

rous, therefore, to expect of our Protestant contemporaries that they should interest themselves in the affairs of the latter, or feel keenly for the wrongs of the Popish father. Their sympathies are for the rich; for these who can afford to pay them for their tears, so much *per drop*; and who are prepared to make liberal allowance—cash of course—for every column of righteous indignation. For the wealthy, well dressed father, therefore, their sympathies are reserved; for the sorrows of the poor man, clad in fustian, and eking out a scanty subsistence by the sweat of his brow, they entertain a most decorous indifference. What right has a poor man, a man who cannot give evening parties, or invite his friends to dinner—to the sympathies of such fine delicate gentlemen as the editors of the *Herald* and *Gazette*! Here is one reason then of their silence upon the "Belleville Abduction Case." The victim is a poor man, and cannot afford to pay them for their sympathies.

Again he is a Papist; and that which is mortal sin for Papists, is not only pardonable, but highly laudable, when practised by Protestants against Papists. To malign, to slander, to invent and circulate the grossest falsehoods against the latter, is the business, the duty of every sound Protestant journalist; this is their vocation, whereby they gain their bread—how then can it be expected that they should seek to do justice, or provoke investigation into the rascalities of their co-religionists!

But if, as a Papist, Patrick Martin has no justice to expect from a Protestant press or a Protestant magistracy, as a Catholic and as an Irishman he is entitled to the sympathies of his fellow Catholics and fellow countrymen. These we invoke for him; and though even now, we do not presume to pass judgment on the merits of the case—because we have not heard the Protestant version thereof, and because we desire to be as impartial, as honest, and therefore as unlike Protestants as possible—yet we still contend that there is enough before the public to warrant us in calling for investigation into the particulars of this cruel outrage, perpetrated, apparently, with the connivance of the Protestant magistrates of Belleville upon a poor and unhappy Irish Papist. From the columns of the *Hamilton Times* we learn what strange freaks these same Protestant magistrates are in the habit of playing to screen their brother Orangemen from the hands of justice; and we have therefore but too good reasons for crediting them with an equal readiness to give their aid to inflict injustice upon Papists. In this Belleville case the magistrates may be innocent; but the presumption against them is strong, and the silence of the Protestant press is proof almost conclusive as to their guilt.

We should add that his daughter Mary Martin is not the only child that has been taken away and secreted by Protestants. There is a girl only 12 years of age who has been decoyed from her father's—Patrick Martin's—house, by a Mrs. Wills—a Protestant; and when her father endeavored a few days ago to obtain access to his young child, this was refused to him. "The father," adds our correspondent, "is perfectly honest, but very poor." He has not money to put in motion the machinery of the law: his oppressors are numerous, wealthy, unscrupulous, ready to swear to any falsehood, or to commit at a moment's notice any amount of perjury; and are moreover protected, aided and abetted in their villainies, by the resident magistracy. Here then is an appropriate pendant to the Miss Starr case, differing in this mainly—That whereas Miss Starr being of age, left her father's house of her own accord, unincited thereto by others—the children of Patrick Martin have been taken from him by force, and are by force withheld from him.—Such is Protestant justice!

"BROWN'S QUARTERLY REVIEW," JULY 1859.—The following are the Contents of the number of this journal before us:—

- I. "The Church and the Revolution—Conversations of our Club."
- II. "Public and Parochial Schools."
- III. "Complete Works of Gerald Griffin."
- IV. "Lamenais and Gregory XVI."
- V. "Napoleonic Ideas."
- VI. "Literary Notices and Criticisms."

We turn naturally to the second article on the list, to see what the distinguished writer has to say on the School Question; and whether he has therein allayed the anxiety which a late article of his on the same subject had occasioned amongst his many friends and admirers. From the perusal of this second article we rise with feelings of bitter disappointment, indeed we may say of pain.

"State-Schoolism"—or as the *Reviewer* pleasantly designates it—"the District School System" is an American pet; it is the pride of the American people, their boast, and really their glory. It is dear to their hearts, and we cannot strike them in a tenderer point than in striking their system, or do anything more effectual in stirring up their wrath against us, or in confirming prejudices against our religion." The *Reviewer* concludes, therefore, that Catholic opposition to the infidel and tyrannical system of Yankee State-Schoolism, is always injudicious,

often unjust; and feeling, as he tells us, "as an American as well as a Catholic," he has wished to vindicate the honor of his country "against the unjust aspersions cast on it by men who are indebted to her free institutions," &c., &c. For the rest, see any stump oration on the 4th of July.

