

of filth and profanity, *The Monk Knight of St. John*,—and last week he denounces a kindred abomination, entitled *Celio, or New York above ground, and under ground*, which as he justly remarks "is a trashy licentious production, without one redeeming point—equally unfit for the drawing room and the kitchen, the cottage and the mansion; disgraceful to the author, and not less to the publishers."

Sincerely do we trust that our brother's exertions, in this instance, will, as before, be crowned with success, and that *Celio* will be doomed to share the well-merited exile of the recreant *Monk Knight*!

But here an important question naturally suggests itself.

Why should journalists be constrained to undertake the ungenial and revolting task of perusing such leprous effusions in order to their exposure and reprobation?

It is surely incumbent upon our booksellers to take measures that their shelves and counters present nothing inimical to the interests of decency, virtue, or morality!

What would we think of a druggist who should expose for sale lozenges, palatable to the taste, and alluring to the eye, which at the same time were impregnated with arsenic, or corrosive sublimate? Could such a one urge in extenuation of his guilt, that he sold the article because it was popular and marketable, but had never tested nor analysed the deleterious substances which it contained? Most assuredly he could not! Such a plea would avail nothing with a jury, nor avert the sentence of the judge! The obvious rejoinder would be, that it was his bounden duty to see that his wares contained nothing tending to the damage of health, or the destruction of life!

In a moral point of view the responsibility of the bookseller is thoroughly analogous to that of the dispensing chemist.

If he be a reputable tradesman, his customers are unquestionably entitled to assume that he will deal in no commodities which have a tendency to taint the purity of their families and households. This much, at least, they have a right to expect—that, if he sell poison, he shall sell it as *poison*—indicating the fact plainly and specifically.

Do the bibliopoles of Toronto regulate their transactions by this rule?

If any one had the time and the resolution to wade through the masses of pamphlet fictions which our bookstores constantly exhibit, we doubt not that the explorer would discover many productions equally reprehensible with those which the *Patriot* has so righteously nailed to the gibbet of public execration!

We ourselves can add to the foul catalogue the writings of REYNOLDS, which, we grieve to say, are publicly offered for sale in our literary marts. If we are too sweeping in our accusation, most readily shall the *amende* be made.

One of the romances of this unscrupulous black-guard—who in religion is an infidel, and in politics an undisguised Chartist,—lately fell into our hands, and we can confidently affirm, that a more horrid cento of profanity, radicalism, and licentiousness, never issued from the press since the days of Faust.

Booksellers of Toronto, such things ought not to be!

We call upon you as Christians,—as husbands—as fathers—and as brothers, to act no longer as panderers and purveyors to the brothel!

Most willingly do we concede that hitherto you have sinned in ignorance. We cannot bring ourselves to believe that one of your fraternity would knowingly disseminate the seeds of moral disease!

Your attention, however, has now been specially called to the subject, and henceforward the plea of ignorance will not in any degree avail you!

Deliberately do we repeat, that it is your bounden duty to ascertain the specific character of every production which, orally or by advertisement, you commend to the notice of your customers. This is a position which we hold to be incontrovertible.

And we give you fair and timely warning, that if you neglect your duty in time to come, we shall not be unmindful of our own.

We distinctly declare that we shall keep our eyes upon the character of the articles which you deal in, and whenever we discover that a work of unquestionable infamy has been sold in a Toronto book-store, we shall lay before the public the character of the work, and specify the name of the delinquent tradesman, who disgraced his reputable calling by making merchandize of such moral carion!

THROWING OFF THE MASK.

Fuller tells us a quaint story, touching Cardinal Montalto, who filled the Papal throne, under the name of Sixtus. Previously to his election, he so artfully counterfeited sickness, and the multiform infirmities of old age, as completely to dupe and hoodwink the Conclave. On a division for the vacant "Apostolic chair," the crafty mimic was unanimously chosen by both parties, as a mere stop-gap, under the conviction that he could not possibly outlive the year.

