

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. Glyn, Mills & Co., Bankers, Lombard-street, London; the National Bank of Scotland, Glasgow; Messrs. Downan, Griemell & Co., Liverpool.

HENRY CHAPMAN & Co.,
St. Sacrament Street.

Montreal, March 1853.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JUNE 17, 1853.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The infamous attack upon the Nunneries, proposed by Mr. Chamber's Bill, now before the House of Commons, has aroused the indignation of the Catholics throughout Great Britain and Ireland. A petition against this monstrous measure, approved of by His Eminence the Archbishop of Westminster, has been prepared, and will no doubt be signed by every true Catholic who loves his Church and hates tyranny.

Its last clause is pregnant with meaning, and clearly indicates what Protestant legislators may expect if they insist upon passing this most iniquitous Bill. "Your petitioners apprehend," says the chief Pastor of the Catholic Church in England, "that one consequence of this measure, if passed, will be to place the Catholics of England in the painful position of having to choose between obedience to the dictates of their conscience, and obedience to the law of the land." Not a doubt of it: and as little reason to doubt to which of these two—the law of "conscience" or the law of the "land"—Catholics will yield obedience. They are bound, in such a case, not only not to obey, but to resist, the law of the land. As little sin would there be in shooting a scoundrel, attempting to force his way into a convent, as in shooting a mad dog. Never, we trust, while Catholics can pull a trigger in their own defence, will they submit to such a monstrous outrage on their rights as free men.

Look at the provisions of this Bill. It begins with a lie; and to gratify the intense hatred of Catholicity of its framers, it strikes a fatal blow at the personal liberty of every British subject. Its preamble is a lie—"Whereas difficulties have been found to exist in certain cases in applying for, and obtaining the writ of *habeas corpus*." "Name"—cry the Catholics—"name one case, in which these difficulties have occurred: if you cannot, it is because none have occurred; and your preamble, which you are bound to prove, is false, and the measure based thereon unjust." Look at the clauses of the Bill, and see what fearful power is entrusted to the irresponsible nominees of the Crown. These men, whose proceedings are to be in secret, are to be authorised—at their free will and pleasure—without any crime having been proven, without even an affidavit from a single citizen, that he has any reason to believe that a crime has been, or is likely to be, committed—to break into the house of every man in the kingdom; to thrust their filthy presence into every lady's bed chamber, and then, separating wife from husband, daughter from mother, sister from brother, to subject the inmates, male and female, to every lewd and beastly interrogatory which their libidinous fancies may suggest. Of course this measure is designed to be employed solely against Catholics; but it is so worded, that the very villainy that it meditated against them, may some day be employed with fatal effect against its originators. If this Bill passes, the last security to personal liberty in England will be at an end. Every man's home will be at the mercy of the Commissioners, and liable to be broken into without a moment's notice, and without even a warrant from a magistrate. To such a law, Catholics are not bound to pay the least respect: to resist it, by force if necessary, becomes a duty to themselves as freemen, and as freemen, we trust in God that they will resist it, should it unfortunately pass. Still we cannot believe that a people so attached to their personal liberty as the English—so jealous of all secret and irresponsible power—so long accustomed to the forms, at least, of freedom—will permit their morbid hatred of Catholicity to hurry them on to the perpetration of such an act of suicidal folly. Ireland too is not idle; but is, under the guidance of her Prelates, preparing to show a stout resistance to this outrage upon personal freedom. If it should succeed it will not be without a strenuous opposition from the liberal Catholic members.

The Continental news is warlike. Fresh troubles are breving in the East, and there is every prospect of a rupture between Russia and the Porte, which cannot fail to involve the other great European powers in the contest. Russia is concentrating her masses on the Turkish frontier, and the fleets of England and France are on their way to the Dardanelles. This threatening aspect of affairs has had an unfavorable effect on the Funds. The news from India is unfavorable; the British troops have suffered severely, and have been obliged to demand reinforcements. From China we learn that Nankin has been invested by the insurgents; and some reports say that the city had already fallen into their hands.

