low a sew of the latter it is difficult to see. In face of the fact that to the Jewish nation more than to by other on earth had God's providence been paniested for hundred of years, this declaration the Alexandrian Jew is astonishing. It was inhed the error of Arius, who as St. Athanasius reates adopted the following idea of Christian theo-When God was about to call into existcony. "When trot was about furin) ence this world of creatures (tien gennatien furin) ence this world was too pure and lovely conscious that His hand was too pure and lovely conscious and inverse of participate immediately in the act He brought to participate only One, whom He called the Son or the Word, and who acting as an Intermediator (mesos genomenos) between God and the world, might create all things."

Truly "there is nothing new under the sun."

MR GLADSTONE AND THE PROTES-TATION OF 1789.

The following very important letter appeared in the Specialor of Saturday, March 13:-Sir,—It is time that the history of the "Declaration and Protestation signed by the English Protesting Catholic Dissenters in 1789" should be a little cleared up. If you would afford me space for the purpose, I will undertake to show that Mr. Gladstone has been betrayed into making a series of statements relative to that document absolutely unfounded and directly opposed to fact. Let me say at once that I yield, to no one in respect for Mr. Gladstone's sincerity, veracity, and honour; but in this matter I think it is impossible to acquit him of very grave negligence or, as I prefer to think somewhat rash credulity. It is hard, of course, to expect from him or from any person not a Catholic, and not trained in theological studies consummate accuracy in describing the proceedings of the Council of Constance or the Council of the Vatican; but it might reasonably be supposed that he could not utter half-a-dozen egregious misstatements in relating the history of an Act of Parliament, from which an hour's study of "Hansard" and the Statute book would have preserved him.

Mr. Gladstone asserts that "this very important document" (the Protestation of the English Catholic Dissenters) "brought about the passing of the great English Relief Act of 1771;" that "this Protestation was in the strictest sense a representative and binding document;" that the English Catholics "asked and obtained relief on the express ground that they renounced and condemned the doctrines" set forth in it, and especially on the ground of their declaration that they "acknowledge no infallibility in the Pope;" that the Act accordingly prescribed an oath "including the words. 'It is not an article of the Catholic Faith. neither am I thereby to belive or profess, that the Pope is infallible;" that the Irish Blshops in 1810 declared that this oath had " become a part of the Roman Catholic religion;" that by such means principally Cathelics "obtained the remission of the Penal Laws"-" the Anglo-Reman Bishops, clergy, and laity" having previously "rejected the tenet of the Pope's Infallibility"-and in Ireland the still stronger assurance having been that Papal Infallibility was " no part of the Roman Catholic faith, and never could be made a part of it;" finally, that the Roman See and Court, aware of these declarations and assurances, were "gailty of practising upon the British Crown one of the blackest frauds recorded in history."-(Vaticanism,

pp. 45 49.) Now if Mr. Gladstone will take the trouble of referring to the debates on the Relief Bill of 1791 in the 28th and 29th volumes of "Hansard" he will find that in all these statements he is more or less, and in the majority and more important of them, absolutely mistaken. He will find that Parliament was in no sense influenced by any declaration concerning the Infallibility of the Pope, but advisedly and avowedly gave relief in the Act to those, the vast majority, who refused to take any oath limiting the spiritual power of the Pope, as well as to those who were willing to take an oath in the terms of the Protestation. He will find that at the instance of the Anglican Bishop of St. David's the passage which he quotes concerning the Pope's Infallibility was struck out of by the Bill as it came from the Commons; and that, in a word, no such outh has ever been imposed by Parliament or taken by Catholics. (31 George III., c. 32.) Consequently it will be apparent that the oath which the Irish Catholic Bishops approved in 1810 was a different oath altogether from that which he imagines they were considering. So far is it from being true that the English Bishops, clergy, and laity rejected the Pope's Infallibility in 1791 in order to get relief from Parliament, the truth is that they petitioned and otherwise moved Parliament in 1791 not to give them relief under any delusion as to their true doctrines; and all the English Vicars-Apostolic, in two Encyclical Letters, one dated October 21 1789, and another January 19, 1791, condemned the oath which disavowed the doctrine of Infallibility, and urged their people to demand the rejection of any Bill imposing such an oath. I cannot conceive where Mr. Gladstone can have discovered any assurance from the Irish Catholics not merely that Papal Infallibility was no part of the Catholic faith, but that it never could be made a part of it. I find no citation to justify this astounding statement in either of his pamphlets, while he had an absolutely authoritative declaration in the opposite sense, that of Archbishop Troy in 1793, quoted by F. Newman (Letter to the Duke of Norfolk, pp. 12-13,) before him while he was writing "Vaticanism." Let me add that Archbishop Troy held in Ireland at that time about the same position and influence that Cardinal Cullen does now; that he was a prelate of very mederate opinions, greatly respected by and having considerable influence with the Government of the day; and that this statement was made at the time when the Irish Parliament was engaged upon its great measure of Catholic Relief, which opened every public career save that of Parliament to us. It fairly takes one's breath away to be told that all these facts are only the elements of "one of the blackest frauds recorded in history."

