

UPPER CANADA MOVING.—We give below the petition in favor of an amendment of the School Laws, adopted by the brave Catholics of Alexandria, and which is being circulated for signature amongst the different parishes and missions of Upper Canada.

That this petition will be unanimously signed by the Catholics of Upper Canada we cannot permit ourselves to doubt. Long have the Catholic laity been taunted with their apathy on the School Question; and that apparent apathy has been urged in Parliament as an argument for perpetuating the existing system with all its evils. From this reproach our friends have now the opportunity of redeeming themselves; of this argument, or *quasi* argument, they have it now in their power to deprive their open enemies, and their treacherous friends. Will they not then avail themselves of this opportunity? will they not by one vigorous effort, by one good pull—"a long pull, and a strong pull, and a pull altogether," as they say at sea—approve to the world their fidelity to principle, and secure to their children the priceless blessing of "Freedom of Education?"

TO THE HONORABLE THE MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, IN PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED.

The Petition of the Roman Catholic Inhabitants of the Parish of St. Finian, in the County of Glengarry.

HUMBLE SHewETH—

That we, the undersigned, the Roman Catholic Inhabitants of the Parish of St. Finian, in the County of Glengarry, your Petitioners, have labored under all the disadvantages of the Act to amend the Laws relating to Roman Catholic Separate Schools in Upper Canada.

That the Chief Superintendent of Education for Upper Canada has declared in his Special Report on the Separate School Provisions of the School Law of Upper Canada, that in his opinion the Provisions of the Separate School Act of 1855 were not so convenient for the supporters of Separate Schools, as the fourth section of the Supplementary School Act.

That your Petitioners have now a right to complain that the Trustees of Separate Schools are elected differently from the manner in which the Trustees of Common Schools are elected.

That the whole number of Trustees of a Separate School are elected annually; whilst the Trustees of Common Schools retire and are replaced one by one—that is, one in each year, so that the whole body of Trustees of a Common School cannot be replaced till the third year after their first election.

That the Trustees of Separate Schools are not subject to re-election, unless they consent, which renders the management of Separate Schools the more difficult for an entirely new body of Trustees.

That one, at least, of the Trustees of a Separate School is obliged to verify, under oath, their half-yearly Returns to the Chief Superintendent of Education; which implies an unworthy suspicion of the integrity of Roman Catholic Trustees, since no such obligation is imposed on the more favored Trustees of Common Schools.

That the law does not recognise the Roman Catholics of Upper Canada as supporters of Separate Schools, unless they give notice to the Clerk of the Municipality in which any Separate School is situated, that they are supporters of such Separate School; whilst all Catholics are liable to pay all rates imposed for Common Schools, and Common School Libraries, unless they obtain certificates from the Clerk of the Municipality in which they reside, that they are registered supporters of the Separate School of such Municipality.

That, on the contrary, the law recognises all as supporters of Common Schools, except registered Catholics, without their giving notice to the Clerk of the Municipality that they are supporters of the Common School.

That the Trustees of the Separate Schools are obliged to send their half-yearly Returns to the Chief Superintendent of Education; whereas the Trustees of the Common Schools only send their half-yearly Returns to the local Superintendent.

That the Trustees of Common Schools receive their share of the Municipal Local Fund; whilst the Trustees of Separate Schools are excluded from any share of the Local Fund.

That the Trustees of the Common Schools receive their portion of the Legislative Grant from the local Superintendent; whilst the Trustees of Separate Schools are obliged to appoint agents in Toronto, who may exact a commission for obtaining from the Chief Superintendent the portion of the Legislative Grant due to the Catholic Trustees.

That the supporters of Separate Schools are obliged to pay the debts contracted by a Common School before the time of a separation between a Common School and a new Separate School; whilst they are, at the same time, excluded from any portion of the property acquired from those debts existing at the time of the separation.

That on these grounds, and on account of the invidious differences between the Common and Separate Schools, we, your Petitioners, humbly pray that your Honorable House will be graciously pleased to take into consideration the evils of the foregoing grievances of which we complain; and that your Honorable House will be graciously pleased to remove them by enabling the Roman Catholics of Upper Canada to enjoy the same rights, the same privileges, and the same advantages in Separate School Education, that are in the possession of the supporters of Common Schools. And for which reason your Petitioners humbly pray of your Honorable House,

That the election of Trustees of Separate Schools, and their continuance in office, be of the same nature as that of the Trustees of Common Schools.

