

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.
 PUBLISHED AND PRINTED EVERY FRIDAY
 At No. 369, Notre Dame Street, by
 J. GALLIES.
 G. E. CLERK, Editor.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE:
 To all country subscribers, Two Dollars. If the subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the year then, a case the paper be continued, the terms shall be Two Dollars and a-half.
 To all subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a-half, in advance; and if not renewed at the end of the year, then, if we continue sending the paper, the subscription shall be Three Dollars.
 The True Witness can be had at the News Depots. Single copy 3d.

We beg to remind our Correspondents that no letters will be taken out of the Post-Office, unless prepaid.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, JUNE 9.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

JUNE—1865.

Friday, 9—Ember Day. Fast.
 Saturday, 10—Ember Day. Fast.
 Sunday, 11—Trinity Sunday.
 Monday, 12—St. John of St. Fac. C.
 Tuesday, 13—St. Anthony of Padua, C.
 Wednesday, 14—St. Basil, B. D.
 Thursday, 15—Corpus Christi.

The "Forty Hours" Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament will commence as follows:—

Saturday, 10—Holy Trinity of Contrecoeur.
 Monday, 12—St. Margaret Blairdie.
 Wednesday, 14—St. Anthony, Lavaltrie.

NEWS OF THE WEEK

The tidings which have reached France of the enlistments that, under the pretence of "emigration to Mexico," have been carried on in New York, under the very nose, and with the tacit approbation, of the Federal authorities, have created a marked sensation in Paris, and will have the effect, it is surmised, of recalling the Emperor from Algeria. If continued, there can be no doubt but these enlistments will lead to war; for however averse the French may have been to the Mexican expedition at the beginning, now that it is an accomplished fact, and now that their national honor is bound up with the maintenance of the Imperial dynasty which their victorious arms have established in Mexico, they will not readily renounce the fruits of that expedition, or allow themselves to appear in the light of abandoning an ally. The Italian question has undergone no change since our last. By this time the Piedmontese Government is regularly installed at Florence; but whether this is to be looked upon as a kind of "halfway house" to, or as a virtual renunciation of, Rome is a point still warmly discussed.

There has been a lively debate in the British House of Commons on the question of oaths, imposed upon Catholic members of Parliament. The subject was brought before the House by the motion for the second reading of a Bill introduced by Mr. Monsell, and having for its object to assimilate the oaths taken by Catholics to those exacted from all non-Catholics, not members of the Anglican sect, and from Jews. In spite of the opposition of Messrs. Whiteside, Whalley, and Walpole, the motion was carried by a majority of 56 in a House of 324 members; and it is to be hoped that the useless and gratuitously insulting clauses of the present form of oath will soon be abolished.

It is hard to follow the thread of Protestant argument on this long vexed question. Our opponents insist that the oath in its present form should be retained, because it affords a security to the Protestant Church establishment of Ireland against Catholic aggression; and anon they turn round and argue, that oaths are not binding upon the Catholic conscience, and that consequently the oaths which they attempt to preserve, offer no security to the peculiar Irish institution for whose sake those oaths are enforced upon Papists. Of course Mr. Whalley distinguished himself on the occasion of the debate; and having argued that it was necessary as a protection to the Irish Protestant Church to maintain the present form of oath, he immediately proceeded to show that Catholics had no regard for the sanctity of an oath. For this purpose he commenced reading in English out of a book which he called "Cases of Conscience" the author's name not given. Being interrupted by invitations to "sing" and other exhortations to make an end of his nonsense, he complained greatly of the apathy of the Treasury Bench; being called upon to state in what language the book from which he quoted was composed, he replied "in Latin," but being respectfully requested to read the original, he prudently declined. Altogether the Hon. Member made an exhibition of himself, and contributed his part to the success of the cause which he opposed; as did also by speaking on the other side, Sir G. Grey and Mr. C. Fortescue who with masterly logic, exposed the absurdity of imposing oaths upon men, whom the advocates of that system accused of having no regard for oaths at all.

