

## 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. Glynn, Mills & Co., Bankers, Lombard-street, London; the National Bank of Scotland, Glasgow; Messrs. Bowman, Grinnell & Co., Liverpool.

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

## 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, JULY 22, 1853.

### NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The time of Parliament has been chiefly taken up in the discussion of the affairs of India. These debates, though highly important, are intensely uninteresting, and make about as wearisome reading, as the Report of an Evangelical Missionary Society, or the speeches at a Tea and Bible Soiree. The majority in favor of the present Government was large, 322 against 142. It was expected that the discussion on Mr. Phipps's amendment to the "Nunnery Inspection Bill," would come off on the 20th inst.; Mr. Lucas is prepared with a counter amendment. Great discontent prevails on the part of the working classes; and "strikes," as they are called, are fast becoming the order of the day, especially amongst the unskilled laborers. At Stockport, 30,000 factory hands have struck work; and their example has been followed by the operatives of Manchester, Spitalfields, Birmingham, and other large manufacturing towns; it is even said that the Manchester police have joined the strike. With this discontent amongst the operatives there is springing up a considerable political agitation. The cry for the People's Charter is again making itself heard; monster meetings are again being held; and the old Chartist leaders are coming out again, as busy as a certain old gentleman is said to be, in a gale of wind. At the same time, if any credit may be given to the revenue returns, the commerce of the country must be flourishing; these returns showing an increase, for the present quarter, of one million sterling.

War, or no war, is the all engrossing topic of the day, dependent for a solution upon the caprice of the Czar, whose intentions, in spite of negotiations, manifestos, and ultimatums, remain as much a mystery as ever. Everybody, save the Russian, seems to dread war, and therefore seeks to flatter himself that peace may still be preserved. Lord Clarendon replied to a question on the subject in the House of Lords—that there were still reasons to hope for a pacific settlement of the Eastern difficulties, from the important negotiations then pending. It was rumored that Turkey would accede to the demands of Russia, and that Prince Menschikoff would return to Constantinople to re-open negotiations. In the mean time, the Russian army was concentrating on the frontiers, and was held in readiness to cross the Danube; the Turks, on their side, are making great military preparation, as if in expectation of an immediate attack.

The Aberdeen cabinet is threatened with a break up, from internal dissensions, originating from the conflicting views which its members take of the proper policy to be adopted upon the affairs of the East.—The retirement of the Earl of Aberdeen is spoken of as probable by some, whilst others say that the schism has been, for the moment, patched up.

### DR. BROWNSON AND MR. DRUMMOND.

It is not without much repugnance, not without feeling as if an apology were due to Dr. Brownson for mentioning his name in connection with that of a fellow like Gavazzi, that we find ourselves called upon to notice the invidious comparisons, which, in certain quarters, have been attempted to be instituted between the lectures delivered in this city by the first-named gentleman, and the harangues of the notorious ex-monk. We feel that it is almost an insult to Dr. Brownson—a gentleman who, even by the admission of his religious and political opponents, is unequalled as a dialectician, and one of the ripest scholars of whom America can boast; who has mastered more systems of philosophy than perhaps any other living man has even glanced at, or knows the names of (*vide Christian Register*, a New York Protestant publication); whose splendid talents attract the attention, and command the admiration of the learned in every country in Europe; who, by his writings, has done more to cause the name of his native country to be known and respected by foreign *litterati*, than all the other writers, and authors of America put together; and who, with the road to fortune, to political honors, to power, and popularity, invitingly open before him, has, in obedience to the dictates of his conscience, renounced them all to take up the cross and follow Christ—we say that we feel that it is an insult to such a one, even to mention his name on the same day with that of a fellow like Gavazzi, who is notorious only for his vices; who, if he had not perjured himself—if he had not forsworn himself, and violated the most solemn vows which man can make to his Creator, would have lived and died, unknown, unheard of, an obscure monk in some remote Italian convent.—We may contrast two such men; but to compare

them is impossible, because they have no points of resemblance.

