NOTICE.

The Proprietors of the Montreal Courier *do not acknowledge any Receipts granted by* Alfred Haddock *since the* 1st *of March last.*

Montreal, 20th April, 1850.

☞ THE MONTREAL 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 tri-weekly, on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays. Subscription, six dollars per annum, payable in advance.*

☞ THE SEMI-WEEKLY COURIER *(bi-weekly) is published on Monday and Thursday evenings, in time for the Mails, at the low price of* THREE DOLLARS *per annum, payable in advance.*

☞ *All* LETTERS *must be post-paid, or else the postage will be deducted from the amount sent.*

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

THE COURIER.

SATURDAY, MAY 4, 1850.

Troy and Boston Railroad—A Grave Question.

We lay before our readers this morning the proceedings of a meeting of the subscribers to the stock of this Road, held in this city last week.

The question of building and the time of building this Road is one of grave importance to Troy, and it rests with our citizens to determine whether we shall have not only a Road to Boston, but also a Road to Rutland, and thence through Vermont, to Montreal—for the one depends on the other. The question is not, whether our relations with the North and East shall be improved or continue the same as they are; it is not whether we shall stand still or go ahead; but it is—shall we go ahead, advance to high prosperity as the depot of the trade of the North and the East, or retrograde and sink into insignificance from the loss of trade. For, if we do not conduct to our city the two Roads branching off at Eagle Bridge, one to Vermont and the other to Boston, most assuredly, our neighbors, the Albanians, will conduct those Roads to their city, which more than we, is now experiencing the necessity of new improvements.—*Troy Whig.*

The wholesome and legitimate rivalry between two cities like Albany and Troy, placed as they are at the head of the navigable waters of the Hudson, and both emulous of the profitable honor of becoming the trading depot of the North, must promote and facilitate the construction of a Railway striking direct from Montreal to the Hudson. Capitalists, house-owners, landed proprietors, and merchants, in the American towns, liberally aid all Railway projects which even remotely promise to improve their means. There are no natural impediments to prevent uninterrupted Railway travel in mid-winter. The depth of snow cannot check a powerful engine; and once a Railway from Montreal to New York is complete, proprietors of Railway Stock to the Lines will derive income from property, that for six months of the year is now dormant and unproductive.

Erie Canal.

The haste with which the Contractors for the enlargement and improvement of the Erie Canal passed over their work, to be ready for the navigation by the 25th April, may, during the busy season, create many breaks and detentions. Every year the transit trade is checked by some accident or other, to which the Erie Canal, like all artificial channels of communication, is liable. False principles of legislation, and separate nationalities, have neutralized those services which we might otherwise derive from a River such as the St. Lawrence:—

SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
Toronto, 10th April, 1850.

SIR,—I have had the honor to receive and to submit to the Governor General your letter of the 25th ultimo, and in reply am commanded by His Excellency to acquaint you, for the information of the Quebec Board of Trade, that the views of the Government on the subject of the new Navigation Act have been already fully given in the correspondence with the Montreal Board of Trade, referred to in your communication.

With regard to the suggestion of the Board of Trade, that American vessels might be permited to come from any American port on the upper Lakes direct to Quebec, there to load with return cargoes, under such regulations as the Governor General should see fit to impose, I am to inform you that His Excellency, under existing circumstances, does not deem it expedient to assent to the same.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
J. LESLIE,
Secretary.

The Hon. W. Walker, &c.

The Quebec papers are puzzled to understand the motives which move the Ministry in thus creating preferential rights in favor of Montreal. It is probable that they have a lingering expectation of obtaining Reciprocity, and wish to retain in their own hands a shadow of power. Their conduct in the matter is neither Statesmanlike, honest, or straightforward, and we believe some doubts exist as to the authority vested in a Colonial Governor to decide questions of an Imperial character. A suit would test the pretension.

Railway Liabilities.

The Whitehall and Saratoga Company had a verdict returned against them for $410, being the value of the baggage and money lost by a passenger, named Margaret Hart, who bought at Whitehall tickets through to Troy. Judge Parker charged that the Company was responsible for the delivery of the baggage at the end of the *whole route* for which they had sold tickets, and that they were also responsible for the acts of their agents. Part of the property lost consisted of sovereigns:—it was claimed that the complainant was not entitled to recover for the loss of the sovereigns, on the ground that the company had advertised they would not be responsible for money of passengers, and had forbid their agents to accept the charge of any. The court charged that such advertisement does not relieve the company so long as they do receive the money. The rule is, that if a traveller travels with a large amount of money, and gives no notice of the fact to the agents of the road, that they might take additional care for its security, then the company is not liable; but if from any act on the part of common carriers, passengers lose amounts of money which may be considered but sufficient to defray ordinary travelling expenses, they were liable for the amount lost and for any inconvenience passengers may suffer in consequence.

