

would be not only bad policy, but gross injustice towards the honest hard working man, were such a system of prison discipline enforced as should make the condition of the criminal, an object of envy, or even equal to that of the poorest and most destitute non-criminal in the community. Let us first cease to treat mere paupers as criminals; and then perhaps it will be easier to persuade society that criminals should be treated as criminals; that they are sent to jail to be punished, and not to be petted, converted, or exhibited on platforms at Anniversary Meetings, as babes of grace, and as the seals of the ministry of that eminent vessel, the Rev. Uriah Heep. Too much tenderness for the criminal is invariably cruelty towards the honest man.

## PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENT.

On the motion of the Hon. Mr. Morrill, a special committee of five members was named on the 5th instant, to examine into the amount of the resources at present applicable to the fund for the support of Common Schools, and for the establishment of district libraries; also to enquire into the propriety of compelling the Municipalities to apply the sums accruing from the Clergy Reserves fund, to the creation of a Common School fund.

Our readers will remember that—by the Clergy Reserves Bill—the sums accruing from the Clergy Reserves are, after certain charges, to be handed over to the different Municipalities, with leave to apply them to any purpose to which the Municipal funds are now applicable—and that the Municipal funds, though applicable to Common, are not applicable to Separate School purposes. It is now proposed to make it obligatory on the Municipalities to apply the above mentioned sums to the creation of a Common School fund; and if there be in the House one member, honest in his advocacy of the claims of the Catholic minority, and sincere in his professions of liberality, we trust that he will not miss the occasion which will be presented to him when Mr. Morrill's Committee reports, to move that it be also rendered obligatory on the different Municipalities, to apply a portion of the sums accruing to them from the Clergy Reserves, to the creation of a Separate, as well as a Common School fund. If it be right to have Separate Schools at all, it is clear that these schools are entitled to share, according to the number of their pupils, in all funds accruing from public sources.

On the same day, Mr. Dorion moved for a Committee of the Whole, to consider certain Resolutions on the Temperance Question. The pith of these Resolutions was—to make the licensing system more stringent; to prohibit any person from selling intoxicating liquors in quantities less than five gallons; to vest in the local Municipalities the power of granting licences, and make regulations for the sale of spirituous liquors; and to prohibit holders of licences from selling intoxicating drinks to any except lodgers and bona fide travellers.

Mr. Sanborn moved in amendment that the Committee be instructed to enquire into the expediency of a total prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquors.

Mr. Felton also moved an amendment to the effect that it was expedient to suppress intoxication by more stringent regulations for the granting of licences, and by punishing drunkenness as a crime.