And had the comparisons, to which we have alluded, been confined to the columns of the more rabid of the Anti-Catholic press, we should have refrained, out of respect to Dr. Brownson, from taking any notice of them. Enjoying, as he does, not only an American, but a high European, reputation, it can be of little consequence to a person like Dr. Brownson, what a few obscure individuals in Montreal may happen to say of him. But the language of the *Montreal Gazette*, and others, has been held in our Colonial high-places; and no less a person than the Attorney General, Mr. Drummond, has, from his seat in Parliament, given forth to the world that, if Gavazzi in his language was *personally* offensive to Catholics, Dr. Brownson, in his Montreal lectures, was not less so, to Protestants. Such an assertion, or rather innuendo—for, knowing the falsity of the insinuation which he sought to convey,—knowing, how totally unlike in every respect were the lectures of Dr. Brownson and Gavazzi; that the one speaks and writes like a scholar, and a gentleman, the other like a low uneducated blackguard, Mr. Drummond was guarded in his language—such an innuendo, or insinuation, coming from such a quarter, naturally carries with it much weight. "Oh! Mr. Drummond said it—even Mr. Drummond, an Irish Papist, admits that the language of Dr. Brownson was just as bad as that of Gavazzi—quite as violent, as personal, and as scurrilous." And of course, if Mr. Drummond says it, there is no more to be said about it by any one else. The majority of men are incapable of forming an opinion for themselves; they take their opinions, as they do their hats, ready made, seldom giving themselves the trouble to enquire whether they be based upon fact, or falsehood. To a certain extent, therefore, and amongst a certain class, Mr. Drummond's insinuations against the character of Dr. Brownson's lectures, have been received as the verdict of an enlightened, and conscientious Catholic. Dr. Brownson's were just such lectures as those of Gavazzi.

Not that Mr. Drummond, when he delivered himself of his speech in Parliament upon the subject of the riot at Quebec, believed that there was any, the slightest, resemblance between Gavazzi and Dr. Brownson; but, betwixt the men, or their lectures. Mr. Drummond is a man of education—he has, we believe, repeatedly heard Dr. Brownson lecture; he is acquainted with, and if we are not very much misinformed, professes, in *private*, whatever he may do in *public*, a very great admiration for the learned gentleman's person and writings. It is therefore impossible to find, for Mr. Drummond, the same excuse that can be alleged for the unenquiring, and gross multitude. These latter may take up the cry against Dr. Brownson, ignorantly, and therefore, possibly, honestly. Mr. Drummond, on the contrary, when, as a public man, he thought fit—by way of pandering to the low tastes, and vulgar prejudices of the rabble, and in the hopes of making a little political capital against the next election—to speak disparagingly of Dr. Brownson, spoke against his conscience. He well knew, at the time, what a pitiful, what an undignified part he was playing—how little becoming the statesman, or the scholar, the gentleman, or the honest man. By this line of conduct, Mr. Drummond may have earned for himself a few cheers, a little stinking breath, from the implacable enemies of his race, and creed; but, most certainly, he has not merited, nor has he earned, either the respect of his own countrymen, or what, to the high-minded statesman should be of far more value—the approbation of his own conscience. Nay! we much doubt whether Mr. Drummond's tergiversation has even raised him in the opinion of such men as George Brown. These fellows have a natural liking for everything that is mean, and sneaking, it is true, and must therefore, to a certain extent, sympathize with Mr. Drummond; but still even these can put no faith in him. Though somewhat gross, and heavy of intellect—"dull" the *Montreal Herald* has it—even Protestants of the George Brown stamp will hardly allow themselves to be made fools of by Mr. Drummond's professions of liberality. As a piece of business then, Mr. Drummond's language was as impolitic, as it was dishonest, and, in the long run, will, as he will yet find, profit him with neither party.

But, leaving Mr. Drummond to make his own conscience, we would fain say a word or two upon Dr. Brownson's Montreal lectures. No doubt that in these the lecturer was very severe upon, did say very harsh things against, Protestantism, or Denialism—no doubt that he ridiculed the idea of basing, an affirmation upon a protest, or a positive religion upon a bare negation. We do not deny, we do not attempt to soften, the harshness of Dr. Brownson's language against Protestantism;—we ourselves heard him say it—we admit it—that—"All truth, all good, lie in the order of Being; all falsehood, all evil, in the order of Non-Being." We heard him assert that "of contraries both cannot be true;" and that "two and two make four, and not five, nor yet three." Nothing more abusive of Protestantism did we ever hear from Dr. Brownson, simply because it would be impossible to convey in language, any stronger denunciation, or condemnation of Protestantism, as a religious, or intellectual system. Dr. Brownson, it is true, assailed Protestantism with all the force of his logic; a weapon most fatal to Protestantism at all times, and of which the Doctor is a consummate master; but never did Dr. Brownson say one word against the persons, or characters of Protestants as individuals. Even when he laughed at their miserable logic, or rather want of logic, he did so good humoredly; he did so courteously; and he always spoke tenderly of the individuals themselves. In proof of this, we appeal, to the fact—conclusive to every one capable of reasoning—that, whilst amongst Dr. Brownson's hearers, there were present Protestant ministers of different denominations, several of these same gentlemen, were

after the lectures, at their own request, introduced to him, and entered into courteous conversation with the lecturer; which, most assuredly, they would not have done, had they deemed the lectures, to which they had just been listening, *personally* offensive, or, like Gavazzi's lectures, filled with the most rabid and obscene abuse of Protestant ministers. Certainly, no Catholic gentleman, after hearing one of Gavazzi's harangues, would have sought an introduction to him.