That the half-yearly Returns of the Trustees of Separate Schools be received without being

verified under oath, as the Returns of the Trustees of Common Schools are received without being verified under oath.

That those half-yearly Returns of Trustees of Separate Schools be received by the local Superintendent in the same manner as are received the Returns of the Common Schools.

That the Trustees of Separate Schools receive from the local Superintendent their share of the local assessments, and their portion of the Legislative Grant according to the average attendance of the Separate Schools, in the same manner as the Common Schools now receive their monies.

That all the Roman Catholics in any school section, or ward, where a Separate School is, or may hereafter be established, shall, after the time of such establishment, be recognised by law as supporters of such Separate School.

That it be not necessary that Roman Catholics be obliged to register their names with the Clerk of the Municipality in which they reside, so as to be held supporters of a Separate School; but that the fact itself of their being Roman Catholics be sufficient to have them recognised by law, as supporters of a Separate School within the section in which they reside; as all others are regarded as supporters of Common Schools, without their names being registered as such.

That at the time of Catholics separating themselves from a Common School, they be not deprived of their share of the property belonging to the said School at the time of their separation; on account of their having, according to their numbers, contributed towards the acquisition of that property.

That it is not equitable, that the Roman Catholics of Upper Canada should be deprived of their share of the property belonging to a Common School at the time of their separation, when the Dissenters of Lower Canada are not deprived of such property under similar circumstances; and therefore, your Petitioners pray that such injustice may no longer continue.

That in cities, towns, and incorporated villages, divided into wards, one Trustee be elected in each ward; and that all the Trustees on the different wards form a Body Corporate.

That in a ward where a Trustee is elected, but where a Separate School is not established, the children of the said ward be permitted to go to the Separate School in an adjoining ward; and that the Catholics in the ward in which the Separate School is not established, be exempt from all rates payable to Common Schools and to Common School Libraries.

And that the Catholics in the ward in which the Separate School is not established, be protected by their Trustee, elected from their wards, he being a member of the body Corporate of Trustees.

And, as in duty bound, your Petitioners will ever pray.

ORANGE MAGISTRATES.—The *Toronto Mirror* of Friday last, contains an amusing account of the sort of justice administered to Catholics by these partisan nominees of our Orange Government. The worthy in question, by way of adding insult to injury, holds—in cases wherein Catholics are interested parties—his Court in an "Orange Lodge;" and there plays such fantastic tricks as at last to make even his brother Magistrates interfere with, and reverse his decisions. Of course it is vain for Catholics to look for redress from an Orange Attorney-General, or an Orange Governor.

Hence proceed those accursed "secret societies," which are, and long have been the curse of Ireland, and are yet doomed to be the curse of Canada. No one but a fool can doubt that there, where Orangism exists and is fostered by Government, there also counter "secret" organizations take root, and spread themselves. We have in fact been informed that the extent to which "secret societies" are spreading both in Upper and Lower Canada is most alarming;—and that unless something be done quickly to check the growing evil, a considerable portion of our adult population will be enticed to join them; and in view of the rapidly spreading evil, we have been earnestly requested to remind our readers that every Catholic who, no matter upon what pretence, or what provocation, becomes a member of a "secret society" is *ipso facto* excommunicated; cut off from the communion of the faithful whilst living, and doomed after death to hell-fire for all eternity. Yet alas! it is to be feared that too many will still persist in disregarding the voice of the Church; and unless the Executive and Legislature of Canada adopt an entirely different policy towards all "secret societies" in general, and towards Orangism in particular, from that which they have pursued for some years past, there are but too good reasons for believing that these pests of social order, and religion, will extend their ramifications throughout the Province.

POLITICAL PORTRAITS.—Here is one from the pencil of the editor of the *Toronto Colonist*. If not a flattering, it we think, will pretty generally be recognised as a very faithful likeness of a *Liberal Catholic*:

"Of all our public men, perhaps none has shown such ingrained inconsistency as Mr. Sandford Macdonald. Conservative by education, but a Reformer by profession—Roman Catholic by creed, yet a supporter of secular education—Upper Canadian by birth and residence, although contending for a Lower Canadian metropolis—his whole conduct seems to be marked by the same kind of feebleness which causes a rickety child to be provided with an iron framework to sustain its uncertain steps. Detesting Mr. Brown with all his heart and soul, he still does not scruple to follow humbly in his footsteps, and thankfully accept such crumbs as he may scatter amongst his docile followers."