A long and animated debate ensued. The Hon. Mr. Spence was in favor of a prohibitory law. Attorney General Drummond alluded to the effects of Temperance legislation upon the revenue. Mr. Stevenson attacked the prohibitory law, and stated that, wherever it had been tried, it had proved a failure. If he believed that such a law would be beneficial, he would vote for it; but he was convinced that it would do more harm than good. Mr. Smith (Victoria) was in favor of total prohibition. He thought that there should be a law not only to make a man who got drunk, pay a penalty, but also to disgrace him by suspending him from his office, if he held one. Mr. Hartman had confidence in the "Maine Law," which, according to him, had succeeded well wherever it had been tried. Mr. Lorranger said that the feeling of the House had been shown to be generally unfavorable to the "Maine Law"—and that he believed that out of doors, the feeling was equally strong against it. He opposed the idea of punishing the drunkard, contending that he was only a victim. Mr. Jackson had no doubts about the right of legal prohibition, but saw difficulties. Mr. Marchibon spoke in favor of Mr. Dorion's Resolutions. Mr. Rankin declared his opinion that the whole discussion on the question was worthless. In the United States, people carried about bottles in the shape of books, with the words HOLY BIBLE printed on them; from which Holy Bibles he had seen drawn spiritual consolation. Stolen waters were sweet, and prohibition would but stimulate drinking. He was prepared to vote, however, for any measure which would make it impossible to obtain spirituous liquors. Mr. Spence contended that licence laws would not make men sober, therefore the efficiency of the "Maine Law" should be tested. The loss by drunkenness, he estimated at \$4,000,000 per annum, compared with which the loss to the revenue by the total cessation of the liquor traffic would be nothing. Besides, the money which was now spent in drink would be spent on other dutiable commodities. Mr. Young was in favor of temperance, but did not think a prohibitory law the best remedy for drunkenness. On the Continent of Europe, where there is no prohibitory law, there was no drunkenness. In England and in Canada there was a vast amount. He would desire to encourage the use of light wines amongst the people. Mr. Laberge remarked that there was an immense amount of beastly drunkenness amongst the people of Upper Canada; but that such was not the case amongst the "inferior race" of the other section of the Province. Perhaps it was owing to this that amongst the French Canadians there was a feeling of opposition to the "Maine Law." No opinion in favor of that law came from Maine; and even if such a law were called for by the gross intemperance of the Upper Canadians, it was unnecessary in Lower Canada. Even the warmest friends of Temperance thought that such legislation was more likely to promote than to diminish drunkenness; and that religion was the best guarantee for sobriety, as for all other virtues. If however Upper Canadian members wanted a prohibitory law for their section of the Province, they were welcome to it. Mr. Powell warned the House against repeating the action of last Session. If a prohibitory law passed, an army of revenue officers would be required to prevent smuggling, and by the great body of the people it would be treated as a most arbitrary interference with the liberty of the individual. Mr. Wilson was in favor of prohibition. He did not think that the Anglo-Saxon race could be induced to abandon strong drink for light wines, and thought every one in Lower Canada was in favor of temperance.

Mr. Cartier—"So they are; but not for chaining men." Mr. Wilson replied that he believed the "Maine Law" to be the only means of promoting temperance.

Mr. Smith, of Northumberland, was in favor of the "Maine Law." He alluded to the American whalers, on board of which liquors were not used, and where, in consequence, the crew never got drunk. Mr. Ferris thought that the House was occupying itself with a measure which would end in a farce. Such a law as that proposed would be useless. In Lower Canada the people were in favor of temperance, because they practised it; they were however opposed to coercion. Mr. Drummond said that the House agreed that a stringent law was necessary to put down tipping. On this all were agreed, though they differed as to what that measure should be. The "Maine Law" had been tried, and had signally failed; and if enacted here, would, like all other tyrannical laws, prove a failure also. In New York, where the law was in force, taps were open everywhere; in Vermont it was still worse;

people went down into cellars and got their liquor there.—But though opposed to a prohibitory law, he was as strongly in favor of stringent licence laws as any one could imagine. Prohibition was contrary to the spirit of the British Constitution. Mr. Felton asked leave to withdraw his Resolutions, which was refused. The Inspector General did not think that the revenue question should be allowed to embarrass the question before the House. The House then divided; when Mr. Dorion's Resolutions were adopted by a large majority.

On the 6th inst., the Hon. Mr. Cameron moved for an address to His Excellency, for a copy of the charge delivered by His Honor Judge Duval to the Jury in the St. Sylvester case. It was reported that the Judge had laid down the law to the effect that—where a premeditated assault was committed, and the death of the person assaulted ensued, the only who had dealt the fatal blow had actually incurred the guilt of murder, or of manslaughter.

Mr. Alley supported the motion; and had no doubt that Judge Duval would be delighted to comply with it. He had been present at the trial referred to; and could state most positively that no such doctrine as that attributed to the Judge had been enunciated from the Bench—a doctrine attributed to him by papers which had prejudged the case, and which before the evidence in defence of the accused had commenced, had brought in a verdict of guilty against them.

Mr. Drummond was opposed to the granting the request of Mr. Cameron, as he felt that it would be establishing a very dangerous precedent to make newspaper statements the ground for a formal accusation against a high judicial functionary. Neither did he think that the House had power to call upon a Judge for his charge.

