

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

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

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, MAY 27.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

We have very little to report from Europe. Pending the Conference a suspension of arms between Germans and Danes, has been agreed to. Previous to this there had been a smart engagement between a Danish and an Austrian flotilla, in which the former won a complete victory. The news was greeted by the House of Commons with loud cheers.

The Polish insurrection may now be looked upon as at an end. The Russians remain masters of the field, and except from God the Poles have no assistance to expect. From Rome we have the gratifying intelligence that the Sovereign Pontiff's health is quite re-established.

The past week has led to no decisive results on the war between Northerners and Southerners. Grant having failed in all his attempts to carry Lee's position by a front attack, now meditates an attack upon the latter's right. Butler's expedition has come to naught, at all events it has done nothing out of which even Northern telegraph manipulators can frame a report of a victory. On the whole the advantages have been with the Confederates, who hold their ground, inflict fearful losses upon the invaders of their native land, and maintain an attitude of defiance. In the West the Federal arms have met with a series of disasters. Gold at New York has ranged from \$1 to \$4 during the week.

Governor Seymour of the State of New York has directed his Attorney General to lay indictments against all persons engaged in the seizure of the *World* and the *Journal of Commerce*; which journals were by a high handed exercise of military despotism, and in violation of the Constitution of the U. States, and of the laws of the Sovereign State of New York, suppressed for reasons which our readers will find elsewhere. This action of Governor Seymour is cheering, not only because if persisted in, it promises to lead to a collision between the State authorities and the despotism of Washington, but because it indicates that the remembrance of their ancient liberties is not entirely lost—even amongst the unhappy victims of Yankee tyranny.

SECTIONAL.—This is a phrase much in vogue just now amongst journalists and a certain order of politicians, and is applied by them as a term of reproach to those who differ from them upon the great political questions of the day, affecting the relative positions and the future relations of Upper and Lower Canada. The representative from the Lower Province is said to be "sectional," and is taunted with "sectionalism," who by his language and his votes professes to have the interests of Lower Canada, her laws, institutions, and distinctive nationality at heart; who is unwilling to sacrifice the slightest of those interests, or to do aught tending to efface or emasculate that distinctive nationality; who acts as if his allegiance were due to Lower Canada; and whose main object is to transmit to his children unimpaired and in full vigor, that national life which he has inherited from his fathers—those laws, that language, and above all that religion, in which the people of Lower Canada live and move, and have their being. To regard every political problem that may present itself from a national standpoint, to aim at solving it in a manner favorable to Lower Canadian interests, and Lower Canadian nationality—this is "sectionalism"; and in a word, the reproach is levelled at all those Lower Canadians who, whilst cheerfully accepting the position of subjects of Queen Victoria, and unfeignedly desirous of upholding their existing connection with the British Empire, object to being passed, and in the interests of Upper Canada, though the political crucible, so that they may be fused or blended into one homogenous mass with their Anglo-Saxon and Protestant fellow-subjects.

But should the Lower Canadian be ashamed of being "sectional," is there aught in the reproach of "sectionalism" of which he should be afraid? On the contrary, if in his bosom there burn a spark of patriotic fire, if his sweet mother-tongue be dear to him, if the laws, the usages and above all if the religion of his forefathers be precious to him, he should make it his boast and his glory to be "sectional"; and in every act of his life, public or private, he should make it his aim to deserve the taunt of "sectionalism," which is hurled at him? Why should the French Canadian Catholic be ashamed of being "sectional," and intensely "sectional"? Why should he hesitate to avow that his heart is with his own country, and not with that of strangers and aliens? that he cares a good deal for all that may in any manner affect Lower Canada; and that—except in so far as he is a Christian, and therefore bound to love all men, and a subject of Queen Victoria, and therefore bound to take an interest in the welfare and

stability of all parts of that great and many-tongued Empire over which Victoria rules—he cares not a straw about the affairs of Upper Canada or the Lower Provinces? Is it made a subject of reproach to an Irishman, to a Pole, to an Italian, to a Hungarian, that he cares more, infinitely more, for the well-being of his native land than he does for the political greatness of the nation to which by force of arms, or the intrigues of diplomacy he may for the moment happen to be attached? The Russian official or *Jack-in-Office* no doubt condemns the "sectionalism" of the Poles, who will not quietly yield to a process of Russification, and refuse to identify themselves with the other subjects of the Czar. But an impartial public does not endorse this verdict; neither does it withhold its esteem and its sympathies from the brave Poles desperately fighting against great odds for the autonomy of their native land, and the preservation of their distinctive national life—their laws, their language, and their religion. How then can that be blameworthy in the Catholic French Canadian, which is praiseworthy in the Catholic Pole?

