



PLEASURE EXCURSION TO LAVALTRIE

UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF
The Irish Societies of this City,
THE PROCEEDS TO BE GIVEN TO THE ST.
PATRICK'S ORPHAN ASYLUM.

THE Steamer JACQUES CARTIER will leave the Wharf at Half-past SEVEN o'clock on WEDNESDAY, the 17th inst.; and returning will leave for Montreal at 5, P. M.

BANDS of MUSIC will be in attendance; and every exertion will be made by the Joint Committee to render the Excursion pleasant.

Price of Tickets, (which are limited) 2s 6d each. Children under 12 years, half price. And may be had at Sadler's Book store, and Mr. H. Prince's Music store, Notre Dame street; Mr. John Phelan's, Dalhousie-square; Mr. Thomas Hanly, near Canal-bridge, and also from the Secretaries

HENRY J. CLARKE,
FREDERICK DALTON.

N.B.—Should the weather prove unfavorable, the Excursion will be postponed to Wednesday the 24th.

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. Byan, Mills & Co., Bankers, Lombard-street, London; the National Bank of Scotland, Glasgow; Messrs. Lowman, Ginnell & Co., Liverpool.

HENRY CHAPMAN & Co.,
St. Sacrament Street.

Montreal, March 1853.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON,
At the Office, No. 4, Place d'Armes.

TERMS:

To Town Subscribers. . . . \$3 per annum.
To Country do. . . . \$2½ do.
Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, AUG. 12, 1853.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The Royal visit to Ireland has been postponed on account of the Queen's sickness; Her Majesty has been suffering from an attack of the measles, but is convalescent. The nursery question came before the House of Commons on the 20th ult., in the form of Mr. Phipps's amendment—that it be referred to a select committee to consider whether any, or what regulations are necessary for the better protection of the inmates of establishments of a conventual nature, and for the prevention of the exercise of undue influence in procuring the alienation of their property. The great majority of speakers, whether Catholic or Protestant, declared themselves opposed to any special legislation upon the subject, and expressed their disapproval of the insulting manner in which the religion of about one fourth of the population was treated. Mr. J. Ball, objected to Mr. Phipps's motion as unnecessary; as the first of a series of attacks upon the religion, educational, and charitable establishments of Catholics; he admitted that:—

"If any special privileges and immunities were accorded to the inmates of convents, he should be the first to admit that it was the duty of the State to secure by inspection and supervision, the due administration and management of such bodies; but the system in this country was to ignore these establishments, and then, in consistency, the legislature ought not to pry into their concerns, or interfere in the management of them."

He concluded a long and eloquent address by pointing out the dangers to which the present Non-Popery agitation, was exposing the peace of the nation, and by warning the House against the degradation, of tamely submitting to the dictation of Exeter Hall and its kindred societies. Of these societies and their labors the speaker gave a humorous description:—

"He found that among the religious societies of this empire those which most engaged the minds of the people were such as had for their object to raise the most intense feeling and hatred against the Catholic population of the country. These societies were composed of men who disavowed anything in common except their animosity towards the Catholic Faith. Such bodies rejoiced in different names, but their object was the same. There was the "Protestant Association," the "Evangelical Alliance," the "Protestant Alliance," and so forth. There was one striking feature in the publications of all these institutions, namely, their sudden alternations between the most triumphant hope, and the most profound despair. On one page they boast of their splendid successes, and on the next the reader is called upon to deplore the formidable front that was shown by Popery, and the enormous sums that were being poured into the country for the purpose of purchasing the Protestant faith of the people of England. Thus, in one place, they were told that no fewer than 100,000 addresses had been circulated amongst the electors of Scotland, and that the result was that no fewer than twenty-seven members had voted for Mr. Spooner's motion, while only eleven had voted against it. Again, it was stated that the enormous number of 137,600 tracts and pamphlets had been distributed in the city of Glasgow alone, and the total number circulated in Scotland must, therefore, have defied all ordinary powers of computation. Of course the natural inquiry would be, what had been the character of these publications? They were of various prices, from the very moderate charge of a

shilling per hundred, to 6d each. Their titles were such as these:—"The Pope, the Enemy of God and Man," "Popery, like Paganism," "Popish Bigotry," "The Fifth of November," "Idolatry of the late Pope." Then came a few murders attributed to Popery, and so on (hear, hear). It was by the circulation of such documents as these, that the "religious societies" to which he had alluded, attempted to carry out their aims; and there was no doubt that the ignorance of the people of England, and still more, of the people of Scotland, had been practised upon to a fearful extent by the wholesale dissemination of these atrocious libels (loud cheers). One of the most important of these publications bore upon its title-page, the following testimonial from the Earl of Shaftesbury:—"Extremely cheap, well adapted for the necessities of the time and singularly suited to the intelligence of the people." (Hear, hear). This periodical, so vouched, however, probably contained more offensive and abominable calumnies than any that ever disgraced the press of this country (cheers). He would not sully his lips by repeating passages in illustration of this remark; but the house would judge of its tone by an article on convents (or "Nunneries," as the writer called them), in which he concluded by calling upon the people of England to—

"Raze to their foundation stones
Those homes of infamy."

