☞ THE MORNING COURIER is published daily during the six business months of the year, viz.: from the 1st of May to the 1st of November, and the other six months bi-weekly, on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays. Terms—Four dollars (£0) per annum, payable in advance.

☞ THE EVENING COURIER (bi-weekly) is published on the Tuesday and Saturday of each week in time for the Mails to the interior of three dollars (£2) per annum, payable in advance.

☞ All Letters on matters for publication, or else the postage will be deducted from the amount sent.

☞ VOLUNTEER CORRESPONDENCE solicited from all parts of the Continent of America. If made use of, the person transmitting the information will be liberally remunerated.

THE COURIER.

TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 1851.

On Friday last a smart debate, as usual,—for the debates now are all smart,—took place in the Assembly relative to the public works on the Chambly Canal and the lower St. Lawrence. On Mr. Keefer's report being presented by Mr. Merritt, it was opposed by Mr. Hincks, who called it a crotchet of the hon. member. It would appear that, in the opinion of Mr. Hincks Mr. Merritt, including that of the Welland Canal, are all crotchets. With respect to the last mentioned work, the hon. member had to sustain a perfect storm of opposition during the whole progress of its formation. In the elegant language of one of the speakers, Mr. Merritt was "a very bad man, a very bad man indeed;" but when a holiday visit was made to the Canal last Summer by the two Houses of Parliament, with "the Bruce" at their head, and when the capabilities of the work were fairly tested, and its advantages to the Province sufficiently proved, then Mr. Merritt became all at once "a very good man, a very good man indeed." Well, it is no small wisdom to acknowledge a mistake, as it requires considerable magnanimity to rectify a wrong, even when it is done in ignorance; but if it be really true that experience teaches fools, Mr. Hincks should have hesitated to call any proposition of such a man as Mr. Merritt "a crotchet," more especially as the Inspector-General's own legislative efforts have turned out, for the most part, to be not only "crotchets," but crotchets of a very expensive character. Witness the Turnpike Road "crotchet," which was, and continues to be, everywhere characterised as a rascally "crotchet;" look also at the Reciprocity "crotchet," big with so many trips to Washington, and ending in nothing but an outlay of good hard dollars. But we have neither leisure nor space to enumerate all the "crotchets" that have emanated from the "crotchety" head of this "crotchety" Inspector-General; the last "crotchet" is his opposition to a proposal of Mr. Merritt's to extend our inland navigation, than which a more important consideration cannot occupy the attention of any legislative body. The deepening of the St. Lawrence is a Canadian interest so obvious, so easy in the performance, when the skill of the present age is brought to bear upon it, that we consider it perfectly astounding to read or hear of any one opposing it. We know at least one comparatively little river of the Old Country, not a hundredth part so large as the St. Lawrence, which, 30 years ago, could scarcely admit a vessel of sixty tons within its banks, but which has now its principal sea-port twenty miles above its embouchure, which receives ships of eight or nine hundred tons. We have no doubt that, in spite of the factious opposition of the Hinckses and their worthy coadjutors, Mr. Merritt will ultimately carry out his object; and that, though he may relapse into being "a bad man, a very bad man indeed," he will turn out once more to be "a good man, a very good man," when he shall have been instrumental in opening the St. Lawrence to ships of any burden from Lake Ontario to the Ocean.

MONTREAL, June 16, 1851.

To the Editor of the MORNING COURIER.

SIR,—I perceive by this morning's Courier that you reply to the True Witness. You do give some of the Catholics credit for being good subjects, and in doing so you give them only their due. Yes they or you may not be right in calling that paper an organ of a violent anti-English party; but I can assure you, if such a party does exist, it is not the most competent person to know it or else hide it in the Province. The French Canadian Catholic is not an enemy to England; and many of us as strong Conservatives of the abusive and low proclivities of the True Witness and low proclivities of the True Witness, or we are averse to anything Saxon. We wish to maintain the union of our holy religion in peace, desiring that when we are obliged to defend our principles, the discussion should be carried on with decency and without personal attacks. We require no more courage to defend ourselves than simple truth; and when any editor of a newspaper, Catholic or Protestant, think to himself any other, or resorts to offensive language in our defence, we cannot but see the approval of any of the members of the Catholic Church, and of this I am certain.

I am,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
A CATHOLIC.