Certainly of all men, Irishmen should be the last to reproach others with "sectionalism"; for it is their glory and their boast that they are, and ever have been, "sectional"; that they have remained Irishmen, and have not subsided into West Britons. All the great and honored statesmen of Ireland—Curran and Grattan, O'Connell and his fellow-laborers in the cause of national and religious liberty—were "sectional" and intensely "sectional." If then to these we refuse the tribute of our respect because "sectionalism" is a vice, we must honor such men as Castlereagh, and the bilingue tribe who for pensions and peerages basely bartered away the independence, and the distinctive national life of Ireland. Surely then, Irishmen, so "sectional" themselves, will not esteem French Canadians the less because the latter also are "sectional"; because the latter occupy as towards Protestant and Anglo-Saxon Upper Canada, precisely the same relative position which they themselves occupy as towards Protestant and Anglo-Saxon England! "*Ireland for the Irish*" is a good cry in the mouth of the Irishman; "*Lower Canada for Lower Canadians*" in the mouths of the French speaking and Catholic population of Lower Canada, is a cry equally justifiable, equally honorable to the hearts and to the heads of those who utter it.

We know not how it may be with others; but we have no hesitation in proclaiming ourselves "sectional," and intensely "sectional," and we are so not in the interests of nationality alone but of religion; not for the sake of Lower Canada only, but for the sake of the Church in Upper as well as in Lower Canada. To our ears the term "sectional" conveys no reproach, for well we know the men by whom the phrase is used, and why they use it. We know that it is but the form in which their spite against all who oppose their dishonest designs upon our ecclesiastical institutions, and thwart their mercenary projects, finds vent, or expresses itself. To the Protestant Reformer, intent upon the spoliation of the Church, the humiliation of the *Romish hierarchy*, and the triumph of Protestant Ascendancy, the "sectionalism" of the Lower Canadians, opposes insuperable obstacles: to the needy place-beggar or political adventurer who cares not a straw for nationality or religion—for country or for Church, whose sole object in life is to make his way in the world, and forward his own sordid interests, "sectionalism" in like manner is especially odious; as it implies adherence to principle, a scorn of material interests, and a belief that there are objects better worth fighting for than beef and pudding, than pork and beans. It interferes with his plans: it has naught in common with his aspirations after office: and therefore the place-beggar or professional politician curses it in his heart, and with his lips denounces it as irreconcilable with those large and liberal views in which he delights. He, to get into an office, and to have the fingering of the public plunder, is ready to adopt now this now that, line of policy: to ally himself to-day with his bitterest opponents of yesterday, with men whom but a few hours ago he was vituperating and holding up to the scorn of the community, as thieves, rogues, hars and corruptionists. The "sectional" politician, on the contrary, as distinguished from the trading or professional politician, takes his stand upon principle: and not to save the world from ruin, would he sacrifice, waive, or for one moment consent to hold in abeyance, one iota of that principle. Of course betwixt such men there can be no community of sentiment: of course *Jack-in-Office* whose views are large and liberal, who cannot conceive how men should be such fools as to prefer duty to advancement in public life, and a pure conscience to a Government situation, hates him who opposes him with all the bitterness of which his official soul is capable, and seeks to vent his spleen in ridiculous nick-names such as "sectional" and "sectionalism." In like manner the Catholic who is faithful to his religion, who believes that of contraries both cannot be true, and acts up to that belief, is, by his large-

viewed and liberal coreligionists, as well as by Protestants, denounced as "sectional." "Sectionalism" in our Canadian politics is, in short, the counterpart of what is often called "sectarianism" in religion. And just as no Catholic need feel ashamed of the latter epithet when applied to him by Protestants, or *Kawtholics*, so no Lower Canadian should feel annoyed at having the term "sectional" applied to him, either by the avowed enemies of his race and creed in Upper Canada; or by the more treacherous and therefore more dangerous enemies who under the pretence of liberalism and of large and enlightened views are prepared to carry out the hostile policy of Mr. George Brown and his friends the Protestant Reformers of U. Canada. Let us be "sectional," always "sectional," above all things "sectional." Let our rallying cry be "*Lower Canada for the Lower Canadians*"—and let us in like manner leave our Western fellow-subjects free to manage their own affairs as they please.