Mr. Gladstone may, however, suppose that the question of Infallibility was insufficiently considered in 1791, and that Parliament then took a leap in the dark. If he will refer to Hunsard, he will find that the topic of Infallibility and that of the Pope's influence on civil allegiance were as much in the air of public debate then as they have been since he published his Expostulation. Mr. Fox, in his downright way, goes straight to the point. Ho

"It was said by some that the Pope was infullible, by others that the Church and Council were infallible, but mone had over contended that that House was infallible; they might subject men to fines and penaltics for being better than themselves, at all events only for differing from them on the mode of worshipping the Diety." (Hansard,

vol. xxviii; c: 1368.)
It is to be observed Mr. Fox was here dealing with the question as to whether the advantages of the Bill should be limited to the minority of Protesting Catholic Dissenters, or extended to the majority of English Catholics, who objected to the oath disavowing Papal Infallibility. It is unfortunate that we do not possess a full report of Mr. Burke's speech, but the sentence, which you will allow me to quote, describing a passage from it is for every reason, worthy of Mr. Gladstone's attention. Mr. Grattan said of Mr. Burke that he not merely "knew everything" and "saw every-

forupt world which as organic or comservator. The second print of the grant of the grant of the second bring himself to greatest of my countrymen, I could not have so a doctrine it is difficult to see. In face imagined that in 1901 he would not have by anticipation the main argument of the Expostulation. Mr. Burke, as Hansard's reporter says :-

"Was likewise very successful in his irony upon the doctrine that much was to be feared from the Pope's power to release Papists from all allegiance to government and every other scruple of conscience by his dispensing and absolving power," (Vol. xxviii, c. 1372.)

Mr. Pitt too declared he was averse to drawing a hard-and-fast line between the two descriptions of the Roman Cathelics, and argued that, if the Bill were to pass in its then shape, it would be necessary to repeal certain of the Penal Laws, in order to do even justice to all Catholics, whether they were Ultramontane or Protesting Dissen-

"It would be proper to repeal those statutes, if the present Bill or any measure of the kind passed, hecause in that case, if relief of the nature proposed by his honourable and learned friend who had made the motion was granted to one description of Roman Catholics, and the statutes to which he had alluded were suffered to remain unrepealed, it would have something like the effect of re-enacting them, as it would appear that the Legislature, apprised as they had been of their existence. thought that the other description of Roman Catholics merited to have such disgraceful statutes remain in force against them."-Hansard, vol. xxviii. c. 1374)

The Bill, however, went to the House of Lords as a Bill to relieve Protesting Catholic Dissenters only, and with the objectionable oath attached to it, but apparently qualified by the addition of some words recognizing the Pope's Infallibility in spirituals. I have not been able to discover what those words were, but the Archbishop of Canterbury, though as I gather from his speech, disposed to support the Bill, objected to the form of the oath, on the score that it did not sufficiently define the limit of Infallibility. His Grace said:---

"To the oath there was obvious objection that though it denied the Infallibility of the Pope except in matters of spiritual doctrine it was certainly clear that whoever was admitted to be infallible in points of doctrine was admitted to be infallible in declaring what was doctrine, so that the restriction that was intended as to the influence of the Pope in temporal matters might be overcome if he himself chose to declare that such matters were not temporal, but spiritual." Hansard, (vol.