We beg to call the attention of our temperance friends to the notice of the Annual Meeting of the St. Patrick's Total Abstinence Society, which is to take place next Sunday evening, in the new Vestry adjoining St. Patrick's Church.

A CASE FOR THE FRENCH CANADIAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY.—As the "Swaddlers" are now in Session, we would take the liberty of calling their attention to the case of an apostate reported in *Galignani's Messenger*. The M. Bourasseau below described, is just the stuff that "Converts from Popery" are made of; and would be an invaluable as well as a most appropriate addition to the noble army of *Colporteurs* in Lower Canada. It is time that Achilli and Gavazzi should take heed to their Protestant laurels, for here is one who bids fair to be a most dangerous rival to the above named shining lights of the Conventicle:—

"A singular case of swindling was three days ago submitted to the Tribunal of Correctional Police of Beaupreux (Maine-et-Loire). A man named Bourasseau, after being a monk at St. Laurent-sur-Serre, a naval gunner, coachman in a house of Jesuits, servant to a lady of rank, and a concierge, entered in 1854 as monk in the monastery of Notre Dame de Bon Secours at Marseilles, founded specially for providing for indigent sick, and he assumed the name of Brother Raphael. In May, 1855, the Bishop of Marseilles authorised him to go about France to collect subscriptions for the community, and he got himself presented to the Emperor and Empress at Biarritz; he too obtained from the Bishop of Nancy, first chaplain to his Majesty, a letter of recommendation to railway companies, by means of which he was allowed to travel at a reduced rate. He made a large collection, but (as was afterward discovered) he, instead of handing it all over to the community, abstracted 1,000fr., and a silver watch, which he deposited in his own name with a tradesman at Marseilles. Some time after the Bishop of Marseilles authorized him to make new subscriptions in the north of France, and on going to Paris he obtained the protection of the late Archbishop Sibour. He was, on the Archbishop's recommendation, admitted to distinguished families, and he pretended to see visions. "I see the Virgin, the saints, and the angels!" he used to cry; "they speak to me, and encourage me." But suspicion was excited, and the authorization he had received to collect were withdrawn. He then went to America, and at Quebec, New York, Boston, Baltimore, &c., he represented to Protestants that he had abandoned Catholicism; to Catholics that he was authorized to collect for the establishment at Marseilles, and he obtained money from both. The Bishop of Marseilles, hearing what he was about, wrote to say that he was an impostor. At the end of November, 1855, he sailed for New Orleans, but was wrecked; he then gave out that by that disaster he lost 75,000fr. He afterwards visited the Danish island of St. Thomas and Guadeloupe, and raised subscriptions in both; in the latter island with the authorization of the bishop, whom he imposed on. In August, 1856, he arrived at Brest with a considerable sum in his possession, and from that place he went to Marseilles, where he asked the tradesman who had received his first deposit to accept a second one. He then applied for re-admission to the monastery of Bon Secours, and, in the hope that he would give up the money he had received in America, it was granted. But nothing could be got from him and he was expelled. Towards the end of 1856 he had obtained admission to the Dominicans at Lyons, but being found to be devoid of all religious principle, he was, at the end of four months, turned out. He was next heard of at Montpellier, where he bought a house for 5,500fr., and lived in it for some months. He afterwards went to Lyons, where he obtained admission to the Order of the Freres de la Sainte Famille de Bellay, but did not succeed; he, however, was accepted in another community in that city, but did not stop in it long. Afterwards he went to Genoa, where he was received in an orphan asylum, but was expelled in a fortnight. He next entered a similar asylum at Rouvray-les-Rouen, and stopped there two months. He afterwards returned to Marseilles, then went to Nantes, then obtained hospitality in the monastery of St. Trappe, at Bellefontaine, then in a monastery at St. Martin de Beaupreux, and then from the cure of Cholet. In all his peregrinations he solicited and obtained subscriptions for Notre Dame de Bon Secours at Marseilles, and he appropriated the whole amount to his own use. At Cholet, a commissary of police, from whom he solicited a gratuitous passport on the plea of poverty, questioned him, and not being satisfied with his answers had him searched. A sum of 2,000fr. in gold was found on him. The commissary arrested him, and all the preceding circumstances were then brought to light. When these facts had been proved to the tribunal, the man was called on for his defence, but he had none to offer, and was condemned to two years' imprisonment and 1,000fr. fine.—*Galignani's Messenger*.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—Yes. By referring to the Division List of the Legislative Assembly of last Session, an *Inquirer* will find that on the 28th April, Mr. Brown and M. Dorion voted on different sides upon the Bill for authorising the Grey Nuns to dispose of part of their real estate; and that on May 5th of the same Session, Mr. Brown and the members of the Ministry voted together, on the same side of the House, and on two occasions, for the Incorporation of the Orangemen, and against M. M. Dorion and McGee; who both, stoutly and eloquently, opposed that most infamous measure, both on the motion for its first and on that for its second reading. Here indeed there was a most monstrous alliance, and one ineffably disgraceful to all parties concerned therein; and our correspondent is quite correct in denouncing as the grossest inconsistency and the rankest hypocrisy, the clamors that have been raised against a "Brown-Dorion" alliance, by the very men who were the former's comrades in supporting the Bill for Incorporating a "secret politico-religious" society, whose sole object is to put down Popery, and to maintain Protestant Ascendancy. At the same time, as the *True Witness* is as little disposed to fraternise with the *Rouges* or *Clear Grits*, as he is to ally himself with the "Scarlet Brothers," an *Inquirer* must excuse us for declining to publish his communication.