"PRINCIPUS OBSTA."

The great question of the day, in so far as Lower Canada and the Catholic Church in British North America, are concerned, came up for discussion in the Legislative Assembly on the motion of Mr. G. Brown for a Committee to inquire into the causes of the unsatisfactory relations actually existing betwixt Upper and Lower Canada, and to devise a remedy mutually acceptable to both sections of the Province. The main motion, after several amendments thereunto had been proposed and negatived, was carried by a majority of 59 to 48.

What Mr. Brown can expect from his Committee, now that after a profuse expenditure of talk he has obtained it, we are at a loss to conceive. It will meet, report, and separate, we suppose, but it is impossible to suppose that from it any good will proceed—that it will make any discovery, or that it will in any manner accomplish the task assigned to it.

There is not a man, woman, or child, who cannot indicate the causes of the evil complained of—the unsatisfactory relations actually existing between the two sections of the Province; and it requires neither a conjuror nor a Parliamentary Committee to discover them. The iniquitous and impolitic Legislative Union of two Provinces, inhabited by races alien to one another in blood, in language, and in religion—a measure which was not only a crime but a blunder—is the cause of all our political discontents; and until the cause itself be removed, he must be a shallow-pated fool indeed, who expects that the effects shall disappear. Mr. Brown knows this well; every member of his Committee knows it; and knowing it, they will of course carefully abstain from declaring it, for it is one of those unpleasant though palpable or self-evident truths which "politicians"—(we use the word in its Yankee sense)—do not care to meddle with.

And if a Committee to inquire into the causes of the political discontent which obtains, and which threatens to clog up the wheels of the governmental machine entirely, be unnecessary—because those causes are known and patent to all men, equally useless is the appointment of such a body for such an end as that which Mr. Brown pretends to have in view. No modification of the Legislative Union can be conceived of even, which shall prove mutually satisfactory to Upper and to Lower Canada. Any arrangement which should in any degree tend to allay the existing dissatisfaction of Upper Canada, would of course only augment the dissatisfaction of the Lower Province; for the reform which the one proposes to attain, the other is determined to ward off as the greatest of evils. The task imposed upon the Committee is thus an impossible one; as impossible as if it were imposed upon it to devise some means by which the pelting of frogs in the pond might be made as acceptable to the frogs as to the boys, to the pelted as to the pelters.

Yet though we look on the nomination of the Committee as a humbug—though it can effect nothing, and although its proposers and supporters do not even expect it to effect anything—we look upon the vote by which it was affirmed as a great misfortune, and a great menace to the autonomy of Lower Canada, and the integrity of Catholic ecclesiastical property. That vote is a sign of weakness on the part of the Lower Canadian section of the Legislature; a symptom of a readiness to make concessions of which their enemies will avail themselves to exact more, and still more damaging concessions, from those who if they were true to themselves, their country, and to their Church, would prefer dying to a man in their last ditch to making any the slightest concession to their exacting foes. It may seem but a small thing, but still it is a concession, and this concession is a triumph to the enemies of Lower Canada and of the Church. The *Globe* claims it as a victory, and congratulates the country, that is to say its friends, "on the great progress which has been made, as indicated by the sentiments of members expressed in this debate, and the large number of Lower Canada votes at last manfully recorded in favor of action on the question zealously pressed on their attention for so many years."—*Globe*, May 20. This

is the light in which our enemies look upon the result of the debate on Mr. Brown's motion—and they are right. Lower Canada interests, the interests of the Catholic Church, have been betrayed and imperilled by men whom Lower Canadians have foolishly or treacherously returned to Parliament as their representatives; and Upper Canada will be encouraged to continue its war against "the laws, the language, and the religion" of those who by their timidity and their treachery have approved themselves so ready to yield. If we are such fools as to give our enemies an inch, they will not be long in taking an ell.