xxix., c. 667). Thus so far is it from being true that any fraud was practised on Parliament, the very question of the object and limit of Infallibility was plainly brought before the House, much as it might be if Parliament was now legislating in the full light

of the Vatican Council. By far the most remarkable speech in either House was that of the Bishep of St. Pavids's, Dr Horsley .. To that high-minded prelate, the Catholics of England are indebted for a trank, manly, and complete vindication of the grounds upon which they opposed the Bill, and for an argument against the oath disavowing Infallibility, so convincing that in committee the measure was enlarged so as to include all Catholics, the more objectionable parts of the oath omitted, and the Irish oath (the same substantially as that taken by Catholics until the Act 34 and 35 Viot., C 48, was passed) substituted in its stead. I have stated that the majority of the English Catholics protested against the anti-Infallibilist Clause of the oaths Bishop Horsley refers to this as a notorious fact. He says:-" Now, my Lords, it is, I believe, a well-known fact that a very great number-I believe I should be correct if I were to say a very great majority-of the Roman Catholics scruple the terms in which the oath is unfortunately drawn, and declare they cannot bring themselves to take it,"-and he fully justifies their doing so. He goes further,-he wonders that Catholics can be found of such a spirit as to be willing to take the oath. "I believe," he says, "the gentlemen of the Catholic Committee who declare themselves ready to take the oath will see some difficulty in particular parts of it when they consider the full import of certain terms." Happily Bishop Horsley's entire speech is given by Hansard. Mr. Gladstone might have expected to have some notice of such a speech and such a debate in Mr. Charles Butler's Memoirs, to which he refers as a standard authority. Not a word of it. But, be it remembered, Mr. Charles Butler was Secretary to the Catholic Committee to which Bishon Horsley so pointedly referred, and was the prime mover in their least creditable proceedings. The art of cooking Catholic history so as to suit the taste of the age is by no means an original invention of Lord Acton. It appertains to the gentlemen of

that school in all generations.

But the question remains-Was the Protestation signed, as Mr. Gladstone asserts, by the four English Vicars-Apostolic and a great number of Cathelics? and did it declare " we acknowledge no infallibility in the Pope"? It was so signed, and it did so declare. It was a very great mistake, but it was instantly, amply, openly repented of and atoned for. The proceedings in Parliament suffice to show that the great majority of English Catholics would not consent to purchase civil liberty on such terms. The four Vicurs-Apostolic, immediately after the Protestation was published, on October 21, 1789, solemnly condemned the oath proposed to be founded upon it (the eath of the Protesting Catholic Dissenters); in this condemnation the Bishops of Ireland and Scotland agreed; and it was promptly confirmed by the Holy See. So that, though there was a great mistake, there was no deception of Parliament and no fraud upon the Crown. On January 19, 1791, the Vicars-Apostolic, in a letter to all the Faithful of their respective districts, on the eve of the introduction of the Bill into Parliament, renewed their condemnation of the oath; called upon all good Catholics to petition Parliament not to pass any measure containing such an oath; and expressly repudiated the name "Protesting Catholic Dissenters," a name surely as offensive to Catholic cars as I suppose the name "Romani ing Protestant Ritualists' would be to members of the Church of England now-a-days. It is mentioned by one of the speakers in the House of Lords that copies of the condemnation and objections to the Bill were generally circulated among Members of both Houses. It is plain from these speeches that the great leaders on both sides of the House were fully informed as to the issues involved. Mr. Gladstone throughout argues as if the Protestation emanated from some adequate anthority in the Catholic Church. He has overlooked Mr. Butler's statement that it was drawn up by Lord Stanhope, who (so Mr. Butler says) did not even consult any Catholic of his acquaintance as to its terms. It is in its form and verbiage an essentially Protestant decument. In particular—the statement concerning Infallibility is brought in, as it were, inadvertently and gratuitously, and without direct reference to the charge to which the paragraph containing it purports to reply. My own belief is that those who signed the paper, on trust or at random, did not at the moment discern the difference between sayings that they did not "acknowledge" Infallibility, and saying, what all Catholics did and could safely say before 1870, that it was not a defined "article of faith." But. as I have already stated, 4the error was promptly

the Catholics of this country.