The language adopted by the *Times* on this question is important, as showing the direction in which the current of English public opinion is setting. The *Times* pokes fun at Mr. Whalley,

indulges in irrelevant sarcasm at the expense of Mr. Newdegate, and sets Exeter Hall, and the saints at defiance. It recognises, tardily indeed, but it still recognises a great fact: That "the Church and Constitution of this country"—that the monarchical and aristocratic institutions of Great Britain, have naught to fear from Catholics: that "whatever danger threatens them, it certainly does not spring from the pretensions of the Church of Rome." Assuredly it does not. The danger which menaces the Church and the throne in England proceeds from the self same quarter as does that danger which menaces the Papacy, which menaces crown and altar in every country in Europe. It proceeds from the enemies of the Pope, from the party of the Revolution, from the apostles of modern Liberalism and infidelity. The Catholic Church is essentially Conservative, and anti-revolutionary: and the Anglican Church, in so far as its temporalities are concerned, has far better reason to dread its allies of Exeter Hall, the Liberal evangelicals of Protestantism—than it has to fear the hostility of Catholics. This the *Times* itself points out:—

"A significant illustration was afforded yesterday of the quarter from which, if from any where, danger to our present religious establishment might be apprehended. The suggestion that the Bishops might be spared from the House of Lords was loudly cheered, not from the Roman Catholic, but from the Radical and Nonconformist quarter of the House, and by this circumstance Sir G. Grey pointed an unanswerable rector to the argument we are considering. If it is proper to impose an Oath on all members who are ill affected to the present constitution of the Church, then, beyond all question, such an Oath ought to be exacted from the members and friends of the Liberation Society."—*Times*, May 18.

The property, or temporalities, of the Establishment may perhaps some day be confiscated as national property; the Bishops may be voted a nuisance; and the throne a useless piece of political furniture fit only for the lumber room. But not by Catholic votes will these things be accomplished. In the struggle, daily becoming more imminent, betwixt the two great political parties into which society is divided—the Catholic, that is to say the sincere or ultra-montane Catholic, will certainly be found by the side of English Protestant Conservatives or Tories; just as his Catholic forefathers rode side by side with Prince Rupert and the Cavaliers, at Edgehill, at Marston Moor and at Naseby. Indeed if the monarchical and aristocratic institutions of England fall not till they be assailed by Papists, then are they doomed to immortal life.

The "Conspiracy" trials at Washington have elicited nothing new this week, but have displayed in a still stronger light than ever the mendacity of Andy Johnson's Proclamation charging Jeff. Davis, and Southern refugees in Canada with complicity in the murder of the late President. Jeff. Davis is to be tried for treason before a civil tribunal. Amongst the heroic feats of Yankee warriors, we read in the *Buffalo Courier* how a party of them have frightened to death a little girl, the daughter of Mr. Beverley Tucker, whose house they were rummaging. Mr. Stanton has resigned office.

By latest advices from Europe we learn that the Washington authorities were insisting with increased pertinacity on their preposterous demand for compensation for injuries inflicted by the Confederate steamer *Alabama*. Of course the British Government will not condescend to listen to demands so ridiculous, which if persisted in will lead to war. This is probably the design of the Washington Government.

It is very imprudent for Protestants to challenge comparisons betwixt their treatment of the aboriginal races of this Continent with whom they have come in contact, and the treatment which the same races have received at the hands of Catholics. Such comparisons are most "odorous," as Mrs. Malaprop would say; and the less our separated brethren stir the question, the better for their own nostrils, and for their own credit.

What are the simple facts of the case? These: That everywhere where Protestant races have colonised, or settled in America, there in a short time, the aboriginal Red Man has disappeared, or has, as in their own favorite style they delight to express it, "been improved off the face of the earth." Or if, here and there, we find a few scattered specimens of the ancient owners of the land still extant, they are invariably the most degraded and brutalized of the human race—thieves, drunkards, liars and prostitutes. Where and what to-day are the representatives of the numerous tribes of Indians that once peopled the States of Massachusetts, of Vermont, of Connecticut? In short of that part of the Continent subject to Protestant sway? In the sad records of those once numerous, but now extinct races do we read what Protestantism has done for the cause of humanity, and Christian civilisation.

