefly interested, concerning the Indians, and the early French missionaries and voyageurs—that, in consequence, he had long conversations with Mr. Williams on these topics, on board the steamer, and at Green Bay; and that finally, before starting for St. Louis, he engaged Mr. Williams to communicate to him any further particulars upon the above mentioned topics, which he—Mr. Williams—might chance to possess. Accordingly we find that on the 25th October, four days after the interview, Mr. Williams did write a long letter to the Prince, containing, no allusions to the wonderful, and soul disturbing, revelations that had been made on the night of the 19th and 20th, but certain curious details respecting the first settlements of the French on the shores of the great Lakes. This letter was politely acknowledged by *Lieut. de Vaisseau V. Touchard*, who, in transmitting the Prince's thanks, added that should Mr. Williams ever visit France, His R. H. would be glad to see him. Here then we have two different versions of the substance of the Prince's interviews, and conversations, with Mr. Williams. As both cannot be true—as either the Prince must be a liar, or Mr. Williams—(or rather his abettor, for we do not believe Mr. Williams to be anything worse than a dupe, or tool in the hands of some designing knave)—an impostor, it is worth while enquiring—of these two opposing statements, which is the more entitled to credit?

There is this much to be said for the Prince's story—it is consistent throughout, and is perfectly, and easily, reconcilable with all the admitted facts of the case; whilst, on the other hand, there is about the story of Mr. Williams, such an amount of antecedent improbability—the story of the interview with the Prince is so *a priori* incredible, (for what object on earth could the Prince have had in revealing a secret of such importance to a man like Mr. Williams, who, by his own showing, has been guilty of violating, a solemn pledge, and a written promise?)—that, unless supported by the strongest evidence—extrinsic and intrinsic—common sense would command us to reject it as an impudent forgery. But the story of Mr. Williams is full of the grossest contradictions; in one part it is inconsistent with another part, and contains internal evidence of being, not only a forgery, but a very clumsy forgery to boot.

Mr. Williams has, for years kept a "*minute journal*" of every thing which has occurred to him—it is to this "*minute journal*" that we propose introducing the reader; and if it can be shown that the writer contradicts himself upon some material facts, it is but a fair conclusion to suppose that he is little entitled to credit upon others of more importance. With the little space at our command we can but notice two or three of the discrepancies to which we allude.

Much stress is laid by Mr. Williams, or rather by his advocates, upon the fact that, immediately upon his arrival in America, the Prince made anxious enquiries after a missionary amongst the Indians of the name of Eleazar Williams. In one version of the story, as told by Mr. Williams himself, we are informed that the Prince applied to Mr. T. L. Ogden of New York, for information—that Mr. Ogden wrote to Mr. Williams, who replied that "he would be exceedingly happy to see the Prince." This was a short time previous to the steamer interview. Now, in the "*minute journal*" for 18th October, 1841, we find the following entry:—

"Captain Shook of the steamer stated that the Prince had made inquiries of him two or three times since leaving Buffalo, about Mr. Williams, the missionary to the Indians at Green Bay; and that as he knew no other gentleman in that capacity, excepting myself, I must be the person, the object of his enquiry. I replied 'That cannot be Captain—he must mean another person,' as I have no acquaintance with the Prince."

Now, if the account of the correspondence between Mr. Ogden and Mr. Williams—in which, the former acquainted the latter with the Prince's anxiety to see him, and the latter replied that he would be happy to meet the Prince—be true, the story of Mr. Williams' incredulity, when informed shortly after, by Captain Shook, that the Prince *did* wish to see him, must be false; Mr. Williams would not have replied—"that cannot be; he must mean another person," had he had any correspondence

on this very subject with Mr. Ogden. But Mr. Williams has evidently a very treacherous memory, of which here is a still more striking instance:—

In 1848—about six years and a-half after the memorable, and soul-disturbing, interview with the Prince, in which the latter revealed to Mr. Williams the secret of his origin—a Mr. T. Kimball writes to him, informing him, that an aged French gentleman, named Bellanger, who had lately died at New Orleans, or Helena, (for the place is not certain), upon his death-bed, had confessed that, in 1795, he had brought the Dauphin to America, and that, under the name of Eleazar Williams, the son of Louis XVI. was laboring as a Protestant Missionary amongst the Indians in the Northern part of the State of New York. The letter added, that Bellanger had been bound "by the *Sacramental oath* of the Roman Catholic Church never to disclose, particularly in Europe," the descent or family of the royal youth.—What the "*Sacramental oath*" of the Roman Catholic Church is—what induced Bellanger to commit perjury on his death-bed—or to whom he made the confession—we are not informed; the lively imagination of the intelligent Protestant reader must supply these particulars. Well—how does Mr. Williams receive, in 1848, this full confirmation of the same story that he had heard from the lips of the Prince de Joinville in October, 1841? The "*minute journal*" will inform us:—

"Green Bay, March 10.—In the letter I have received from Mr. Thomas Kimball from Baton Rouge, Louisiana, my curiosity is somewhat excited; and it may be a novel news.