I cannot close this letter without saying in all ter. I have that sense of his immortal labours for | 50 cts. the good of my country, vainly spent as they may seem for the present day to have been on an ingrate generation-I have the true knowledge of the heroic zeal with which he gave all his genius, capacity, and influence to the service of Ireland in those years of his glory-that it has been a great pain to me to have to say what I have said. But I have also that confidence in his magnanimity and love of truth that I feel sure he will thank me if I have succeeded, as I hope I have, in showing that he has in haste made a mistake which it can only be to his honour to correct, in uttering a charge of such a cruel character against the memory of men, who, though they erred for a moment through "a blunder of the sudden," did not hesitate, at the risk of public obloquy and continuous civil outlawry, to avow their unpopular principles,-so ap proving themselves both honest Englishmen and orthodox Catholics.—I am Sir, &c.,

AN IRISH CATHOLIC. .

JOHN BRIGHT AND FATHER O'MAL-LEY.

To the Editor of the TRUE WITNESS.

DEAR SIR. - Your respected Correspondent 'Sacerdos' (whose letters I always read with pleasure and profit) in your last week's issue has fallen unwittingly into an error in supposing that John Bright's letter referred to by him was addressed to the Irish Home Rule Movement under the leadership of Mr. Butt. Such was not the case. Mr. Bright's letter was written to the Reverend Thaddeus O'Malley, author of a pamphlet on "Federalism" which the Rev. gentleman had sent to Mr. Bright with a letter asking his opinion on it; this he certainly got in language not very complimentary to the wisdom of its Rev. author.-Now it should be borne in mind and well understood that the scheme of Federalism proposed by Father O'Malley in his pamphiet, is not the "Federal plan" called Home Rule adopted at the Great Home Rule Conference held in Dublin Nov. 1873, which is the platform of the Nationalists of Ireland -that the two plans differ in many essential particulars. So much so that Father O'Malley stands alone without a single supporter to his "absurd" scheme, as Mr. Bright calls it. On the other hand the Home Rulers have the hearty and the unanmous support of the Nationalists of Ireland. Father O'Malley's "Federalism" is what Mr. Bright has assailed, calling it "absurd and monstrous proposition, and not the present popular plan of Home Rule, so ably and so eloquently supported by Mr. Butt, Mr. A. M. Sullivan the late lamented Mr. Martin, and the other Nationalists of Ireland. I enclose an abstract from an able Editoral, on Father O'Malley's work and Mr. Bright's letter, cut from " The Nation" of the 6th March last commenting on this subject that will show the estimation in which Father O'Malley's visionary scheme is held in Ireland and as "The Nation" is the organ of the " Irish Home Rule League" it speaks with au-

By your inserting this letter and the extract referred to in your next isssue, you will oblige a Home Ruler and an old friend and admirer of the TRUE WITNESS.

April 26th, 1875.

The following are the extracts. "MR. JOHN BRIGHT AND THE REV. MR. O'MALLEY.

"We are not for taking Mr. Bright's opinion on any question of Irish politics for one whit more it is worth. Mr. Bright is an Englishman with large and liberal opinions on many questions but when the question is of the national rights and liberties of Ireland his liberality vanishes and those strong national prejudices which are deepscated in his nature come to the front. But in the particular instance now before us, we have no hesitation in saying that we agree almost entirely with the views stated by Mr. Bright. We agree with him in regarding the Rev. Mr. O'Malley's proposal for the establishment of Federal Parliaments in each of the three kingdoms as utterly visionary and impracticable. Of course the Federalisation of the whole British empire is not a political impossibility, no more than is the conversion of England into a Republic; but speaking in view of all the existing facts, and with reference to as far distant a future as living men need care to think about, we set these things down as incapable of realisation. It would be quite within the power of the English people to effect such changes in their form of government if they thought fit, but they show no disposition to do anything of the kind and no proposal to that effect addressed to them from Ireland will ever induce them to turn their thoughts in that direction. Mr. O'Malley's labour to recommend to them the overthrow of their existing constitution and the substitution of a Federal scheme for it, is therefore labour lost. But we would wish Mr. Bright and everyone else, to understand that with the Rev. Mr. O'Malley's political scheme the Irish Home llulers have nothing to do. Father O'Malley is a venerable, amiable, and respected clergyman, but this proposed Federation of the three kingdoms is a fancy of his own, an ideal creation which he fondles and nurses with great affection, but for which he can get no one else in Ireland to say a good word. His project is entirely too wild and chimerical to be approved of for a single moment by the common sense of the Irish people.