Herein lies the great danger to Lower Canada, her Church, and her institutions. Our enemies are bold and enterprising because they believe us to be timid and compromising; and they believe us to be so because we return to Parliament, and support in power, men notorious for their hostility to Lower Canadian interests. If the Upper Canadians believed that we were in earnest; if they were assured that sooner than make any the slightest concession which should have the effect of giving to their section of the Province any increase of influence in the common Legislature, we would win the voice, and at every risk, insist upon the repeal *pur et simple* of the Legislative Union, they would very quickly moderate their tone, abate their pretensions, and desist from their insolent aggressions. The Union is necessary, is at all events highly profitable, to them; though at best it is but an evil to Lower Canada which for the sake of peace we are content still to endure, iniquitous though it was in its inception, and most unjust as towards our section of the Province; and therefore the only system of tactics which carries with it the faintest hopes of success is that which we indicate, and which is expressed in the formula—"Equality of Representation or Repeal of the Union."

We publish below the division list on Mr. Brown's motion, showing by whom it was supported, and by whom it was opposed; to whom we should look upon as our friends, and whom we should treat as foes:—

YEAS.—Messrs. Auld, Bell [North Lanark], Biggar, Bowman, Brown, Buchanan, Burwell, Carling, Cartwright, Chambers, Cockburn, Cowan, Currier, Dickson, Dunkin, Dunsford, Ferguson [South Simcoe], Howland, Jackson, Jones, [South Leeds], Macdonald [Glengarry], Macdonald [Toronto west], Macdonald [Cornwall], McFarlane, Mackenzie [Lambton], Mackenzie [North Oxford], McConkey, McDougall, McGee, McGivern, McIntyre, McKellar, Morris, Mowat, Muir, Notman, O'Halloran, Parker, Pope, Poulin, Ross [Prince Edward], Rymal, Seachard, Scobie, Smith [Toronto East], Smith [East Durham], Somerville, Stinson, Street, Thompson, Wallbridge, [North Hastings], Walsh, Webb, Wells, White, Wilson, Wright [Ottawa County], Wright [East York].—59.

NAYS.—Messrs. Archambault, Beaubien, Bellerose, Blanchet, Boursassa, Brousseau, Caron, Cartier, Cauchon, Chapais, Cornellier, Coupal, Daoust, De Boucherville, Denis, A. A. Dorion, J. B. Dorion, Duckett, Dufresne [Iberville], Dufresne [Montcalm], Evanturel, Ferguson [Frontenac], Fortier, Gagnon, Galt, Gaudet, Geoffrion, Harwood, Higginson, Holton, Houde, Huot, Joly, Lafontaine, Lejeune, Langevin, Armour General Macdonald, Piquet, Perras, Pisonneault, Raymond, Robitaille, Ross [Champlain], Simpson, Sylva, Thibault, Tasse, Turcotte.—48.

CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT MISSIONS.—From the most unexpected quarters we receive testimony as to the comparative efficacy of Catholicity and Protestantism in the conversion and civilisation of the heathen. The following we clip from a correspondent of the *London Times*, Mr. M. J. Briggs, who is describing (April 28, 1864) the actual state of affairs in New Zealand, and speculating on the probable results of the efforts now being made to educate, civilize, and Christianize the aboriginal races.—Speaking of the Protestant missionaries, and of their labors in translating the Bible into the native tongue, this Protestant and therefore unexceptionable witness deposes as follows:—

"Much money has been foolishly wasted in reducing the Maori to a written language, or rather to a mongrel language invented by the Missionaries. The Old Testament is their favorite, and almost their sole study."

Immediately after this confession of the waste of money by the Protestant Missions, our witness alludes to the labors of the Catholic Missionaries and the Sisters who have accompanied them to New Zealand:—

"So far as I know, the acquisition of English has scarcely been attempted except by the Roman Catholic teachers, who, being able to command the services of devoted women, have in an institution at Wellington done more than any others to cleanse and civilize young native girls."

The writer of the above has been resident in New Zealand for twelve years, and knows therefore what he is writing about. His allusions to the "mongrel language" or gibberish into which Protestant Missionaries, and the persons employed by the Bible Society, translate the Holy Scriptures will provoke a smile from those who are conversant with the subject, and have seen or heard repeated the blasphemous nonsense into which your Protestant evangelists "do" the Word of God. And yet the subject is too painful for laughter, for nothing has more tended to bring Christianity into disrepute, or rather ridicule, amongst the heathen than those ridiculous translations of the Bible which Protestant Missionaries circulate as the "Word of God in the native dialects." The Chinese, and other polished peoples of the East, receive them with surprise and merriment; and though the bindings of