Mr. Somerville observed that this was not the first time an accusation had been brought against the Judge. Mr. Brown argued that on such a matter great latitude should be allowed; and then went on with some ravings about a man having been murdered in open day simply because he was a Protestant—for which he was very properly called to order by the Speaker. Mr. Lyon was in favor of the motion: Mr. S. Smith was as strongly opposed to it, and did not think it becoming the dignity of the House to take action on mere newspaper reports. Mr. Rankin would vote for the motion; at which Mr. Turcotte was surprised, and took the opportunity of giving a flat contradiction to the assertion of Mr. Brown about there being two distinct parties in Lower Canada. Mr. Lorranger would be glad to see the Judge before the House, as he was convinced of his innocence; but he could not vote for the motion on mere paragraphs from the daily journals. Mr. Rhodes hoped the motion would be carried. Mr. Felton considered the motion very indecent; and after some representations from the Hon. J. S. Macdonald and Mr. Drummond, the House adjourned till Monday.

On Monday the 10th the debate upon Mr. Cameron's motion was resumed. Mr. Drummond opposed it as irregular and an undue stretch of authority. Mr. Wilson (London) believed that neither the House, nor the Crown, could compel the Judge to give a copy of his charge. Mr. Cameron thought that, if the Judge refused to give a copy when asked, there might be no means to compel him. Mr. Macdonald, (Att. Gen.) without going so far as to say that the motion was unconstitutional would oppose it. Solicitor Gen. Ross could give no information as to the matter in dispute; could not say whether the Judge had laid down any such doctrine as that attributed to him, and did not believe that he had. Mr. O'Farrell, Mr. Bellingham and others having delivered their opinions, the House divided: 44. Majority against Ministers 4. The House then adjourned.

On Tuesday, Mr. Attorney General Drummond moved that the House do adjourn till Thursday, in order to give Ministers time to consider what course they should adopt after the adverse decision of last night. On Thursday he should move that that decision be re-considered. Adjournment agreed to.

## To the Editor of the True Witness.

DEAR SIR—I have just read a letter in the last issue of the *Mirror*, under the signature of "J. George Hodgins, Deputy Superintendent, Education Department, Toronto," presuming, according to his opinion, and of course for his own interest, to correct "the omissions and errors"—as he deems it to call them—in the letter of a correspondent from Brantford; but if Mr. Hodgins confined himself to matters of fact, as he promised, and not commenced by personalities and calumnies, perhaps he would have gained more confidence for himself as an official, placed in public trust.

Mr. Hodgins is a gentleman whom I have found very obliging whenever business called me to the Department over which he presides as Deputy; and it is with regret I am now obliged to convince him by facts, of his own errors and omissions, &c. It is an error for Mr. Hodgins to assert that correspondents from Brantford and Nichol are the only persons who make known their local grievances in public journals; for he omitted London, St. Thomas, Niagara, Thorold, Toronto, and many other places, as by weekly journals we are informed; and I may add that the Trustees of Catholic Schools in this Province have often sufficient reason to do the same. Mr. Hodgins is in error in asserting that the Brantford correspondent preferred "this mode of settling local questions" for he has in his office a letter from the Trustees of the Catholic school of this town since last June, asking information on very important local matters; and up to this he has not sent any direct reply. The correspondent from Brantford, Mr. Editor, did not "prefer this mode," &c.; and therefore Mr. Hodgins ought not to calumniate him. Mr. Hodgins is in error in reference to Rev. Dr. Ryerson's letter; for when I went with two Catholics of a neighboring school to the Office of the Township clerk to get certificates, it was there stated by a Trustee of a Common School, in the hearing of many, and even by the Township Clerk himself, that Rev. Mr. Drummond had received a letter from Dr. Ryerson, prohibiting the giving of such certificates. Mr. Hodgins is in error in attributing this error to me; he ought to have attributed it to those who substituted the name of Dr. Ryerson for J. George Hodgins; but of course it was taken for granted; and as a matter of fact, that Rev. Dr. Ryerson, J. G. Hodgins, and all other chosen officials, would willingly combine, and agree to whatever could tend to embarrass and cheat the upholders of Catholic schools. Mr. Hodgins is in error in respect to the information given "in person on every point." In December last, I asked Mr. Hodgins from what distance could the Trustees of the Separate School receive taxes, when persons wished to support said school; his reply was—"As far as would be reasonable." This was the only point I now recollect on which I asked information, and which was "satisfactorily explained;" but it appears that in January last, Mr. Hodgins explained it otherwise in his letter to Rev. Mr. Drummond, Local Superintendent.

