

Chap. VI. Certain remedies against distrust.

It is to be hoped that the brethren in Tuscany will bring to light much treasure from those mines of Italian evangelical literature, which the Inquisition has held closed since the great Reformation. In respect to the liberty of the press, matters stand legally as before; but the Tract Society and our good brethren at Florence, have adopted the tactics advocated by these letters, viz., "that the way to get liberty in Italy is to take it." Before the Archbishop fled from Florence they had decided to ask him no more questions on the subject, but to print the Bible at venture. We soon shall see whether Rome can check the movement. Tuscan Bishops certainly cannot. These have recently met with a signal failure in the rejection by the chambers, of their petition against the liberty of the press. A spirited debate arose upon it in which truth and righteousness obtained a great triumph over priestcraft. A fair trial of the question before the Assembly is all that has been wanting for a long time. We owe the Bishops many thanks for coming up to the tussle.

Should the Pontiff be restored by armed intervention, we can hope for no such freedom at Rome. It is morally certain that upon such an event the evangelical Protestants, now so busy there, would be put under the severest restriction; for whatever may be the political liberality of Pius IX. as a churchman he is every inch a pope; and will tax every resource of the Papacy to check a Protestant development in his dominions. In this moreover, he will be supported by many of his political enemies, who as Catholics or Rationalists are alike intolerant of an evangelical church. But the Pope cannot take away the liberty they have had, nor undo the consequences of it. The Bible will be in the hands of many thousands of Romans who will judge Popery by it, as by the only standard of faith and practice; while hundreds of thousands will continue to judge this oppressive power by the principles of the new republican constitution, which they will best appreciate while they suffer for them.

The Roman Republic! Little did we imagine when, standing near the altar in St. Peter's, a witness of the unparalleled splendour that invested the Pope during the ceremonies of Easter Week; that in less than a year this idolized man would be a fugitive, this royal pageantry a hoisted play, and the Roman people gathered beneath this dome to celebrate their own unostentatious sovereignty. But so it is. On the 10th of February, 1849 the Roman Republic was proclaimed by the Constituent Assembly; on the 12th the people crowded with enthusiasm to St. Peter's to inaugurate it in a *Te Deum*. This Republic may prove but a short-lived creation; still it will have accomplished a great and valuable work. Its first utterance was to pronounce the fall of the Papacy from the temporal power; its second, to promise protection to the Church. It advocates thus the incontestable rights of the people as civilians, and holds up to them their duty as Christians; i. e., vouching a spiritual independence to the Pope, without denying it to any other minister of religion. Catholic Europe, however, will not admit these rights nor be satisfied with simple protection for the Church; and the Roman Republic, should it not commit suicide, must suffer martyrdom. Could we but see it march, steadfast in political justice, to this latter doom, we might count upon its speedy resurrection in honor and glory; but such good augury for it is impossible, while the land is filled with the clattering of evil birds.

Of all the Italian States, Tuscany, alone, now deserted of their Grand Duke, will link its fortunes with those of Rome. Piedmont is ambitious to mediate between the Pope and "his subjects," as she still calls the Romans, if therefore these two States were republican to a man, what resistance could they make against such force as now begins to close around them in the union of the rest of Catholic Europe, joined even by the apostate Protestant powers, to reinstate this "vicar of Christ," as they term him, upon the throne of the Caesars? Pius IX. himself, though opposed to armed intervention in his favour, is more than ever decided not to enter Rome again except as its civic ruler; and before his acceptance of the offered mediation of Piedmont, this latter title, to the grievous disappointment of the Romans, was fully conceded to him. Where then are the arms, the treasure, the generalship, the diplomacy and the moral courage, that shall make the name of Roman Republic stand against the world? But now that the Republic has been proclaimed, the Papacy thrust with acclamation from its temporal power, and the sword drawn by an excommunicated people in the face of the Pontiff, where is the hope of a peaceable settlement of Roman affairs? What is to save Europe from being embroiled in the strife?—And what is the end to be, if not—Rome on fire?

G. H. H.

CANADIAN NEWS.

From the St. John Morning News.

THE CANADIAN INDEMNITY QUESTION.—We are indebted to the Halifax Chronicle, for the following comments, as well as extracts, from the London Daily News, relative to the Rebellion Losses Bill. The Tories (says the Morning Chronicle) charge the present Canadian Government, with encouraging rebellion, and rewarding instead of punishing traitors. A brief exposition of facts, will show how far their charge can be substantiated, or their statements relied upon. It is unnecessary at present to enter into any details regarding the unfortunate rebellion of 1837 and 1838, into which some misguided men were goaded by the domineering insolence of the party now in opposition to the Government. This party, it seems, is now desirous of making a public display of loyalty by turbulence and violence—by language and acts, which would be a disgrace to any lawless mob. It is worthy of remark, that after the rebellions of '37 and '38 were quelled, Earl Durham's first act on assuming the duties of Governor General, was a recommendation to the

British Government to concede to Canada that Responsible Government which her people had again and again petitioned for, but in vain, and the refusal of which had caused the effusion of so much blood. We now quote from an able article on the subject, in the London Daily News of the 22nd ult. The narrative is more simple, clear and succinct, than any account of the affair we have yet seen.