the books are by them eagerly sought after, as affording excellent materials for the soles of their slippers, the contents are indignantly or rather contemptuously scouted as unworthy of the attention of any intelligent or educated person.—Amongst heathen of a lower class, the effects of these "mongrel" translations are more injurious, still more prejudicial to the cause of religion and morality; for from them the readers form the most degrading notions of the Christian God, and deduce the most execrable system of ethics. Of all books the Bible is by far the most difficult to translate, even into the language of a people highly advanced in material civilisation and secular learning. It requires the most full and familiar acquaintance with all the idiomatic expressions, all the literature, all the thoughts, habits and feelings of these into whose tongue it is translated; and in the case of savage nations, such as the New Zealanders, no words are to be found in the native vocabulary in which the language of the Bible can be rendered.—Not having in his rude state, the ideas which these truths imply, the savage has of course no words to represent them. Our readers may therefore easily imagine what ridiculous or rather blasphemous balderdash is a New Zealand Bible, translated into the "mongrel language invented by the Missionaries;" and how pernicious must be the effect of the circulation of such wretched trash amongst the poor ignorant people amongst whom these Protestant Missionaries labor—not in vain indeed, in so far as they themselves, and the good things of this world are concerned.

EVANGELICAL LOYALTY.—In a late issue of the *Montreal Witness* we find the following lines of "original poetry" strongly suggestive of our contemporary's loyalty. They form part of an address apparently, to the Yankee flag:—

"I love the flag, because it flings
Defiance in the face of kings."

Why then in the name of common sense does not the writer betake himself to Yankee-land, and place himself under its flag? Why does he remain here in Canada, claiming the protection of a monarchical form of government, which he hates, and would fain see subverted? A Yankee at heart, he has no right to the privileges of a British subject.

The reasons assigned in the *Witness* for the writer's love of the Yankee flag, are of the true revolutionary and Jacobin stamp; they are worthy of that party who in the last century raised bloody hands to heaven, and with impure lips invoked the speedy inauguration of their revolutionary millennium, by the strangling of the last king with the bowels of the last priest. The political antipathies of the *Witness* are in strict keeping with his religious antipathies and his hatred of priests.

We are happy to say, however, that his aversion to kings is not participated in by all his coreligionists; and that the latter love, neither the flag which the *Witness* loves, nor the principles which that flag represents. Dearer to them is the glorious and long victorious battle flag of the gallant Confederates. They love that flag because it is the standard of freedom and of State Rights: and—

"They love that flag because it hurls
Defiance in the teeth of churls."

In so far as poetry is concerned, we contend that the above stanza is at least as good as anything in the *Witness*, whilst in point of sentiment it is immeasurably superior.

RIGHTEOUS INDIGNATION WASTED.—In the early part of last week, the *New York World* published a document professing to be a Proclamation from Abe Lincoln, in which the failure of the campaign against the Confederate States was admitted, a day of prayer and humiliation was appointed, and another call for 400,000 men was announced. This document was subsequently denounced by Mr. Seward, as a forgery, though some thought that it was genuine, and was suppressed by the Washington authorities for fear of the impression its appearance would make on the country. At all events it was denied by Mr. Seward; and by way of vindicating the national liberties, and upholding the freedom of the press, the printing office of N. Y. *World* was, without form of trial taken possession of by a gang of soldiers, and the publication of the pectant journal prohibited. Hereupon the *Witness* broke out in the following strain of righteous but most unnecessary indignation:—

"The *World's* FORGERY.—Firmly as we believe in the doctrine of human depravity, we could not believe yesterday morning that the *World's* announcement of a proclamation or message by President Lincoln, was a hoax. It gave part of the exact words of the alleged message; and the President's signature, and the certainty that it would, if a forgery, be detected in an hour or two, made us think that no paper, with any character whatever, could fabricate a bogus proclamation. At the same time, the source from which the information exclusively came, was very suspicious; being bitterly inimical to the Government; and the news itself was very unlikely. It was explained in the after-part of the day, that the whole was a vile and audacious fabrication, doubtless for some purpose which does not yet appear fully, but probably to go uncontradicted by the steamer sailing for Europe at 10 o'clock yesterday morning. It will not surprise our readers after this, to hear that the *World* has been suppressed by military authority; and some other papers of the same treacherous and seditious kind.

Our innocent and credulous contemporary has