

revealed word of God—certain portions which they now receive as good, sound Scripture, were spoken of very contemptuously by some of the earlier reformers. Not one of them can venture to affirm that they have the pure, genuine word of God, such as He willed it to be understood or received—each sect of them is well known to have modified and arranged a Bible for itself—to wit, Baptist Bibles, and so on, and yet the Bible—the Bible is the sum and substance of their theology and controversy, history, chronology and all—“quote the Bible—go into them with the Scripture!” seems to ring ever in the ears of their disputants, and so they do quote, and drag in the Bible, on all manner of occasions, whether it suits the subject or not. Now, when we speak of our Bible we have something tangible to hold by—we have that sacred volume handed down to us from one generation to another, on the authority of the Church, without change or the shadow of alteration. We can vouch for the purity of God’s word, as contained in the present compilation known as the Bible, for the guardian of the faith has preserved it as a sacred deposit, and presents it for the veneration of her children. But what is their Bible—they have in it what Luther (honest man!) was pleased to style an *epistle of straw*, and some which that Reformer considered unworthy of being written by an apostle—“but, no matter,” say the evangelicals, “it is all the word of God—the Bible—the Bible!” Now, with us, that Epistle of St. James is just on a footing with all the rest—no Catholic has ever dreamed of speaking contemptuously of any part or portion of Holy Writ. We have no cause to eschew any one passage, for our divine religion embraces every text—every dogma—within her code of doctrine—she seeks to make her children act on the precepts of the Gospel, and so, obtain salvation for themselves, rather than “quote the Bible” on all occasions, and let the sense evaporate in empty sound. Then to hear how disrespectfully this Britannicus speaks of that great and learned doctor of the Church, St. Jerome—methinks he might afford him a little more respect, were it but for decorum. But then, of course, *Jerome* (as he calls him) was rather *Romish* for his taste, and besides he was “*but a man like ourselves—and long ago dead*,” so it is quite unnecessary to append the title of *Saint* to his name. Now, if it was St. Martin Luther, or St. Calvin, or St. John Wesley, why, of course, it would be exceedingly naughty to speak of them as though they were little short of fools; but the case is far different when the question is of a Father of the Church—a man who spent several years in solitary penance in the deserts of Palestine, can have no sort of claim on the anti-penitential offspring of the Reformation. We, Catholics, are “*great in Church History, and the Fathers of the Church*”—to be sure we are, but as to Protestant disputants, “they are,” as was said in the course of a controversy by a great prelate of the present day, “better acquainted with the *daughters* than with the *Fathers* of the Church.” Not a doubt of it, Mr. Editor, it is Catholics who quote the Fathers.

And then as to the question of the celibacy of the clergy, treated of by your correspondent, this same Britannicus makes either the drollest, or the most malicious assertion, as the case may be. He affects to believe that the Catholic Church discountsenance marriage—and says it is honorable in all—certainly, and so the Church takes it, and she holds it in the highest reverence, and sanctifies it with all possible solemnity. Why, this writer forgets that matrimony is the nursery of the Church, whereby her children are renewed from one generation to another.

But is there no one going to take up the cause of the F. C. M. Society—are they going to rest contented under the plain, straightforward charge of *lying*?—What of the priest who gave the *Sacrament* to all who would receive it, eh?—have you found out what sacrament it was, or what priest, or in what parish it occurred? I guess not.—I am, Dear Sir,

Yours, &c.,

A CATHOLIC.

Montreal, 25th Sept., 1850.

TO BRITANNICUS.

Dear Britannicus,—You are much in error if you imagine that the remissness of Pope Honorius, in condemning Monothelism, or the temporary weakness of Pope Liberius, are any stumbling blocks to Catholics, or can, in any manner, diminish their respect for the authoritative decisions of the Holy See. The infallibility which Catholics attach to these decisions, belongs only to those which are pronounced *ex Cathedra*, and addressed to the universal Church, and which are ratified by the consent of the whole Church, expressed formally, by means of a general Council, or by implication, as when they are tacitly received and universally adopted. Now, it will puzzle you to prove that either Honorius or Liberius propounded their errors, as dogmas to the Catholic Church.