In 1845, when the Tories were in power, and after the measure had been passed giving compensation for rebellion losses in Upper Canada, an address was voted recommending the payment of similar losses in the lower province. In 1846, the Tories being still in power, a commission was appointed to ascertain the extent of these losses. Under this commission, claims were registered to the extent of £240,000. Of these, claims to the extent of £60,000 were classed as "speculative or casual." For the payment of the remaining claims, amounting to £180,000, the commission recommended the immediate appropriation of £100,000. All this was done by the Tory Government in order to secure, in their parliamentary extremity, Lower Canadian support. Failing in this, the matter proceeded no further, and the report of the commission was unacted upon until the late Government quitted office.

Mr. Lafontaine, the Attorney-General for Lower Canada, has now introduced a bill to redeem the pledge then made by the Government to the Lower Canadians; in other words, to indemnify those who had suffered from the rebellion in Lower Canada, as those in Upper Canada had already been indemnified. Yet it is for this—that is to say, for seeking to carry out their own proposal—that the Tory party has roused the province into its present state of excitement. The whole of the sufferers in Lower Canada, have been indiscriminately termed "French rebels," and as such, the prejudices of the Upper Canadians have been sedulously evoked against them. To pay the rebels, it has been alleged that the province was to be taxed to the extent of £180,000, whereas all that Lafontaine's bill contemplates is to raise £90,000 for this purpose instead of the £100,000 proposed by the Tory commission of 1846. In answer to the charge that they intended to compensate rebels, the ministry point to the bill, which is not only framed upon the model of that giving compensation to the Upper Canada sufferers, which nobody ever denounced as giving compensation to rebels, but is actually drawn up in the very words of that bill. Thus the Tory party, in order to create an excitement, which might reinstate them in power, raised an outcry against a measure not only framed in exact accordance with an unexceptionable measure already passed, but a measure which they themselves originated. It would be difficult, in the diversified annals of party ricklessness, to find a more discreditable page than this. Notwithstanding the excitement thus wantonly raised out of door, the lower house has signified its sense of the justice of the measure by passing into committee upon it by a large majority.

The measure, so hastily condemned, is not a measure to remunerate rebels, but to compensate innocent sufferers in Lower, as innocent sufferers in Upper Canada have already been compensated for losses incurred during the rebellion. The agitation in the province is purely a party one, set up for party purposes of the most questionable kind. The cabinet never contemplated compensation to those who had been found guilty of treason, or who had confessed their guilt. An amendment was moved in committee depriving of such compensation all those who were convicted or sent to Bermuda by Lord Durham, and of these Dr. Nelson, on whose case much stress is laid, was one. This amendment was seconded by Dr. Nelson. It was not needed to deprive rebels of the compensation intended for innocent sufferers, the object of its formal submission to the committee being to remove effectually from the public mind any apprehension as to the real scope of the bill to which reckless misrepresentation might have given rise.

It came out in the course of debate in the Canadian Parliament, on the Rebellion Losses Bill that these self-same Tories who now affect such great alarm that open and avowed rebels will be compensated, remunerated convicted Rebels and appointed them to offices of honour and emolument.

A Mr. Mason, who holds a situation in the Custom House, given to him by the Tories, was engaged in the rebellion, and banished to Bermuda; on the Tory Government introducing their resolutions to pay the rebellion claims; he had a pledge from Dominick Daly, from Hon. Wm. Morris, and even from Lord Metcalfe, that his being at Bermuda would be no objection to his claim for compensation.

The reference to this case has brought Mr. Masson out, who, in a recent letter, furnishes some curious information on the subject. We have only room for a brief extract. After stating his application to the Conservative Government, immediately after their official notice for all persons to file their claims for rebellion losses, Mr. Masson observes:—

I took the opportunity of speaking to the Hon. Mr. Daly, then Provincial Secretary, of my claims, and I asked that gentleman: "if my exile to Bermuda would be an obstacle to the payment of my claims, and if I could present an account of the losses I had sustained?" This gentleman answered me immediately, "There can be no objection to any person; your exile to Bermuda is nothing; every person will be paid." I had occasion the same day to see the hon. Mr. Morris, then I think, Receiver General, and he told me nearly the same thing.

Thus spoke two of the members of Government. But what said the Governor himself in reference to Mr. Masson's claim?

I thought it my duty to state to his Excellency the fears which I entertained to present an account of my losses, inasmuch as my exile to Bermuda might be an obstacle to my just demands. Sir Charles Metcalfe smiled, and answered—"Is it not a fact that the Ordinance of Lord Durham has been found illegal? If the Government did not believe you worthy to receive compensation for your losses, you would not have been named in the confidential office which you now hold to-day, the duties of which you

fill so well, after the report of Mr. Druscombe to me.—Present your account. The intention of the Government is to pay all without exception."