There will be an extraordinary meeting of the Law Students' Society held this afternoon, in the Court House, at half-past 3, when the members, and all other Law Students, are requested to attend.

LEEDS.—The Convention of Delegates from the different Townships of the County of Leeds met at Farmersville on the 28th of last month, to nominate a candidate to represent that County in Parliament at the next General Election. The following gentlemen were nominated:—Mr. Ormond Jones; Mr. O. R. Gowan; Mr. George Crawford; and Mr. David Bewes. On the vote being taken, the choice of the majority fell on Mr. O. R. Gowan, who received 36 votes.

CITY NEWS.

Proceedings of the Corporation.

WEDNESDAY EVENING, May 1, 1850.

PRESENT:—His Worship the Mayor; Messrs. Bourret, Lyman, Larocque, Beaudry, McFarlane, McDonald, Hall, Whitlaw, Lynch, McGrath, Atwater, Leclaire, and Lamarche.

Alderman Lyman rose to say, that he felt himself honored by moving that a vote of thanks be given to the Alderman opposite him, the Hon. J. Bourret, testifying the high opinion the Corporation entertained of his public utility while amongst them; also their regret for the necessity he was under of leaving them, as well as their opinion that his late appointment to the honorable offices he held in the Legislature, were well deserved by him.

The vote was moved and passed without any opposition.

Hon. Mr. Bourret rose to reply, that it was with sincere regret he felt himself called away from the Councils of the Corporation. He would only say, that it should ever be his study to maintain the character they had given him, by performing honestly the duties of a good citizen. For the present, he would say no more than that in his new office he would use every exertion to promote the interests of this city. Business of importance made it necessary that he should withdraw.

Mr. Bourret then took leave, personally, of every member of the Corporation.

WATER COMMITTEE.

A letter was read, signed by J. Dinning, Esq., to the effect that the citizens of Montreal, inhabiting Mountain Street, St. Antoine Street, and neighborhood, complained of the want of water, especially during the Summer, to allay the dust. They, therefore, petitioned the Corporation to use the water from the city tanks. It was referred to the Water Committee.

ELECTION OF A TOWN COUNCILLOR FOR THE ST. ANTOINE WARD.

His Worship the Mayor reminded the Corporation that, in consequence of the appointment of the Hon. Joseph Bourret, late Alderman for St. Antoine Ward, a vacancy was created. He would, therefore, announce that an election to replace that gentleman would take place on the 14th of this month, and the following gentlemen appointed Returning Officers:—Robert McKay, Esq., to be Returning Officer, and Mr. N. S. Whitney to be Deputy Returning Officer. There would be three polling places for the election, and three Returning Officers. The places appointed for polling were as at the last election.

APPOINTMENT OF ALDERMAN IN PLACE OF HON. JOSEPH BOURRET.

Moved by Alderman Lyman, seconded by Alderman Larocque, "That J. U. Beaudry, Esq., be appointed Alderman in the room of Hon. Joseph Bourret."

The vote passed unanimously.

The Finance Committee reported that it appeared to them proper, in consequence of the great fidelity and attention of the City Treasurer, Mr. Demers, and in consideration, also, of the Assistant Secretary's equally satisfactory conduct, that a donation of £50 be presented to the former, and a donation of £25 to the latter.

Alderman McFarlane wished to remark, that nothing could be more deserving the notice of the Corporation, in order that they might remunerate it proportionably, than the conduct of the gentlemen in question; the duties they had to perform were very onerous. Mr. Demers had long performed those to the satisfaction of all concerned; and, in fact, one of the gentlemen mentioned in the Finance Committee Report had been doing the work of two. In both the cases these gentlemen, in consideration of the vast amount of labor imposed upon them, and their fidelity in the discharge of it, were entitled at least to this mark of the esteem of the public.

Councillor Atwater did not at all doubt that both the gentlemen alluded to were well deserving this donation as a compliment, nevertheless he was averse to the expenditure of money, except for necessary items. If this principle of "gratuitous donation" be followed, doubtless the Corporation would have a heavy task before them. Although he did not venture to assert, that their merits entitled them to the sum specified, nevertheless he did not see why the Corporation had anything more to do than fulfil the contract voluntarily agreed on by both parties. He would, therefore, vote against the donation.

Alderman Lyman regretted that, in many instances, the public money, by whose fault he would not inquire, had been misapplied, if not completely thrown away. With regard to the vote in question, he would say, that small though the sum was, he did not see that the Committee were called on to give it away gratuitously at a time when their Treasury was so much exhausted, and when a public work of great importance was just under their consideration. He would vote against the measure.