That Osius fell, that in Liberius the flesh triumphed, as it did with St. Peter, over the spirit, are melancholy facts which the Catholic acknowledges with sorrow. There is a tear for the weakness of the men, but there is no doubt for the purity of the faith of the Church. Had you, dear Britannicus, been subjected to the same cruel treatment, which the aged Bishop of Cordova and the Pope Liberius underwent, from the satellites of an unworthy son of the great Constantine, you, also, might have signed worse than a semi-Arian creed, and been pitted, more than blamed, for it, afterwards. You might have been more apt to imitate Liberius in his fall, than in his subsequent repentance and heroic reparation of his weakness.

But how do you know, which of the formulas of Sirmium it was that the unhappy Liberius signed? The opinion held by the majority of those writers who

have the most deeply studied the question—of men such as Baronius, Fleury, Berninus, and Orsi, is—that it was the first formula of Sirmium which Liberius signed. A formula to be condemned, indeed, because of the omission of the Nicene word, *Consubstantial*,—but still a formula in which the Eternal Divinity of the Son is proclaimed, and which even St. Hilary, no friend to the memory of Osius, or of Liberius, considered Catholic. Yet, no matter. We, as Catholics, know that Liberius erred in signing any formula in which the whole words of the Nicene Creed were not inserted,—that he erred still more in condemning St. Athanasius, and thus abandoning that holy man to the fury of his enemies. These were the private errors of Liberius, wrung from him by the force of torture, and long imprisonment: but they were not dogmas propounded to the acceptance of the Church. On the contrary, they were protested against as soon as known. So far from weakening, these facts tend to confirm the faith of Catholics, in the perpetual presence of Christ with the Church which he had founded on a rock. Not even the temporary fall of one Pope, or the culpable negligence of another, have been permitted to have any evil effects upon that Church, or to pollute the purity of the faith once committed unto the Saints.

Your blasphemous denial of the Real Presence, scarcely requires a notice. It would be remarkable for its display of ignorance, were it not more conspicuous for its bad taste. It does not become you, or the members of any of the mushroom sects of yesterday, to call the faith of all Christians for more than 1500 years, and of the great majority at the present day, *profane and absurd*. Remember that the Unitarian might, although his good taste will not allow him to do so, just as easily, and with more show of mere human reason upon his side, make use of the terms *profane and absurd* to the doctrine of the Trinity, which, I suppose, you hold; and which rests upon no surer foundation than does the doctrine of the Real Presence, or Transubstantiation, for the terms are convertible. If the fact that the absence of the word, *Transubstantiation*, in the works of the early Fathers, is a proof that the doctrine was not held from the beginning, then, by parity of reasoning, we must conclude that the ante-Nicene Fathers were Arians, from the absence of the word, *Consubstantial*,—and that the Apostles did not believe in the Incarnation, because that word is nowhere to be found in the Apostolic writings.

LAICUS.

* Qui hanc Apostolicam ecclesiam non Apostolicam traditionis doctrina lustravit, sed profana prodicione immaculatam maculari permisit.—Leo. Ep.

CANADA.

We copy from the *Pilot*, the following brief outline of Mr. Gough’s temperance lecture, on Friday evening last. It is not because that Mr. Gough is a Protestant, that Catholics should undervalue his services in the cause of morality. We sincerely hope that he may be the cause of much good in Montreal:

MR. GOUGH.

Mr. Gough began by adverting to an objection started by some persons, that Temperance Societies are low, levelling institutions, of the *Fourierite* kind. It was not necessary to expend much time in exposing such an objection, but it gave Mr. G. an opportunity to offer some pungent and powerful remarks on that *aping of aristocracy*—that desire to occupy a position for which he is not fitted by birth or education—by which many a young man has been irreparably injured.

The lecture was chiefly devoted to an examination of the arguments commonly urged in favour of “moderate drinking.”