To the above letter of "a Catholic" we desire to reply in as brief terms that could be construed, by any person of sense, to the slightest degree offensive. We can only judge of national sympathies by the writings or public speeches of parties, and, therefore, when we are attacked so rabidly in the columns of a paper setting itself up to be the Roman Catholic organ, we must attribute the blame to it in accordance with the taste and sentiments of those supporting it, and subscribing to it; though we say now, as indeed we said before, that we cannot believe all the Roman Catholics to be so gross in mind, or so malevolent of heart, as to sanction so flagrant a perversion of the amenities of life as that of which the *True Witness* was guilty in its last issue; and we are glad that our correspondent, "a Catholic," bears us out in our charitable consideration. No man of either sense or good taste could have had the effrontery to defend Mr. Tache in his insolent retort to an English gentleman. The language of every conquered country has uniformly been the language of the conqueror, and if the case be different in Canada, it is a boon granted by British generosity to French Canadian turbulence, and ought to be used with modesty, rather than, as in Mr. Tache's simpleton. The time may come, and that when the *Jacquiere* members of either House, if they use their privilege so offensively, may be after all reminded of the *civil* results of the taking of Quebec, and that if they must be Members of a British Colonial Legislature, they must also there speak the language of their conquerors, or be silent. We shall return to this subject at an early day.

THEATRE ROYAL.—The lovers of the Drama, and those who take delight in the thrilling voice of lovely woman, will be glad to learn that the very handsome interior of the late Theatre Royal, Dalhousie Square, also the magnificent scenery, have been repurchased and removed, and that the same proprietor has purchased a site in a most central situation for the immediate erection of a neat and suitable Theatre, which will be opened to the public on the 1st October.

THE NUBIAN MINSTRELS.—These amusing negrotic conductors of "Wit, Fun, & Laughter," give a Concert this evening in the Odd Fellow's Hall. "Laugh and grow fat" was once the title of a jest-book that went through one hundred and twenty editions. If any one has the slightest ambition to grow fat, therefore, let him by all means visit the "Nubian Minstrels." Such a chance for "Skin-and-Bone" may not occur again in a century.

GARRICK THEATRE.—*We are informed* that Mr. Newton, (late of the Theatre Royal,) assisted by several gentlemen Amateurs, purpose giving a series of entertainments in the above Theatre, on the occasion of the visit of our American friends to this city, commencing on the evening of Friday and Saturday, (20th and 21st instant.) Amongst the pieces selected, we notice, "The Review," "The Tooth Ache," and "The Irish Tutor"—all standard plays—also a scene from "Rob Roy;" and, for the first time in Montreal, a new Farce entitled "Dolleus Genard," with several others of an equally interesting nature. We are glad to see that our old friends, Captain Lovelace and Mr. H. W. Smith, will take an active part in the evenings' amusements. [From Mr. Newton's long experience in matters Thespian, we have no doubt the pieces will be "got up" in first-rate style, and hope he will receive the favorable notices of our friends from the Empire City.—*Communicated.*

Free Trade!!

We regret to learn that the manufacture of glass at St. Johns is about to be discontinued—we cannot compete with *foreign imports*, without a protection, in the shape of a duty of 30 per cent., on the actual sterling cost of the articles.—Com.

CANADIAN AFFAIRS.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

TORONTO, June 12.

The proceedings in the House last night were of a more exciting character than usual.

Mr. Christie moved to refer the accounts of the Trinity House at Quebec and Montreal for the year 1850 to a Select Committee of that Members. The standing expenses of Trinity House at Quebec were £2,800, the whole revenue being £10,000. He thought the fact that the expense was one-fourth of the revenue was of itself a sufficient reason for enquiry.

After an uninteresting discussion the accounts were referred to the Standing Committee of public accounts.

Hon. Mr. Boulton introduced a Bill to provide for the more convenient assembling of the Provincial Parliament. Second reading on Wednesday next.

Mr. Mackenzie moved the second reading of the Bill to establish Constitutive Courts. He proposed to bring the parties together in a private room, before a Judge, when each should tell his own story in his own way, and the Judge pronounce a decision. He referred to the existence of similar Courts in other countries, and the good effects that flowed from them. Mr. Paul condemned the system for going in here with one another; and Daniel O'Connell was of Mr. Paul's opinion and the largest people to get Conciliation Courts. When Daniel O'Connell's case was brought before the House of Lords, one part of that body said to the other, a legal who, and the other said there had received a legal who, and the other said there was no machinery in the country for carrying it out.

