

of collusion. Thus armed, the husband goes into Court; gets a so-called divorce from his wife; and thus both parties are mutually gratified.

This evil, which of course may be of almost daily occurrence, but against which no legal remedy can be provided, or even conceived so long as the law deals with adultery as it does, and pretends to find therein valid grounds for divorce—was apparently present to the mind of our Toronto contemporary when he penned the following lines:—

"To hold out a prospect of divorce, is, in fact, to let loose in very many men, fancy, and speculation, and bring about a necessity for the change that otherwise never would have arisen."—Toronto Colonist.

This is no doubt the truth; and in the interests of morality, it would be better, if divorce be granted for any cause—that it should be granted for every, the slightest cause—say for having cold feet—than that it should be granted for adultery, but for adultery alone.—And thus whilst the *Colonist* professes "itself well satisfied that it will not be too easy to get a divorce under the new law," we should be better pleased if it were simply impossible.

A LITTLE EVIL FOR A GREAT GOOD.

If there is one thing with which, more than with any other, our Protestant neighbors delight to taunt us, it is this: That our Church inculcates, and that we Papists hold, the doctrine that it is lawful to do evil for a good end; or, in other words, that the end justifies the means. So deeply are anti-Catholic prejudices rooted in the minds of Protestants, that it is next to impossible to eradicate them. We may cut them down one day, but the next they sprout up with tenfold vigor; and it would almost seem that in their case has been fulfilled the menace of Scripture, and that the Lord has given them up to their own delusions, that they may believe a lie.

But what is most remarkable, most extraordinary, is, that the very false and immoral doctrines with which Protestants reproach Papists, are held, and reduced to practice by our accusers. And whilst the Catholic Church denounces as a damnable error, the proposition that it is in any case lawful to do evil that good may follow, the Protestant world unconsciously act as if that condemned proposition involved an indisputable truth. They act upon it, we say, as if it were an axiom underlying and the basis of, every sound system of ethics. Of this we have a notable example in a case which has appeared in the public journals, and which is still pending before the legal tribunals of Upper Canada. To this case, as an illustration of our thesis, we hope we may be permitted to allude, though the subject is, in some respects, one that is scarcely fitted for our columns. We shall therefore go as little into detail as possible; contenting ourselves with a bare outline of the facts, as we find them recorded, and commented upon, in the Protestant press.

A Mrs. Elizabeth Kane died in child birth lately at Toronto; and in consequence it is said of the want of professional skill as an *accoucheur* on the part of her medical attendant. As his case is still before the Courts of Law, and as with the merits of the case, in a professional point of view, we have no concern, our readers will appreciate our motives for avoiding entering into any details upon this part of the case—further than this: That it is objected to Dr. Cotter, the medical attendant, that by killing the child he might have saved the mother's life; and that, though repeatedly urged by the husband to adopt this course, he at first declined doing so. Subsequently however it would appear as if his scruples had been overcome, and that an attempt was made to perform a murderous operation known as "craniotomy." At all events, the child died before delivery; and shortly after, the mother followed her unfortunate babe. Hereupon the *Montreal Pilot*, who does but speak the general sentiments of the Protestant world, indulges in the following comments:—

"British practice was urged by Dr. Cotter as the reason why he would not accede to the father's request to save the mother, even if the child was lost. British practice, as we understand it, is the very contrary—requiring that medical men should save the life of the mother be the loss what it may to the child. The Church of Rome holds the opposite doctrine."—*Pilot*, 2nd inst.

In his first statement the *Pilot* is correct.—"British practice," and the custom of most Protestants in these matters, is to make no scruple of destroying the life of the child, if that destruction seems necessary for the safety of the mother.—The art of destroying the life of the child under such circumstances is, if we mistake not, actually taught in Protestant Medical Schools, and is certainly extensively practiced—as every one who is acquainted with the state of obstetric morality in Great Britain must admit. "The Church of Rome," does not, however, hold the opposite doctrine; for she does not hold that, under any conceivable circumstances, it is lawful to take the life either of the mother, or of the child.

But the point to which we desire to direct attention is this: That the opinion that it is lawful in certain cases to kill the child in order to save the mother—or, in other words, that the end justifies the means—does obtain very extensively in the Protestant world; and that in consequence we are not unjust towards Protestants in charging them with holding the maxim that it is lawful to do evil that good may follow. This conclusion flows, we assert, from the study of the obstetric morality of the Protestant world; and as this involves a question of morality, not of surgery, we may be permitted to say a few words thereupon.