MARRIAGE LAWS IN PRUSSIA.—Of the evil consequences of any interference with the jurisdiction of the Catholic Church in Matrimonial matters, the following paragraph from the "Foreign Correspondence" of the *London Times* furnishes ample proof; showing too, how the unrestricted right of divorce flows, as a logical consequence, from the premise that marriage is a mere "civil contract."

To understand what follows it must be remembered that Prussia, true to its Protestantism, and to the anti-Christian policy of which in Canada the Ministerial organs of the press are the exponents, altogether ignores the indissolubility of the marriage tie; and recognises the right of divorce amongst its subjects upon the most trifling grounds. Of the nature and number of those grounds we may form some notion from the subjoined extract:—

"The Bill on Divorce laid before the Lower House by the Mantuffel Cabinet in the session of 1857 proposed to repeal no less than nine grounds on which divorce might be obtained by the law of the land as it then stood and still stands. These nine causes of divorce were,—1, mutual consent; 2, deeply-rooted aversion; 3, continuing to frequent the company of a third party after the same has been interdicted by order of Court; 4, inability on the part of the wife to establish by proof the correctness of her conduct after she has quitted the husband's roof; 5, refusal of the duties of marriage; 6, impotence, &c.; 7, insanity and idiocy; 8, incompatibility of temper; 9, false and malicious slander. A Committee of the Lower House, to which this sweeping Bill was referred, so far modified it as to propose to leave four out of the above nine grounds in the statute-book, but the proposals of this Committee were not accepted by the House. Any compromise which the present Ministry can offer will fail to satisfy the demands of the extreme Church party; while, if they propose to touch No. 1 of the above grounds of divorce—viz., 'mutual consent'—they will raise a violent opposition in the country at large. They will not conciliate a man of the clerical party, and they cannot but irritate their own supporters."

We return our thanks to Mr. Lovell for "the Lower Canada Law Almanac," on a sheet compiled by George Finty, Esq., Crown Law Department. It contains, together with much valuable information, a Calendar of each month, showing on each day the courts meeting thereon throughout Canada; a complete list of the Judiciary, and of all the Judicial officers, in the different districts the terms of all the Courts, showing where, when and under what authority they are held.

OUR POLITICAL POSITION.
TO THE CATHOLICS OF UPPER CANADA.
(Concluded from our last.)