Councillor McGrath wished to remind the Corporation that, as far as he was concerned, he would strenuously oppose all such measures of donation. This was not the time for such proceedings. He wished to remind the Corporation that, instead of heaping favors upon either one or the other of these gentlemen, (who, whether they were poorly paid or over paid, had, at all events, fair remuneration,) it would be much more to the purpose to consider the best means of alleviating the distress of the many poor persons who were either badly paid for their day's work, or could get no work at all. He would, for these reasons, oppose any donation.

Councillor McDonald fully coincided with Councillor McGrath. It was a hard thing that, in Canada, an able-bodied man, the father, perhaps, of a family, could not, in the present state of things, ordinarily look for better payment than an English shilling for his day's work.

For the donation—Messrs. Beaudry, McFarlane, Larocque, Lamarche, and Leclaire.

Against—Messrs. Lyman, McDonald, Atwater, MacGrath, Hall, Lynch, and Whitlaw.

For the donation	5
Against it	7
Majority	2

RE-BUILDING OF ST. ANN'S MARKET.

Mr. Sexton (City Clerk) read a Report from the Finance Committee, with an Estimate from George Browne, Esq., of this city, Architect. This was a tender submitted to the Corporation, and accompanied by two designs of the proposed building, which is to be erected on the ruins of the Parliament House. He proposed to the Corporation to execute the design at the cost of £3000. The design No. 2 has been approved by the Committee, as answering their object in the re-erection of the Market. Upon this plan the building will resemble the Bonsecours Market, being an oblong edifice, or parallelogram, elevated in the centre, but without elevations at either wing, as in the case of the Bonsecours Market.

Moved by Alderman LaRocque, seconded by Councillor Whitlaw:—"That the building be commenced according to Plan No. 2 so soon as £3000 shall be advanced as loan to the Corporation."

Alderman LaRocque wished to remark, that the proposed building was much wanting. He would say that the Plan just proposed, and under consideration at present, was such as they might, with all propriety, adopt. Mr. Browne had completed the Bonsecours Market at a period when (it was well known) the Corporation had involved themselves in difficulty by their agreements with other Contractors. He had also personal experience of Mr. Browne's skill in his profession, and he doubted not that if the Corporation gave him the work under consideration, they would not have to answer the charge of stupidity and ignorance which had been alleged at the period he alluded to against them, from the fact that they did not give employment to competent Architects.

Alderman McFarlane remarked, that it was not because Alderman LaRocque wished to employ Mr. Browne, or because Mr. Browne had been employed before, that the Corporation should give the Contract to him, unless his terms were equally advantageous with those of other Architects. Why not leave the thing open to public competition? Were there not many Architects ready to send in their Plans, and to send them in too at the lowest figure? He would, therefore, move an amendment to Alderman LaRocque's motion.

Moved by Alderman McFarlane, seconded by Councillor McDonald:—"That the building of St. Ann's Market be submitted to public competition, and that the several Plans of the Architects be brought under the consideration of the Corporation."

Majority against the motion, 4.

For Alderman Larocque's motion, that the building of St. Ann's Market, according to plan No. 2, be commenced when the sum of £3000 shall be in the hands of the Treasurer:

Ayes.—Atwater, Leclaire, Whitlaw, Lynch, Beaudry, McDonald, Larocque, Lyman.—8.

Nays.—Messrs. McFarlane, Hall, McGrath, Lamarche.—4. Majority, 4.

From the Seminary of Montreal, a demand for £8 and odd shillings, *rente constituc* for ground, due by the Corporation. Agreed to.

POLICE REPORT.

The Report of the Police Committee on the Petition of Mr. Robert Kirkup, against remuneration for damages done to his property at the late Municipal elections, was confirmed.

The Report of the Police Committee on the Petition against permission to admit the erection of a soap manufactory by Mr. Watson, St. Urbain Street, next came up. On the vote of concurrence, it was moved, in amendment, that the matter be referred to a legal adviser of the Corporation for his opinion, which was carried on a division.

The Council adjourned at 10 o'clock.

MONTREAL, May 3, 1850.

To the Editor of THE MONTREAL COURIER:

SIR,—I have to thank you for affording me the use of your columns to vindicate a newspaper (the *Christian Inquirer*) published in a distant city from the misrepresentations of the Montreal *Witness*. Will you allow me to trespass on your kindness once more, which I trust will be the last the public will have to hear on this unpleasant topic. The *Witness* of Monday last gave his authority for an assertion made on the 1st ultimo, and says that his assertion "is substantially maintained." Permit me to place this assertion and the alledged proof side by side, that the public may have an opportunity of forming an opinion on this matter:—

ASSERTION, *as contained in the "Witness" of 1st April last*,

"For instance, an article which appeared in it, (*Christian Inquirer,*) not long since, was, we are informed, to the following effect, viz.:—If our Saviour had lived at the present day, he would not have been the perfect character he was, as he had not the same temptations to contend with that he would have now."