NOT AN INTEMPERATE EXPRESSION.

"But has Father Gavazzi ever been reported as a man who indulges in intemperate language? In all the reports made of his addresses not one intemperate expression has been attributed to him."—*Gazette*, 10th inst.

It is fortunate that the *Gazette* has thus formally put its opinion on record; still more fortunate is it that the *Globe* has published a full report of Gavazzi's lecture—the one on the "Inquisition," which led to the disturbance at Quebec—for, in the first place,

we know now what is, in the opinion of the *Gazette*, "temperate language" towards Catholics; in the second place, this "temperate language" having been published in the *Globe*, it is impossible for it to lie, quibble, or shuffle out of it, or to pretend that it disapproves of it, as a blénish, upon an otherwise excellent address. On the contrary, these passages, "not at all intemperate," as the *Gazette* affirms, were the very passages the most loudly applauded; it was for the sake of these passages that Gavazzi was invited, courted, and protected; they were the salt which alone gave savor to the otherwise rapid mess which he set before his audience. Read them, Catholics; meditate upon them, and lay them to heart. Remember that it is too late for Protestants to disclaim them now. On the contrary, the *Gazette* affirms confidently that "not one intemperate expression" has been, or can be, attributed to Gavazzi. We copy from the *Globe*, the most violent anti-Catholic organ of Upper Canada:—

"The Roman Clergy have no social affections; they are cruel hearted, and have a cruel nature against all beings of mankind."—*Globe*.

"From the 13th century of the Christian era, the Roman Catholic Clergy never more were a Clergy of Christ; but a Clergy of blood and slaughter."—*Id.*

"Don't call yourselves priests, Roman Catholic Clergy; call yourselves murderers."—*Id.*

"There is the Ribbon Society in Ireland—a society for murders and assassinations, composed wholly of Roman Catholics, headed by Roman Catholic priests."—*Id.*

"The Church of Rome belongs to Anti-Christ and the Devil."—*Id.*

"THE ROMISH CLERGY ARE THE SOUL OF SATAN—THE SOUL OF THE DEVIL HIMSELF."—(*Applause*.)—*Id.*

We will stop here for the present to make a few remarks, merely reminding our readers that, in the eyes of Protestants, there is not, in the above language—when applied to Catholic Clergymen—"one intemperate expression."

And now, Protestants of Montreal, who see nothing "intemperate," nothing improper in the above expressions—who, by your invitation to Gavazzi, and by your loud applause at all he said—have yourselves endorsed, and are responsible for every one of these expressions—allow the TRUE WITNESS to ask you one or two questions.

You have, either personally, or by report, known for many years, a great number of these "Romish Clergy"—you have, many of you at least, been associated with them in public enterprises of charity—you have seen their conduct during the years of Typhus Fever and Cholera—you have sat at the same table with them, and in company with them devised means for carrying succor to the unhappy victims of last year's conflagration. Tell us then—have you ever found these "Romish Clergy," whether from the Seminary, the Episcopal palace, or the Jesuits, whether French, or Irish, or Germans—have you found them, "without social affections?"—have you found them "cruel?"—or have they, by their conduct, ever given you reason to suppose that they had "a cruel nature against all beings of mankind?"—Do you really believe that the "Romish Clergy" with whom so many of the first Protestant citizens of Montreal have been of late connected in the "Relief Committee," deserve to be branded as a "Clergy of blood and slaughter?" or that our beloved Bishop, Mgr. Bourget—a man loved and respected by all who know him—is a man of "blood and slaughter?" You have seen these same "Romish Clergy," with heroic self-devotion, which attracted the admiration of thousands in Europe, though we cannot say that we ever heard that it provoked many imitators amongst the Protestant clergy of Canada—you have seen them, braving death, and disease in its most hideous forms, rushing, not to slaughter, not to kill, but to save alive;—not to take the lives of others, but to lay down their own; and this you have seen, not once or twice only, but always, whenever your city has been visited by any great sickness or calamity. Tell us then—Do you think it "temperate" to call these men "murderers?"—do you really believe that they "belong to Anti-Christ and the Devil?"—do they deserve to be denounced as the "Soul of Satan—the Soul of the Devil himself?"—do you really believe that they deserve to be spoken of as Gavazzi spoke of them? No—you do not.