Leaving, however, these pseudo Catholics to pursue their own course, let us consider, Gentlemen, what is your policy and duty at the present moment. As your policy as conscientious Catholics must ever be in accordance with your duty, and as your duty must ever be in accordance with morality, it is from the laws of morality alone that you can learn your true policy. Now one of the clearly defined laws of morality is this—*I would beg of you to mark it well*—"When the instruments are confessedly evil, and there is no necessity of action, then you are bound to abstain from acting." Now to apply this fundamental axiom of morals to your duty with regard to the two great parties in the State. We have seen, I think, pretty clearly that both parties—"the Ins" and "the Outs"—are equally adverse to the Catholic cause—"There is no faith to be kept with Catholics," is their fundamental principle. If the one is sworn to do all in their power to oppose Catholicity, the other does it without being sworn. Both are equally inimical to the Church of God. Neither will grant her the least concession, except it be wrung from them by the direst necessity. Both then are evil, and as such it is impossible for you as Catholics to support either. You cannot conscientiously give your support either to "the Ins" or "the Outs." You may perhaps strive to solve over a guilty and reproving conscience, as some have done, by appealing to another fundamental maxim of morals; but if they will read this their pet maxim rightly, it will stand them in but poor stead. They tell us that of "two evils we must choose the less," and applying it to the matter in question, they argue that as both parties are evil, we must choose the less; that as both "the Ins" and "the Outs" are enemies to our religion, that we must give our support to that which is the less inimical. It is a fact worthy of note that this argument is used by the quasi-Catholic supporters of both "the Ins" and "the Outs" against each other, both claiming that the party they support is the less inimical of the two. If they would quote this maxim honestly, and in its integrity, they would immediately find the ground knocked from under their feet. "Of two necessary evils choose the less." Now in that word "necessary" lies the whole morality of the maxim. We are not allowed to choose the less of two evils, unless one of those evils be necessary—that is, unless we cannot avoid both. Now, no sane man will say for a moment that in the case of our present political position, there is any necessity involved. We are free to remain away, and are bound therefore to do so, seeing that both parties in the State are inimical to our dearest and most precious interests.

But because you cannot conscientiously support either party in the State, are you therefore, Gentlemen, to remain idle? Certainly not. Neutral you must or ought to remain, but passive, never. Whatever may be your duty towards the present contending parties, you never can lose your responsibility towards your religion first, and towards the State afterwards. You are bound to support your religious interest, and to oppose its enemies. Now in the present state of affairs, there is but one way left for you to do this. In the first place, to withhold your support from either party, as at present constituted; and in the second place, to form for yourselves a third and perfectly independent party in the State, whose object shall be, by unity of action, to wrest from the country an acknowledgment of your conscientious convictions, and a promise of concession towards them. This done, it will then be your duty to enforce it.

I must confess, Gentlemen, that with regard to the possibility of forming such a party I have great doubts. Not that I have much fear for the Catholic constituencies, but for their representatives. True patriots, that is to say, conscientious politicians, are too seldom met with now-a-days. It may be that a constituency has been kept free from all taint of bribery and corruption, and that a representative has been cast about for, and by apparent good fortune found, who, to all appearances, is of the right brand; a model politician—in short, an honest man. But alas! such is human nature—what guarantees have we that he really is so, or being so that he shall remain so? We have seen too many examples of self-styled Patriots in these our days to have much confidence in them. Like our winter Canadian larks, your Canadian Patriot is before election of the purest white; he is, (or says he is) honest, conscientious and incorruptible—the drifted snow is not purer from sight of contamination than his soul. But let him once be returned—let him but once feel the influence of the warmth of governmental patronage and place, and his coat is changed—he is in fact quite another animal. His own constituents would not recognise him. It is this that will form the chief obstacle to the influence of an independent party. Nevertheless the attempt must not, therefore, be abandoned. Honest constituencies must in time beget honest representatives; both in the course of nature, and because they will be forced by necessity and fear to act honestly. It becomes your duty then, Gentlemen, to form this Independent Catholic Party, totally irrespective of the Ins and the Outs—of the Liberal or Tory parties. You must form a Catholic platform, and by this you must stand or fall. Let it once be felt that you are united and determined not to support any party that will not guarantee you the planks of your platform, then and then only shall you obtain political justice.

A. U.

THE TORONTO LEADER. (Ministerial) noticing the proceedings of a public meeting of the Anti-Ministerialists held at Coteau Landing, on the 8th inst., and at which Resolutions strongly in favor of "Freedom of Education," and equally strong against "Representation by Population," were adopted—comments in the following strain:

"By whomsoever conceived, and by whomsoever concocted, these resolutions constitute the latest Lower Canada platform. And they contain much useful instruction. They show us that Representation by Population is openly repudiated by Mr. Brown's allies, in Lower Canada; that their motto is education under clerical influence and an extension of the Separate School system; that the Clear Grits are looked to as the persons most likely to have no scruples about putting their hands into the public purse to pay the whole of the casual rights, due to Lower Canada Seigniors. These are the conditions on which the Brown-Dorion alliance can receive any support, in Lower Canada. What say Upper Canada Liberals to the new platform?"—*Leader* 21st inst.

Remittances in our next.