Sometime previous to the passing of the Amended School Act of 1855, I walked on Dr. Ryerson, accompanied by the Hon. J. Elmsly, to ask information respecting the first proviso of the 12th Section Supplementary School Act of 1853. Dr. Ryerson having referred to the said section, and having read it, told me that the Separate School Trustees could receive taxes from Catholics at "any distance." This decision, Mr. Hodgins' information, together with the wording of the 12th Section Supplementary School Act, (which does not say a word in reference to Municipalities) led me to understand that, at least in justice, there could be no difficulty for a Catholic residing within 2½ miles of this town, to pay his taxes to the school in which his children receive their education; but, to my surprise, I found this man was, in January last, sued to a Court of Justice by other Trustees, and obliged to pay sixteen dollars and costs to a Common School from which he received no benefit; whilst he had to pay to the Catholic School for the education of his children. This act of

injustice reminds me of the *Tithe Proctor in Ireland*; and I feel astonished how, in the face of such an act, the Education Department can uphold the false motto—*Religio, Scientia, Libertas*! But since the wording of the 12th Section of the Amended School Act of 1855, which Mr. Hodgins has quoted for my information, differs very much from the 12th Section of the Supplementary Act of 1853, which was framed in favor of supporting Separate Schools, and not repealed, I will here quote it for Mr. Hodgins' information:—

"XII. And be it enacted that any person residing in one School Section, and sending a child or children to the School of a neighboring School Section, shall nevertheless be liable for payment of all rates assessed for the school purposes of the section in which he resides, the same as if he sent his child or children to the school of such section, and such child or children shall not be returned any other than the school of the section in which the Parents or Guardians of such child or children reside; but this Clause shall not be held to apply to persons sending children to or supporting Separate Schools."

This Clause evidently allows Catholics to send their children to a neighboring school, and to support it by taxes without reference to Municipalities.

Abstracting for the present, I will take a case in point. Suppose that Mr. Hodgins was placed in the position of the Catholic referred to, and that there was a Catholic School near his residence; that he, through conscientious motives, withdrew his children from said Catholic School, and sent them to his own Methodist School in Brantford; and that after having complied with the forms of the law as the Catholic did—nevertheless, he should be dragged to a Court of Justice, and obliged to pay sixteen dollars and costs, to the Catholic School from which he received no benefit; that he could get no redress, neither from a Catholic Chief Superintendent, nor from a Catholic Deputy; none from a Catholic Priest Local Superintendent; none from a Catholic Township Clerk; none from a Board of Catholic Trustees;—would he not appeal to a friendly Methodist journal to advocate his rights? and, as a British subject, reasonably expect, from the Legislature, protection and redress?—would he not be likely also to adopt the usual *Rant*? and say—these Catholics never read the Bible, and, consequently, know nothing of the golden sentence—"And as you would that men should do to you, do you also to them in like manner."—St. Luke vi, 31.

Mr. Hodgins cannot consider a journal a respectable one, which gives publication to any injustice of which Catholics have to complain, in reference to the Department of which he is Deputy; because if this mode be preferred, the same will certainly be discovered, and he will have to throw the whole scheme over board. Not a word to be said about the unnecessary labor, and great inconvenience, Catholic Trustees are put to, every half year, to fill up Reports; afterwards others must be filled up, in consequence of not being able to obtain *Blanks*, until after the day before which the Report ought to have been sent in, according to law. What means this apparent neglect?