The law of God is clear, precise, and universal. "Thou shalt not kill," is a precept always obligatory upon all; but, above all, obligatory in the highest degree, upon the medical man, whose business it is not to destroy life, but to save it.—It is therefore evident to every one whose moral sense has not been enfeebled, whose moral vision is not distorted, that it is evil to kill a child.

And granting for the sake of argument—that we are far from admitting its truth—the

Protestant assumption that the life of the mother is of more value than is that of the child, and entitled therefore to higher consideration, it follows that the "British practice" of child murder, elegantly couched under the scientific term of "craniotomy," can only be defended upon the plea: that it is lawful, to kill the child—i.e., to do evil—in order to save the more valuable life of the mother;—i.e., for the sake of a great good. In other words, the maxim that it is lawful to do evil with a good intent is practically acted upon by Protestants; and so generally obtains amongst them, that it excites no indignant disclaimer when explicitly laid before their eyes in the columns of their periodical press.

"The Roman Church," on the other hand, teaches as an invariable truth, that it is never, or under any conceivable circumstances, lawful to do a *minimum* of evil, for a *maximum* of good. She teaches that he who kills, or compasses the death of the child *in utero*, is to all intents and purposes as much a murderer, in the worst sense of the word, as he who kills, or compasses the death of the adult. And this is why the Church condemns unequivocally that "British obstetric practice" to which the *Pilot* refers us; and which we have reason to fear obtains, to a certain extent, in Canada as well as in Great Britain and the United States.

Hitherto we have seemed to admit with Protestants that the life of the mother is of more value than is that of the child. This however we deny; for the death of the unbaptized child, and it is to it alone that we refer, implies the death of a soul, as well as death of the body; seeing that it is impossible that the child dying unbaptized by baptism, can ever attain to the enjoyment of the beatific vision. With the mother however the case is different; as, supposing her to be baptised, it is her own voluntary act, her obstinate refusal to accept the terms of salvation freely proffered to all, if the bitter agonies attendant upon the dissolution of her earthly frame—if borne in a spirit of Christian resignation—be not but the prelude to eternal and unutterable bliss. Viewed then from a moral, and Christian standpoint, it is more imperative to save the life of the child, than that of the mother; though under no conceivable circumstances can it be lawful for any man to take the life of either.—For the end can never justify the means; and it is an insult to God Himself, the source of the natural or moral, as well as of the positive, law, to assert that it is lawful to do even a little evil for a great good.

No! Life and death are in the hands of the Lord, and in His alone. He alone Who gave life has the right to take it away, or to authorize others so to do. Painful therefore as the duty of the conscientious and humane medical man must often in certain cases be, that duty lies nevertheless plain before him. He must try and save both lives; but he has no right to sacrifice the life of one for the good of the other; and even when the death of one, or even of both, seems inevitable, still it never can be lawful for him to kill. He must do his best to save life, and leave the result in the hands of God—of Him Who gives, and Who takes away, Whose name be blessed.

In our above remarks we have no intention to reflect in any manner upon the medical attendants of Mrs. Kane. It is said indeed that the operation of "craniotomy" was attempted by Dr. Cotter; and this report is indirectly confirmed by the *Toronto Freeman*, who devotes an article in his issue of the 11th to a defence of the said Dr. Cotter. We regret much that the *Freeman* treats the subject in such a manner as would almost induce his readers to believe that he, though a Catholic, sees nothing unlawful, nothing morally infamous in child-murder. He speaks of "craniotomy" and of the "perforator"—the tool with which the murder is performed—without one word of reprobation; as "dangerous to the life of the mother;" and as "fatal to all the children"—which indeed it must be, seeing that its very object is to compress the head of the child, by extracting the contents of the skull. But to our surprise, and to our pain, seeing that the *Freeman* speaks as a Catholic organ, he does not seem to be aware that, not only is the use of the "perforator" always attended with danger; but that its employment on the living child, is always deliberate murder; repugnant therefore to the laws of God, and worthy of the severest punishment from the civil magistrate. The *Freeman* should be careful how he treats of such topics. Either he should eschew them entirely; or, when treating of them, he should be most careful to warn his readers that the medical man who employs the "perforator," and the mother and husband who sanction its use, are, one and all, morally guilty of brutal murder—the destroyers, not only of the animal, but of the spiritual life of the child on whom they operate. It is hard enough that these truths should be ignored by the Protestant press; but the danger to morality becomes serious, when professedly Catholic journalists speak in such a manner as to suppress the all important fact, that the operation of "craniotomy," is not only physically dangerous, but is *always*, and under all conceivable circumstances, when employed on the living child, a mortal and most damnable sin. If the *Freeman* will not take our word for this, we refer him to any Catholic theologian whom he may please to consult.