However, Dr. Brownson's lectures are before the world, and in print. They were reported in the *Montreal Gazette*, in the *True*, and in the other, *Witness*; and to these printed reports we appeal.—If therein, any thing *personally* offensive can be detected—if any attack upon the characters of the Protestant ministers of Montreal, or Quebec, of Canada, or Great Britain, can be pointed out, we are very certain that Dr. Brownson will, upon its being represented to him, offer such reparation as it behoveth a gentleman to make, and a Protestant minister to accept; we pause for a reply. To those who accuse Dr. Brownson of personalities against Protestants, we say—"Desist from your vague generalities, and condescend to particulars; point out the passage complained of; cite the words, and state where they may be found." Until this be done, we shall have the right to assume that no such passages exist; and to treat the allegations against Dr. Brownson, as destitute of any foundation in truth; as mere ordinary Protestant lies.

### A "MISTAKE," BUT "NO GO."

"The best laid schemes o' mice an' men  
Gang aft a-gley."—Burns.

It was a mighty clever "mistake" that of yours Master Sheriff Sewell; a mighty convenient "mistake" indeed, that you made, in the preparation of your Jury lists; but like many another "mistake" of a similar nature, it has turned out "No Go." You are sharp no doubt, but there are others as sharp as you are; and thank God, your "mistake" has been detected, and you yourself exposed. It is to be hoped, for the credit of Canadian justice, that you may never have the chance of making such a singular "mistake" again, given to you.

This Mr. Sewell, who, strange to say, is still permitted to disgrace the office of Sheriff of Quebec, is the same person who made himself so ostentatiously offensive to his Catholic fellow-citizens, by the prominent, and insulting part he took in introducing Gavazzi to the people of Quebec. Such conduct, not creditable certainly to any person professing to call himself a gentleman, was especially unbecoming on the part of the holder of an important office in the administration of justice—on the part of one whose bearing therefore, above that of all other men, should, on all occasions, and under all circumstances, be characterized by a high and dignified neutrality. Unfortunately for himself, Mr. Sewell must needs make himself disgustingly prominent as a politico-religious partisan, and that, in the most offensive manner possible. In the mêlée that took place on the occasion of Gavazzi's second lecture at Quebec, Mr. Sewell came in for a share of what was going, and got himself very roughly handled. But Mr. Sewell is Sheriff of Quebec; and as Sheriff, entrusted with the preparation of the Jury lists, from which would subsequently be selected the Jury to try the persons accused of having taken part in the riots in which the Sheriff suffered. It is at once evident what an advantage it would be for the Sheriff—a Protestant Sheriff to boot—if a good, sound Protestant Jury could be obtained, before whom to try the "bloody" Papists, accused of rioting, and of lifting up their boots against the sacred hinder end of a Protestant Sheriff. Well, singularly and unaccountably enough, it came to pass that in preparing his Jury lists, Mr. Sheriff Sewell made one of the most providential "mistakes" imaginable. He passed over names that should have appeared on the list, and inserted others that should not have appeared there at all—all by "mistake" of course. And what makes this "mistake" more providential, and remarkable is this—that the result of it would have been to secure a Protestant majority on the Jury, and of course, to have rendered certain the conviction of the Catholics accused of rioting, no matter how clear their innocence—had those unfortunate Papists been tried before them. And how soothing to a Protestant Sheriff's wounded feelings, and bruised hinder end, that would have been, may easily be imagined. Still it must be remembered that it was all a "mistake."

Fortunately for the ends of justice this "mistake" was detected in time; and, in consequence, the trial of the accused has been postponed until next term. So, that in this instance at least, the "mistake" has turned out to be what our old friend Sam Weller, would style a "caveat," that is, a legal term signifying "No go."

We trust that our Catholic friends at Quebec will bestir themselves, and keep a bright look out, lest a similar "mistake" should occur a second time; for, even with the most evangelical of Sheriffs, "mistakes" will occur; they were very common in Ireland a few years ago, as our Irish readers must very well recollect. But we must have none of these "mistakes" here; and the best way to prevent their recurrence is, for the Catholics of Quebec to insist, peremptorily, that a public officer who, whether through natural imbecility, or deliberate malice—we do not pretend to say which—has shown himself incompetent to fulfil the duties of his office without making "mistakes," shall be summarily dismissed from a situation which he is evidently unworthy to hold. Mr. Sewell's "mistake," has gone a great way already to make the integrity of our Courts of Law suspect; and until he be dismissed from his situation,—until the possibility of his making a similar "mistake" a second time be removed—no prudent

man can entertain any feeling, save disgust and contempt for the way in which justice is administered in Canada.