No sooner, however, had he attained the goal of his ambition, than Sixtus ceased to be an actor. He threw aside his crutches—resumed his natu-

rally vigorous walk and upright carriage—and thundered forth the *Te Deum* with an energy befitting unsapped strength and unwearied vitality.

One of the deceived members of Conclave, having expressed to Sixtus his astonishment at the sudden change, the wily and astute Pope replied,—"While I was looking for the keys of St. Peter it was incumbent upon me to stoop; but, having found them, the case is entirely different, and I walk upright as usual!"

This legend has been vividly brought to our recollection by the rampant attitude which Romanism has now assumed in the mother country.

Previously to the passing of the ill-omened "Emancipation Bill," the Papists, like crafty Montalto, appeared as if weighed down to the dust with humility and ultra-meekness. How blandly they babbled to Protestant liberalism, about "civil and religious liberty!" How cordially did they give the right hand of fellowship to the Whig, and that nondescript *lusus*, the Conservativist! Their aspirations were modest—their wants but few! All they hoped for—all they craved—was a frugal alms of political privileges! As for the Anglican Church, they protested and vowed, by "bell, book, and candle," that they would not hostilely touch it so much as with the tip of a little finger!

The bait took. What the result has been, we need not detail. The most superficial student of the history of the last twenty years can tell how faithfully Romanism has kept the vow, which she made before the prudently-forged chains which restrained it, were struck off by a deluded and spell-bound nation!

The modern Sixtus now thinks that he may safely bring the masquerade to a complete termination!

For long enough, he thinks, has he been creeping, like an unambitious mendicant friar, through the fair Dioceses of heretical England. The pear, in his opinion, is now thoroughly ripe, and only awaits his gathering.

Casting aside the crutch, and brandishing the usurped keys, the Pope, untamed and untaught by adversity, no longer with simulated modesty designates his emissaries as *Missionaries*, but professes to confer upon them titles, which imply that in his apprehension, Great Britain is neither more nor less than an ecclesiastical serfdom and appendage of Rome!

In speaking thus, we do not use the language of exaggeration. The rumpet of the Vatican gives no wavering or uncertain note at the present moment.

A few weeks ago the *Tablet*, which as our readers are aware, is the accredited organ of the usurping Italian Bishop, uttered the following contemptuously plain words, in reference to the late mock-creation of "English sees in England by that arch-schismatic:—

"In this Act of Pius IX., the Puseyites have that open declaration for which they have so long been professing to look. Rome, said they, has never yet formally spoken against us—her Bishops, indeed, are sent here, not as having any local authority, but as Pastors without flocks—Bishops of Tadmor in the desert, or of the ruins of Babylon, intruding into territories which they cannot formally claim as their own. This specious argument is, once for all, silenced. Rome has more than spoken—she has spoken and acted: she has again divided our land into Dioceses, and has placed over each a Pastor to whom all baptized persons, without exception, within that district, are openly commanded to submit themselves in all Ecclesiastical matters, under pain of damnation; and the Anglican sees, those ghosts of realities long passed away, are utterly ignored."

There is no Jesuitism here. The cloven foot is developed with brazen and unmitigated hostility. The whine, which so captivated and befuddled the Dissenting platforms of dreaming England, is exchanged for a stern, full-toned, uncompromising voice, which Hildebrand himself might have uttered in his most palmy and scorching days. If the Methodist, the Jumper, and the Presbyterian would escape the pain of damnation, they must kiss the toe of the imperious Pius IX.,—or else seek refuge in the God-framed ark they have so long despised.

The only effectual defence against the battery of Rome, now so unequivocally unmasked, is the pure branch of Christ's Catholic Church, established in our beloved native land. There is no other haven where a safe anchorage may be found!

Sectarianism, has ever been an obsequious and patent stepping stone for Rome, in her struggles after universal ascendancy. But for the influence of the *Concubine* the mass-house would never have aspired to the usurped status of a *Cathedral*!