We would caution all who buy Pain Killer, to be careful and call for Perry Davis' Pain Killer, and to take none not put up in square bottles, with Perry Davis & Son's note of hand on one side of the bottle, and "Davis' Vegetable Pain Killer" blown in the glass. All others are spurious.

At Richmond Hill, C. W., on Tuesday, the 25th instant, the wife of M. Telford, Esq., of a son.

Died.

On the 11th inst., at his residence, Manor House, St. Catharines, Mr. James O'Haviland, a native of Co. Londonderry, Ireland, aged 56 years.

On the 8th inst., in Cobourg, C.W., of inflammation of the bowels, Stephen McKenny, a native of Ballyshannon, Co. Donegal, Ireland—a good and sincere Catholic. May his soul rest in peace.

MONTREAL MARKET PRICES.
January 25th, 1859.

Flour, per quintal	\$3.00	\$3.30
Oatmeal, per do.	2.70	2.75
Wheat, per minot	00	00
Oats, do.	60	70
Barley, do.	70	75
Pears, do.	80	85
Beans, do.	0.00	0.00
Buckwheat, do.	50	55
Onions, per minot	67	80
Potatoes, per bag	75	80
Beef, per lb.	7	15
Mutton, per quarter	1.00	1.15
Pork per 100 lbs. (in the carcass)	6.00	6.50
Butter, Fresh, per lb.	25	30
" Salt, per lb.	17	18
Eggs, per doz.	30	32
Cheese, per lb.	10	15
Turkeys, per couple	1.20	2.20
Geese, do.	85	1.50
Fowls, do.	40	60
Hay, per 100 bds.	5.00	7.00
Straw, do.	3.00	4.50
Ashes—Pots, per cwt.	6.10	6.15
" Pearls, per doz.	6.40	6.50

GOLDS,
COUGHS,
ASTHMA,
CATARRH,
INFLUENZA,
BRONCHITIS,
HOARSENESS,
SORE THROAT,
WHOOPIING COUGH,
INCIPIENT CONSUMPTION,
BROWN'S BRONCHIAL TROCHES.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1857, by John I. Brown & Son, Chemists, Boston, in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the Dist. of Mass.

BROWN'S BRONCHIAL TROCHES.
Cures Cough, Cold, Hoarseness and Influenza. Relieves Irritation or Soreness of the Throat. Relieves the Hacking Cough in Consumption. Relieves Bronchitis, Asthma and Catarrh. Clears and gives strength to the voice of SINGERS. Indispensable to Public Speakers.

BROWN'S BRONCHIAL TROCHES.
[From Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, who has used the Troches five years.]—"I have never changed my mind respecting them from the first, except to think yet better of that which I began in thinking well of. In all my lecturing tours, I put 'Troches' into my carpet bag as regularly as I do lectures or linen. I do not hesitate to say that in so far as I have had an opportunity of comparison, your Troches are pre-eminently the best, and the first of the great Lozenge School."

BROWN'S BRONCHIAL TROCHES.
[From Rev. E. H. Chapin, D. D., New York.]—"I consider your Lozenges an excellent article for their purpose, and recommend their use to Public Speakers."

BROWN'S BRONCHIAL TROCHES.
[From Mr. C. H. Gardner, Principal of the Rutgers Female Institute, New York.]—"I have been afflicted with Bronchitis during the past winter, and found no relief until I found your Troches."

BROWN'S BRONCHIAL TROCHES.
For children laboring from Cough, Whooping Cough, or Hoarseness, are particularly adapted, on account of their soothing and demulcent properties. Assisting expectoration, and preventing an accumulation of phlegm.

Sold by all Druggists at 25 cents per box.

NOTICE.
THE ANNUAL MEETING of the ST. PATRICK'S TOTAL ABSTINENCE SOCIETY will be held next SUNDAY EVENING, immediately after Vespers, in the new VESTRY adjoining St. Patrick's Church. A full attendance of Members is requested.

EDWARD MURPHY, Secretary.
Jan. 27, 1859.

IMMIGRATION.
PASSAGE CERTIFICATES, PER SABLE & SEARLE'S FIRST CLASS LINE of Packet Ships, from LIVERPOOL to QUEBEC, NEW YORK, OR BOSTON, and also by STEAMSHIP from GALWAY, are now issued by the undersigned.

Rates and information will be furnished on application. All letters must be pre-paid.

HENRY CHAPMAN & CO., Agents,
Montreal.
January 1859.