"The intelligence is so improbable it had no weight nor consideration with me; and thinking at the same time there may be mistake as to the person, I shall wait patiently the meaning of all this for a further information from Mr. Kimball upon this new and mysterious subject."

Now, if, in 1841, Mr. Williams had been assured by the Prince de Joinville, that he was the son of Louis XVI. and the lawful King of France—the confirmation of the very same story, in 1848, would not have appeared "so improbable," as to merit "no weight nor consideration," from him; he would not have thought that there was a "mistake as to the person," and the subject would most certainly not have been "*new*" to him. Mr. Williams' "*minute journal*" of 1848 is therefore not reconcilable with his "*minute journal*" of 1841; of the two statements, we must reject one, at least, as false; and so we come to the conclusion that the account of the events of the 19th and 20th October, 1841, as given by the Prince de Joinville, is the more credible.

But Mr. Williams is not only contradicted by himself, but by his reverend Protestant friends as well; we still quote from the "*minute journal*." On the 24th March, 1848, a few days after the receipt of the startling and improbable intelligence from Mr. Kimball, we find the following entry:—

"I have written to Mr. Leavitt, of Boston, and sent the letters containing the mysterious news in relation to my origin."

Letters, which, as we are informed by the entry of the 10th of the same month, expressly mentioned the Rev. Eleazar Williams, *by name*, as the person who was brought over to America by the deceased Bellanger.

The Rev. Joshua Leavitt is next brought on the stage, and appealed to in confirmation of Mr. Williams' story. But the former gentleman, who, if the entry in the "*minute journal*" be correct, was fully informed in March, 1848, of Mr. Williams' "mysterious origin," tells us:—

"In the autumn of the same year, Mr. Williams called on me, and greatly astonished me by saying that he himself was the supposed Dauphin."

We can only account for the Rev. Joshua Leavitt's "great astonishment" in the autumn, by supposing that he had not heard, in the spring of the same year, that Mr. Williams was "the supposed Dauphin," and that the letters from Mr. Kimball, which Mr. Williams forwarded to Mr. Leavitt on the 24th of March, did not contain "the mysterious news in relation to his"—Mr. Williams—"origin." It may be added, as confirmatory of this hypothesis, that Mr. Leavitt caused to be printed in the *Chronotype* newspaper of the 12th April, 1848, the substance of the extraordinary statement received from Mr. Williams. Accordingly, in the *Chronotype* of that date, we find a statement to the effect that, a Frenchman of the name of Bellanger, who died in 1848, at New Orleans, or the Island of Cuba, had confessed on his death-bed that he had brought the Dauphin over to America; but there is no mention whatever therein, of Mr. Williams, or of his identity with the son of Louis XVI.—a rather singular omission, if, as Mr. Williams' "*minute journal*" assures us, Mr. Leavitt, had been fully informed of these important particulars by the letters forwarded to him on the 24th March, "containing the mysterious news in relation to his"—Mr. Williams—"origin." From these discrepancies between the "*minute journal*," and the Rev. Joshua Leavitt's depositions, we are inclined to suspect—that, the idea of personating the Dauphin had not presented itself to Mr. Williams, or rather to his friends—when the letters to Mr. Leavitt were forwarded;—and that the whole of this extravagant romance was concocted betwixt the commencement of April, 1848, and the autumn of the same year, when Mr. Leavitt was so "greatly astonished" at being told by his friend, Mr. Williams, "that he, himself was the supposed Dauphin."

The following discrepancy is also note-worthy.—In the first article upon this subject, in *Putnam's Magazine* for February, the Rev. John H. Hanson, speaking in the first person, says:—

"I have examined, in the presence of two physicians, the right knee of Mr. Williams. It has on it the deep indented scars of a nervous tumor, and the disease must have been severe, as the leg down to the instep is blackened with it."—P. 210.

Mr. Williams, too, says himself:—"My knees are eaten up with scrofula, and there are no other scrofulous marks on my body."—P. 198.

In the April number the subject is continued; and