Mr. Prince said, it was very curious to see the member for Haldimand introduce a Bill like this—it was very funny. The author of the Bill was guilty of a little bit of presumption, which did not look well in the showing. It was a Bill to three years standing would see the absurdity of this Bill. Would the people of Haldimand thank the hon. gentleman for introducing this Bill? If they did, they must be a precious set of fortunate. Daniel O'Connell did try to establish a thing—it deserved no other name—of this kind; it was an utter failure. He objected not to the principle of this Bill; but it was altogether opposed to the existing machinery. The parties were to appear in person in these Conciliation Courts—how was a gouty man to come into Court? The scheme was utterly absurd and nonsensical.

Mr. Mackenzie rose amidst cries of question. The House of Assembly passed a Bill similar to this 21 years ago, but it was lost in the Legislative Council. If the four lawyers, including Her Majesty's Solicitor General, who had spoken, had not felt that it was necessary to say a good deal against this Bill before they allowed the vote to be taken, they would not have gone to the trouble they did. How was it that his (Mr. Mackenzie's) personal conduct was constantly alluded to, and the Speaker to remain silent? Was he to be called "liar," "scoundrel," "rebel" one day, "absconding debtor" to-day? How would the Members of this House appear before the Continent of America, if the private character of such Member was to be made a subject of discussion? He defied any one to stand up in this House and say that he (Mr. M.) had ever attacked the private character of any man ever since he had a Seat in this House. If he was so bad as he had been described by the disgraceful language that had been used, why not expel him? (Cries of no, no—you are not worth it—from Mr. Smith; of Frontenac.) His name would go down to history, and his opponents could not help it. For himself, he disregarded these personal attacks; they would not make him lose his temper; but it was not creditable to this House that such disgraceful language should be applied to a Member who has so much right to vote in any one in this House, and who had enjoyed the confidence of some of the largest constituencies in the country. To come to the question: why had he been so absurd for attempting to introduce a Bill that had been in operation in several countries of Europe, in some of the United States, and in the Island of Jamaica? The Sol. General had cut a very ridiculous figure in this argument. He had said the County Judges would be so burdened with cases in the Conciliation Courts that they would never get through the business; and then he went on to prove that there would be hardly any cases brought into these Courts. Why, if there would be no cases hardly, how could the Judges be so terribly burdened with them? That was the wisdom of the learned Solicitor General, in a case in which he (Mr. Mackenzie) feared his conscience was on the one side, and his advocacy on the other. Then it had been said that the codification of the laws in the United States was a failure. Where was the evidence of this statement? did they wish to go back to the old system? He hoped the people would leave half the lawyers at home at the next Election—(applause in the Galleries)—much as one of the forty-eight here had praised the whole clan; but he had spoken against a bad system. The Solicitor General had said that he (Mr. M.) would not read this Bill to his constituents; but he would ask what opinion had he held on this subject different from those he now avowed? The Solicitor General had asked what would be done if a Dutchman and a Scotchman, not knowing one another's language, should come before the Court? Well, these were some curious things in this world, and it required the inventive genius of the Solicitor General to conceive this case. But there was no fear that any difficulty would arise from these imaginary cases—Dutchman and Scotchman did not quarrel. He wished to see the lawyers vote against this measure; it would afford useful information to the country people. This was the important Session, it was stated, on behalf of the entire three Sessions.

Mr. Lafontaine followed the example of Col. Gray on a former occasion, and of Mr. Smith, of Frontenac, on the present, in making personal attacks on the Member for Haldimand, who, he could, had been denied the respect of all political parties. He then opposed the Bill in detail, pronouncing it something perfectly monstrous.

Hon. Mr. Hincks spoke in opposition to the Bill. He deprecated the personal attacks that had been made, but considered it went on to open the speech, with such language as rebel, murderer, &c., applauding the words cheers and very considerable laughter.

Mr. Rankin supposed that the subject had been thrashed out, and the discussion, therefore, wearying. He did not agree with the principle of the Bill, and the discussion, therefore, was in favor of the principle of this Bill, was the people of the country were in favor of Conciliation Courts. The Bill did not go far enough—it would not punish the lawyers sufficiently. He was in favor of punishment, and that was meant by fixing the amount of costs. He would say a few words in explanation of his vote. He was in favor of the principle of the Bill, and would vote for the second reading—in order to get it into Committee. There they were prepared to move amendments, and he would get the amount made the minimum for arbitration to effect