It is objected, that the Teetotaler is waging war against time-honored, long-standing observances, indulged in by our forefathers, who were pillars of the church and ornaments of society. To this it was replied, that we judge of an action according to the light in which we are enabled to view it;—that there is more sin in the drinking usages of society, as now practised, than there was in the times we are looking back upon, because new light has been thrown upon the subject;—that it is ridiculous and absurd to do things merely because our ancestors did the same, since the circumstances which led to their adoption of a certain course may have ceased to exist;—that we live in an age of progress;—and that if teetotalism is to be regarded as insulting the memory of our forefathers, every railroad, every steamship, and all modern improvements must be stigmatised in the same manner.

The Lecturer then proceeded to urge the importance of acting in accordance with professed principles. If the temperance principle is acknowledged to be right, it should be exemplified in conduct, without flinching or concealment.

After some admirable observations on the “obstinate” class, those who pride themselves in their singularities, and affect remarkable firmness, and whom it is useless to attempt to win over to the cause, Mr. Gough resumed the discussion of the “moderation” question.

If it be said, that moderate drinkers ought not to be so spoken against, it is easy to observe in reply, that every drunkard was first a moderate man. If any ask, how are we to judge of moderation? the answer is ready—we are to judge according to circumstances. What is life to one, is death to another. One man would be overcome by a third part of the quantity of drink which another might take with impunity. We ought not to set an example which others cannot follow. In this respect, the position of those who advocate moderation is a fearful one.

Some will say, that in advocating total abstinence we condemn the Bible. But to the passages which contain a permission or approval of the use of wine we can oppose those which convey warning of reproof respecting it. And we can refer to abstainers who are represented as examples—such as Jonadab the son of Rechab, Daniel, and John the Baptist—as well as to numerous exhortations to self-denial, which is the characteristic principle of teetotalism. Surely, too, when we come to look at this subject in the light of eternity, we shall be ashamed of having argued in favor of a mean, pitiful, animal gratification.

Some accuse us of assailing respectable men. Their very respectability increases the danger. Many a man begins his intemperate career in the company of the respectable—but intoxication proves a sad leveller. Twelve men were brought up by the Montreal Police a few days ago, charged with being found drunk in the streets. Among them were several vagrants, two agents, a furrier, a chemist and druggist, a farmer, and a gentleman!

Mr. Gough illustrated these remarks by narrating many striking and affecting incidents. He concluded, as on former occasions, by a powerful appeal to the consciences of his hearers. It could not be without effect.

OGDENSBURG RAILROAD.—We understand that this great work will be opened to-day to the public, through its entire line from Rousse’s Point on Lake Champlain, to Ogdensburg on the St. Lawrence, a distance of 118 miles; and that the Champlain and St. Lawrence Railroad Company are now, in connexion with the Ogdensburg line, ready to transport passengers from Montreal to that place—leaving this at half-past nine in the morning, and reaching Ogdensburg at seven in the evening—for \$3½.—*Montreal Herald*.

On Sunday next, at three o’clock in the afternoon, will be laid, the corner stone of a new Catholic Church, which is to be built on the Point Levy heights, on a spot near to that on which the old church of the Church of England stood. The new church is to be 107 feet long and 75 feet broad with galleries in the interior. The Catholic population of Point Levy, we are informed, will be indebted for this place of worship, to the Catholic zeal of 10 of their fellow parishioners. During the ceremony, which is an imposing one, a collection will be made in aid of the work and no appeal need be made to the Catholic community in this city, to countenance the ceremony with their presence and aid the undertaking with their purses. People of all persuasions may give aid towards the erection of any place of worship.—*Quebec Chronicle*.

It is confidently asserted in Toronto that Parliament is to be called together in February next, and that the Government has determined to remove as soon as the navigation opens.—*Quebec Chronicle*.

THE POTATO CROP.—From all parts of the Country we hear reports of the Potato crop being very much damaged by the dreaded disease. In some places whole fields will be worthless. It appears, too, that fields supposed to be nearly, or even perfectly free from it, on being examined, have proved to be extensively damaged. Generally, low heavy soils show it first, but no soil is exempt. On all sorts, and whether wet or dry, the disease is more or less prevalent.—*Bytown Packet*.

