

the case is prepared to believe. To be sure, a small portion of the island was reserved in this new Treaty for those who were opposed to the surrender; but the Indians have been so often supplanted by white men, and so frequently circumscribed in their possessions, and then driven from them altogether, that they could easily see that after this new surrender soon an Indian would have no place on that island to set his foot.

To call in question the Indians' right "to dictate who shall and who shall not stay on the island," is about as just and reasonable as it would be to call in question the right of a white man to prevent usurpers from squatting on his own premises.

Because the Indians are not willing that white men should possess and occupy their island, the editor of the "Globe" asks the question, "whether the Queen's subjects are to be driven out of her dominions by violence?"

We may easily answer that question by asking another. Are not Indians also "the Queen's subjects?" Have not thousands of them sealed, with their blood, their loyalty to the British Crown? And are they to be driven "by violence" from their land? By this kind of dastardly and vile treatment thousands of the poor aborigines have not only been driven out of the British dominions "by violence," but have been driven out of the world before. "their time came," and their blood still stains the skirts of their oppressors.

It is said, "The authority of the law must be