"Indeed, we can hardly conceive a wilder notion than that to the furtherance of which the Rev. Mr. O'Malley applies himself in his "little book." is, of course, quite open to him to propose that or any other political scheme which commends itself to his mind, publish it, and call attention to it, on his own responsibility, and no one has any right to complain, so long as Mr. O'Malley's peculiar views are not attributed to other people. But, as a matter of fact, some persons appear to suppose that the Rev. Mr. O'Malley, in this matter, is an exponent of the principles of the Irish Home Rule movement. No opinion could be more unfounded. There is not in the ranks of the Home Rule League, nor, we believe, within the shores of Ireland, a single man willing to join the Rev. Mr. O'Malley in advocating the political project with which that reverend gentleman, is so enchanted. Father O'Malley stands alone on that ground; he cannot find a human being to share it with him. We cannot be surprised that Mr. Bright-or anyone else -should refer to his proposed Federalism of the three kingdoms as a mere fantasy altogether outside the range of practical politics; but we wish that at all events it should be clearly understood that the Irish Home Rule movement is a thing altogether distinct and different from the scheme put before the public by Father O'Malley in his "little book," and that Irish Home Rulers are content to stand upon their national right in demanding a local legislature for the management of their local affairs, leaving England and Scotland to enjoy their own constitution, mould their form of government, and deal with their own affairs as they may think proper." - Dublin Nation, March 6th.

"LA CREME DE LA CREME."-We liave received No. 17 of this musical monthly, and its contents and manfully atoned for. Our Catholic politics exceed, if anything those of the previous numbers. are, I am afraid, often very stupid, but I think it. The present number contains four first class pieces. cannot be denied that they are always fairly of Music, for which the publisher's price is one straightforward. I submit that, under the circum- dollar and ninety cents but they can be procured

he Eternal God should come in contact with this thing," but that he "foresaw everything." Great stances, it is rather an abuse of terms to treat such for the small sum of fifty cents. The following or the world whether as Creator or Conservator." as is my veneration for the genius of the protestation as, "in the strictest are the contents of the envrant number of the protestation as, "in the strictest are the contents of the envrant number of the envrant num rice Imitatif, by C. B. Lysberg; La Bohemienne. Romance, by E. Ketterer; Morning Dew. Morecau sincerity that I wish the task had not fallen to my de Salon, by S. Smith. Published by J. L. Peters, hand of exposing Mr. Gladstone's sin in this mat-

CANADIAN ITEMS.

THE CONGREGATION DE NOTRE DAME, OTTAWA .-THE NEW CHAPEL.—On Tuesday morning 20th inst. the new chapel of the Convent of the Congregation de Noire Dame, Centre Town, was blessed, and the altar consecrated by His Lordship Bishop Duhamel, according to the prescribed ritual. His Lordship was assisted by the Very Rev. Vicar-General Jouvent, Rev. Fathers Collins, Barrett, Durocher, O'Connor (Alexandria,) &c., and Revs Dr. O'Connor, Father Porcile, and other clergymen, whose names we did not learn, were also present. The ceremony was most interesting and impressive especially the consecration of the altar, which, as we before remarked, is the first marble altar ever raised in Ottawa, and display most admirable elegance of design, as well as great artistic skill in execution. The main piece of the altar 1s of Brockadilla marble, the columns of the tabernacle of Amprior marble, and the whole of the workmanship was executed at Mr. W. Somerville's establishment in this city, which adds much to its already well established reputation by turning out such admirably chaste handiwork .- Standard.

Hon. John Young's plan for the improvement of Montreal harbour is as follows:—A wide channel cut from the Lachine rapids would supply a great water power: the water from this would be utilized to fill a main hydraulic dock built on the shoals outside of Mill-street, and between it and Victoria Bridge; around the edge of this basin would be mills and factories driven by the strong head of water. Between Mill-street dock, 3,100 feet long, 300 feet wide, and 20 feet deep, which would be entered by a does water channel vessels coming into the canal could enter two large basins at Point St. Charles, one of which is now partially constructed in connection with another scheme. There would also be direct entrance to the hydranlic dock from the "Distributing Basin." The island shoal would be made use of, and a wharf be built around it if necessary. Railway trains would run from Point St. Charles alonside the two western basins, and also by means of bridges over the entrance to the hydraulic dock down on both sides of the Mill-street dock. Between the two railway bridges would be the entrance to large floating and dry docks.

