

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
At No. 223, Notre Dame Street, by
J. GILLIES.
G. E. CLERK, Editor.

TERMS:
To all country subscribers, or subscribers receiving their papers through the post, or calling for them at the office, if paid in advance, Two Dollars; if not so paid, then Two Dollars and a-half.
To all subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a-half, if paid in advance, but if not paid in advance, then Three Dollars.
Single copies, price 3d, can be had at this Office: Pickup's News Depot, St. Francis Xavier Street; at T. Kaddell's, (late from Mr. E. Pickup), No. 22, Great St. James Street, opposite Messrs. Dawson & Son; and at W. Dalton's, corner of St. Lawrence and Craig Sts.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, AUG. 7, 1863.

With this number we close the 13th volume of the TRUE WITNESS. Many of our subscribers are in arrears. As our terms are payment in advance, we presume that those of our friends who have let the whole year pass without so much as thinking of our terms, will hardly deem us importunate, if, at this date, we ask them to settle before entering upon a new year.

It seems to be a popular superstition that to take a newspaper, is to patronize it, whether you pay for it or not. Our readers are of too enlightened a class to fall into this vulgar error. They know that a paper costs money, and cannot be supported without cash. We hope that those of our readers who consider themselves in reality our friends, will not suffer the week to pass without settling up their old accounts, if they are in our debt, so that they may enter upon the new volume with a clean record.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

OUR latest European dates reach to the 26th ult. No events of any great political importance had transpired since our last. There had been warm discussions in the House of Commons upon the subject of the *Alabama* and other vessels built in British ports for the Confederate Government, but the conduct of the British authorities was ably vindicated by Lord Palmerston.

Affairs in the United States remain unchanged. The attack on Charleston is continued, but no great progress has as yet been made by the enemy towards the reduction of the place. We read of a heavy bombardment, from daybreak till the afternoon of the 31st ult., but we are not informed as to the result. The Confederates seem to be well prepared, and there are good reasons for hoping that the enemy may again meet with an ignominious and disastrous repulse. The attempt at conscription was to have been renewed at New York on Monday; but as the telegrams are silent upon this point, we must conclude that the Government has postponed its design for the present.

The *Globe* assigns three reasons why the Protestant Reformers insist upon Representation by Population. They do so, not because Lower Canadian institutions are bad, but because:—

1. "The institutions of Upper Canada are being moulded by Lower Canadian votes, in defiance of the protest of the majority of Western representatives."

Because:—

2. "We are deprived of legislation and administrative measures which we anxiously desire, by Lower Canadian influence."

And because:—

3. "We find the Provincial money squandered by the votes of French Canadians, and discover a very good reason for it in the fact that Lower Canada pays only 30 per cent of the taxation, while Upper Canada pays 70 per cent."

Therefore concludes the *Globe*, "we ask Representation by Population as a remedy for these things." Such is the burden of an article in the *Globe* of the 24th ultimo, under the caption "The Issue Presented" and given in reply to the *Canadian* of Quebec.

The *Globe* is not logical. Admitting for the sake of argument the literal truth of the grievances which constitute its premises, its conclusion is not contained therein, does not therefore logically flow therefrom. For, if it were true that the autonomy of Upper Canada under the present arrangement, is outraged—and that that section of the Province, though contributing the more largely of the two to the general revenue, is doomed to see that revenue squandered by Lower Canadian votes—and that all that the *Globe* and its friends desire is a remedy for these grievances, and the restoration to U. Canada of its lost autonomy—then the conclusion from the premises laid down by the *Globe* might just as well be:—

"therefore we ask Repeal *pur et simple* of the Union as a remedy for these things,"

as:—

"therefore we ask Representation by Population as a remedy for these things."