Not a word to be said about the apportionment granted—not a word about the time the little mite will be retarded—not a word about the new and unreasonable formalities lately invented, &c.—not a word to be said respecting the ways resorted to, to kidnap, as it were, Catholic children, and induce them to go to Common Schools, where they can be returned with all others picked up in like manner, and draw public money without any voucher. Such glaring facts as these, together with the discovery of the effects, of long and deeply concocted schemes to annihilate Catholic Schools, (if it were possible), and to embarrass and cheat their upholders, have now roused Catholics to insist upon their rights; for they have received cause to be aroused. And moreover, I consider that a journal which would refuse publication to such facts, as the above, should no more be entitled to a respectable name, than a person who should see his neighbor plundered, and not the least alarmed, could be entitled to the character of an honest, or of a respectable man. So far Mr. Hodgins and I differ in opinion.

But, Mr. Hodgins has thrown the whole fault of the restrictive clauses in the School Act on the Legislature, and appears to claim to himself, in the absence of the Chief, a right to sit as supreme judge. In this also I differ in opinion with Mr. Hodgins. For, inasmuch as he is only an official, and strongly suspected by many of being partial, I think he has no right to sit in judgment; and that there ought to be a Supreme Board of Hon. Gentlemen, who would see that Dr. Ryerson and his Deputy executed the laws justly, and apportioned the public money fairly.—If the Legislature would deem fit to appoint a Supreme Board, as in other countries, and let the money received from every public source for education be distributed equally to every school, in proportion to the number of pupils attending, and to the time kept open, by a qualified Teacher, this would create a spirit of laudable emulation—and still there would be a principle of peace and union established among every sect living in common society.

I hope I have not advanced a word in this letter by which any person will feel offended. I have stated facts; to this I have been forced. But until Mr. Hodgins will correct his false charges, his omissions and errors—until he will give Catholics some little proof of impartiality in the discharge of the high and important public duties which he is entrusted—I will not take any public notice, on these points, of anything further he may choose to assert as Deputy. Still I do not say, Mr. Editor, that I will not again respectfully request you to give publication to many other facts relative to the unjust working of the School system, when I shall have leisure from indispensable obligations, which, at this time, press heavily upon me.

I am, Dear Sir, your obedient servant,  
J. RYAN, R. C. Pastor.

Brantford, Feb. 26, 1856.

## BROTHER JONATHAN,

HIS CLERGY, HIS DOGS AND HIS LAWYERS.

"The devil a Puritan, or anything else he is, but a time-server."—*Twelfth night*.

## To the Editor of the True Witness.

MR. ANDREW—I observe that you've been somewhat before hand w' me, in noticing what the *Herald* says about our neighbors—the Americans—w' regard to the annual amount o' silver they pay to maintain their clergy. "Friend Jonathan," he says, "pays twice as much for his criminals, nearly twice as much for his dogs, and six times as much for his lawyers, as he pays for his clergy;" and winds up by asking Jonathan if he is no ashamed o' himself!

"Ashamed o' himself," quotha! Raily, Davie, considerin' a thing, I, for my part, canna weel see how he can be "ashamed" to hae to pay sae little for either clergymen or kirk. Nor do I opine that even our modern *Seseraw* o' the *Witness* wad believe him to be "ashamed;" but I jalouse he wad rather be inclined to award him praise that he had sae little need o' them.