As we, however, thank God, are not Americans, in the sense in which the *Reviewer* restricts the term to citizens of the United States; as we owe neither respect nor gratitude to their "free institutions;" and care not a straw, thank God, for their "pets," their "pride," or their "wrath," we, at all events, may, and will, speak our minds freely on the subject of State-Schoolism; and as a Catholic freeman, will still denounce that system as the most degrading that a brute despotism ever yet succeeded in imposing on a people. That a mind, naturally so vigorous and independent as is that of the *Reviewer* should find itself compelled to do homage to this foul "pet," is another and most melancholy proof of the degrading influence of democratic despotism; of all despotisms, the vilest—and morally and intellectually, the most degrading to its subjects.

Thus, whilst the *Reviewer* in one breath upholds the monstrous tyranny of "State-Schoolism"—a tyranny far worse, and more dangerous to civil and religious liberty than even "State Churchism"—has approved itself to be in the Old World; he in the next breath destroys the very arguments by which he had essayed to defend the former system; for he says:—

"We do not, as our readers well know, recognise in the State any right to interfere in spiritual matters, but we do recognise its right, if it judges proper, to establish a system of District Schools for all the children of the land, whether rich or poor, and to appropriate funds or to impose a public tax for their support."—p. 323.

Whilst again he tells us that he *denies*—

"Most energetically its (the State's) right to interfere with the conscience of any class of its citizens."—p. 340.

Now these two propositions are naturally self-destructive. The first is incompatible with the rights of conscience asserted in the second; the second is incompatible with the right of the State to establish District or Common Schools, in a mixed community.

For the *Reviewer* must know that it is as much an interference on the part of the State with the conscience of the citizens to compel them to pay for the support of Schools to which they entertain conscientious objections, and therefore, will not send their children—as it is, or would be, to compel them to pay for the support of a Church against which similar objections were by them entertained, and to which, therefore, they would not go themselves. Now who is to decide? who is to adjudicate betwixt the State and the individual, as to the validity of the Catholic's conscientious and supernaturally grounded objections, which he urges against being taxed for the District Schools? Not the State certainly; for it can have no legitimate jurisdiction in the domain of conscience. Competent it may be, and no doubt is, to decide as to the advantages of a particular projected line of railway, and to sit in judgment upon the merits of our public drains and sewers. But on the domain of conscience it must not trespass; but within that shrine it must not presume to set a sacrilegious foot; for when it does, when it does obtrude its ungainly presence into the recesses of that temple, then the rights of conscience, then all civil and religious liberties are trampled in the dust.

The *Reviewer* will not therefore we suppose attempt to assert the State, as judge, in its own cause, as against the individual complaining of the injustice of its School Laws, and in the supernatural domain of conscience. Neither is there, in the United States at least, any third party, distinct from the State, on the one hand, and from the individual on the other, recognised by both, and therefore competent to adjudicate betwixt them. There remains, therefore, only the individual, asserting his conscientious scruples against the School edicts of the State; and, therefore, the bare enunciation of the existence of these scruples on his part, should, in a State constituted as is that in which the *Reviewer* lives, suffice to exonerate the individual so asserting his rights of conscience, from all taxation for either State-school or State-Church purposes. But this is all, we believe that the most violent opponents of State-Schoolism contend for; and it certainly is incompatible with the right which the *Reviewer* challenges for the State of imposing a Common School education on all its subjects.

Were there a third party; a something between the State and the individual, recognised by both as competent, as having jurisdiction in the supernatural order, to sit in judgment upon conscientious scruples, admitting or denying their validity—then, indeed, but in such circumstances only, could the *Reviewer* logically predicate of the State a right to impose common schools on all its subjects, and deny, at the same time, its right to interfere with their conscientious scruples. Such a tribunal does not exist in the United States; such a tribunal can exist in no Protestant or non-Catholic country; and therefore to no Protestant or non-Catholic State can it be either prudent or just to commit the task of educating or controlling the education of any of its subjects. Material provision for their education it may make; provided always that that provision be equally and impartially dealt out amongst the members of all different denominations. But in a Protestant or non-Catholic State, common schools are utterly incompatible with civil and religious liberty; which consists in the total non-interference on the part of the State with the conscientious convictions or scruples of any, the poorest and humblest of its subjects. In that the Catholic asserts such

conscientious scruples against allowing his children to attend the District School, or the Meeting House, he ought to be exempt from all taxation, direct or indirect, for the support either of School or of Meeting House.