(Hear, hear). Surely no hon. gentleman would rise in his place and say that that was not disgraceful (cheers). But (continued the hon. gentleman throwing down the work) he declined to read any more.—These works attributed to Catholics the most wicked crimes that had ever disgraced our nature. And these were the tracts which had been circulated in such vast numbers, not amongst the educated, but amongst the ignorant members of the community. Even the members of the Peace Society came in for their share. After premising that Louis Napoleon was under the complete control of the Pope, and that his object was to invade England, and destroy Protestantism, one of these writers said, "It is quite evident that the Peace Society were in secret league with the Pope." (great laughter). Then he went on to say that it was rather suspicious that Messrs. Cobden and Bright "were strong supporters of the popish home conspiracy." (great laughter). The sheriff of an Irish county had summoned two grand juries on which there was not a single Catholic member (hear, hear). Of course, if the charges against the Catholics were true, that sheriff was quite right, for they were not fit to be members either of a grand jury or even of a society. But what did they mean to do with the Catholics of this empire? Did they mean to drive them out to some remote colony, for it was clear that both persuasions could not live together in one community if they were to regard each other in such a light (hear, hear). Another very noticeable peculiarity in all these societies was the energy with which they called upon the public to subscribe to them (laughter). Really, since speculation in railway shares had failed, one of the best things a man could do was to publish "no popery" tracts, or to become the officer of a "no popery" society (hear, hear). The grand chorus which all these concerns sung was "subscribe liberally.—Empty your pockets." Atrocious as were the libels which were showered upon Catholics, he did not ask the house for any means of redress. When the hatred of three-fourths of the population was thus sedulously aroused by these publications against the remaining fourth, the safeguards which the constitution provided for all the citizens of the State became neutralised. Recent events show, the hon. gentleman said, that trial by jury was itself becoming no longer a safety for the minority, under the influence of these flagitious appeals to the religious prejudices of the majority."

Mr. E. Ball, though a Protestant, and totally opposed to the Catholic religion, spoke strongly and warmly against the proposed interference with the rights of private individuals; and pronounced the highest eulogium upon the convents in England. The debate was adjourned to the 10th inst.

By the arrival of the *Baltic*, we gain no additional information respecting the settlement of the Eastern question. A pacific solution is confidently spoken of; but to many it appears that the object of the Czar in lending a favorable ear to the propositions of the other European powers, is merely to gain time. The Russian troops have not yet been withdrawn from the Principalities, and until they are, no reliance can be placed upon the pacific protestations of the Emperor.

WHAT SHOULD BE DONE?

Poor dear Mrs. Nickleby was always famous for the excellence of her advice. "Do something, pray do something," she kept constantly ringing in Mr. Nickleby's ears till the last moment of his existence; and though no one can doubt of the propriety of the lady's advice, and of the duty of the gentleman to have "done something" in his embarrassed circumstances, it may be, reproached to Mrs. Nickleby that her advice was somewhat of the vaguest, and urged in excuse of Mr. Nickleby's inaction that he really did not know what to "do." The relative positions of our Protestant Committees at Quebec and Montreal, and the Canadian Executive, are not unlike those of Mrs. Nickleby and her unfortunate husband. Still the former cry, "Do something—Why don't you do something?" But the mischief of it is, neither Committees nor Government seem to know exactly what the latter ought to "do."

We believe that there is one point with reference to the late disturbances on which Catholics and Protestants will cordially agree—viz., that it is the duty of the Government to make diligent enquiry into the causes of these disturbances, and to exert all its powers, both to bring the guilty to justice, and to secure society against a recurrence of similar unhappy scenes. And when we talk of "guilty," we mean the "guilty" on both sides; for such there were.—The attack upon the Protestant church at Quebec was an outrage upon the property of our fellow-citizens which we should be ashamed to defend, and which we should be sorry to see go unpunished; the actors therein will, we hope, yet be detected, and meet the reward of their misdeeds—but by due process of law, after a fair and impartial investigation before the proper tribunals, and not by means of

packed juries, and other violations of the law, more atrocious even than the crimes of which they stand accused. That a delay has occurred in the trial of the accused is not the fault of the Government; nor can it be attributed to any desire on the part of the authorities to screen the guilty. It must be put down to the Quebec Sheriff's scandalous violation of the Jury Laws; it is upon him then that the indignation of the community, on account of the consequent delay, should be vented.