ALLEGED PROOF, *given in last Monday's "Witness,"*

"The religious community, which has respected the teachings or admired the lives of the leaders of the Unitarian movement, has often objected that there is a defect in Unitarianism. The advocates of Unitarianism have often admitted it. It has often failed—like all other denominational forms of the Christian religion—to awaken the spirit of more unfettered inquiry on religious truth. But not because it is not true; and not because it is not the whole truth. Yet we need more. Do not leave us, we may say to our teachers, to meditate for ourselves upon the doctrine of God, but teach us every duty that He requires. Do not leave us in blind admiration of the Saviour; show us what so good a being would have done in our place. Show us what goodness like His would do, engaged in the midst of business and gain, like ours—in the relationships of home such as we sustain—in the midst of temptations to worldliness, such as we are surrounded by—in connection with a Government and nation like ours, and with a state of civilization, such as that of the nineteenth century. Do not teach us the abstract doctrine, we may say to them, that we should love our neighbors as ourselves; a thousand circumstances seem to forbid it; society seems based upon an opposite doctrine; our hopes in life, the demands of others upon us, and the rivalship of the world *seem* to forbid it; teach us what it is to love our neighbor as ourselves."—*Correspondent of Christian Inquirer, 17th November.*

Your readers will now be ready to ask, what shadow of proof is there in this quotation? and, indeed, if the assertions of the *Witness* are generally made on such grounds, as the above case exhibits, its statements ought to be received with great caution. It will be observed that, as to the matter of our Saviour's living at the present day in Boston, it is the production of an imagination rendered super-fertile by sectarian prejudice. And as to any insinuation concerning the possible imperfections of our Saviour's character, that is a perversion—the scope of this passage from the *Inquirer* being totally different, viz., to set forth our Lord as a perfect example. To this, however, the *Witness* objects. But our Lord himself even condescended on a certain occasion to perform a menial office: to wash his Disciples' feet, and said, "I have given you an example;" yet the *Witness* seems to think it borders on profanity to present him as an example in the ordinary affairs of life. It is this which, in the opinion of the *Witness*, constitutes the dangerous character of the *Christian Inquirer*. Let the public judge for themselves in this matter. I can only use your columns to discuss a question of fact, and do not feel at liberty to enter upon any subjects of theological controversy.

I can scarcely help wishing the *Witness* had published the whole of this very *dangerous* article, which his friends have, after much search, found in the *Christian Inquirer*. But, perhaps, Sir, in justice to the calumniated New York paper, you would print the closing paragraph of the communication, in order that the public may be better able to form an opinion how far the *dangerous* character pronounced against it is justified:—

"Let us remember the slave; labouring that we may give him his freedom; and the wife, his child, his wages, his limbs, his rights to read the words of the Saviour, and to worship God. Let us remember those who are doomed to die—whom society frowned upon in their birth, neglected in their youth, and pursues with death, when, from their native degradation, they fall into crime, and on each of whom God has set his mark, as upon the first murderer, that we should not kill him. Let us remember the thousands and hundreds of thousands that die each year in war, and never remit our efforts, until not a weapon of war is forged, nor a passion that leads to it entertained in the human breast. Let us disseminate our general principles, not the special applications of them. Let us lead men up to Christ, but still teach, as they are on the way to Him, what duties He requires of them. The fundamental principles of our denomination require constant development in the truth. The world, the church and heaven require us not to spend our time in generalities, but to teach us the whole council of God, and set forth every duty."

With regard to the assertion made by the *Witness* concerning the Montreal subscribers to the *Inquirer*, it is untrue, and that is all it is necessary to say about it. He says he will publish the facts of the case now, if I furnish them; but the public have no interest in these facts, so that all I would say on this point is to recommend to the *Witness* henceforth a change of method in such matters, and instead of making assertions, and afterwards asking for facts to sustain them, let him henceforth get possession of the facts before he makes statements; but the rash utterance was made on the 1st day of April, and I will, therefore, permit him to carry his *poisson d'Avril*.

THE AGENT FOR THE CHRISTIAN INQUIRER.

MONTREAL, May 3, 1850.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE MONTREAL MERCANTILE LIBRARY ASSOCIATION:

GENTLEMEN,—The ample Report of the *Herald*, and the subsequent publication of a pamphlet containing the Report of your late Special Meeting, have brought the proceedings of that occasion fairly before the public. It is right that it should be so, for, on a matter of such importance as that involved, the public ought to be made acquainted. And now, since these proceedings have been made known, may it not be well to review and consider them in view of your approaching Semi-Annual Meeting, called for the 6th instant, when the same question may be expected to be raised. The facts of the case, as made apparent by the published documents, are simple. At the request of some parties connected with the M. L. Association a certain religious newspaper was presented to the News-Room. In November last this paper was formally received by the Board of Directors, and next month it was expelled on account of the doctrines which marked its columns. Certain insulting expressions were embodied in the Resolution of expulsion, for which, however, apology has been made. This apology ought to be accepted, and I trust has been so accepted. We have, therefore, nothing more to do with the mere matter of insult. We have to do only with the question of expulsion on account of religious opinion.