In his article upon "Lamenais and Gregory XVI," the *Reviewer* again trenches upon very dangerous ground; and without perhaps, defending any condemned proposition, or denying any of the positive teachings of the Church, he seems to us at least, to take delight in showing how close to the verge of the dangerous precipice he can walk without falling over; and with what skill he can traverse the dark chasm of heresy yawning below. His feats in this respect remind us of M. Blondin crossing the Falls on a rope. In either case we admire the dexterity of the performer; but we do think that the exercise is neither pleasurable to the spectators, nor profitable to the performers therein. And in some respects—as for instance in the case of the French Episcopacy, whose censure of the philosophical and theological errors of Lamenais, it is insinuated, was dictated by personal ill-will towards the latter—our feelings are pained by the indecorous freedoms which the *Reviewer*, a layman, permits himself to take with the duly appointed rulers of Christ's Church; and whose censure of Lamenais was certainly sustained by the Encyclical of the Sovereign Pontiff, even though the brilliant French writer be not therein indicated by name. True—the French Episcopacy is not the Church, and is neither impeccable nor infallible; but a censure pronounced by such high authority, confirmed by the most eminent theologians amongst the Jesuits at Rome, and, in substance, ratified by the occupant of the Chair of Peter, deserves we think consideration more respectful than that which the *Reviewer* awards to it.

In his fifth article the *Reviewer* makes no secret of his suspicions of the ultimate designs of the French Emperor. In entertaining these suspicions many excellent Catholics will agree with the *Reviewer*, though justice must force them to admit that the Emperor has not done much to confirm them. He is accused of having suppressed "liberty in France;" but this we think is unfounded; and whilst we are no admirers of Cæsarism, or of Absolutism in any form—whether monarchical, or polyarchical—we cannot but recognise the fact that there exists at the present day in France, far more true liberty, personal liberty, civil and religious liberty, than that country enjoyed under the corrupting *bourgeois régime* of Louis Philippe. The Church is more free than she then was, and her Pastors are more at liberty to control the education of her children, than at any former period of the present century; and such being the case, if Louis Napoleon is not justly entitled to the praise of being the "Restorer," he is at all events free from the reproach of being the "Destroyer" of French liberty. That he is a great man, in the ordinary sense of the word *great*, even we his contemporaries are forced to admit; whether he is a good and honest man, it will be for posterity to decide.

The ordinary *Notices and Criticisms*, complete this number of a periodical of whose literary merits it is impossible to speak too highly, even if as Catholics we cannot express our approbation of all its contents, and strongly deprecate the writer's views upon the School Question. We must not forget however that he is an American, a citizen of a strongly bigoted Protestant and democratic community. Under such circumstances it is difficult for most men to think freely, and impossible almost for any man to speak or act freely. He must consult "public opinion" rather than the dictates of conscience; he must accommodate himself and his utterances to the passions and prejudices of a brute majority; and it is but natural that he should earnestly deprecate their wrath, and submit himself to the teachings of their most sweet voices. Hence his tenderness towards the "American pet," ugly, ill-conditioned mangy cur though that "pet" be. However "*Love me, love my dog*," says the proverb, and the *Reviewer* seeks to testify to the world his ardent patriotism, by his affection for his country's darling; he will not therefore strike, or kick the brute out of his way, even when it defiles the Catholic Church with its noisome presence.

"THE VOLUNTARY PRINCIPLE IN ITS BROADEST APPLICATION."—It is pleasant to have our views as to the meaning which "Protestant Reformers" attach to this formula—"The Voluntary Principle"—fully confirmed by the leading organs of that party. Thus the *Montreal Witness* is in Lower Canada the accredited organ of "Protestant Reformers." On all politico-religious questions it occupies the same ground as does the *Globe* of Upper Canada; and fairly represents the views and policy of the said "Reformers" in both sections of the Province. "Representation by Population," or other organic changes in the "Constitution of Canada as it is," are advocated by the *Globe* and the *Montreal Witness*, as a means of obtaining a preponderating influence in the Legislature; and how that influence when obtained, is to be exercised—how it will be brought to bear upon our ecclesiastical institutions—and what the party known as the "Liberal Protestant Reformers," understand by the "Voluntary Principle"—shall be apparent from the following paragraph which we clip from their organ in Lower Canada, the *Montreal Witness* of Aug. 6th:—