There died in Napanee on Monday morning last one of its oldest residents in the person of Mrs John Hosey, who has resided there without change since 1812. Having been born on the 19th July, 1781. she was in her ninety-fourth year; and to the very last moment the stirring scenes in that remote period of the history of Canada were fresh in her memory, and her clear remembrance of the War of Indenendence and the particular incidents connected with it of local importance were always listened to with intense interest. When she and her husband removed to Napinee, there were but two stores, a tavern and two or three residences, and she lived to see it spring from this small hamlet into one of the most flourishing and prosperous towns in the Doaoiaim.

Mr. Robert Follis, of Tenth Concession of Turnberry, went into the swamp to chop some cedar The first tree he cut down lodged on a hemlock stub, standing about twenty feet high. Mr. Follis then climbed up the cedar and got on top of the stub, which appeard to be solid, to let the cedar down but, unfortunately for him it proved to be hollow in the centre, and as soon as he got his weight or it, he sank down to the bottom, and could not ext cate himself. As he did not get home at dan several neighbors went in search of him with lantern and did not find him until about ten o'cloc when he was heard calling for help. A pole w then reached down to him, which he managed take hold of, and was hauled out. He was pret well cramped up, having been in such a positi that he could not move for about nine hours.

PROMOTION.—We are glad to learn that Mr. J Hanley, G. T. Station Master at this place, is be promoted, his future station not being decid yet, but supposed to be Napanee. At the same tit we rearct his removal from Gananoque, as duri the time he has been here, his accommodating a friendly manner has made him exceedingly popul and doing business with him is literally combining business with pleasure. We believe he is to succeeded by the present Agent at Mallorytown. Gananoque Reporter.

REGISTERED LETTERS.—We have before us an genous check book, to be used by merchants for the purpose of checking the number of registered lette given to their clerks for postal delivery. The boo is taken to the post office, when the official charge marks the number of letters delivered him and affixes his initials in proof. The blan are so arranged that the receipt of letters is record in the same manner. The book has been approv of by the Postmaster General, and will, no doug provean acquisition to the counting-room of o merchants and business men .- Gazette.

A strong whirlwind visited Robin's Hill, ne Napance, on Monday, the 19th inst., and uncereme iously took possession of a partly enclosed no frame house belonging to Mr. Wesley Dies, whi it raised into the air some ten feet from its found tion, throwing it down nearly a complete wrec The building was what is called a balloon fran 16 x 24 feet. It will require to be rebuilt from t foundation.

REMITTANCES RECEIVED.

Lake Temiscamingue, Rev F P, \$2; Lachine, Rev P O, 2; New Glasgow, P S, 1; La Presentation, Rev J S, 2; Ormstown, P M, 2; Cadyville, N. Y. Rev F McG, 2; Ray of Islands, Nfld, Rev F S, 2.25; Windsor, Mrs M B, 2; Gaspe Basin, Rev M B, 2; Chippewa Falls, Wis, D C, 2.50; Gaspe Basin, A J P. 2; Woonsocket, R I, Rev'N A R, 2; Oxford Centre, JH, 4; Hamilton, M J F, 2; Morrisburgh, D McH, 2; Mountjoy, M D, 2; Springtown, P K 1; Beaverion, DAC, 2; St Andrews, JH McD, 2; DMcM2; St Urbain, Rev AF, 5; Amprior, DS, 2; Hopefield, J M, 2; St Sylvestre, D H, 3; Kingston, J G, 2; St Canute, J M, 2; Egerton, J B. 50cts ; Wheatland, J.R., 2; Tracadle W.D., 3; Williamstown, Mrs. M.C.F., 4; Rigaud, J.O.C. 1,50; Lansdown, T McG, 2; Tweed, Miss H M D, 1; St Joseph d'Ely, Rev A D, 1; Huntington, J H. 1,50 Portneuf, Rev F D, 2.