That Repeal would assure to Upper Canada its autonomy, and full and absolute control over every cent of its own revenues, and would therefore be a full and complete remedy for all the things of which the *Globe* complains, no one will deny. But that Repeal would also deprive the *Clear-Grits* or Protestant Reformers of the

West, of all power of in any manner interfering with the affairs of the Lower Province, and therefore is it, that it is not the remedy which they will accept. Therefore, also, is it clear that the truth is not in them, when they tell us that the *only* reasons which urge them to ask for Representation by Population are those enumerated above by the *Globe*. They have an *arrière pensée*; for were it not so they would be as willing to accept Repeal of the Union as the Lower Canadians are to offer it—seeing that that Repeal would be a perfect, infallible, and immediate remedy for all the things for which alone the *Globe* professes to seek a remedy when it and its friends ask for Representation by Population. It is clear then that they want something over and above a remedy for these things—and that is, Upper Canadian ascendancy: and it is just this something over and above that remedy, that we of Lower Canada very properly refuse to give. Were it true, as the *Globe* asserts, that all that Upper Canada asks for is perfect liberty for herself; and since that liberty would be fully assured by Repeal of the Union, which the *Globe* and its friends will not accept—it is, we say, as clear as that two and two make four, that the Upper Canadians are really aiming at something besides perfect liberty for their own Province when they clamor for Representation by Population.

This want of good faith, of singleness of purposes characterises every line which the *Globe* writes upon the subject at issue. When it speaks to us of guarantees; when it assures us that "Upper Canada is prepared" in case of our being such arrant fools as to yield to its iniquitous and insolent demand—"to give every useful guarantee that the rights and privileges of Lower Canada will remain intact"—it betrays the dishonesty of its designs, and it treats those whom it addresses in such terms as idiots. For in the first place, before Upper Canada could guarantee the "rights and privileges of Lower Canada," it would be necessary to enumerate accurately and exhaustively all those "rights and privileges." Now here, at first starting is a point upon which the two Provinces could never agree: for that which we of the Lower Province would claim as "rights and privileges" would not be recognised as such by the other section of the Province. And again, even if this insurmountable difficulty could be evaded, how in the name of common sense could Upper Canada guarantee anything to Lower Canada. No guarantee which the former could offer would be more valid or binding than an Act of Parliament; and that which one Parliament can make, another is competent to unmake. The only guarantee that Lower Canada could have then, in such a case, would be Upper Canada's honesty, and forbearance; and judging Upper Canada by its utter disregard of honesty in all its dealings with Lower Canada, and by the insolence of its pretensions, these would be but a rotten stick to rest upon. One guarantee, only, that Upper Canada shall not infringe upon our "rights and privileges" do we ask or put confidence in: and we need scarcely add that that guarantee would consist in placing all these "rights and privileges" beyond the reach of Upper Canada—or in other words by dissolution of the existing Legislative Union. This done, but not before, the two Provinces then standing to one another in the relation of independent contracting parties, might discuss and mutually agree upon the terms or conditions of their future; they might, if it so pleased them, consent to enter into some fresh Union with one another, and upon such terms as might mutually be agreed upon; or with the co-operation of the other British American Provinces, they might lay the foundation of one great Confederacy such as that to which apparently the *Globe* alludes. But as an essential preliminary to such an arrangement, it is necessary that the existing Union betwixt Upper and Lower Canada be dissolved, so that each of them may, as an independent contracting party, and as in this respect the equal of each of the other British Provinces, have a voice in determining the conditions of its future existence, whether as a member of a great Confederation of all the British North American Provinces—or as a separate and distinct Province.

We say that the *Globe* is not honest in that it refuses Repeal of the Union which would give Upper Canada all it demands: we say also that we do not believe the *Globe* to be honest when it offers guarantees for the preservation of the "rights and privileges" of Lower Canada—seeing that it would not accept similar guarantees from this section of the Province in behalf of the "rights and privileges" of U. Canada.

To bring this question of honesty to an issue, here is what we propose to the *Globe*. It pretends that U. Canada, having a majority of representatives, and therefore a preponderating influence, in the United Legislature, could and would give to Lower Canada ample guarantees for all the "rights and privileges" of the latter—for its autonomy—and the safety of all its peculiar institutions. Be it so.

But if under such circumstances as those above specified, Upper Canada could guarantee Lower Canada against aggression, much more easily

then can the latter grant, and the former prudently accept, similar guarantees from the other Province. We propose therefore that, instead of the complex scheme of the *Globe*, comprising—first, a violation of the terms of the existing Act of Union; and secondly the granting of checks, guarantees &c. by Upper to Lower Canada—the Western section of the Province, which desires only—so the *Globe* tells us—"to manage her matters as she pleases," should at once accept from Lower Canada precisely the same guarantees for the security of all her "rights and privileges" as those which through the *Globe* she so generously offers to Lower Canada, as a full and adequate security for all the "rights and privileges" of the latter. These can be but one of two reasons suggested, why the *Globe* should decline such an offer. Either the perfect autonomy of Upper Canada is not all for which it contends in its agitation for Representation by Population: or it does not believe that any guarantee which one section of the Province can offer to the other—even with perfect Equality of Representation—would ensure respect for the "rights and privileges" of the latter.