"Mexico, Spain, and the States of Italy—not even excepting Sardinia," says our Reform contemporary, "are now writhing in vain efforts to free themselves from the power of ecclesiastical corporations, the result of the suicidal policy of past ages, which gave to these corporations grants of public money or property, and power to hold all they could wring from the superstitious fears of their rotaries. These were great possessions accumulated in the name of charity or religion, but chiefly of education. In this honored name did the Sulpicians and Jesuits, and Black and Grey Nuns get their great territorial possessions in Canada, none of which, unhappily, have been secularized, with the exception of the Jesuits' estates, but which must be secularized, so far as property held for gain or revenue is concerned, before the political liberties of Canada are safe."

This then is what our "natural allies" mean when they advocate "The Voluntary Principle."—The secularisation, or as the *Herald* would

phrase it, the "nationalisation" of the Church property of Lower Canada; of the possessions of the Seminary, of the Hotel Dieu, Grey Nunnery and our other religious, educational, and charitable institutions. We shall require strong proof before we believe that the Irish Catholics of U. Canada, generally, hold these views, or are prepared to contract any kind of political alliance with any party in the State that does. At all events, no one can pretend now that the Protestant Reform party are not clear and explicit as to their designs; and if amongst Catholics there be any seriously disposed to join that party, they cannot subsequently complain that they have been deceived; they cannot plead ignorance, at all events, of what kind of dirty work it is that their "natural allies" expect at their hands.

THE MISS STARR CASE.—The *Globe* and the Protestant press, generally, Ministerial and anti-Ministerial, are of course "improving the occasion" to the utmost of their abilities; and seek by heaping silly abuse upon the Bishop of Toronto, and the Clergy of the Seminary, to testify to the world the abundance and the depth of their common Protestantism. The following extracts upon this topic are from the *Bowmanville Statesman*, one of the organs of the "Protestant Reformers" of Upper Canada, and are worthy of George Brown himself:—

The Church of Rome knows no mercy, nor has it one redeeming trait in its character. The aim of the Catholic Clergy is to ruin the peace and happiness of every family. They delight in such acts of sedition as we refer to; and while asserting their innocence, as they did to Mr. Starr, profess to be glorifying God by telling deliberate lies, and ruining the character of helpless and unprotected females.

The abduction and concealment of Miss Starr calls for vengeance. It remains with Protestants to assert their rights, and at once to punish the offenders. Resolute homes, blighted characters, ruined hopes, and suffering humanity call for united action to drive the accursed papacy from our land; and happy will Canada be when she is freed from Papist broods, nunneries, and convents, with their myriad demoralizing accompaniments. Away with all connection with such a people. Let the Protestants of the present day act towards the Catholics as the Jews did with the Samaritans of old. Toleration is no longer a virtue.—*Bowmanville Statesman*, Aug. 4.

We certainly cannot but congratulate our Catholic friends of Western Canada, upon the good taste, the gentlemanly language, and truly Christian sentiments of their now-found allies; their "honorable and honored friends" the "Protestant Reformers" of Upper Canada! Well may it be said, that place-hunting, like misery, makes a man acquainted with strange bed-fellows.

ANOTHER GEM FROM THE "PROTESTANT REFORM" PRESS.—We are again indebted to the *Bowmanville Statesman*, one of the leading journals of the "Protestant Reformers" of Upper Canada for the exquisite little gem which we append; and which we trust our Popish readers will not fail to treasure up in their hearts as a token of the good will that "Protestant Reformers" bear towards their religion:—

"We ask for a change because we believe that a change is necessary. We wish to be separated from the Frenchmen in Lower Canada because we know that our connection with them is ruinous to our morals, our commerce, and productive of the vast amount of legislative corruption that is now and has been, cursing the country for so many years. They have made Responsible government a reproach and a bye-word, and have made it subservient to the wants and desires of that ANTIPODE OF PURITY, POPERY."

COLLECTION FOR THE POOR.—The collection taken up on Sunday last from the St. Patrick's Congregation was for the poor and amounted to the sum of Two hundred and thirty-eight dollars. The amount realised by the Picnic for the St. Patrick's Orphan Asylum, on the 10th inst., may be stated at above Eight hundred dollars. These simple figures of arithmetic are stronger and more eloquent than any figures of speech.