Per J B McM, Lochiel—A B McM, 2; H McD, 2.

Per J McI, Port Hawkesbury, N S-Self, 2; M D, 2. Per P N, Thurso-M O'L, 1.50; J McD, 1.50; W

Per Rev D O'C, South Douro-Haultain, R S, 2. Pet F L E, Kingsbridge-C McC, 2; J 6, 1. Per J H, Guelph-Self, 2; J B, 4; B C, 2; Mrs K, 1; MC, 3.

Per A B, Mayo—M L, 1.50.

Per Rev F W, Huntingdon—Self, 1.50; J F 1. 50; T M, 1.50 J D, 1.50; W F, 1.50; M McD, 1.50; W.W. Jr., 1.50; J.C. 1.50; W.H, 1.50; H. P. 1.50; Landerville, W.D., 1,50. Landerville, W D, 1,50. *

Per L S, Sheenborough Self: 1,75; W D, 1,75; E C, 3,50; J S, 1,75; G M, 1,75; P M, 1,75; J S 1,75; T H, 1,75; B Mag, 1,75; J M, 1,75; Fort William W J, 1,75

William, W J. 195.

Per Mrs McI, Port Hawksbury, N. S.—Low River Inhabitants, A. L. 2. Standard Co. Per J.H. Eganville—Self, 2; Oscola, O.C. 2. Per W H, Lacolle-S D, 2,50.

Per T M, Peterborough-Self 3; South Bouro, G Per J H, Chambly Canton-Self, 2; Mrs. M, 3,17. Per P P L, Belleville-W C, 2. Per D C, Halifax, N S-Sheet Harbor J F McK. 4. Per L L, Kemptville—Self 2, J C, 2. Per T D, Marysville—T H, 2. Per J D, Leeds Village-Lancaster, N. H. M D. Per JL, Perth-JM, 2; WF, 2.

Ð

Married.

At St. Patrick's Church, on the 20th inst, by the Rev. P. Dowd, P.P., Martin Cassidy to Jennie Cahalane, both of this city.

At the Cathedral of Montreal, on the 20th April inst., by the Most Beverend E A. Taschereau, Archbishop of Quebec-in the presence of the Right Reverend Bishop of Gratisnopolis-Edward Antile Panet, Esq, N.P., to Miss Marie Louise Elizabeth Terroux, second daughter of Robert Terroux, Esq. Died.

In Ottawa en April 23, after a long and painful illness which he bore with Christian resignation, Edward Farrell, a native of the Co. Wexford, Ireland. Aged 53 years. R.I.P.

At St.John's, P Q., on the 21st inst., John Duns, formerly of Chambly, and lately of Stanbridge East, azed 69 years .- R.I.P.

MONTREAL WHOLESALE MARKETS.—(Gazette)							
Flour & brl. of 196 B.—Pollards \$3.45 @ \$3.60							
Superior Extra 5.15 @ 5.26							
Extra Superline 4.90 @ 5.00							
Fine 3.90 @ 4.00							
Strong Bakers' 4.70 @ 4.90							
Middlings							
City bags, [delivered]							
Outment per bushel of 200 lbs 5.59 @ 5.60							
Corn, per bushel of 56 lbs 0.79 @ 680							
Pease, per bushel of 66 lbs. 0.00 @ 1.0.							
Barley, per bushel of 48 lbs 0.70 @ 0.70							
Lard, per lbs							
Cheese, per list.							
do do do Finest new 0.00 @ 0.00							
Pork—New Mess							
Thin Mess							
Firsts 5.55 @ 5.60							
Pearls-Firsts 8.70 70 6.70							
Butter-Market quiet; rates are 14c to 18c, ac-							
cording to quality. Roll at 15c to 16c; New as 20c to 22c.							