What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. Guarantees therefore against Lower Canadian aggression which, under the existing system of Equal Representation, would not secure the autonomy of Upper Canada, which would not place her "rights and privileges" out of danger, and which could not therefore be either honorably or prudently accepted by U. Canada, would be no security to Lower Canada against the aggression of the Western Province, more especially when the political influence of the latter should have been greatly augmented by Representation by Population. Such guarantees therefore, could not be honorably or prudently accepted by Lower Canada; and yet the former can give no guarantee to the latter which we are not equally competent, and willing to give to Upper Canada. Yet so it is. The coin which our enemies bestow upon us, and with which they impudently bid us to be content as a full equivalent for the sacrifices which we are called upon to make, is scornfully rejected when by us tendered to them. Are we not right therefore in taxing them with want of honesty, with double dealing, with fraud in fact, with keeping two sets of weights and measures?

To the fustian in which the *Globe* indulges about its regard for "the power and fame of British America" as the reason for its opposition to Repeal of the Union, we know not what to answer, for such vague platitudes are not susceptible of any very precise answer. We may however say that neither the physical nor the moral greatness of British America is dependent upon the forcing upon any of its component parts a political order to which it is averse: that discontent, heart burnings and strife, and therefore weakness not strength, discord not harmony, must be the consequence of imposing upon Lower Canada a Legislative Union with Upper Canada with Representation by Population: and that though we care a good deal about the happiness and well being, moral and material, of the individual men women and children now residents in British N. America—we care not one straw about the political abstraction of which the *Globe* speaks—and for the sake of which it proposes to inflict wrong and insult upon Lower Canada in particular.

THE MANITOULIN ISLANDS.—The late disturbances with the Indians on these islands have called forth much abuse of some of the Catholic clergy, acting under whose advice it is supposed that the Indians have refused to give up their lands to the Canadian Government. The subject is wrapped up in much mystery; but, as far as we can gather them, the facts of the case are these:—

When Sir Francis Bond Head reigned over Upper Canada, a treaty or compact was entered into with the Indians, according to which the latter were to leave the main land, and were to receive in exchange for their old hunting grounds the exclusive use of the Manitoulin Islands, where they were to remain, and to be unmolested by the whites. Many Indian tribes in consequence, and amongst others that of the Waquimakong from the United States, took up their abode on these Islands, trusting in the good faith of the British Government. In October last, however, the present Commissioner of Crown Lands, Mr. McDougall visited the Islands, and summoning the chiefs around him contrived, partly by threats, partly by fraud, and partly by the abundant administration of bad whiskey, to persuade the majority of those chiefs to renounce their rights, and to agree to surrender their lands to the government. The Indians when the matter was fully explained to them, expressed great repugnance to the contemplated change; and it is said that stimulated by some of the Catholic missionaries resident amongst them, they determined not to give up their lands without a struggle, and to drive away the whites who had hitherto been allowed to settle amongst them.

The *Globe's* version of the affair we give below, together with that of the *Toronto Leader*, and the *Commercial Advertiser* of Montreal.

It will be seen that the *Globe* does not pretend that the Canadian government has any "right" as against the unfortunate Indians of Manitoulin. Its argument is simply that of the ruffian bully, of the unprincipled buccaneer, who cannot conceive that rights of property should be allowed to interfere with his views of gain. "A fine tract of territory" says the *Globe* "like the Manitoulin cannot be permitted to remain uncultivated because it is Indian property"—thus admitting that the lands from which it is now proposed to expel the Indians by force is "their property." So much for the morality of the proceeding; and as for the question of law we will allow our several contemporaries to tell their several stories:—