If the child was dead at the time, there was no moral wrong done.

CATHOLIC LIBERALITY.—The New York *Metropolitan Record*, one of the first Catholic periodicals of the United States, and published with the approval of His Grace the Archbishop of New York, mentions the pleasing, and to Catholics the very honorable fact, that on one day the sum of eight hundred dollars, was taken up for the St. Joseph's Seminary, in the different Catholic Churches of New York. This sum was independent of other collections, donations, and proceeds of Bazaars; and when we bear in mind of whom for the most part the congregations of Catholic Churches in the United States are composed, it is a gratifying proof that on this Continent, as at home, the children of Ireland are ever foremost in every good and charitable work.

DR. FORBES.—Our readers have doubtless by this time learned through the columns of the Protestant press, that Dr. Forbes of New York has, in a letter addressed to the Archbishop of that Diocese, announced his secession from the Catholic Church; into which he was received some years ago as a convert from the sect of Protestant Episcopalians, and in which he was admitted to the Holy Order of the Priesthood. We have refrained hitherto from saying anything on this painful subject, in the expectation that some reasons would be assigned, either by Dr. Forbes or his friends, in explanation of the step that he has taken. In this expectation we have been disappointed; and the following vague and mysterious letter from Dr. Forbes to the Archbishop of New York contains all the light that the former has hitherto seen fit to throw upon the subject:—

New York, Oct. 17, 1859.

Most Rev. John Hughes, D. D., Archbishop, &c.:—Most Reverend Sir,—It is now nearly ten years since, under your auspices, I laid down my ministry in the Protestant Episcopal Church, to submit to the Church of Rome. The interval, as you know, has not been idly spent; each day has had its responsibility and duty, and with these have come experienced observation, and the knowledge of many things not so well understood before. The result is that I feel I have committed a grave error, which, publicly made should be publicly repaired. When I came to you it was, as I stated, with a deep and conscientious conviction that it was necessary to be in communion with the See of Rome; but this conviction I have not been able to sustain in face of the fact, that, by the natural rights of man and all individual liberty, must be sacrificed, not only so, but the private conscience often violated, and one forced, by silence at least, to acquiesce in what is opposed to moral truth and virtue. Under these circumstances, when I call to mind how slender is the foundation in the earliest ages of the Church upon which has been reared the present Papal power, I can no longer regard it as imposing obligations upon me or any one else. I do now, therefore, by this act, disown and withdraw myself from its alleged jurisdiction.

I remain, most reverend Sir, Your obedient servant,
JOHN MURRAY FORBES, D. D.,
Late Pastor of St. Anne's Church, N. Y.

It will be seen that the "Late Pastor of St. Anne's Church" assigns no reason for his secession from the Church. In the circumstances in which he finds himself, it is to be supposed that he is anxious to put himself in the best possible light before the public, and that he has said all that can be said in vindication of his conduct.—Under such circumstances surely every man would, if he could, eschew generalities, and enter as minutely as possible into detail—that is, if he believed that his conduct would bear close investigation.

