To Advertisers.

General Advertisers are requested to send in their favors before Eight o'clock, P. M., on the evening prior to desired publication.

Auctioneers will oblige by sending in their Sales before Six o'clock, P. M.

Provincial Parliament.

The Proprietors of the *Montreal Courier* beg to state, that they have just completed their arrangements for the reception of the Reporters from the Seat of Government, (Toronto,) and that full details of all the *sayings* and *doings* in the Canadian Legislature will always appear in the columns of their journal.

Parties supplied at their residences by the Carriers, at the low rate of 7½d. per week, or 5s. (one dollar) for the Session.

To the Carriers of the "Courier."

THE PROPRIETORS of the *Courier* inform their Carriers, that the following premiums will be awarded to them on their sales during the week, viz.:—

£0 10 0	to the first.	
0 7 6	to the second.	
0 5 0	to the third.	
0 2 6	to the fourth.	

These Premiums are exclusive of the usual Commission.

COURIER OFFICE,
June 12, 1850.

THE COURIER.

TUESDAY, JUNE 18, 1850.

Disastrous Fire and Loss of Property in Montreal.

It is with deep regret we call the attention of the public to the details of the late calamitous fire. The origin thereof has been traced to the carelessness of some persons, who, while smoking in a house hard-by the Protestant Church, near the Gas Works, threw the matches among some shavings, which quickly ignited. The result was in the fullest sense of the word disastrous,—it was ruinous. Out of the thickly peopled district of Griffintown, 600 persons have been sufferers, having lost, by this wide-spreading misfortune, house, home, and goods, and all these able-bodied men and of matured years. If we estimate the number of persons thrown upon the world by this event, we would conclude that treble that number have been the sufferers. Nor is this statement the result of anxiety to pre-occupy the attention of our readers; it is, upon the contrary, the candid statement of those who are desirous that the lamented occurrence should be pourtrayed in the most favorable light. The first notice of the fire was given by the persons in the neighborhood of the carpenter's shop where it originated—this was about the hour of 4, P. M. In the course of half-an-hour the bells at the Griffintown Seminary and Notre Dame Church commenced to ring; but as this signal lasted only for a couple of minutes, the people in the distant quarters of the town were not aware of the alarming nature of the fire. Upon arriving at the spot, a large timber-yard in Prince's Street, surrounded by wooden palisades, was discovered to be on fire, and this event was the greatest stimulus to the flames that could have occurred under the circumstances. The flame quickly spread thence into Dalhousie Street, with fatal success; Wellington Street shared in the conflagration; Prince's Street and Ann Street. These five Streets, forming a quarter-mile in depth, were, in the course of 40 minutes, counting from the commencement of the fire, enveloped in flames. It cannot be said that the firemen neglected their duty upon the occasion. We know from persons who were upon the spot at the hour of 4, that, upon the notice given by the inhabitants near the Gas Works, the engines were hastening on their way to the fire. A large detachment of the military gave efficient aid also at the scene of the burning. We impute their failure to the combustible materials that we noticed in the vicinity of the spot where the catastrophe had its origin; secondly, to the crowded plan upon which the greater part of the property consumed was erected, and in some measure to the difficulty of procuring water—the wharf being a quarter mile distant from the locality where the fire originated.