Let honest, non-political Dissenters (and that there are many such, we are fondly willing to believe) let them rouse themselves from their trance before it be for ever too late! If they rally not around the rock-founded Church of Christ, ere long they will be stifled in the smoke of the sand-built, straw-thatched cabins, which they have been so thoughtlessly building for themselves. To that straw, no rational man can doubt, that if things go on as they have been going, the torch of Rome will be speedily, promptly, and mercilessly applied!

Especially do we implore all, who call themselves

Anglican Churchmen strenuously to resist the encroachments of Popery upon sound Catholic grounds. This is not the time to halt and hesitate between two opinions. In the words of our eloquent and uncompromising contemporary, the *ENGLISH CHURCHMAN*, to which we respond from the deepest recesses of our heart of hearts:—

"Away with all fastidious and misreading squeamishness on the subject. Let us have the courage and the honesty to 'call things by their right names.' There is but one CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC CHURCH in England: there are many SCHISMS, and among the most sinful, stands the ANGLO-ROMAN, for its Bishops and Priests know the Lord's will in this matter, and do it not—they know that our Bishops and Priests have descended in an unbroken succession from the Apostles—they know that the English Church has preserved inviolate, and publicly confesses, the Three Creeds of the whole Catholic Church, without adding to, or taking from them; which they also know is what they cannot say of their own Church. If then, there is and can be, no doubt among us which is THE CHURCH, and which is THE SCHISM, why should we go on deceiving others, if not ourselves, by shrinking from a plain and distinct avowal of the Truth? If the English Church be indeed to us, and in our eyes, a veritable portion of the Catholic Church—"the Witness and Keeper of Holy Writ"—"The Pillar and ground of the Truth"—"THE LORD'S BODY"—upon what principle dare we be silent, or inactive, while Roman Falsehood is injuring her, and robbing her of her Priests and people? What Apostle, or Father, or Confessor, or Council, or Church, gives us, by precept or example, any warrant for such conduct?"

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

We have been informed that a very strange proceeding is now going on in this ill-fated Institution, ushered into that body under the auspices of the Hon. Peter B. DeBlaquiere, the Chancellor thereof. It seems that the Chancellor, for reasons best known to himself, has taken a stand in direct hostility to his Lordship, the Bishop of Toronto; and to gratify what to us appears to be his spleenetic feelings, he has laid before the Senate a document, in the form of an address to the Governor General, as Visitor of the University, complaining bitterly, and in unmeasured terms, of certain language used by his Lordship while recently in England, in reference to the character of the University over which he presides, and reprobating the idea of giving to the proposed Church of England College a Royal Charter. The Bishop, in giving a history of the Institution, it seems, said:—"That in the last session an act was passed, which came into force on the first day of January, 1850, expressly excluding from the College religious instruction according to any form of doctrine whatever; prohibiting any form of prayer, or any act of public worship, and disqualifying any graduate of the University who may have taken Holy Orders from having a voice in the Senate."—and further, he pronounced it, as then constituted, "impious" and "anti-Christian."

Why the Chancellor has suddenly become so sensitive as to take umbrage at these expressions, we are at a loss to understand. He must certainly have known the constitution of the body over which he consented to preside—at least we presume he did, for his own sake, and we think we can prove by abundance of testimony, and even out of his own mouth, that the Lord Bishop was strictly justifiable in using the language attributed to him.

By the 5th section of the Act establishing the University of Toronto, it is provided that "the Chancellor shall not be a Minister, Ecclesiastic or Teacher, under or according to any form or profession of religious faith or worship whatsoever."

Why not have allowed the Convocation to elect whom they please as Chancellor, if the great object was not to exclude everything of a religious character?

By the 12th clause it is enacted, that "there shall be no Faculty of Divinity in the said University, nor shall there be any Professorship, Lectureship, or Teachership of Divinity in the same." Is this not a clear and positive enactment against the instruction of the pupils in any matter connected with religion?