Since writing the above, we learn that a Rule was taken upon the Sheriff, by order of the Court, to shew cause why a penalty should not be imposed upon him for the illegal manner in which he had summoned the Jury. To this rule the Sheriff answered on Monday last by counsel, and obtained delay, until the first day of next term, to produce affidavits to show that his, apparently, barefaced violation of the Jury law was not intentional. We hope, for the sake of justice, he will be able to do so; although, we confess, we are at a loss to conceive how he can satisfactorily account for the omission of so many Catholic Jurors, whose names upon the Jury list were passed over, and the names of Protestants substituted. What say our Evangelical contemporaries—and what would they not say if the accused were Protestants, and the Sheriff a Catholic? We pause for a reply. At all events, this "mistake" of Mr. Sewell will cost the country dear—not less, says the *Journal de Quebec*, than £3,000.

### THE GAVAZZI INQUEST.

The Court of Inquiry, composed of the principal officers of the Garrison, to investigate the conduct of the officers and men of the 26th regiment, implicated in the affair of the 9th ult., has concluded its sittings, with the recommendation that Sergeant Connor, and three privates, who, on the Inquest swore to having heard the officers give orders to fire, be handed over to a Court Martial, in which the accused will have an opportunity of substantiating their depositions against their officers. We fear that the cause of the firing of the troops will still, in spite of all inquiries, remain as much a mystery as ever; unless the evidence, extraordinary indeed, but still not incredible, of our friend Mrs. Margaret Brown, should be found to throw some light upon it. Putting aside the consideration whether the Mayor did, or did not, immediately after reading the Riot Act, cry out "Fire Fire," as of no consequence, we cannot agree with the finding of the minority of the Jury "that the troops fired by order of the said Mayor." The men of the 26th are not raw recruits; they had previously been cautioned against paying attention to the orders of any person, other than their commanding officer; and we cannot bring ourselves to think so lightly of the discipline of a gallant and distinguished regiment as to believe that its men would fire upon a peaceable body of citizens, upon the mere cry of a civilian "Fire Fire"—which are not military words of command, and would therefore have no effect upon such perfect machines as are steady, disciplined soldiers—or that they would fire at all, unless they firmly believed, that they had received orders to do so from their own officers. Neither can we believe that the officers, who on their examination swore that they never gave orders to fire, perjured themselves. Officers in H. M. Service are not lightly to be suspected of falsehood; and we place implicit confidence in the assertions of Lieut. Col. Hogarth, and his brother officers, that they did not order the troops to fire, as in the statements of gallant gentlemen who would scorn to do a dishonorable action. We have an hypothesis—which we offer merely as an hypothesis—by means of which we think that the whole unfortunate mystery is susceptible of solution? We believe in short, that the men fired under a strong, and to the steadiest troops, not altogether an inexcusable delusion; but that the officers did not give the order to fire—as thus:—

There was much confusion and noise in the vicinity of the troops, who, it seems, when the Mayor commenced reading the Riot Act were "standing easy" with arms sloped. Seeing the Mayor reading the Riot Act, and wishing to have his men in readiness, it is probable that the commanding officer brought them to the—"attention"—and—"carry arms"—without having the least intention of giving any other word of command? Now, if immediately after the order—"carry arms"—some drunken or mischievous person in the crowd near where the Mayor and officer in command were standing had, as testified by Mrs. Margaret Brown, continued in the same tone of voice—"ready—present"—what more natural than that the men, already on the alert by being brought to the "attention," should fancy that the second order was but a continuation of the first, and act accordingly? We do not say that it was thus that the catastrophe occurred; but it is the only feasible explanation that has as yet been offered; and there is much in the evidence of different witnesses to confirm it.

For instance, Sir James Alexander—a military man—says, he saw the men making preparations for firing—that is, going through the different prescribed military movements previous to firing. The men evidently, did not come at once like a lot of cockney sportsmen out sparrow shooting, from "slope arms" to "present;" but went through the regular preparatory stages, thus giving Sir James—as he himself testifies—time to get under shelter before they fired. Clearly the men must have been acting under the influence of regular words of command, given with military precision. That it was not the officers who gave these words of command is clear from the awkward position in which Capt. Cameron found himself when his division fired, in front of the muzzles of their pieces, many of which, at the risk of his own life, like a good and gallant gentleman he knocked up with his sword. Had Capt. Cameron given, or received from his commanding officer, the order to fire, he would have fallen into the rear, the proper place for an officer when about to give such an order. From these two facts put together, we come to the conclusion that the men heard regular military words of command, uttered in rapid succession, and that they fired in consequence; but we also conclude that the officers did not give those;