A very different story do we read in the records of those races who fell beneath the sway of Catholic rulers. In Catholic Canada, whose physical conditions are not more favorable to the Red Man than were those of the Protestant settlements to the South of the St. Lawrence, we find that the aborigines still exist, and increase in numbers; we find them living in communities; and by the testimony of Protestants, we learn that the men, as a general rule, are re-

markable for their sobriety; the women for their chastity; all for their quiet, peaceable, and orderly conduct—and this too in the vicinity of large cities, which present so many temptations to drunkenness, to impurity and to vice in every form. Here truly is a marvel, a miracle, we may almost call it; for the constant fate of the aboriginal races in the vicinity of exclusively Protestant settlements shows that it is not the normal or natural condition of savages to prosper physically, and morally, when brought into close and constant contact with the races of Europe. If not natural, then supernatural, that is to say the product of some supernatural factor. In a word, we attribute the marvellous phenomena presented by the prolonged existence, the physical conditions, and moral well being of the native Indian tribes of Canada, to the influence of Catholicity, to the labors of the Catholic missionary, and above all to the Sacraments of the Church. It is for those who differ from us to assign some other cause for the phenomena, and to explain the reason for the difference betwixt the actual condition of the aboriginal races in the vicinity of Boston, and that of those in the vicinity of Quebec and Montreal.

No matter, however, to what potent cause or agency we may attribute it, the difference, the marvellous difference itself remains incontestable; and the sad fate that has befallen their brethren wherever, and whenever these have had dealings with, or come much in contact with Protestants, should be a salutary warning to the Indians in Canada to shrink from, and to reject the proffered ministrations of the Protestant missionary, no matter under what guise or under what pretences soever the latter may present himself to them. He comes but to rob them of that religion to which alone they owe their present elevation in the social scale; to which they owe indeed their existence, and but for which they would be to-day as are their brethren who once owned the wide hunting lands of the neighboring republic.

These remarks have been elicited by a communication that appeared in the *Witness* of the 29th ult., and professedly emanated from a Mr. Morrison, "missionary teacher," as he calls himself. This Mr. Morrison, who seeks to impose upon the Indians of Caughnawaga by representing himself as simply a "teacher," when addressing his fellow-Protestants of Montreal and seeking to enlist their sympathies with his enterprise, makes no secret of his real calling. He styles himself "missionary teacher." It is therefore obvious that proselytism is as much the object of his attentions to the Indians of Caughnawaga, as is the secular education which he professes to impart. This is a very important point; for when addressing the Indians he expressly disclaims all thought of proselytism; and yet it is as a "missionary" as well as a "teacher," in an essentially proselytising capacity therefore, that he at the same time presents himself to the public of this city, challenging their sympathies, and claiming their co-operation in the good work that he has auspiciously commenced.

But what are the objects of this proselytism? Is it possible to attribute it to a sincere disinterested anxiety for the moral and spiritual welfare of those who are to be the subjects of Mr. Morrison's ghostly ministrations? He indeed professes that such is the case, complaining in the early part of his communication to the *Witness* of the "deplorably ignorant and utterly neglected condition" of the Caughnawaga Indians, &c., &c. But the effect of these professions of disinterested affection, and of these assertions respecting the benighted and neglected condition of the said Indians, is much impaired, if not utterly dissipated, by what he himself, in a moment of injudicious candor, admits respecting their moral condition. For instance, he tells us, as "characteristic" of these deplorably ignorant and utterly neglected Indians, that:—

"They are with few exceptions, as far as I can learn, strict teetotallers, and quiet, orderly, and peaceable in their conduct."

After which he affectionately but somewhat inconsistently "recommends" them to the persevering prayers of the saints:—
 "that the great Head of the Church may gather into His fold many of those lost sheep," &c., &c.
 "Lost sheep" indeed! and what kind of a mutton is our good Mr. Morrison himself, we should like to know, that he presumes to characterise as "lost sheep," as muttons about to be damned, the strictly sober, well conducted, orderly and peaceable Indian population of Caughnawaga? "Lost sheep" indeed? when they manifest in their conduct those very fruits of the spirit, indicated by Saint Paul in his epistle to the Galatians:—

"But the fruit of the spirit is . . . peace, . . . temperance, against such there is no law."—c. v, 22, 23.

We ask it in all seriousness and in all charity: Are temperance, and chastity, and "quiet, orderly and peaceable conduct" the ordinary characteristics, we do not say of European Christians, but of the Indian races of North America, when brought into close and constant contact with the former? Are they not rather extraordinary traits of character?—most extraordinary, indeed supernatural, or above nature?—Can a tribe of Indians living in the vicinity of a

large city, and exposed to its numberless temptations, who are sober, well conducted and peaceable, be justly spoken of as men "utterly neglected" and as "lost sheep"? Do not, on the contrary, the very characteristics which our Protestant "missionary teacher" attributes to the Indians, speak as it were with a sound as of trumpets in favor of the tender cares lavished upon them by the Romish teachers under whose exclusive control they have hitherto been?