By the 17th clause of the Act a Senate is to be formed, "which shall consist of the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, the President, and all the Professors of the said University, and of twelve more additional members, who shall be appointed to seats in the same,—one half thereof by the Crown, and the other half thereof by such Colleges in Upper Canada as now are, or who shall hereafter be incorporated, with the power of conferring degrees in Divinity alone." And it further provides that "no person shall be qualified to be appointed by the Crown to any such seat in the said Senate, who shall be a Minister, Ecclesiastic or Teacher, under or according to any form or profession of religious faith or worship whatsoever." By this section it will be seen that the Professors are to be members of the Senate *ex officio*, without regard to any religious belief whatsoever; and the six members to be appointed by the Crown are not to be Ministers, Ecclesiastics or Teachers, under or according to any form or profession of religious faith or worship whatsoever.

This meaning which the Lord Bishop evidently intended to convey, as will be understood by any dispassionate person, was that, in the event of the Incorporated Colleges in Upper Canada becoming affiliated as contemplated by the Act, no graduate in the University, who may have taken Holy Orders, could have a voice in the Senate, unless indeed, he was appointed to a Professorship therein in some branch of secular education; for by the Act it is put out of the power of the Crown to appoint a person in the Holy orders a member of that body. A graduate, therefore, who has taken Holy Orders, and who is not a professor, and who is not appointed by an affiliated college, is prohibited from having any voice in the Senate of the University. The sentiments complained of, as being expressed by the Bishop while lately in England, were not then for the first time published by him; nor are they sentiments confined to him alone. Before he left for England he made substantially the same statements in his pastoral letter, dated so far back as the 7th February last, which must be fresh in the recollection of every one. These same sentiments were responded to in the Memorials which he bore to England, to her Majesty the Queen, and to the Lords spiritual and temporal, in Parliament assembled, by twenty

thousand of the inhabitants of Canada. Similar sentiments have been expressed by the organ of the large and influential Methodist body in this Province; and the university of Queen's College, Kingston, so far back as April last, expressed the same sentiments in language not easily to be misunderstood. The Trustees of that respectable body said on that occasion that, "they avoided the University of Toronto on account of the irreligious character of their Act of Incorporation." Not only (say they) "is the teaching of Theology prohibited in the University of Toronto; but all forms of divine worship, all public prayer, anything that can remind either Professors or Students of God, and the duties we owe to Him—of our responsibility and obligations, is rigidly and peremptorily excluded. And as no test whatever is required of the Professors, not even a belief in the existence of God, there is nothing in the Act to prevent Infidels, Atheists, or persons holding the most dangerous and pernicious principles from being entrusted with the instruction of youth, at that time of life, when evil impressions are most likely to be made on their minds." What stronger language, we would ask, could be used than is contained in the above quotation, to show that in the opinion of thousands besides the Bishop, the University of Toronto is a Godless Institution!