And yet—knowing these things to be false—knowing that the calumnies which Gavazzi was heaping upon the heads of your unoffending fellow-citizens—who not only have never wronged you, but have, by their devotion in the cause of charity, spared this city from many a grievous infliction—were but lies—knowing that the "Romish Clergy" were not cruel monsters, and were not animated by a "cruel nature against all beings of mankind"—knowing that it was foul slander to call them "murderers," a "Clergy of blood and slaughter," and to stigmatize them as "The Soul of Satan—the Soul of the Devil himself"—knowing all these things—you not only allowed this Gavazzi to utter in your presence these most monstrous lies—these most cruel calumnies; but, at every fresh outrage, at every fresh attack upon the characters of the "Romish Clergy," you publicly ratified, and endorsed, by your applause, that which in your inmost hearts you knew to be false. Shame upon you—we do not say as Christians; for men who could so act are unworthy of the name of Christians—Shame upon you—we do not say as gentlemen; for we would not deprecate the title of gentlemen by applying it to such as you;—but—Shame upon you as men! Fie—Fie upon your manhood!

Gavazzi is vile. The man who makes his livelihood by calumniating his brother, whose stock-in-trade is falsehood and ribaldry, is but a mean pitiful object; we cannot but despise him; and hard would it be to find one, more worthy of the contempt and abhorrence of every honest man. And yet such an one there is. It is he who sits by, and listening to

what he knows to be falsehoods and calumny, applauds the foul wretch who gives them utterance.

Let us look at some more of the "temperate language" of this noble friend to "civil and religious liberty," as the *Globe* calls him—

"He"—Gavazzi—"desired that a memorial be sent to Queen Victoria, signed by all true Protestant ladies, in order to obtain the TOTAL DESTRUCTION OF ALL NUNNERIES."

"He urged upon all Protestants to watch the movement of the Jesuits, and if they found them guilty of violating the rules of Protestant society take his advice and expel the Jesuits from Canada."

"My dear brethren, TOLERANCE WITH THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IS A CRIME AGAINST YOUR CHURCH AND AGAINST YOUR SOCIETY."—*Globe*.

"This is Protestant 'civil and religious liberty,' for you with a vengeance, advocated without 'one intemperate expression'—It consists in 'the total destruction of all nunneries'—the expulsion of our Professors from our Jesuit Colleges, and intolerance against 'the Roman Catholic Church.'—And why so, good master Protestants? Why should our convents be destroyed at your pleasure?—Why should the Jesuits submit 'to the rules of Protestant society' on pain of expulsion?—Why is 'tolerance of the Roman Catholic Church a crime?'—and above all—Why should Catholics be tolerant towards one, who openly, and with the applause of his audience, advocates intolerance towards them? Is it a sin to be intolerant towards the Apostle of intolerance—the advocate of the destruction of our convents—and the expulsion of our religious orders? Or is there one law of right for you, and another for us? Who are you, what are you, we should like to know that you should dare insult us in this manner?—that you should presume thus to advocate the persecution of our societies, and the intolerance of our Church? Tolerance indeed! we ask no toleration from you. We are here by as good a right as you are, and here will we remain in spite of you. We are as good men as you are, in every respect; in intelligence, in virtue, and in every estimable qualification. And you have the impudence to talk about 'Tolerance with us being a crime'—and call yourselves the 'friends of civil and religious liberty!'"