This is a very grave question. It amounts just to this—whether your Institution is to be conducted on principles of Freedom or Exclusion. The M. L. A. was established on a basis of Freedom, but the Directors, by their Resolution of December last, have introduced the wedge of Exclusion, which, if not removed at once, may be driven farther by some subsequent Board, until not even a semblance of Freedom will remain. To place it out, by nullifying the Resolution, is the only chance of safety, the only method of restoring the Institution to its original integrity.

With this view, a Special General Meeting was called on the 6th ultimo, when the friends of Freedom were but in a minority of one. No person is so bound by his vote on that occasion, that he may not vote otherwise on the next, if he should see sufficient reason to change his opinion on the merits of the question at issue. The friend of Freedom may vote on the side of Exclusion, if further consideration lead to this result, or the advocate of Exclusion may vote on the side of Freedom.

We have now the debate before us, with time to ponder upon it.—Mr. Taylor, and the friends of Freedom took the ground of *principle*. No matter what political opinions they individually held, they would assert the right of papers of opposite opinions to be in the News-Room. No matter what religious opinions they held themselves, they maintained the right of papers representing different views to be in the Reading-Room. Although Trinitarians themselves, they insisted on the right of a paper holding Unitarian sentiments to all the privileges granted to other papers. Mr. Winn, and the advocates of Exclusion, took the ground of *expediency*. They maintained that any paper should be excluded which was specially offensive to certain persons. They held that, if the reception of a Journal should so offend the predilections of a certain class of subscribers, as to become a source of contention, it ought to be expelled. One of the advocates of Exclusion (Mr. Boyd) summed the matter up in a business-like way, and thus put the question:—"Some thirty members were prepared to leave the Association" if the *Christian Inquirer* were received, while only "six or seven would leave" if it were excluded, what then was the Association to do? He conceived it ought to be excluded. His reasoning on this question obviously amounted to this, that while "he held its rejection would be *unjust*," yet inasmuch as the loss of thirty subscribers, against that of six or seven only, stared him and his fellow-Directors in the face, he voted for the rejection. In other words, he was so influenced by the disparity in casting up the balance of profit and loss, that, on the ground of expediency, he voted for what he held to be injustice.

I offer no remarks on what was said by the friends of Freedom, for they stood on the plain principle of Liberty. Mr. Winn's was the leading speech on the side of Exclusion, and was characterized by a mild and proper temper. But, taking the ground of expediency, he laboured of course under great disadvantages in argument. He draws his leading inference in favour of Exclusion from a gratuitous assumption, which being itself baseless, the inference is without value. He says that three-fourths of the religious newspapers in Canada are not taken into the News-Room, and that of thirty or forty religious newspapers published in the United States, only one is taken. Hence he infers it "most unreasonable to expect that a paper, the organ of the very smallest body, should be taken while the rest were excluded." Here he assumes (for it is the only thing that could justify his inference) that the friends of Freedom would sanction the exclusion of all other denominational forms of the Christian religion—to awaken the spirit of more unfettered inquiry on religious truth. But not because it is not true; and not because it is not the whole truth. Yet we need more. Do not leave us, we may say to our teachers, to meditate for ourselves upon the doctrine of God, but teach us every duty that He requires. Do not leave us in blind admiration of the Saviour; show us what so good a being would have done in our place. Show us what goodness like His would do, engaged in the midst of business and gain, like ours—in the relationships of home such as we sustain—in the midst of temptations to worldliness, such as we are surrounded by—in connection with a Government and nation like ours, and with a state of civilization, such as that of the nineteenth century. Do not teach us the abstract doctrine, we may say to them, that we should love our neighbors as ourselves; a thousand circumstances seem to forbid it; society seems based upon an opposite doctrine; our hopes in life, the demands of others upon us, and the rivalship of the world *seem* to forbid it; teach us what it is to love our neighbor as ourselves."—*Correspondent of Christian Inquirer, 17th November.*