This Dr. Forbes has not done. He complains in vague terms that, by communion with the See of Rome, "the natural rights of man, and all individual liberty, must be violated;" but he is very careful not to give an instance, or to cite a case wherein the violation complained of has occurred. So with regard to the moral teachings of the Church—he complains that "one is forced to acquiesce in what is opposed to moral truth and virtue." But the ethical teachings of the Church are to-day, in every respect, what they were when Dr. Forbes, at his own urgent request, was admitted to her communion; and if in conformity with "moral truth and virtue," then, so are they to-day. That they were so in conformity, when he was received a Catholic, Dr. Forbes implicitly admitted by joining her communion; a step which he adopted either with, or without, making himself acquainted with her moral teachings. If without so making himself acquainted, then he is self-condemned as a most imprudent person, whose judgment is not to be relied upon; and if after making himself acquainted with the moral teachings of the Catholic Church—then he stands self-condemned as a most dishonest person whose word is not to be relied on; as one, who according to his humor or caprice, will pronounce vice virtue, and virtue, vice. It will of course be remarked that, though Dr. Forbes makes this sweeping charge against the Church, he is most careful not to cite one single instance wherein her moral teachings are opposed to "moral truth and virtue." Nothing would be easier for him than to do so, were his charge not a falsehood; and nothing would more fully vindicate in the eyes of the world his secession from an immoral Church. Why then, it will be asked, has he not cited some instance wherein the Catholic is obliged "to acquiesce in what is opposed to moral truth and virtue?" The reason is obvious; because it was impossible for him to do so, without exposing himself to the certainty of detection; and because there is nothing so dangerous as the "lie with a circumstance."

But, though Dr. Forbes' letter throws no light upon the subject, we find the reason of his conduct more than hinted at by the New York Protestant press; and the reason by these assigned, is some disputes which he, Dr. Forbes, has had with his ecclesiastical superiors. The *Evening Post* alludes to a report that was current in New York some months ago, when Dr. Forbes resigned the care of St. Anne's Church; and which attributed that step to his "dislike of the arbitrary exercise by the Archbishop of his authority over the inferior clergy, which imposed an unpleasant restraint on one accustomed for many years to the less stringent discipline of the Protestant Episcopal Church." And the New York *Times* is still more explicit; it says:—

"Since his conversion to Catholicism he has had charge of St. Anne's Church, which he was largely instrumental in building up, and which, so far as the labor of its supervision was the smallest Catholic Church in the city. He had one assistant, to whom he left nearly the whole care of the Church. We understand that some three months since he applied to the Archbishop for another assistant on the ground that the care of his children required so much of his time and attention, that he could not satisfactorily perform the duties of his pastorate. This request the Archbishop declined to grant, whereupon Dr. Forbes resigned, and his resignation was accepted."

We are inclined to accept the explanation given by the New York Protestant press. We suspect that Dr. Forbes has, with many excellent qualities, and great talents, natural and acquired, a proud spirit, and is very fond of having his own way; and that the discipline of the Church, is, in consequence, often irksome to him, as having been brought up a Protestant, and,

therefore, in a great measure, a stranger to the virtues of "obedience," and "humility." The best service we can render him is to pray for him, that he may repair the scandal his fall has occasioned.

We have much pleasure in recommending to the favorable attention of our readers a fine collection of lithographed portraits, which Mr. P. H. McCawley is offering to the public in the different Cities of both sections of the Province. To the Catholic these portraits will, we are sure, be very welcome, and their intrinsic merits can hardly fail to procure for them a prompt and remunerative sale. The collection consists of portraits—published by Mr. McCawley at considerable expence—of His Eminence Cardinal Wiseman, Archbishop of Westminster; of His Grace the Most Reverend Dr. McHale, Archbishop of Tuam; of their Lordships the late Bishop of Kingston, the Rt. Reverend Dr. Phelan, and his successor the Rt. Reverend Dr. Horan. The last will, we are sure, prove highly acceptable to the Irish Catholics of Quebec, amongst whom the present Bishop of Kingston has long labored, and by whom he is so warmly and deservedly esteemed. Besides these, Mr. McCawley has also for sale portraits of the Bishops of Sandwich, and of Bytown, C.W., and of the Bishop of Detroit, U.S., the Rt. Rev. Dr. Lefebvre, together with splendid full length portraits of the Rev. Dr. Cahill, and of Daniel O'Connell, the champions of religious liberty.

These portraits are all executed in the best style, and, as accompanying certificates testify, are faithful likenesses. We should mention that amongst them is one of Louis Napoleon, Emperor of the French, which as a work of art is excellent, and as an embodiment of the features of one of the most remarkable men of the present day, is sure to be eagerly sought after, as a memorial of a great man, and highly appreciated by its possessors. In conclusion, we can heartily advise our friends to give Mr. McCawley every encouragement; and we trust that the good taste he has manifested in his collection will be duly appreciated by a discerning public. Mr. McCawley is, we believe, about to visit Quebec, where, we have no doubt, he will be well received.