١					
	TORONTO FARMERS MARKE	CT	(<i>Q</i> u	obe.)	
ո	Wheat, fall, per bush			-	00
[و	do spring do		94	0	94
٠, ١	Barley do	1	00	1	02
,	Oats do	ŧ	48	o	47
٠.	Peas do	0	85	0	86
۰١	Rye do	0	00	0	00
-	Apples, per brl	0	00	0	00
'n	Geese, each	()	55	0	75
h	Turkeys	Ú	70	Ĩ	00
۱- ا	Cabbage, per doz	0	50	0	60
n.	Onions, per bush	0	75	I	60
0	Dressed hogs per 100 lbs	в	50	9	ÓU
e	Beet, hind-qrs, per lb	6	50	н	00
۱- ا	" fore-quarters	4	50	6	00
1	Mutton, by carcase, per 1b.	3	00	9	00
	Potatoes, per bus	O	00	0	00
-	Butter, lb. rolls	0	25	6	28
k	" large rolls	0	17	0	20
3	tub dairy	O	20	0	22
١.	Eggs, fresh, per doz	0	14	0	15
ı,	" packed	0	124	U	1::
7	Turnips, per bush	0	20	0	25
ı	Hay	18	00	21	60
i-	Straw	9	00	10	00
. 1					

OW I	Turney ber paper trice trices to	•		0 20	,
on l	Hay	18	00	21 00	١
tri-	Straw	9	00	10 00	
			••		
rk,	OUT TO THE PARTY OF THE PARTY O			_	
ı n	THE KINGSTON MARKET (Briti	ah W	7rig.)	
n·k	FLOUR-XXX per bbl	8 75	to	6.25	
vas !	" " 100 lbs				
to	100 100 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4	3,25		3.25	
ity	Family" 100 " Ex Fancy 100 "	2,00		2.50	
	Ex Funcy 100 "	9.00	to	0.00	
on	GRAIN-Barley per bushel	0 92	to	٥.9٥	
	· Rye " "	0.00	to	0.65	
P.	Ex Funcy 100 " GRAIN—Barley per bushel Rye " Peas " " Gats " " Whent " "	0.00	to	0.80	
to	Onts " "	0.41		0.42	
led	Wheat " "	0.85		0.90	
me	Maar- Beef, fore, per 100 lbs	5.00		6.00	
gai	" hind " " "	7.00			
ınd	a live a at at			8.00	
		0.00		0.00	
ar,		0.10		0.12	
ng	Mutton " "	0.07	to	0.09	
pi:	Mutton " " Veal " "	9.00	to	0.00	
	Ham " in store	0.14	to	0.15	
	Hatu " in store Bacon " "	0.12	to	0.13	
in-	Pork	9.00	to	10.50	
ho	Hides-No 1 untrimmed	5.00		6.00	
ers	4 2 4			4.00	
ook	Lambskins,			1.25	
in	" pelts	חלת	to	1.50	
- 1	Calf Skins			0.10	
by					
iķe	Dekin Skins	0.30	to	0.50	
led	Tallow	0.04	to	0.03	
red	Pourray—Turkeys, each			1.50	
ıpt,	Geese "			0.80	
our	Ducks per pair	0.70	to	0.75	
	Fowls per pair	0.50	to	0.75	
ear	GENERAL—Potatoes bus, Butter, tub, per lib do print Eggs, per dozen	0,50	to	0.60	
	Butter, tub, per 16	0.16	to	0.18	
on-	do print	0.20	to	0.21	
CW	Regs per dozen	0.12	to	0.15	
ich	Cheese, home made	A 31	to	0.14	
da-					
ck.	Hay per ton	0.00	to	10.00	
me,	Steaw " "	4.00	to	4.50	
the	Wood, hard, on street			5.25	
	Coal, delivered,	. 3.2	5 to	-	
	Wool per lb				
	I U SEMDI			_	

J. H. SEMPLE. IMPORTER AND WHOLESALE GROCER, 53 ST. PETER STREET.

(Corner of Foundling,) HOMTREAL.

ST. PATRICK'S SOCIETY.



THE REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING of the above CORPORATION will be held in the SO-CIETY'S HALL, Corner of Craig and St. Alexander Streets, on MONDAY EVENING next, 3rd May, at EIGHT o'clock.

SAMUEL CROSS, Rec. Sec.



May 14t, 1874.

THE ANNUAL MEETING of the Montreal Branch of the IRISH HOME RULE LEAGUE will be held in the ST. PATRION'S HALL, corner of St.

Alexander and Craig Streets, on TUESDAY EVENING next, the 4th of May, at EIGHT o'clock, sharp, for the Election of Office-Bearers for the ensuing year.

P. J. COYLE, Sec.