The *Globe* says:—The rebellious Indians on the Manitoulin, or rather we ought to say the rebellious priests who have excited the Indians to deeds of violence and wrong, have added another to their list of crimes. The officers of the law, bearing regular warrants for the arrest of offenders, have been resisted in the execution of their duty, and compelled to leave the Island without executing their mission. The tragic end of poor Mr. Gibbard, the chief of the officers of the law, casts a lurid shade over the whole transaction, but is not actually connected with it. The case is quite bad enough without his death being added to the load on the shoulders of Priest Kohler and his associates. It must be recollected that the offences of these persons have no necessary connection with the question of the surrender of the Island or any portion of it by the Indians. A certain part of the land has been surrendered, while certain Indians, under the influence of the priests, refused to sign the treaty, and still retain the section of the Island devoted to their use. Not content with this, they assemble in arms, proceed to dictate who shall and who shall not stay on the Island, and drive off by violence those obnoxious to them. When the law endeavors to redress this grievous wrong they resist its officers, and compel them to leave the Island. It is obvious that there is but one way of treating the matter. It is not a question of giving more or less favorable terms to the Indians or any section of them. The question is whether the Queen's subjects are to be driven out of her dominions by violence? There can be but one answer. The authority of the law must be enforced at all hazards. We would, of course, deal mildly with the poor, misguided Indians, using every means to convince them of their error, but the white men who have incited them to rebellion must be dealt with decidedly by the arm of the law.

We have always advocated the most liberal treatment of the Indians. Poor people, they do not live so long among the whites, that we should grudge them anything we can give them. But they cannot be permitted to stand in the way of the advance of civilization on this continent. A fine tract of territory, like the Manitoulin, cannot be permitted to remain uncultivated, because it is Indian property. It is not desirable for the Indians themselves that it should remain: From the proceeds of the lands when they are sold they will be far richer than if the Island were left in a state of nature. The present Government have dealt bountifully with the Indians of the Manitoulin. They have permitted them to retain an ample allowance of land for their own use, and when the rest is sold the proceeds will be theirs. What more could be asked? We believe that nothing more would have been demanded by the Indians, but the priests seem to be afraid that the interests of themselves or of their church would suffer by the settlement of the Island, and hence we have the violent scenes of the past few weeks. There was an original error on the part of the late Government in offering too small a compensation to the Indians for the surrender of the land, and threatening them with violence if they refused it. But the present Ministry changed all that, and stood prepared, and stands prepared now, to make every arrangement which justice to the Indians demands. But they will not submit to have their authority defied, and violence inflicted on unoffending individuals. They will, we are sure, extend the authority of the law over the Manitoulin as well as all other sections of the public domain, and teach priest Kohler and his coadjutors the folly as well as the wickedness of their proceedings.

The *Toronto Leader* regrets that the Government "cannot without loss of dignity recede from a position into which it should never have got;" and the *Commercial Advertiser* makes the following remarks; tending to show that if law be on the side of the Government, right is on the side of those whom the *Globe* calls "rebellious Indians" and "rebellious priests." The plain fact of the matter is this. The whites covet the rich lands of Manitoulin, the "property" of the Indians; and are therefore not slow in discovering valid reasons for entering in, and taking possession thereof. The whole transaction is very discreditable to the Government, according to the accounts hitherto published—but perhaps we have not as yet seen all the truth. Here is what the *Commercial Advertiser* says on the subject:—

The Indians are contending against an attempt by the Commissioner of Crown Lands to rob them of their property, under the pretence of a treaty for its disposal to the Province, made by a minority of those interested in the face of the protest of the majority. We are told that troops are to be sent to Manitoulin, and opposition to the spoliation of Mr. Commissioner McDougall is to be put down by force of arms. The Administration have just about the amount of courage and discretion necessary to launch the power of the Empire on a few dozens of poor Indians, who can hardly be held responsible for breaking laws which they do not assist to make, and are otherwise ignorant of. The simplest way to quell the trouble at Manitoulin is to act justly and generously towards the Indians, even if so doing involves the concession of a dogma.