THE "FAMILY HERALD."—This is the name of a new Weekly, of which the first number made its appearance on Wednesday last. Though latest born of our Montreal press, the stranger is by no means the least in size, or merits, amongst them. Its articles evince a practised hand, and its selected matter is in excellent taste, whilst in other respects it is certainly inferior to no journal in the Province. The *Family Herald* bids fair then to become a general favorite, and we heartily wish it a long and prosperous career.

We direct attention to the advertisement of P. F. Walsh, Watchmaker and Jeweller, in another column. Our readers will observe that he keeps constantly on hand an extensive assortment of Watches, Clocks, Jewellery, Fancy Goods, Stationery, &c., which he will sell at moderate prices. He gives special attention to the repairing and tuning of Watches, in which art, we are happy to say, he is unsurpassed.—Call at No. 178, Notre Dame Street, and judge for yourselves.

We are requested to remind the members of the St. Patrick's Society of the meeting called for Monday evening next, which, it is expected, will be numerously attended, as the subject chosen for debate—"Should emigration from Ireland be encouraged?"—is exceedingly interesting, and one which we have no doubt will be ably discussed. Every member should make it a point to attend.

REPORT OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION FOR LOWER CANADA—FOR 1858.—This Report shows great and steady progress in the general education of the people. We find therein that the number of children attending the schools is increasing, and that the pupils are making great advances in their studies. As compared with the School attendance of 1857, that of 1858 shows an increase of 7,188—the total number being for the latter period, 155,986.—Upon the whole, we have every reason to feel satisfied with the progress of our Lower Canadian School system; and may be permitted to cite that system and its working, as proof that in a Catholic community the State can interfere actively in the cause of education, without infringing on parental rights, or doing violence to the conscientious scruples of any of its subjects. If in Upper Canada the case is different, it is because Upper Canada is Protestant; and because from a Protestant community it is very difficult, if not impossible for a Catholic minority to force the recognition of their rights as parents, or to obtain respect for their religious convictions.

The *Montreal Witness* complains that, in treating of the Irish *Revival* the *TRUE WITNESS* quotes only the testimony of Protestants unfavorable to the movement. This complaint is unreasonable, and betrays the writer's ignorance of the laws which regulate the value of evidence.

No man is a competent judge or a reliable witness in his own case. Thus the testimony of a Protestant in favor of a Protestant movement is worthless. But every man is a good witness against himself; therefore the evidence of a Protestant against a Protestant movement is unexceptionable.

The evidences against the *Revivals* by us cited are from Protestants of every stripe, of every shade of opinion. If the Rev. Mr. Stopford is, as the *Witness* complains, "High Church," the *Northern Whig* is very "Low church," whilst the *Athenaeum* is perhaps of "No church" at all. Yet all three are decidedly Protestant, or Non-Catholic, and all three agree in condemning the Irish *Revivals*.

LONDON CATHOLIC INSTITUTE.—At the Annual Meeting for the election of Officers of the London (C.W.) Catholic Institute, held on the 1st of November, the following gentlemen were chosen for the ensuing year:—
Mr. Edward Killen.....First Vice-President.
" Thomas O'Brien.....Second Do.
" Martin Macnamara.....Second Do.
" John M. Tierney.....Cor. Secretary.
" John McLaughlin.....Rec. Do.
" John Cavanagh.....Librarian.

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

Wheat.—The market has been variable at all the chief centers of business on this Continent. At the close of last week, prices were quite excited, but they have rather fallen since. In Chicago, Spring Wheat No. 2 was 80 cents on the 11th. The price in Montreal has been about \$1.12 to \$1.15 in barge. Canada Spring Wheat, in car loads continues at about \$1.10 to \$1.12, delivered.
Peas are 70c to 72c per 66 lbs.
Flour, owing to a rise in New York, was very firm on Saturday at \$5.15 for Superfine, but became easier on Monday, and was sold at \$5.10 to \$5.15. To-day it is held by some parties at \$5.20. Fancy is scarce, \$5.30 to \$5.40; Extra \$5.75 to \$6; Double Extras, \$6 to \$6.50.

Butter.—Considerable sales of Store-packed have been made from 15c to 15c. At these rates it is now dull. Dairy is 16c to 18c.
Hogs are in demand at \$5½ to \$6½, according to weight and quality.