Again the large body of Roman Catholics have expressed the same views, and utterly decline to become associated with so Godless a body. These sentiments, so generally entertained, so strongly expressed, and so thoroughly true, caused his Excellency's advisers to reflect, and reflection brought home to their conviction the awful truth promulgated by the Lord Bishop and all the respectable Christian bodies in Upper Canada, and Mr. Baldwin came down to Parliament the very next session after the Act of Incorporation passed, with a bill which ultimately became a law, intended to remove, if possible, the stigma so justly affixed to that seat of learning. The title of the Act is, "To remove certain doubts respecting the intention of the Act of the last session of the Parliament of this Province, for amending the Charter of the University of Toronto." And the preamble, among other things, recites, "That notwithstanding the distinct avowal of the principles upon which the said Act was based, doubts have been raised as to the Christian character of the said Institution, and of the powers of the University by statute or otherwise to make the necessary preparations for insuring to its members the opportunities of religious instruction and attendance upon public worship by their respective Ministers, and according to their respective forms of religious faith; and that for the satisfaction of all whose minds may have been disturbed by such doubts it is advisable to declare," &c. The first enacting clause then proceeds to give authority to the University to pass statutes regulating the attendance on religious worship by under graduates and students, and to make regulations for their attendance upon lectures in the said University. Does not the very fact of passing this Act clearly show that the Institution was justly obnoxious to the censure so generally passed upon it? Yet notwithstanding all this, the Lord Bishop is charged with gross misrepresentation in having stated, before the passing of this latter Act, that the University of Toronto was "Godless, impious and anti-Christian." Up to the time of the passing of this Act, and even for many months afterwards, we are informed that the Hon. Peter Boyle de Blaquiere was not prepared to deny the truth of the Bishop's assertions, as we are informed the worthy Chancellor himself said, and it was not till the Senate under the new Act, and within a very few days since, approved of a by-law passed by the Faculty of Arts, providing "that the evidences of natural and revealed religion be recognized for the future as forming a portion of Moral Philosophy," that he felt himself in a position to make, what we conceive, his unwarrantable attack upon the venerable Bishop. The document we have referred to as emanating from the Chancellor was, we are informed, referred to a select Committee, to investigate the matters contained in it, and to report thereon,—which report, we believe, has not yet been made. In our opinion, the Bishop was perfectly justified in the remarks he is said to have made. The organ of the Methodist body was right—Queen's College was right—he thousands of inhabitants who petitioned the Queen against the Godless Institution were right, and the stand taken by the Roman Catholics is right; and we cannot discover, as the Chancellor has, how the by-law providing that the evidences of natural and revealed religion shall in future form a portion of moral philosophy, in any way alters the Godless character of the Institution over which he has the honour to preside. And even admitting that it does establish for it a religious character, that only became established from the time of the approval of the by-law by the Senate; but when the Bishop wrote no one can deny that it was looked upon by all Christian communities, as we contend it is yet, as a Godless University.—*Colonist*.

GREAT WESTERN RAILROAD.—The Board of Directors felt themselves bound to decline the Galt subscription with conditions. The cost of the Branch to Galt, is not yet ascertained. The people of Galt promise to make up as much beyond the \$25,000 as the branch may require; until this is carried out, the building of the Branch will probably remain unconsidered.

TORONTO MARKETS.

TORONTO, NOV. 30, 1850.

	s	d		s	d
Fall Wheat, per 60 lbs.	3	6	a	3	9
Spring do. do.	3	0	a	3	6
Oats, per 34 lbs.	1	0	a	1	1 1/2
Barley, per 48 lbs.	3	0	a	3	1
Peas, do.	2	0	a	2	6
Rye, do.	2	6	a	3	0
Flour, superfine (in Barrels)	21	9	a	0	0
Do. fine (in Bags)	18	9	a	0	0
Market Flour, (in Barrels)	17	6	a	18	9
Do. (in Bags)	15	0	a	17	6
Oatmeal, per barrel	18	9	a	18	9
Beet, per lb.	0	2	a	0	3 1/2
Do. per 100 lbs.	12	6	a	17	0
Pork per lb.	0	21	a	0	3 1/2
Do. per 100 lbs.	15	0	a	20	0
Mutton per lb.	0	21	a	0	3
Lamb per quarter	2	6	a	3	9
Hams, per cwt.	42	6	a	47	6
Bacon	42	6	a	42	6
Potatoes, per bushel	2	0	a	3	6
Butter, fresh, per lb.	0	8	a	0	9
Do. salt, do.	0	6	a	0	7 1/2
Cheese, per lb.	0	6	a	7	6
Apples, per barrel	6	6	a	7	6
Straw	22	0	a	35	0
Hay	40	0	a	60	0
Fire Wood per cord	13	9	a	15	0
Bread	0	4	a	0	5
Eggs, per doz.	0	7	a	0	10
Turkeys, each	2	0	a	3	0
Geese, do.	1	3	a	1	6
Ducks, do.	1	6	a	1	10 1/2
Coals per ton	27	6	a	30	9

EXCHANGE.

Toronto on London	12 1/2 @	0	per cent.
" " New York	2 @	0	"
" " Montreal	1 @	0	"
New York on London	110 @	110 1/2	"