The line of conduct to be pursued by the Government, in reference to the Quebec riots, is pretty plainly marked out. It is to let the law take its course against the parties accused of having been the instigators, and chief actors, in these riots. If proved guilty, we trust that they will be punished; for, as Catholics, we detest all acts of violence, not only as highly impolitic, and calculated to lead to reprisals, in which Catholic Churches, and the property of Catholics, will be the sufferers; but because utterly opposed to the teaching of the Catholic Church, and irreconcilably at variance with the spirit of our holy religion. Catholics can have no sympathy for, extend no approval to, rioting, stone throwing, menaces, or any resource to force except in self-defence.—For the individuals engaged in such acts, the dominant feelings are regret and surprise that any persons calling themselves Catholics should allow themselves for one moment to fancy that, in violating the laws which hold society together, they can be doing the Church service. Of course we pronounce no opinion upon the guilt of the parties accused; from what we have heard, we have reasons to believe that they have been accused most unjustly; and that the real rioters will, on investigation, turn out to have been, a parcel of "rowdy loafers" from Champlain street, and the wharves; fellows such as abound in all large seaport towns; to whom all religions are indifferent, and who, living in a state of chronic warfare against society, see in a riot a chance of indulging their felonious propensities. It is well known that the highly respected clergyman of St. Patrick's Church at Quebec warned his people against taking any notice of the insults and calumnies heaped upon them by Garavazzi; and there is not as yet the slightest reason to believe that a single Irish Catholic, holding, what, by the utmost stretch of the term, can be called, a respectable position in society, was directly, or indirectly, engaged in the assault upon the church.

The whole affair seems to have closely resembled one of those rows which sometimes take place in low theatres, or other "cheap and nasty" places of amusement; and which, despite all the precautions of the best organised police, will occur, even in Protestant places of worship, if their owners devote them to similar vile purposes, or open them to the public for the display of the histrionic performances of an itinerant buffoon, at 1s 3d per head. If Protestants will put their meeting-houses to such uses, they must expect that people will conduct themselves therein as they would in any other place of public amusement to which they are admitted for money—as in Sand's Circus, or the pit of a theatre. Yet neither in the Circus aforesaid, in the Protestant meeting-house, nor the pit of the theatre, would the audience be justified in kicking a row, or in offering violence to the actors. A buffoon like Garavazzi is fully as much entitled to civil treatment from his audience, as Mr. Lovett, the famous Clown of Sand's Circus and Menagerie; and though the latter is by far the more respectable of the two, we condemn the attack upon Garavazzi as strongly as we would the throwing of apples, or oranges, at the other Clown. The rule is clear; if men go willingly into a place of public amusement, their having paid their quarter dollar at the door gives them no right to disturb the performances. We trust that after this full confession of faith, no one will accuse the TRUE WITNESS of approving of the Gavazzi riots at Quebec, or of indifference to the rights of our Protestant fellow-citizens.

The Montreal riot is a far more complicated affair, and presents far more difficulties than does the row at Quebec; nor is it even yet easy to say what line of conduct the Crown Officers should adopt. At Quebec the guilty were all on one side, and comprised in the party who assailed the church, and smashed its windows. At Montreal it is very different; there were three guilty parties. The men who used violence towards the police were guilty of rioting—the author of the wanton slaughter occasioned by the firing of the troops, was guilty of homicide at the least,—and above all, were the ruffians who fired upon the mob, and running after, shot down fleeing and unarmed men, guilty of brutal and cowardly murder. On these points there can be but little difference of opinion: on the first two, none: on the third, we are happy to see that the author of a pamphlet, "The Riots and Outrage of 9th June, in Montreal—by an Eye-Witness," perfectly agrees with us. The writer, though a Protestant, and writing with a strong Protestant bias, has the honesty, and courage to depict the murder of Walsh in its proper colors:—

"It is a scandalous want of fairness to conceal, or wink at the guilt of the parties who, after the dispersion of the mob, ran after them down the street, and deliberately took aim upon the fugitives. The act was mean and cowardly as well as cold-blooded and inhuman; and every attempt to justify or palliate its guilt, shows the absence of a true respect for 'the precious life.'"

We distinguish then in the Montreal riots three crimes, three guilty parties. The mob, or rioters outside the church—the author of the fire of the troops—and the armed ruffians within the church, who rushing out murdered Walsh and Donnelly. And of these three guilty parties, the guilt of the last is greatest, although the loss of life by the fire of the troops was far more extensive; but in the latter case there is no reason to assume the presence of malice, which is an essential ingredient in the crime of murder, and which was plainly manifested in the "mean cowardly, cold-blooded, and inhuman" conduct of the ruffians who were within the church during the lecture.