UNITED STATES.

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY CHILDREN SUPPOSED TO BE POISONED!—HORRIBLE FACTS—DREADFUL SUSPICIONS! The New York Herald of yesterday, gives the following:—

Yesterday, a rumor reached this city that a Quaker lady had been arrested at Morrisania on a charge of poisoning 130 children, at Morrisania, and that an inquest was being held at that village. One of our reporters took the Harlem Railroad train, and repaired to the spot, where he ascertained the following particulars. Miss Mary Shortwell, a Quakeress, of from 35 to 40 years of age, was proprietor of a foundling establishment for about a year, at Fordham, whence she removed in May last to West Farms, Upper Morrisania, about a mile and a half nearer New York. It was ascertained that before she left Fordham many bones of infants had been buried there, from her establishment, a couple of inches under the earth, and nine were found in one pit. Parts of these remains were carried away by the hogs, and a laborer on the railway one day actually took the arm of an infant out of a pig’s mouth, and restored it to the earth. It is stated she had about forty children on leaving Fordham for her present location, and the woman who is employed to bring up foundlings for the Alms House, states that she brought up 150 to the establishment from the Governors of the Alms House alone, within the last ten months. Besides these, infants were received “from all parts of the country,” in the words of Miss Shortwell herself.

There are now only nine left, which were removed to this city yesterday, by Mr. McGrath, under the direction of the Alms House Commissioners, seven women having been sent out to take charge of them.

Mr. Farrington, a mason, who was present, together with Mr. Bouty, proceeded, on Wednesday, to probe the ground, and found coffins two or three inches below the surface. This threw the whole neighborhood into a state of excitement, for nobody had dreamed that there were any bodies interred in the place, the ground being quite smooth. On Thursday the people proceeded farther in their investigations, and discovered six coffins, containing eight bodies of infants, in an advanced state of decomposition. They then went to the Grand Jury, but found they had adjourned, and next to the District Attorney, who referred them to the Coroner, Mr. J. G. Huntington, New Rochelle.

The Coroner, on being notified, called an inquest for yesterday, and the jury, after viewing the bodies at West Farms, Upper Morrisania, proceeded where the witnesses were examined, and the investigation was proceeded with.

Mr. Simeon Draper, the President of the Board of Ten Governors, was also at Morrisania yesterday, and it was stated to the reporter that he wished to have the matter kept dark, and no more noise made about it.

Suspicion was recently roused in the neighborhood from various causes, among others, from seeing so many children go into the establishment, and so few forthcoming. Every alternative day there was one brought from the Alms House, and sometimes two, and

three. It is also stated that one of the nurses went to an Irish dance a short time ago, and being rather late, was asked why she did not come sooner. She replied she had two cross children in charge that she could not put asleep, but that at length she gave them drops, which made them quiet. They went asleep fast enough, and never awakened. Next morning they were dead.

But what has led more immediately to the popular excitement, and the inquest yesterday, was the circumstance of a man named Tom Reilly, engaged with others in the erection of the New railroad depot adjoining the Foundling Institution, remarking one day that there were children buried there, pointing to the spot. The other men said there were not. He replied that there were, for he was told so by the man who buried them.

Thomas Farrington deposed to having found the bodies as we have before stated.

Nicholas Jackson, a colored man, was the next witness. He deposed that he had buried the bodies found, by order of Miss Shortwell—that two of the coffins were concealed in the bushes when he removed them, and the remainder which were in the house were left for him at night by appointment, in the area. He buried them about six rods west of the house, and on another man’s property, though she told him it was her own. He was paid 2s. for one coffin, and 1s. a piece for the rest.

Miss Mary Shortwell, who was a rather well dressed woman, and of respectable appearance, was then examined, when she admitted that she did give the order to bury the bodies in question. She produced three certificates signed by Dr. N. K. Freeman, and dated New York, though he resides at West Farms. She produced four others, purporting to be his also, but evidently in a different handwriting; and the paper being quite fresh, in reply to a juror, she admitted that she had copied them that morning from the others she had obtained from Dr. Freeman. These certificates stated that the children died of various diseases. For one dead body there was no certificate, and she could not account for it.