We challenge Mr. Morrison, we challenge his friends and abettors in the work of proselytism, or converting the strictly temperate, orderly, well conducted and peaceable Indians of Caughnawaga, to cite a parallel case amongst any aboriginal race, either in America, or any other part of the world settled by Protestants. Where shall we look for it? In New Holland? but the filthy degraded condition of the aboriginal races of Australia, of such of them at least as Protestant civilisation has not already sent to an untimely grave, has passed into a proverb. In Van Dieman's Land? But here again, thanks to the influence of Protestant civilisation, the aborigines have long ago and entirely disappeared. Of the numerous tribes which not three-quarters of a century ago peopled this large island, not one, no, literally not one is left alive to-day. Shall we search for our parallel in New Zealand? The Maories and the bloody war they are waging, tell us we need not prosecute our researches in New Zealand. Where then shall we look for it? In the New England States, or amongst the Indians who once ruled with undisputed sway over the vast region betwixt Canada and the Gulf of Mexico? Let us see what Protestant writers themselves tell us of the results of Protestant Missions, and Protestant civilisation, upon the aboriginal races of North America:—

"The whole body of these Indians," says Dwight, in speaking particularly of the Pequods—"are a poor, degraded, miserable race of beings. The former proud heroic spirit of the Pequods is shrunk into the torpor of reasoning brutism. All the vice of the original is left; all its energy has vanished."—*Travels in New England*.

In her work, *Sketches in Canada*, Mrs. Jameson thus describes the effect produced upon her by the sight of the Protestantised Indians, whom she occasionally fell in with:—

"The Indians whom I saw wandering and lounging about filled me with compassion. . . . Dirt, indolence, and drunkenness were but too prevalent."

Mr. Kane, in his *Wandering of an Artist*, draws the following faithful if not flattering picture of Protestant converts at the Norway House Mission:—

"It is supported by the Hudson's Bay Company, with the hope of improving the Indians, but, to judge from appearances, with but small success, as they are decidedly the dirtiest Indians I have ever met with, and the less that is said about their morality the better."

Mr. Bradford, an American Protestant writer, after recognising that the French Catholics have treated the Indians as their fellow-men, admits that his sturdy Protestant fellow-countrymen "treated the Indian like a dog."

And not to multiply instances and quotations which we might do if we pleased, suffice it to say that the *Edinburgh Review* thus touches off the final result of Protestant teaching:—

"The instruction of the Indians in schools, among the Europeans settled in great towns, was another method adopted, and with no better success. These pupils returned to their naked and hunting brethren, the most profligate, and the most idle members of the Indian community."—vol. viii, p. 444.

The Puritans murdered the parents, made captives of and sold as slaves to the West India Islands the children of the Red Men. The descendants of the Puritans at the present day poison the body of the Indian with rot-gut whiskey, and his soul with their pernicious heresies; whilst of the Indians under tutelage of the poor unaided Catholic priest, even the Protestant proselytiser is forced to admit, as "characteristic," that "they are with few exceptions as far as I can learn, strict teetotallers, and quiet, orderly and peaceable in their conduct." Well then! what call have you to meddle with them? How can you hope to make of them something better than they are now? or what can you expect as a result of your labors as "missionary teacher" amongst them, should these labors succeed, but that like the Indians of the United States the subjects of Protestant manipulations, your converts shall also turn out, not sober, chaste, peaceable and orderly like Catholic converts, but in the words of the *Edinburgh Review*, "the most profligate, and the most idle members of the Indian community?"

THE FORTIFICATIONS AT LEVIS.—Active steps are being taken in connection with the proposed fortifications at Levis. The highest point of ground in the town has been purchased by the War Department, and the Royal Engineers have taken possession. This site, which is now occupied by a handsome villa is almost directly opposite the Citadel of Quebec. It is understood that it will be occupied by the central or triangular fort, which is to form one of the defences of the south shore of the river. Col. Dallaire's house and two lots of ground close to the Church of St. Joseph de Levis, have also been purchased by the War Department. Arrangements are said to be in progress for the purchase of a narrow strip of ground nearly three miles length, extending from the Church of St. Joseph to a point immediately opposite the Citadel of Quebec, upon which will be thrown up a line of entrenchments along the brow of the cliff.