Who are you, and what are you, we ask again that you should dare thus to address us? Shall we tell you? But no. Were we to draw a faithful picture of you, the prominent leaders we mean of the Protestant party in this city, it would not be flattering, either to your intelligence as men, or to your honesty as merchants. What have our Sisters of Charity done that they should be reviled as prostitutes, and their calumniators applauded? From them you have received services which you are unable to repay, as your grovelling natures are unable to appreciate. Not of all do we speak; for many Protestants—all Protestant gentlemen—are ashamed of you, and your brutal insults to these poor ladies. They know—and so do you if it comes to that—that they have not merited reproaches at your hands. See how the "Report" published by Protestant gentlemen of this city speaks of these same Sisters of Charity, and gives your calumnies the lie:—

"The Committees cannot let this opportunity pass without thus loudly and publicly recognising and acknowledging the eminent, efficient services rendered by the Ladies of the Grey Nunnery, and by those of the Asyle de la Providence,—services altogether disinterested and rendered to all the sufferers alike, without distinction. This Committee takes pleasure in thus bearing testimony to the devotedness of those Ladies in the fulfilment of their arduous duties at all times and seasons, and on all occasions, but more particularly during the recent flood, when their conduct was beyond all praise. To the zeal and to the promptitude of those Ladies in seconding the views of this Committee; to their useful suggestions derived from long experience; to their economy in the distribution of the relief; to their strict and continual, although kind and benevolent watchfulness, has this Committee been enabled at so comparatively small an expense, to afford substantial aid to so large a number of the sufferers by the fire; and to them it is owing that peace, contentment and harmony, have reigned in the sheds, although occupied at one and the same time by persons of different origins and creeds."

And by way of showing your gratitude, you would endeavor to obtain "the total destruction of all convents." Shame! Shame upon you again! You who could applaud the foul labels of Gavazzi, knowing them as you did to be lies—you who could thus return evil for good—insults for services—and threaten outrage to your benefactors,—are neither Christians, nor gentlemen. You are a disgrace to humanity.

And if a few Irish Catholics should violently express their indignation against these insults—if they should manifest an intolerant spirit towards him who, amidst your cheers, proclaims that "tolerance" towards their Church "is a crime,"—they are branded with every epithet with which your dictionaries can supply you. Let us reverse the case;—let us ask how Protestants would have behaved, if treated as we have been treated.

Suppose, for instance, some degraded Protestant clergyman, obliged to flee his country "for his country's good," had, without embracing Catholicity, professed to renounce all forms of Protestantism, and had come over to Toronto, as this fellow Gavazzi has done. Suppose that, upon his arrival, the Catholic Clergy, with their Bishop at their head, had received him with open arms, and placed their churches at his disposal—issuing placards announcing his lectures against Protestantism, and turning the sacred edifices into public exhibition rooms for the occasion. Suppose that this—of no-religion, ex-Protestant—minister had been publicly introduced by Catholic gentlemen holding high and important situations under government—as Gavazzi was introduced by Mr. Sewell the Sheriff at Quebec—suppose that Catholics had gone to these assemblies armed, and with the declared intention of firing upon the Protestants if they had a

chance—suppose all these things, and you will have an exact idea of the manner in which the Catholics of Quebec and Montreal have been treated. And then suppose, that, amidst the shouts and howlings of his hearers, he had given utterance to the following sentiments, in which the *Gazette* can not find "one intemperate expression":—

"The Protestant clergy have no social affections; they are cruel, and have a cruel nature against all beings of mankind."

"From the 19th century the Protestant clergy never were a clergy of Christ—but a clergy of blood and slaughter."

"Don't call yourselves ministers of Christ—Presbyterian clergy—call yourselves murderers."

"The Methodist church belongs to Anti-Christ and the Devil himself."

"THE PROTESTANT CLERGY ARE THE SOUL OF SATAN—THE SOUL OF THE DEVIL HIMSELF."