MEETING AT EAST HAWKESBURY.

A meeting—the object of which was, on the one hand, to discontinue the efforts made by a few obscure individuals to suppress the *True Witness*; and, on the other, to express the entire confidence which the Catholics of this section of the Province repose in the *True Witness*, and in its Editor, George E. Clerk, Esq., was held on Sunday last, the 21st instant, at the residence of the Rev. J. J. Collins, Pastor of the parish of St. Eugene, East Hawkesbury. The concourse was large and influential; the greatest unanimity and enthusiasm prevailed. The selfish policy of the few individuals who, in order to obtain places of emolument, had not hesitated to sacrifice the interests of Catholics, to deny a journal which has always defended our rights, upheld our principles, and triumphantly refuted the lies and calumnies cast upon our holy religion, was deprecated in strong and energetic language.

The unanimous voice of those present demanded that George Collins, Esq., fill the Chair, and that John McGuire, Esq., act as Secretary; when the following Resolutions were submitted to, and unanimously adopted by the aforesaid meeting:—

Moved by Denis Hurly, Esq., and seconded by James Brennan, Esq.:—

"That this meeting regrets and reprobates as injurious to morality and prejudicial to the interests of religion—the action of the parties that used their influence to suppress the *True Witness*, a journal so solemnly approved of by the Catholic Hierarchy of Canada."

Moved by John M'iver, Esq., and seconded by Michael M'Cormick, Esq.:—

"That the Catholics of this Township repose entire confidence in George E. Clerk, Esq., Editor of the *True Witness*, as the exponent of their policy as Catholics, as the upholder of their rights, and as the defender of their liberties."

Moved by Timothy Maloney, Esq., and seconded by John Ward, Esq.:—

"That the most energetic measures be adopted to sustain the *True Witness*; and that a Committee be appointed to open a new subscription list in favor of the *True Witness*."

Moved by John M'Namara, Esq., and seconded by James Maloney, Esq.:—

"That a copy of the proceedings of this meeting be sent to the Editor of the *True Witness*."

Upon the motion of Denis Hurly, Esq., George Collins, Esq., vacated the Chair, and John Ward, Esq., was called thereto; when a vote of thanks was given to the Chairman and Secretary, and the meeting broke up.

The immediate result of the meeting was the following list of new subscribers:—Michael M'Cormick, Esq.; Timothy Maloney, Esq.; John M'iver, Esq.; John M'Namara, Esq.; James Brennan, Esq.; James

Walsh, Esq.; Thomas Hoisted, Esq.; George Collins, Esq.

John McGuire, Secretary.

N.B.—The Rev. J. J. Collins, P. P., has, at the request of the meeting, kindly consented to act as agent for the *True Witness* in the Township of East Hawkesbury.

To the Editor of the *True Witness*.

Toronto, August 22d, 1859.

Sir,—The admirable address of the Bishop of Montreal, published in your last issue, and cordially approved of by the rest of the Hierarchy, is an important and well-timed document; the publication of which, at the present time, most materially assists in healing the breach which so unfortunately exists in our ranks; whilst the propositions of peace laid down by you in that connection are unexceptionable, unless, indeed, to those who prefer a state of warfare to one of peace, for the purpose of subserving their own interests by gratifying their ambition, or some less worthy motive.

You insist in upholding the "Constitution of Canada as it is" as a *sine qua non* to closing the breach with the *Toronto Freeman*; and in return you offer your aid in effecting a satisfactory settlement of those politico religious questions in which the Catholic minority of Upper Canada are more directly interested. Not being in the editorial secrets of the *Freeman* I cannot venture to guess at its course; but as a subscriber to that journal, and one of those who hailed its appearance as a phoenix rising from the ashes of its rampant party predecessor, I hail your pacific overtures with pleasure; and doubt not, but nine-tenths of its subscribers will do so likewise. For what Catholic who has lived in Upper Canada for the last ten years could put any confidence in the "*Clear Gills*" on any matter affecting the interests of religion? We know them to be a set of unprincipled politicians; equally fanatical, if less dangerous than the Orangemen. In fact we have little to hope for from any sense of justice held by either party in regard to our claims for legislation on separate Schools &c. Our policy then is to stand aloof from both extremes, and watch an opportunity of aiding ourselves by our own efforts.

Yours Truly,

PATER FAMILIAS.

To the Editor of the *True Witness*.