The head governess, Helen Hourigan, was then called as a witness. She testified that only seven children died in the house, and that none could die there unknown to her. She could give no account of that eighth body.

The jury, after consultation, returned a verdict that seven of the infants came to their deaths by disease, and that the eighth died from some cause to them unknown.

The whole case, with other testimony, is to be brought before the Grand Jury at Bedford, in Westchester county, in the beginning of October.

Miss Shortwell is still at her house, and has not been arrested. She possesses considerable wealth. There is not a single child in the establishment now, except that of one of the nurses. One child died on Sunday night, which, with the nine brought to this city yesterday, and the eight bodies found, would make 18. The question is what has become of the remaining 130, if it is true she received that number during the last ten months.

INCREASED POSTAL ACCOMMODATIONS.—The *National Intelligencer* says the Post Office Department has received official intelligence from the General Post Office in London, that “henceforth all letters addressed to the United States and not directed to be otherwise sent will be transmitted by the first packet, whether British or United States, which is despatched after they are posted. This is a gratifying termination of a matter that has been the subject of very earnest discussion between the Post Office Departments of the two Governments.—It will be recollected that the British Post Office has hitherto mailed exclusively by the Cunard steamers, except when the writers have directed the letters to be sent by the American packets.”

PHILADELPHIA AND LIVERPOOL.—It is proposed to connect Philadelphia and Liverpool by a monthly steam packet line between the two cities. Messrs. Richardson, Watson & Co., of Philadelphia, propose to build for that purpose two propeller steam ships, of 2000 tons each, at an estimated cost of \$160,000 each, of which they will subscribe \$100,000.

NEW YORK, Sept. 28.

ACCIDENT TO THE UNITED STATES STEAMER PACIFIC.—A dreadful accident has just happened at the foot of Canal Street. As the Pacific was backing out for her trip to Liverpool, she was struck by the tide, bringing her against the ponderous shed erected there, and tearing it down. Many persons are said to have been killed, but full particulars are not yet ascertained. The steamer will not sail to-day.

From Washington, we have accounts of a dreadful fight on Saturday between Senators Foote and Fremont, which is likely to result most seriously. It arose out of the former accusing the latter of seeking legislation in the gold lands for his own private advantage. A challenge, it is said, has been sent by Foote to Fremont. Foote is still in his seat in the Senate, but Fremont is not. The blow given by Foote brought blood, and the parties were separated by Senator Clark.

In the Senate, on Friday, the fortification Bill was reported without amendment.

The Indian appropriation Bill was passed with an amendment providing for One Million of dollars to pay the award to the Cherokees under the Treaty with them.

In the House the amendment to the General appropriation Bill adding \$200,000 for an extension of the wing of the capital, was rejected, and the appropriation of \$50,000 for a Marine Hospital at San Francisco, and \$100,000 for a Custom House, was adopted.—*Quebec Chronicle*.

NEW YORK MARKETS.

New York, Oct. 2nd—6½ P. M.

Ashes steady, both for Pots and Pearls. Ninety brls sold at \$5.97 a \$6 for Pearls, and \$6.12½ for Pots. Flour—Good demand for Western for export and fair enquiry for the local trade; sales 10,500 brls at \$3.75 a \$4.06 for No. 2 Superfine; \$4.50 a \$4.56 for Common; \$4.50 a \$4.62 for Mixed Michigan and Indiana; \$4.87 a \$5 for Pure Genesee.

Wheat in fair demand, and Prime firm and not plenty; sales 7,300 bush Genesee at \$1.16 a \$1.17½, 1,500 do inferior Western Spring at 85 cents, 1,100 do White Michigan at \$1.05.

Corn easier; sales 15,000 bush at 65 a 65½ cents for western mixed.

Pork \$10.62 a \$10.63 for Mess, and \$8.30 for Prime—market very firm.—*Transcript*.