A government enquiry into the Montreal riots would therefore, if justly conducted, have a far wider scope than our Protestant Committees seem to anticipate. These seem to think that the loss of life by the fire of the troops is the only subject requiring investigation. They are wrong: there is another subject to be enquired into, and one involving a far deeper degree of guilt. If it be the duty of the government to take steps for ascertaining on whom rests the responsibility of the fire of the troops, it is still more imperative upon it to use every exertion to discover, and bring to justice, the scoundrel, or scoundrels who brutally, and, as the Protestant "Eye-Witness" admits, in a "cowardly, cold-blooded, and inhuman" manner, murdered Walsh and Donnelly. If we are to have an investigation at all let us have a full, fair and impartial one; no one sided piece of business. Whilst heartily agreeing with our Protestant cotemporaries in denouncing, the fire of the troops as totally uncalled for, and its consequences as a wanton massacre, we invite them, if they be honest men, to join us in calling upon the authorities to take the proper steps to detect, and bring to justice, the murderers of Walsh and Donnelly. With the depositions which he has before him, the Attorney General, if he be not afraid of giving offence by honestly performing his duty, can be at no loss to discover what course he is bound to pursue. If the cause of the fire of the troops be enveloped in an almost impenetrable mystery, it is not so with the firing from Zion church. There is plenty of evidence already upon this latter point; and when the proper time arrives we have no doubt that plenty more will be forthcoming.

THE JURY PACKING AT QUEBEC.

Mr. Von Exter, the Deputy Sheriff of Quebec, publishes a long rigmarole, in the form of a letter to the editor of the *Quebec Gazette*, with the view of exonerating his principal, Mr. Sewell, from all share in the late scandalous, but happily frustrated, attempt to defeat the ends of justice by means of a packed jury. This conduct is very noble, and disinterested on the part of Mr. Deputy, though his letter is not very grammatical, and in many passages, utterly unintelligible. Still we cannot refuse the tribute of our admiration to Mr. Von Exter in thus coming chivalrously forward as his chief's scape-goat.—It is written that "the lieutenant is to be saved before the ancient," and we see not why the text should not be taken to mean—that the Deputy should be damned to screen the Sheriff: at all events it is susceptible of such an interpretation, and has been, apparently, so understood by the self-sacrificing Deputy, who is worthy of all credit for the excellence of his intentions; though we fancy that neither he, nor Mr. Sewell, nor Mr. Sewell's friends, have much cause to thank Mr. Von Exter for the manner in which he has carried these intentions into execution.

In plain English, Mr. Von Exter, has placed his principal in a far worse light than he was in before: and has, by his letter, fully confirmed our worst suspicions. From this letter, and by Mr. Von Exter's own avowal, it appears that the Panels "of Grand and Petit Jurors" were prepared strictly in accordance with the requirements of the law "on the first and second days of June last"—that is, before the occurrence of the Gavazzi riots. Up to that time there seem to have been no doubts as to the meaning of the Jury Act: and as there were then no inducements to violate the law, Mr. Sheriff and his Deputy ran no risk of mistaking its provisions. This then is the first fact brought to light by Mr. Von Exter's own confession—before the occurrence of the riots, and when the Sheriff had no party purposes to serve, the Jury Panels were made out strictly in accordance with the spirit, and the letter, of the law. Let us see what took place after these riots. The same law being still in force, and still so plain, so clear in its wording, that no one endowed with a grain of common sense could by any possibility have mistaken its meaning.

The summonses for the Jurors having been made out, and put into the bailiff's hands "two days previous to the Gavazzi riot," it was subsequently discovered—on the report of the bailiffs that "eighteen English jurors could not be found,"—that an equal number of summonses to English jurymen, to make good this deficiency, required to be issued. Of course, it will be said, the Sheriff, or his Deputy, immediately referred to the *some* Jury list as that from which he had struck the Panel—"two days previous to the Gavazzi riots;" and took the names of the persons qualified to serve, as they stood thereon, in regular rotation, in accordance with the clear, and unmistakable requirements of the Act. Not at all; in the interval the disturbances had taken place, and the Law, before the riots, so clear, became now utterly incomprehensible. Mr. Von Exter "had an impression" to the effect that "the old lists were run through;" and without so much as taking the trouble to ascertain whether his "impression" were warranted by the facts of the case, or whether even if it were—which it was not—he would, in that case, have been justified in violating the provisions of the Act,—our Deputy—of course without the knowledge or consent of his principal—"took the eighteen jurors wanted," not from the old list, as he was in duty bound to do, but from another list from which he had no business to take them. The consequence of this singular "impression" has already been given. "Not a single Catholic, speaking the English language, was summoned to serve on the Grand Jury; and on the Petit Jury, on which by rights there should have been 14 Catholics, 16 Protestants, there were but 11 Catholics, to 21 Protestants!" And Mr. Sewell and his Deputy wish to persuade us that this was the result of accident; of a mistake forsooth! Do they take us for fools? Do they really imagine that we are such dolts as to believe them? The man who can bring himself to be-