London, August 22nd, 1859.

Sir—Having given publicity, in your journal to a scurrilous article from a correspondent who signs himself *revera*, but who more properly should have signed *monday*, I trust you, who prides yourself on being independent and fair dealing, will give me an opportunity of replying. I should not trouble you, had you not endorsed the article yourself, and had not your correspondent indulged in a gross personal attack on me, in which the conventionalities of private life are not spared. It is all the more necessary that you should so favor me because the source from whence a scandal flows, should also be that from which reparation should be made. I am haunted by *revera* with "having failed in everything and am now seeking some 'God-send' or an office," I do not hesitate to pronounce it, a *libellous and malicious falsehood*. I cannot boast of wealth, but I can, of an unblemished character; free from reproach of any kind, the finger of scorn cannot be pointed at me as the betrayer of innocent female virtue. I cannot be pointed at as the vile seducer first and then as having entered a court of justice and sworn to the crime, against the victim of my own base passions. I cannot be accused of having sent any of God's creatures into ruin or disgrace. No! I thank my God and the instructions I received from pious parents in early boyhood I have been guilty of no such damning enormities as those above mentioned. Neither have I ever come in contact with the conservatives of the peace, nor have I ever had a policeman's "baton" descend with violence on my head for my disorderly conduct, let *revera* examine his conscience and say as much if he can.

I am, sir, yours, &c.

THOMAS COLLISON.

A Great Medicine.—No medicine ever offered to the public has met with such universal and signal success as Parry David's Vegetable Pain Killer. It is a sure cure for all kinds of pain. Try it and thank us for the suggestion. Sold by druggists.

The following Commercial Review has been taken from the *Montreal Witness* of Wednesday last.

Flour.—There is a demand for Fancy, which would bring \$5. No good Superfine can be had under \$4.50, although some low grades have been sold at 4.60. Extras are quiet. Unround Flour continues to sell freely at \$3.50 to \$4.

GRAIN.—No Wheat. Barley, 55 cents. Oats—No transactions.

ASRUS are not coming in so freely, and the price is tending downwards. Potatoes, 27s. to 27s. 6d.; Peas, 28s. 6d. to 29s.

PORK seems to have reached the lowest point. A slight improvement appears in New York, and a considerable lot of Mess, re-inspected, was bought here on Monday at \$16, at which price it cannot now be obtained. The retail price is \$17. Prime Mess, which is in very little demand, is held at \$14.50.

BEER.—There is very little demand for Beer in this market. The prices at which it may be quoted are \$8 to \$9 for Prime, and \$11 to \$12 for Prime Mess; but a quantity could not be forced off at these rates. BEETROOT is firmer, considerable sales of ordinary store-packed having been made at 12s. The market is now bare, and the quantity coming in is small.

FISH.—At a sale on the wharf on Tuesday, Dry Cod brought 20s. 6d. to 21s., and h-l-b-ls. of Round Herrings 7s. Whole Oil brought 48 cents.

Household and St. Ann's Markets.

Wheat—none; Oats, 2s. 3d.; Barley, 2s.; Peas: 5d.; Buckwheat, Rye, Timothy Seed, Flax Seed, Clover Seed—none; Butter, fresh, 1s. 1d. to 1s. 3d.; salt, 9d.; Eggs 9d.; Potatoes, 2s. per bushel; Hay, \$6 to \$7; Straw, \$4 to \$5.

Birth.

In Montreal, at No. 48 Chevreuil Street, on the 19th instant, Mrs. James Knox, of a son.

Died.

In Montreal, on the 21st instant, William Ryan, son of Mr. John Ryan, aged 17 years and 6 months.

In Montreal, on the 21st instant, Mr. James Money, late of Armagh, Ireland, aged 80 years.

CONVENT OF LONGUEUIL.

THE Ladies of this Institution will RESUME the DUTIES of their BOARDING-SCHOOL on THURSDAY, the 1st of SEPTEMBER.

COLLEGE OF MONTREAL.

THIS COLLEGE will RE-OPEN for the reception of Students, on TUESDAY, the 30th instant. No pupils will be admitted unless ready to commence the course of Latin.

CHS. LENOIR, Pre., Director.

WANTED,

A Situation as SCHOOL TEACHER, by a young man who can produce excellent testimonials as to his character; and who held a Model School Diploma from the Catholic Board of Examiners of Quebec. For particulars, apply, if by letter post-paid, to this office.