Andy Johnson's "Amnesty," as by a strange abuse of language the thing is called, is now before the world, and must gladden the hearts of all who wish to see the hatred of the two sections of the United States towards one another kept alive and intensified. We do not believe that any course of policy, however conciliatory, could have induced the Southerners to accept cheerfully Yankee rule, and the new Union which, at the point of the bayonet, has been imposed upon them; but whatever chances of "reconciliation" may once have existed, have been effectually disposed of by the extreme measures of the victorious democracy of the North.

The terms which the latter impose upon their conquered enemy are these: Amnesty to everybody, with exceptions which also include almost everybody of position and influence in the conquered Confederate States. Are excepted from the provisions of the said Amnesty—all the diplomatic agents of the Confederate Government; all military and naval officers above the ranks of Colonel in the Confederate army, or of Post Captain in the Confederate navy; all who having held seats in the Federal or Yankee Congress exchanged them for seats in the Confederate Congress; all who having held commissions in the United army before secession, took service under the Confederate States, or resigned their commissions in order to evade the necessity of fighting against their legitimate State-Governments; all who have been absentees from the U. States with the view of aiding the Confederate cause; all graduates of West Point who joined that cause; all the Governors of the Confederate States; all who own property over \$20,000, &c., &c. And this is what the Yankee Government facetiously calls an Amnesty!

It is perhaps as well as it is; for why should the Confederate States accept a real Amnesty from their national enemies? Their position, recognized not only by all the Powers of Europe, but by the very Government which now has the hypocrisy of talking about an Amnesty, was throughout the war that of belligerents. As with legitimate belligerents, in possession of full belligerent rights, the Yankee authorities negotiated, and exchanged prisoners with the Confederates, thus for ever renouncing all claims to treat, or deal with, them, at any subsequent period, as rebels or revolted subjects. To adopt a different tone to-day towards the Confederates, now that they are conquered, and have no Yankee prisoners in their hands upon whom to retaliate any brutalities or ill-treatment that the Yankees may inflict upon captive citizens or soldiers of the Confederate States, is an act as illogical as it is dishonorable.

The process of what is called "reconstruction" is also being carried out in the same spirit, and on the same principles as those which have dictated the so-called Amnesty, and the dishonorable persecution of the conquered Southerners. As Andy Johnson calls his long list of political proscriptions an Amnesty, so is the military tyranny set up in the conquered States, styled "reconstruction on republican principles." We should much like to know what Liberals or Democrats understand by the words "Republican" and "Republican principles?" but here is the outline of the course which is being pursued, and which in plain English is unmitigated despotism.

The Federal Government will appoint pro-Consuls under the title of Governors over the conquered States. These pro-Consuls will summon Conventions, from which, however, the great majority of the people of the several States will be excluded, to frame new Constitutions; the new Constitutions thus framed and sanctioned by the Central or Federal Government—which has no more legal, or constitutional right to interfere in the internal affairs of any particular State, than it has to interfere with those of Canada—will be imposed at the point of the bayonet, if necessary, on the people of the several States; and thus the great work of "reconstruction" on republican principles will be satisfactorily accomplished. "Vive la republique!" It may do for others, but God deliver us from the curse and degradation of such a republic.

It is amusing and instructive to note how, by the Liberal press, this tyrannical, this contemptuous violation of the Constitution, is treated of, and approved. Says the *Globe*:—

"There are those who will contend perhaps, that constitutionally, Mr. President Johnson has no right of his own motion to exclude any from the rights of citizenship. . . . We do not care to enter into discussion as to what the Constitution says. We know what common sense and the necessities of the case dictate. . . . Again the objection may be raised that this is contrary to the Constitution: Well it may be, but for all that it is right."—*Toronto Globe*, 31st ult.

The end justifies the means. It is right to do wrong that good may follow. It is lawful to do a little evil for a great good. All these maxims which Protestants mendaciously attribute to Catholics, and to the Jesuits in particular, are unblushingly implied and defended in the above extracts from our Liberal Protestant contemporary. It is lawful, the ends being the triumph of democracy, to do wrong; and to violate the express provisions of the Constitution, is, according to the *Globe*, "right." Indeed as to what the Constitution may say on the subject, our Liberal contemporary cares not one straw; the interests of demo-