Suppose that he had exhorted his hearers to effect the total destruction of all Protestant, hospitals, schools, and charitable asylums; to watch the movements of Presbyterian Professors of Colleges, and if they found them guilty of violating the rules of Catholic society, to expel them from Canada; and had earnestly endeavored to impress upon them that tolerance with the Protestant church was a crime against the Catholic Church, and society. What, we ask, would have been the conduct of Protestants towards such a lecturer? Would he, at Toronto, have been allowed, without interruption, or with impunity, thus to insult Protestants—thus to provoke persecution, spoliation, and intolerance against them, and their establishments?—As sure as there is a God in heaven he would not.

Let us not be misunderstood. We deprecate violence, and contend that no man had any right to use force against Gavazzi. But neither would we exaggerate the amount of violence, nor, in condemning the crime, would we forget to take into account the provocation. Now what is the amount of outrage with which any Catholic at Quebec can be charged? Some one person in the audience, cried out, in answer to a statement of Gavazzi, "that's a lie." This was imprudent—the act of a hot-head—but of a warm heart, for the truth was not to be told to an audience which could applaud Gavazzi; but the offence was not after all so very great. This hasty exclamation provoked a violent personal attack upon him who uttered it; and a row, evidently quite unprovoked, was the consequence, in the course of which, acts of violence occurred, which we condemn and deplore.—So much for the Quebec row. At Montreal, where the results have been more serious, there is no proof that the blame is attributable to Irish Catholics.—We will not prejudge; but whilst waiting for the finding of the proper tribunal, we repeat that NO ATTACK WAS MADE ON ZION CHURCH; and that, unless Protestants themselves have subsequently defaced it, not a pane of glass is broken; not a mark left upon its walls. "Show the marks" we say to those who assert that an attack was made. "Oh!" but it is said—"there could, or would, or should, or might, have been an attack." To this we can make no reply, for we are not familiar with the "History of Events that never occurred;" we can only say that we have reason to know that a murderous attack was meditated by persons, calling themselves Protestants, on the Irish Catholics of Montreal. In the same steamer that brought Gavazzi to Montreal, came a numerous band of armed ruffians, who, from their conduct, appearance, and demeanor, would appear to have been picked up in the vilest class of low grog-shops, and amidst the refuse of the stews—broken down bullies from the brothels, and similar dens of intamy. In their foul orgies, these scoundrels, over their cups, boasted of what they intended to do; and made no secret of their hostile intentions towards the Irish Catholics of this city. This we are prepared to prove by incontestible evidence; and we have every reason to believe that it will appear that, to these ruffians, was owing the sad loss of life which took place on Thursday evening. We say this—not by way of prejudging a cause—but in the hopes that this matter may be enquired into.

Next week we shall perhaps be able to lay before our readers some additional specimens of Gavazzi's lectures, in which, according to the *Gazette*, there is not to be found "one intemperate expression."

GAVAZZI'S FIRST LECTURE.

MONTREAL, JUNE 10, 1853.

It is our melancholy office to put on record this day the fatal results of Gavazzi's first lecture. This came off at about 3 past six last evening, in the building called the Zion Church—tickets 1s 3d—which was well filled inside, whilst a large crowd of men of all denominations, gathered outside, attracted, some by curiosity, to see the "renegade friar"—as the *London Times* calls him—others, for aught we know, by improper motives. The police were stationed at the door, and in front of the building, and the troops were held in readiness.

For some time all was quiet. At certain passages of Gavazzi's discourse, the crowd inside the building, many of whom had come armed, cheered lustily: these cheers were responded to by counter-cheers from the crowd outside. The police made a movement to drive away the latter, and a slight conflict occurred; nothing serious—nothing but what 200 or 300 policemen, armed only with batons, but properly handled and led by proper officers, could have easily and effectually quelled without loss of life. A few stones were thrown, but no attack was made on the building, of which, as far as we can learn, not a pane of glass has been broken, not even the paint of a door pane scratched. Whilst this was going on, some persons inside the lecture-room rushed out, and wantonly fired from the steps into the crowd below,