There can we think be but little doubt that attacks upon the Christian Revelation are more generally popular at the present day than they were even in the eighteenth century. There was then certainly no lack of anti-Christian writers; and these also received a fair share of praise and encouragement, both from crowned heads, and from that class of society which more particularly arrogated to itself the titles of enlightened and philosophical. But until lately, in England especially, open attacks upon the Bible, and the truths of Christianity were looked upon as in somewhat bad taste, and exposed their authors to the cold looks of the more respectable portion of British society, and the suspicion of Jacobinism, or ultra-democratic proclivities. It

is not so now, however; and judging from the tone of the English press, from what appears in the *London Times* and in *Punch*, both excellent exponents or indices of public opinion, we should be inclined to draw the conclusion that Dr. Colenso is a general favorite,—and that his raid upon the Old Testament affords, not only pleasant excitement, but intense delight to a class of readers, who but a few years ago would have been horrified, if suspected of hostility to the Christian religion.

To what may this change in public sentiment be attributed? What is it that ensures for every onslaught upon the credibility of the Bible history, and the miracles of the New Testament a prompt and hearty welcome from the educated, and even from the politically Conservative section of English society? Several causes may have been in operation to produce this result: but we believe that one of the most general and the most efficacious has been, and is to be found in the evangelical literature of the day—in that portion of it especially which deals with Revivals, and the conversion of sinners unto God. Men turn from these with loathing and with scorn; they feel that such a God as is therein described, that such a religion as is therein depicted are unworthy of the love and allegiance of any honest and intelligent person; and ignorantly assuming that the God of Christians, and the religion of Jesus are faithfully portrayed in the literature of the conventicle, they naturally but too hastily conclude that the sooner the superstition, *i.e.* the demoralising and intellectually debasing superstition which they accept as Christianity—is exploded the better. Hence their sympathy with the anti-Christian writers of the present day, who they think are doing a good work in overthrowing the religion of the Spurgeons, of the Chadbands and the Hammonds—as indeed they would be doing, were it not that whilst pulling out the evangelical weeds, they are at the same time destroying the pure wheat of Christianity itself. The dangerous enemies of religion are they who by their false conceptions, and representations of it render it ridiculous and odious in the eyes of the intelligent and well intentioned; and when the sickening stuff which the so-called orthodox or evangelical press palms upon the world as genuine Christianity is accepted as such, it is not to be marvelled at that revealed religion itself rapidly falls into discredit. The favorable reception given to the writings of Bishop Colenso, and others of that school, is but the natural reaction against the nauseous cant and irreverent twaddle of the evangelical press and the evangelical pulpit.

By these agencies religion is travestied or made ridiculous; and the hyper-Calvinistic doctrines which they inculcate, and hold up before the Protestant community as the teachings of Jesus Himself, are so repulsive to every intelligent person in whose bosom every sentiment of justice has not been destroyed, and who is susceptible of one ennobling conception of the Deity, that they are scouted with indignation by all except the narrow-minded and illiterate few, who still adhere to the old formulas of the Reformation, and with thick sensual lips repeat us Shibboleth. Better to deny God, that is to say a personal, ever present, ever working God altogether, than to entertain low and unworthy notions of Him; or to accept as His faithful likeness the hideous caricature with which orthodox Protestantism presents the world, and for which it is to be supposed that the devil in some of his leisure moments must have consented to sit.—There are millions who would willingly believe in, and cheerfully worship a God made known to them as love. "Deus caritas est," said the beloved disciple, and so teaches the Catholic Church. According to the showing of the evangelical world this God of love is but an omnipotent and most capricious fiend, delighting in torture, and taking special pleasure in tormenting little children. It gives us a good opinion of the natural virtues of our separated brethren to see that so many of them refuse to worship such a God, and bravely incur the anathemas of the conventicle rather than bow down before such a loathsome Moloch.

The mingled blasphemy and buffoonery of the popular "Revival Literature" of the day contribute then to disgust thinking and well intentioned persons with Christianity itself; just as we should all form a low estimate of the personal appearance of the prominent politicians of the age were we to accept as their faithful portraits, the amusing caricatures which are published in the pages of *Punch*. The latter are often very clever and very funny, and we can enjoy a laugh over them; but the caricatures of the "Revivalists" though most ludicrous, are certainly not clever, and the laugh which they provoke is too often directed against the sublime truths of Christianity. This is why they are so dangerous; they generate irreverence, and invite contempt against that religion itself which they so shamefully misrepresent or travesty.

One subject which is an especial favorite with the artists of the "Revival" school of literature, and which is reproduced in every conceivable attitude, is the agony of little children whilst being subjected to the mysterious process known