Mr. Leeming made a motion to the effect he now proposes, at your last meeting; but it was then ruled out of order. One cannot help thinking, however, that he is singularly unfortunate in all he says or does in this matter. Here is his Resolution as then proposed:—"That inasmuch as the Association is one of a *strictly* unsectarian character, and not founded for the purpose of propagating religious (or political) opinions, that it is necessary for its peace and future welfare, that all religious (and political) newspapers be now and henceforth refused admittance into its Reading-Room." The italics and the brackets are mine, not his, for the purpose of illustration. Now it is evident that Mr. L.'s preamble, if it justifies any action against the Christian Witness, justifies a wider action than he proposes. Stripped, however, of its sectarian garb—the words "political" ought to be inserted where I have placed them; and the Resolution so amended, and thereby rendered consistent in all its parts, would be perfectly legitimate. I do not, by any means, support such extensive action as a desirable step: but it is evident he regards the Board, not simply as the representatives of the mercantile young men of Montreal, without distinction of sect or party, but as the representatives of certain Theological opinions, elected to office through certain Theological interests, and hence justified in excluding any Literature that may be obnoxious to their cherished opinions or prejudices. In other words, they are there to do the thinking for the members of the Association, telling them, authoritatively, what they are to read within the Institution, and what they are to be debarred from reading. We all know that this is not the office of Directors, and it is greatly to be lamented that any member of the Body should be found giving utterance to sentiments so inappropriate and unworthy. Besides, Mr. Evans is here mistaken in matter of fact. He seems to overlook the existence of Mr. John Young, who is a Director. Mr. Young is a Unitarian, but through motives of delicacy, did not attend the Board while the discussion concerning the *Inquirer* was going on, although he was requested to do so. Beside Mr. Young, Messrs. George and Frederick Frothingham, and other Unitarians, have been on the Board, yet I presume they never thought for a moment that they were placed there either to countenance or discountenance any class of newspapers on account of Theological opinion. Seeing this unfounded notion has got into the Board of Direction, the Association should lose no time in pronouncing against it.

Gentlemen, two courses will be presented for your consideration at the approaching Semi-Annual meeting, one of which will be to annul the obnoxious Resolution of 3rd December last, and the other the expulsion of all the remaining religious papers. Mr. Leeming has publicly given notice of a motion to the latter effect, but such a motion is radically defective under present circumstances. It does not annul, or set aside, the force of the obnoxious Resolution of December. It merely staves off the question of Freedom, by an expedient, thought to be demanded by the pressing nature of the case. Mr. L.'s motion might be consistently entertained by all, provided your Institution were now Free. But it is not; for the Resolution of December has made it exclusive and sectarian in its character. To this motion, Mr. Taylor has publicly notified enfranchisement, which, by embodying the decision of perfect Freedom—by "offering to all the various denominational bodies represented in the Association, without distinction," the same privilege—annuls the exclusive vote of the Directors, and thus enables you to assert the Free character of your Institution. Much might be said in favor of Mr. T.'s amendment, on other grounds; but all others are minor issues, and I have no desire to say anything, except on a great question of Freedom or Exclusion.

Mr. Taylor has publicly notified enfranchisement, which, by embodying the decision of perfect Freedom—by "offering to all the various denominational bodies represented in the Association, without distinction," the same privilege—annuls the exclusive vote of the Directors, and thus enables you to assert the Free character of your Institution. Much might be said in favor of Mr. T.'s amendment, on other grounds; but all others are minor issues, and I have no desire to say anything, except on a great question of Freedom or Exclusion.

Mr. Leeming made a motion to the effect he now proposes, at your last meeting; but it was then ruled out of order. One cannot help thinking, however, that he is singularly unfortunate in all he says or does in this matter. Here is his Resolution as then proposed:—"That inasmuch as the Association is one of a *strictly* unsectarian character, and not founded for the purpose of propagating religious (or political) opinions, that it is necessary for its peace and future welfare, that all religious (and political) newspapers be now and henceforth refused admittance into its Reading-Room." The italics and the brackets are mine, not his, for the purpose of illustration. Now it is evident that Mr. L.'s preamble, if it justifies any action against the Christian Witness, justifies a wider action than he proposes. Stripped, however, of its sectarian garb—the words "political" ought to be inserted where I have placed them; and the Resolution so amended, and thereby rendered consistent in all its parts, would be perfectly legitimate. I do not, by any means, support such extensive action as a desirable step: but it is evident he regards the Board, not simply as the representatives of the mercantile young men of Montreal, without distinction of sect or party, but as the representatives of certain Theological opinions, elected to office through certain Theological interests, and hence justified in excluding any Literature that may be obnoxious to their cherished opinions or prejudices. In other words, they are there to do the thinking for the members of the Association, telling them, authoritatively, what they are to read within the Institution, and what they are to be debarred from reading. We all know that this is not the office of Directors, and it is greatly to be lamented that any member of the Body should be found giving utterance to sentiments so inappropriate and unworthy. Besides, Mr. Evans is here mistaken in matter of fact. He seems to overlook the existence of Mr. John Young, who is a Director. Mr. Young is a Unitarian, but through motives of delicacy, did not attend the Board while the discussion concerning the *Inquirer* was going on, although he was requested to do so. Beside Mr. Young, Messrs. George and Frederick Frothingham, and other Unitarians, have been on the Board, yet I presume they never thought for a moment that they were placed there either to countenance or discountenance any class of newspapers on account of Theological opinion. Seeing this unfounded notion has got into the Board of Direction, the Association should lose no time in pronouncing against it.