For, is na Jonathan the most moral creature on a'irth? Is he no' the most civil, and simple, and conceding o' citizens? Do you, even see, or hear o' him otherwise than uniformly loving his neighbor as himself? Then for what should he be ashamed to hae sae little to pay for clergymen? Do you ever hear o' Jonathan tryin' to play the braggadocio over any o' his neighbors that he thinks may hae ower muckle on their hands to prevent him tryin' to coze them? Do ye ever hear o' Jonathan gettin' drunk and playin' the Rowdy; and then w' bowie knives stickin' and playin' fo'k in breast or bum, as may so happen? Na, na. Do ye ever hear o' Jonathan committin' frauds, and forgeries, and burglaries, or o' cheatin' widows and orphans out o' their little savings, or adulteratin', as thers do, flour, or drugs, or spirits, and so on? Na, na, naethin' o' the kind. Does he no', on the ither hand, stand up stoutly for the Protestant religion, by meritoriously, and systematically persecuting Irish Papists? Is na that o' itsel' aneuch

to cover a multitude o' Protestant sins? Does he no, every ither little while, murder baita the Papists, and their wives and weans?—burnin' their houses, and, like Scillor's robber, chuckin' their little ones into the flames, because they were cryin' o' cold. And a' this just punishment indicted on the Irish Papists, because they had the presumption to exercise their right, granted them by the Constitution, of voting at election times according to their consciences; although in opposition to the wishes o' native Jonathan. But what o' that? It's just a' the mair meritorious in Jonathan to shoot the Irish doon like dogs when they daur to show their independence. Mair by token, his clergymen will, maist willingly, absolve him frae the sin o' sic heroic butcheries—that is, if they be a sin, whilk "broad" Protestants deny. Och! och! the pairt Irish, I'm often wae for them, Davie, to think that bigotry should hae the power to drive them frae their bonny native land to seek a hame among a people, who will not permit them to rise higher among them than mere hewers o' wood and drawers o' water, unless they become mean-spirited hypocritical apostates, by abjuring the worship o' their forefathers,—unless they make up their minds to a passive obedience and non-resistance. And then—

"The deeds of their sires, if their bards should rehearse, Iet a blush, not a blow, be the meed of their verse! Be mute every string, and be hushed every tone, That shall bid them remember the fame that is flown!"

No, Jonathan has little reason to be ashamed o' havin' sae few clergymen, when he can do his duty without their prompting. He is a decent man. You never hear o' him committing fornication, or adultery; you never hear o' him cheatin' young women, or auld women either; nor o' gettin' ower weel acquaint w' ither men's wives; or that any o' his sisters rin awa' w' ither women's men. You never hear o' Jonathan murderin' his wife or weans. Did you ever hear o' him flayin' live niggers, or burnin' them to death w' camphene? Na, na. Let naebody ever insinuate, even sic deeds o' brother Jonathan. Then where's the need for him to hire extra clergymen, seein' that he is just as weel whitewashed as he can be, and that a' that they could say to him cou'd na mak' him a shade the whiter. If onybody says to the contrary, tell them he reads his bible ower weel, and ower often to endarge in sic vagaries; and that he gies o'er monee bawbees to missionary societies, to feel ashamed o' the plentiful scarcity o' clergymen in his kintra. He hates w' a perfect hatred, and persecutes w' o'er firm and implacable a pertinacity, the Irish Papists, to be ashamed o' anything that onybody could say o' him. Mair than a' that, I'll wad a bawbee, that if a comparison were instituted—notwithstandin' the world-wide renown, and high pretensions o' his two cuisins o'er the water—to wit—Johnny Bull and Andrew Lang-kail—Jonathan will be found to be as moral a laddie as either the tane or tither; and Davie, lad, when ance the Bear ceases his growlin', and the Eagle folds his wing, and the Lion, ance rampant, shuts his paw and crouches down—each seekin' his repose, which we may hope will be lengthened, uninterrupted and peaceful!—then may you behold Brother Jonathan fall back with a sigh, intil his (un)easy chair and muse, upon the cause that made the waters—lately so rough, and in which he had hoped pleasantly to cast his fishing hook—become suddenly so still;—then you may behold Brother Jonathan become a pattern o' patience, a model o' docility for the edification o' a' creation. Maister Auldor, I'm yours to command,  
SAUNDERS WATSON, EDINBURGH.