HOUSEHOLD AND ST. ANN'S MARKETS.
Wheat—None brought to market.
Oats—1s 10½d to 2s per 40 lbs. Good supply, and meets with ready sale.
Barley—3s to 3s 1½d per 50 lbs. Supply very fair.
Indian Corn—3s to 3s 3d. Supply small, and dull of sale.
Peas may be quoted to-day at 3s to 3s 6d. Good supply.
Buckwheat—2s 9d to 3s. Quantity brought to market very small.
Flax Seed—5s 6d to 6s. Brought in small quantities.
Timothy Seed may be quoted at 10s to 10s 6d.—Very small supply.
Bug Flour—13s 6d to 15s. Supply small.
Outmeal—10s 6d to 11s per quintal Good supply.
Butter—Fresh, 1s 3d to 1s 4d; Salt, 10d to 11d.
Eggs—10d to 11d.
Pointed—3s 6d to 4s per bag.
Apples—16s to 20s according to quality and quantity.

Although there have been many medicinal preparations brought before the public since the first introduction of Perry Davis' Vegetable Pain Killer, and large amounts expended in their introduction, the Pain Killer has continued to steadily advance in the estimation of the world, as the best family medicine ever introduced. Sold by druggists and grocers.

Birth.
At Picton, C.W., on the 26th ult. the wife of Mr. J. B. Quinn, formerly of the City of Quebec, of a son.

Died.
At his residence, near Prescott, on the 7th instant, John Moran, Esq., an old and respected inhabitant, aged 45 years.
In this city, on the 10th instant, Elizabeth McFetridge, wife of Mr. J. Alderdice, Printer.

P. F. WALSH,
Practical and Scientific Watchmaker,
HAS REMOVED TO
178 NOTRE DAME STREET.
(Next door to O'Connor's Boot & Shoe Store.)

CALL and examine his NEW and SPLENDID assortment of Watches, Jewellery, and Plated Ware. P. F. Walsh has also on hand the BEST SELECTED and most varied assortment of FANCY GOODS, Toys, Perfumery, Clocks, Rosaries, Decades, and other religious and symbolic articles.
Buy your Fancy and other Stationery from P. F. WALSH, 178 Notre Dame Street, of which he has on hand the VERY BEST QUALITY.
Special attention given to REPAIRING and TUNING all kinds of Watches, by competent workmen, under his personal superintendence.
No Watches taken for repairs that cannot be warranted.

BUSINESS DEVICE:
Quick Sales and Light Profit.
Nov. 17, 1859.

MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY
OF THE CITY OF MONTREAL.

THE undersigned DIRECTORS, beg to inform the inhabitants of Montreal, that the said Company is NOW IN OPERATION, and ready to insure DWELLING HOUSES and their DEPENDENCIES. They invite those who have such properties to insure, to apply forthwith at the Company's Office, No. 1, Saint Simeon Street, where every necessary information shall be given.

The rates are from one to four dollars per hundred pound for three years.
J. L. Beaudry, President.
Hubert Pace, J. B. Homer.
Francis Benoit, G. L. Rolland.
P. B. Bédaride, Eugene Lamoureux.
P. L. Le TOURNEUX, Secretary.

Montreal, Nov. 17, 1859.
GRAND TRUNK CLOTHING STORE,
WHOLESALE AND RETAIL,
No. 87 McGill and No. 27 Recollet Streets,
MONTREAL.

The undersigned, CLOTHIERS and OUTFITTERS, respectfully beg leave to inform the Public that they have now completed their Fall and Winter Importations, and are prepared to offer for Sale a very large and well assorted Stock of
READY-MADE CLOTHING, OUTFITTING, &c.
Also, English, French and German Cloths, Doekings, Cassimeres and Vestings, of every style and quality. They have also on hand a large assortment of Scotch Tweeds and Irish Freizes, very suitable for this season.

Nov. 17. DONNELLY & O'BRIEN.

IF YOU WANT
THE VERY BEST COOKING STOVE
That can be got for money, ask for the
"QUEEN'S CHOICE,"
FIRST PRIZE COOKING STOVE,
Manufactured by
WILLIAM RODDEN & CO.,
91 William Street.
Montreal, Nov. 10.