Gentlemen, two courses will be presented for your consideration at the approaching Semi-Annual meeting, one of which will be to annul the obnoxious Resolution of 3rd December last, and the other the expulsion of all the remaining religious papers. Mr. Leeming has publicly given notice of a motion to the latter effect, but such a motion is radically defective under present circumstances. It does not annul, or set aside, the force of the obnoxious Resolution of December. It merely staves off the question of Freedom, by an expedient, thought to be demanded by the pressing nature of the case. Mr. L.'s motion might be consistently entertained by all, provided your Institution were now Free. But it is not; for the Resolution of December has made it exclusive and sectarian in its character. To this motion, Mr. Taylor has publicly notified enfranchisement, which, by embodying the decision of perfect Freedom—by "offering to all the various denominational bodies represented in the Association, without distinction," the same privilege—annuls the exclusive vote of the Directors, and thus enables you to assert the Free character of your Institution. Much might be said in favor of Mr. T.'s amendment, on other grounds; but all others are minor issues, and I have no desire to say anything, except on a great question of Freedom or Exclusion.

Another gentleman uttered a similar sentiment, and altogether as inappropriate. In reference to the subscriptions of Unitarians, he said "it was one thing to receive a gentleman's money for a purely secular or mercantile object, and quite another to endorse his religious belief." But how does the reception of a paper, whether political or religious, late the News-Room, become the "endorsing" of the opinions of that paper? Does the Connecticut subscriber endorse the opinions of the Annexation papers, or the Congregational subscriber endorse the opinions of the Episcopal papers? All that represents of "propagating" and "endorsing" religious opinions is out of place. The simple fact of the case is, that papers are placed in a News-Room for the purpose of reference and general information, not for that of propagating or endorsing their respective opinions. And the presence of any paper in the News-Room violates no man's right, since those who do not wish to read are not compelled to do so. But its expulsion is an infringement of right, since to those who wish to read, the privilege is denied. It is plain that in the matter before your Association just now, we have one of those unhappy cases, where mere *prejudice* is brought into conflict with simple *right*. Mr. Morris, and minds of his order, would have respect for the prejudice, but generous, enlightened, high-principled minds, will have respect for the right.

The question of expelling all religious papers is a legitimate question; but the friends of freedom must not permit the grand previous question to be stayed off, or set aside, by the raising of another issue at the present time. While the Resolution of last December stands unrebuked and unCancelled on the Books, the Institution is exclusive and sectarian. It must be annulled before the free character of your Association can be vindicated. To have done this, therefore, is the first duty of the friends of Freedom. To give way to such considerations of expediency as have been advanced, would be to write the ruin of the Institution. On such grounds, every just and reasonable arrangement might be frustrated by any factiously disposed person, who would work on the feelings or prejudices of some (twenty or thirty members, and induce them to threaten withdrawal. There is no safe ground to occupy but that of PRINCIPLE. The man, or body of men, who adhere to this, will eventually overcome every obstacle.

Gentlemen, your Semi-Annual Meeting is fast approaching, and I look with hope to its result. The ultimate issue of

"Freedom's battle once begun"

cannot be defeated, though carried on, "over and over won,"

and must eventually be successful. Remember that "Freedom to Read, Freedom to Think, Freedom to Speak," is the motto and the first privilege of Freemen.

A MEMBER.

COMMERCIAL.

Montreal Market Prices.

FRIDAY, May 3, 1850.

	s.	d.		s.	d.
Flour, per cwt	9	0	@	11	0
Wheat, per bushel	4	6	@	5	0
Corn, per bushel	2	6	@	3	4
Oats, per bushel	1	6	@	1	8
Barley, per bushel	2	3	@	2	6
Peas, per bushel	2	6	@	2	9
Buck Wheat, per bushel	2	0	@	2	3
Rye, per bushel	2	6	@	2	9
Oatmeal, per quintal	7	0	@	8	0
Linseed, per bushel	4	6	@	5	3
Beef, per cwt	25	0	@	27	6
Beef, per lb	0	4	@	0	0
Pork, per cwt	25	0	@	27	6
Pork, per lb	0	3¼	@	0	5
Mutton, per quarter	2	6	@	5	0
Lamb, per quarter	2	6	@	3	4
Lard, per lb	0	6	@	0	7
Butter, Fresh, per lb	0	10	@	0	11
Butter, Salt, per lb	0	6½	@	0	7½
Cheese, per lb	0	6¼	@	0	9
Eggs, per dozen	0	5½	@	0	6½
Fowls, per couple	2	0	@	2	6
Turkeys, per pair	5	6	@	6	6
Ducks, per pair	2	6	@	3	0
Geese, per pair	5	0	@	5	6
Hares, per couple	0	7½	@	0	9
Maple Sugar, per lb	0	3½	@	0	4
Potatoes, per bushel	2	1	@	2	6

For the information of our Commercial readers we are glad to have it in our power to state, that Mr. Watson, Inspector of Flour, has adopted the standard of Inspection recommended by the Montreal Board of Trade, according to which there will for the future, be Superfine flour of first and second quality—the former denoting flour made from fall, and the latter flour made from spring wheat, or fall wheat which had been run too close in the milling to Inspect No. 1.