This double dealing on the part of the Conservatives—purchasing the support of convicted rebels when in office, and denouncing their successors for attempting the same thing when out, has produced its effect upon the public mind of Canada. Besides the disgust produced among the people, some of the Tory organs have turned upon the Opposition and exposed their knavery and hypocrisy. Among these are the *Montreal Herald* and *Transcript*. We quote from the latter:

Some rather strange facts came out in the course of the debate in the House on Tuesday evening. It seems pretty clear from Mr. Hink's statements, that the Commissioners appointed by the late Government to investigate the Rebellion losses in Upper Canada, did agree to pay men actively engaged in getting up that rebellion and that amongst them Lieutenant General Druscombe actually received five hundred pounds!! Two other leaders also, one of whom was convicted of high treason and sentenced to be hanged, but had his sentence commuted, were paid for the destruction of their property by these same loyal Commissioners.

As far as the two parties are concerned, we are of opinion that there is not a pin's difference between them.—Indeed, if there is any difference, it is rather on the side of Mr. Baldwin. The worst of the rebels have been paid in the name of the Conservative party. Had they not given Louis Joseph Papeau his £4000, and Dr. Druscombe his £500, and paid John Tooke (who was to be hung) for the destruction of his property, we do not believe that the present set of men would have ever ventured to bring forward their measure.

From the Quebec Gazette.

THE INDEMNITY ACT.

A few weeks ago, Mr. Lafontaine, literally stultified by the compactness of his majority in the House, and madly expecting to check the rising influence of Papi-neau, by a measure which, in gratifying the animosity and avarice of some French Canadians, was a direct insult to all those who had not been traitors in 1837, brought in a bill to pay rebels who had failed in their attempts to subvert the government, the order, and the peace of the province. It narrowly escaped plunging the country into a civil war; it deranged the naturally peaceful state of men's minds and materially injured our commerce; but it was carried and is now a law.

At first, ministers had not guile enough to hide their sentiments; they coolly stated by the organ of Mr. Blake that the rebellion of 1837 was justifiable; and confident in their strength, did not deign to disguise from their adversaries that they were going to profit by their position to pass a vote of censure on British loyalty in Canada, and constitutionally trample under foot those who professed such a sentiment.

They hold a different posture to-day. Pure calumny! Tory good faith! no rebels to be paid—cries the *Pilot*: the outcry is a mere *ruse de guerre*, invented to create a disturbance; a minister tells us on his own responsibility that no rebels are to be paid; and hopes that, if after the report of the Commissioners, such is found to be the case, the whole of Canada will join in denouncing the present ministry as men who have deceived their country and are unworthy of its confidence. A still higher authority, Lord Elgin, in his answer to the men of Hastings, protests that he only sanctioned the bill under the conviction that no rebels were to be paid.

In order to be perfectly satisfied with this, it would be necessary to have forgotten:

- 1st. Mr. Wolfred Nelson's speeches on the question, of course justifying the part he took in the rebellion, and demanding £23,000 for his share.
- 2nd. Mr. Blake's (a minister's) speeches on the occasion, justifying all kinds of rebellion, and more particularly the rebellion of 1837; and attacking violently the conduct of the volunteers who put it down.
- 3rd. Mr. Lafontaine's silence, when asked point-blank by Col. Prince, whether or no he intended to pay rebels.
- 4th. The general tenor of the speeches on the ministerial side, showing evidently the intention of the party.
- 5th. The eagerness with which ministers adopted Mr. Boulton's amendment excluding the ringleaders only (who had been exiled to Bermuda) from indemnity, as soon as they began to be terrified at the pressure from without.
- N. B. The support wanted by the ministry was not that of the dozen or so individuals who had been exiled, but of the large number of *habitants* whose houses had been burnt after they had left them in arms to overthrow the Canadian government.
- 6th. The tenor of the bill which we publish to-day, in order that our readers may be relieved from all doubt on the matter. We shall examine one or two points.

Section 1. "It is to pay and satisfy all losses arising from the destruction, total or partial, unjust, unnecessary, or wanton, of dwellings, buildings, property and effects of said inhabitants, &c." These restrictions leave no room for deviation to the Commissioners, says the *Pilot*: forgetting that the Commissioners will have to decide what is just and unjust, necessary and unnecessary destruction of property, and that they, being named by the Governor and the ministry, will of course hold the sentiments of which we have above convicted the ministry. If the whole rebellion be justifiable, as Mr. Blake, the minister says, of course all attempts to suppress it were unjust, unnecessary and wanton.

Ibid. "Persons convicted of high treason, and those who were transported to Bermuda, are not entitled to an indemnity." We have heard the opinion expressed by legal gentlemen, that this provision taken conjointly with Section XI, only excluded the convicts or exiles themselves, and would in no wise prevent their families or their representatives from claiming the indemnity for them. Wolfred Nelson's family, for instance, could