Mountainawi, Mairch the aught, 1856.

As St. Patrick's Day falls this year in Holy Week, its celebration will be deferred until Tuesday after Low Sunday, the 1st of April next.

ST. PATRICK'S SOCIETY OF KINROSS.—The regular Annual Meeting of the St. Patrick's Society was held at their rooms, National Hotel, on Monday evening; the President in the Chair. The Secretary having read the yearly report, which exhibited the affairs of the Society as being in a most prosperous condition, the election of officers for the current year was then proceeded with. The following were elected:—

President—James O'Reilly, Esq.  
Vice-President—Jeremiah Mcagher, Esq.  
Corresponding Secretary—Daniel Macarow, Esq.  
Recording Secretary—Mr. P. Hyland.  
Treasurer—Mr. O. Farrell.  
Chaplain—Very Rev. P. Dollard and Rev. J. S. O'Connor.

Executive Committee—Messrs. Joseph Murphy, B. Summers, A. M. Brown, T. McInerney, O. W. De L'Armitage, Garratt Brock, Michael McNamara, James Garsupbell, Daniel Lynch, William Winters and Robert Cody.  
Grand Marshal—Mr. B. Fitzpatrick.  
Assistant Marshal—M. M. Donoghue.

A vote of thanks was passed to the retiring Secretary, Mr. Hugh Cummins, who for four years, discharged the duties of the office with zeal, fidelity and ability—and over \$40 was subscribed towards presenting him with a suitable testimonial of the Society's appreciation of his services.—A Committee was appointed upon the motion of the Vice-President to receive plans and estimates of a "St. Patrick's Hall"—a building which is designed to be an ornament to the city. Mr. Mcagher deserves every praise for the energy and patriotism with which he has entered into the enterprise. In consequence of St. Patrick's Day falling this year on Holy Week, the usual Procession of the Society will not take place until the third day of April.—*Kingston Herald*.

## REMITTANCES RECEIVED.

Kitley, D. O'Connor, 10s; Adjala, Rev. F. X. Pourret, 12s 6d; Belford, W. Mallon, 12s 6d; Osgoode, W. F. Kearns, £2; Somers town, A. M'Donnell, 12s 6d; St. Marie de Monroir, G. Harris, 6s 3d; West Troy, N. Y., A. Moncelly & Co., £3; Beaumont, Mr. Quiskally, £1; Dalhousie Mills, D. M'Donald, 12s 6d.  
Per M. O'Leary, Quebec—J. W. M'Ginn, 15s; M. Lamontagne, 5s; F. Driscoll, £1 10s; U. J. Tessier, £1 2s 6d; Rev. Mr. Horan, 15s; Rev. Mr. Desroismaisons, 12s 6d; Rev. Mr. Garioply 12s 6d; T. Walsh, 7s 6d.  
Per Rev. L. A. Bourret, St. Anne de la Pointe—Rev. Mr. Cecile, 15s.  
Per Rev. J. Walsh, Broomantion—Self, 2s 6d; D. M' Rae, 7s 6d.  
Per J. Andrew, Quiseau—G. Richard, 10s.

## Married.

At St. Patrick's of Rawdon, on the 7th instant, by the Rev. Mr. Quinn, Mr. Octave Germain Belisle, late of Australia, to Margaret Jane, eldest daughter of Alexander Daly, Esq., Crown Land Agent.

## Died.

At Quebec, on the 6th inst., Margaret Jane, only child of Mr. John Quinn, aged 2 years and 2 months.

## CARD OF THANKS.

THE Undersigned has much pleasure in acknowledging the prompt and satisfactory manner in which his claim for loss by Fire, on the 16th FEBRUARY, has been settled by the PROVINCIAL INSURANCE COMPANY OF TORONTO, through their Agent, AUGUSTUS HEWARD, Esq., St. Francois Xavier Street.

JOHN O'MEARA,  
St. Alexis Street.

March 13, 1856.