We have not been able to learn whether the same rule of Inspection is to be applied to Fine Flour, but we think it not unlikely as the reasons which have induced to the alteration of the one mode, apply with equal force and propriety to the other.

PORT OF OAKVILLE, TO BE A WAREHOUSING PORT.—His Excellency the Governor General in Council has been pleased to appoint the Port of Oakville, to be a Warehousing Port, under the provisions of the Act, 10 and 11 Vict. Chap. 31, Sect. 23.

New York Markets.

MAY 2—6, P. M.

ASHES.—Market dull; $5.62½ for *Pots* and *Pearls*; demand fair.

FLOUR.—Tendency downward; demand for the East has fallen off. Sales of 600 barrels at $4.75 for No. 2 superfine, $5.18 @ $5.37½ for common to straight State, and $5.75 @ $5.87½ for pure Genesee.

GRAIN.—*Wheat*.—Demand fair; sales of 3000 bushels pure Genesee, on private terms. *Corn* without change; demand fair; Spring not so scarce; sales of 7500 bushels at 58 cents for damaged, 58½ @ 59 cents for damaged Jersey, and 60½ @ 61 cents for Jersey yellow.

PROVISIONS.—No change in *Pork*; demand fair for local trade; sales of 500 barrels at $10,18 @ $10,25 for Mess, $10 @ $10.18 for Prime Mess, $6.75 for sour Prime, and $8 @ $8.62 for Prime; sales of 180 barrels country Prime at $5.25 @ $5.50; Mess in lots at $8.50 @ $8.75; Prime Mess held at $8,17 @ $8.19, without sales.

Buffalo Markets.

MAY 3.

FLOUR.—Transactions this morning quite limited, and but few sales to report; the *Canada's* news has been received at Halifax, but as yet has had but little influence on the Market. Holders firm at previous rates for Ohio and Michigan, but buyers are less plenty. Sales 500 barrels Michigan at $5; good Wisconsin offered at $4.56, without a purchaser.

GRAIN.—*Wheat* in fair demand, but none of consequence in the Market. *Corn* not so active, but holders firm. Sales 2500 bushels Mixed Waybush afloat at 45 cents, 250 ditto from Store at 45½ cents; good samples of Yellow held higher.

PROVISIONS continue firm, with sales to the trade at our last quotations.

CANAL FREIGHTS without change.

1850.

THROUGH LINE.

FOR TORONTO AND HAMILTON DIRECT

THE New and Splendid Steamer *NEW ERA*, Captain MAXWELL, will leave Montreal for the above and Intermediate Ports, THIS DAY, (Saturday,) the 4th instant, at NOON, and will arrive at Hamilton on Monday afternoon.

For Freight or Passage, apply to
MACPHERSON, CRANE & Co.,
Or to the Captain on Board.

May 4, 1850. 95

REMOVAL.

JAMES GORDON & CO. have REMOVED to the Stores, No. 5, St. Sacrament Street, lately occupied by Messrs. EASTON, PHILLIPS & Co.

May 4, 1850. 95

SCHOOL BOOKS.

JUST RECEIVED, a supply of OLIVER & BOYD'S SCHOOL BOOKS, comprising:—

Reid's Modern Geography
Ingram's Arithmetic
Thomson's Arithmetic
Edinburgh Academy's Latin Rudiments
Edinburgh Academy's Latin Delectus
Edinburgh Academy's Greek Delectus
Ferguson's Latin Grammatical Exercises
Jackson's Book-Keeping
Trotter's Arithmetic
Buttens' Etymological Spelling-Book
McCulloch's Course of Reading
McCulloch's Series of Lessons, &c., &c.

R. & A. MILLER.

May 4, 1850. 95

BY TELEGRAPH

VIA MONTREAL AND BUFFALO.

ARRIVAL OF THE MAIL STEAMER

CANADA.

NEW YORK, May 3.

The Steamer *Canada* arrived at Halifax this day.

The *Niagara* arrived out on the 20th, and brings news caused an advance in Cotton, with sales of 60,000 bales, of which speculators took 10,000. Flour was dull, and in favor of the buyer. Baltimore, 23s.; Philadelphia, 23s. Choice and Western Canal, 23s. 6d. to 24s., according to quality. Yellow Corn 27s. 6d. Exchange; White was lower and sales at 27s. 6d. Coffee unchanged and active, at easier rates. Pork quiet but steady in demand, and prime parcels a shade lower; dull, but firm