

FRIDAY, JUNE 27, 1851.

**THE MONTREAL COURIER**  
is published daily during the four months of the year, i.e., from the 1st of May to the 1st of November, and the other six months tri-weekly, on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays. Subscription, six dollars (\$6) per annum.

**THE MONTREAL COURIER** (bi-weekly) is published on Monday and Tuesday evenings, in time for the Mail, at the new price of one dollar (\$3) per annum. **POSTAGE** is advanced.

All LETTERS must be pre-paid; or else the postage will be deducted from the amount.

**THE VOLUNTARY CONFEDERATION** has notified us all parts of the **Confederates of America**. It made use of the person transmitting the information will be liberally remunerated.

## THE COURIER.

FRIDAY, JUNE 27, 1851.

It appears that the Clergy Reserve question stands *in statu quo*, and must now remain so till the meeting of another Parliament, and even then any action upon it, must be by address or petition to the Home Government—the Canadian Legislature having no power to touch the present settlement. Thus a breathing time will be allowed to the friends of the Church who are favorable to the retention of the Reserves, in which they may be enabled to organize a system of regular constitutional opposition to those who are in favor of their alienation. And when we take into account the precarious position presently held

by Lord Russell, and the strong

nudity that long before another Ca-

Cabinet imminent can meet a new

entirely different formed in England of

we can see nothing and principles

appointment to be in evident and dis-

cian abolitionists. We are the Cana-

the prospect, because it is very *wat*

that the *ministers* is advocated by

not for any love they bear the Church—

they love their own barns better—not

for any anxiety they entertain about

education—ignorance suits them better

—but simply because they cherish a

pure undesignated and unextinguishable

hatred to the Church of England. It is

of no consequence to tell us that Mr.

Baldwin and others are members of that

communion, and must therefore be natu-

rally supposed friendly to what they

think the real interests of the body.

Men's thoughts, feelings, and opinions,

are best known by their actions, and

when we see a person in power, what-

ever may be his private worth, using

that power to diminish the influence

cripple the usefulness, and injure, we

must be constrained to conclude that

man an enemy to at least the secular

interests of the community at whom he

hains his shafts. Were the whole of the

sects and denominations, as well as the

Church, to be included in one sweeping

denunciation, the measure might be less

liable to suspicion; but when we see

the richest and most overgrown of the

whole ecclesiastical organization, we may

be allowed to question the purity of

motive with which these are actuated

who advocate this act of depravation.

### Change of Costume.

A good deal of discussion has been

going on of late in the columns of our

contemporaries on the subject of costume,

and a great deal of small wit has been

expended against those courageous ladies

who have attempted to introduce a more

graceful attire. We should not like to

see the ladies appear in masculine garb

altogether; but most certainly a great

improvement might be made in modern

female costume, both as regards health

and taste, and if a radical change must

take place—we have no doubt that a

moderate reform will ultimately be ef-

fect—*the Turkish* is certainly the

most graceful and the least oppressive

or troublesome of any. But suppose a

lady dressed in a full Turkish costume,

would she be more an object of real

disapproval than if she were to appear

in the dress of her great grandmother?

The utmost extravagance of Oriental

costume would never be equal to the Gothic

costume, the immense hoops, and the high

heeled shoes, of the early part of the

reign of George III. A lady, in those

old days, could not have found room to

sit in any of our largest stages—there

is scarcely a room now in any private

house in Montreal that would have ad-

mitted one of them without a manoeuvre

of some kind or other. No whispering

in corners in these good old days: if a

lady in a ball-room, speaking to her

neighbors, did not call out as if she had

been speaking over a five-bar gate, it

was impossible to hear her, from the

distance. She was obliged to sit to

make room for her hoop'd dress—a de-

bustle, would not make one h—

according to our *modern* notions.

The dress of the *modern* was not in

much better h—, though we lords of the

creation — we require reform as much as

the waves by sailors, but among the middle

and higher classes breeches were uni-

versal, so that a superior and a much more

expensive kind of stocking was neces-

sary and always in use. In those days

gentlemen, when in full dress, generally

wore a coat and waistcoat—both of

very ample dimensions, but without any

neck—or scarf or white cloth, heavily

trimmed with gold lace, velvet breeches

with silver or gold knee buckles; the

stockings were of silk,—and at one period

these stockings differed in color from each

other,—and the shoes had large silver

buckles. The cravat was of fine Brussels

lace, and lace ruffles were also worn

at the wrists. Hair powder—another

monstrosity—was then in general use

among young men of even the middle

classes—the daily employment of the

visiter being absolutely requisite, as the

hair had to be dressed and tied behind

in a queue. Elderly men wore powdered

curls with stiff curls. About the end

of last century, the use of hair powder

among the younger people was given up

very suddenly for a more graceful

fashion, which came from France,

and the present "huge whalebone

bodice and bedraggled skirt" of the

ladies, or the ridiculous looking swal-

low-tailed coat and troublesome round

hat of the gentlemen is from June, 1722,

Dolomieu removed to New Orleans, and

the next year Charlevoix received New

Orleans from Canada, and some 100 cabin

and 1000 head of cattle.

The city was said to have been founded

by the French in 1718, who left 80 men there to clear the ground and erect

buildings. In 1719 the river rose so high that it was abandoned. In 1721 De Poucet surveyed the passes of the Mississippi, and founded a bar with eleven feet of water upon it. In November, 1722,

Dolomieu removed to New Orleans, and

the next year Charlevoix received New

Orleans from Canada, and some 100 cabin

and 1000 head of cattle.

The city was said to have been founded

by the French in 1718, who left 80 men there to clear the ground and erect

buildings. In 1719 the river rose so high that it was abandoned. In 1721 De Poucet surveyed the passes of the Mississippi, and founded a bar with eleven feet of water upon it. In November, 1722,

Dolomieu removed to New Orleans, and

the next year Charlevoix received New

Orleans from Canada, and some 100 cabin

and 1000 head of cattle.

The city was said to have been founded

by the French in 1718, who left 80 men there to clear the ground and erect

buildings. In 1719 the river rose so high that it was abandoned. In 1721 De Poucet surveyed the passes of the Mississippi, and founded a bar with eleven feet of water upon it. In November, 1722,

Dolomieu removed to New Orleans, and

the next year Charlevoix received New

Orleans from Canada, and some 100 cabin

and 1000 head of cattle.

The city was said to have been founded

by the French in 1718, who left 80 men there to clear the ground and erect

buildings. In 1719 the river rose so high that it was abandoned. In 1721 De Poucet surveyed the passes of the Mississippi, and founded a bar with eleven feet of water upon it. In November, 1722,

Dolomieu removed to New Orleans, and

the next year Charlevoix received New

Orleans from Canada, and some 100 cabin

and 1000 head of cattle.

The city was said to have been founded

by the French in 1718, who left 80 men there to clear the ground and erect

buildings. In 1719 the river rose so high that it was abandoned. In 1721 De Poucet surveyed the passes of the Mississippi, and founded a bar with eleven feet of water upon it. In November, 1722,

Dolomieu removed to New Orleans, and

the next year Charlevoix received New

Orleans from Canada, and some 100 cabin

and 1000 head of cattle.

The city was said to have been founded

by the French in 1718, who left 80 men there to clear the ground and erect

buildings. In 1719 the river rose so high that it was abandoned. In 1721 De Poucet surveyed the passes of the Mississippi, and founded a bar with eleven feet of water upon it. In November, 1722,

Dolomieu removed to New Orleans, and