Yesterday (Sunday) a vast number of persons of all ranks visited Griffintown, in order to ascertain clearly the amount of destruction. Certainly the prospect that met their gaze was well calculated to awake their sympathies. Hundreds of respectable families, thrown upon the world's wide common, were yesterday to be seen in Griffintown stalking amid the ruins that had protected their infancy, and witnessed their honest and edifying industry. A large crowd collected in Dalhousie Street around the cellar where a respectable woman, named Mrs. Livingston, had fallen a prey to the flames. Looking upon the spot where her body reposed, we discovered a hollow in the ashes of the ruins, but to discover any traces of the deceased, save this, was impossible, so completely had her remains been calcined to ashes, which the Chemist alone could recognize as those of human clay. It appears that the deceased kept a dairy and had some cows near the house in an enclosure. Having escaped along with her neighbors, she resolved to return for some of her property, probably for some money, and; upon doing so, was suffocated by the flames. A car ran over the body of a laborer upon Saturday in the midst of the crowd. His life, however, is not despaired of. Two children have been missing since Saturday, and these, we fear, have perished. There is still much danger in remaining near the falling chimneys. Among the rest of the ruins we regret to find the fine stone Church adjacent to the Gas Works—nothing but the four walls, and these partly calcined, now remain. We may instance as a providential occurrence the escape of the Gas Works, although in the same street, which has been, with this solitary exception, consumed. What would have been the loss of life had the Gas entered into the item of conflagration, we are happily spared inquiring. One of the Fire Engine-Houses in Wellington Street has been consumed, together with a large quantity of materials. Dalhousie Street has been entirely consumed. Providentially the loss of life has been confined to this one instance, but that of property has extended over two hundred and fifty families, which calls upon the charity, the generosity, and the discernment of the public.

We believe the following are, as nearly as possible, the liabilities of the different Insurance Offices, as far as can be at present ascertained:—

Montreal, from £1500 to £1800.
Quebec, £1200.
Globe, from £30 to £50.
Etna, Protection and Hartford, £10,000
Mutual, from £9000 to £10,000.
North Western, £750.

The Nightingale Ethiopian Serenaders.

This talented Company of Vocalists gave their first entertainment at the Theatre Royal last evening, but from the lateness of the hour we have only time to say, that they proved themselves justly entitled to the high encomiums of the Press at Toronto, Quebec, and in the principal cities of the United States, where they have visited. Their second and last performance but one, takes place this evening.

Monklands Hotel.

The Martinette Family will give their second entertainment this afternoon, in Compain's Pleasure Grounds, at Monklands. It will be altogether varied from the last. The omnibuses will commence running at 2 o'clock from Compain's Restaurant, Place d'Armes.

The Electors of the Borough of Sherbrooke, by a majority of nineteen, have called on their Member to resign his seat.

CANADIAN AFFAIRS.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

TORONTO, June 14, 1850.

The *Mirror* has gone over to the Ministry, bag and baggage. It is regularly sold. It gives evidence this morning of a determination to become a servile tool of the Administration. It gravely informs us, "that the country will not much longer endure the kind of opposition offered now." No doubt the *Mirror* has been placed under the control of Mr. Ryan by a stratagem of the Inspector General. Ryan was lately brought up here, no doubt, for the purpose, and stuck into the Inspector General's Office, The Clerk-Editor will, of course, obey the instructions of the master on all occasions.

I make a brief abstract of a Bill, intituled—

An Act to authorise the Proprietors of the Champlain and St. Lawrence Railroad Company to extend the said Road, and for other purposes—(Mr. DEWITT.)

Repeals 10 and 11 Victoria, chap. 121, intituled "An Act to Incorporate the Montreal and Province Line Junction Railway Company;" also 12 Vic., c. 179, intituled "An Act to amend and extend the Act to Incorporate the Montreal and Province Line Junction Railway Company." Authorises and empowers the Company of the Champlain and St. Lawrence Railroad to construct a branch from some point on the present Line to some point on the River St. Lawrence, opposite or nearly opposite the City of Montreal, and a continuation of the present Railroad from some point at or near the Terminus at St. Johns, in as direct a line as may be readily practicable, to the Province Line at or near Rouse's Point, with one or more sets of rails, and on the locomotive or atmospheric principle, as the Company may deem best, and to erect wharves, warehouses, stores and other buildings at either termination, and at such other places on the Line of the said branch or continuation as they may deem best. £75,000 new Stock may be raised, if necessary.

TORONTO, June 14, 1850.

Last night, in the Legislative Assembly, Mr. Hincks announced the intention of Government to introduce a general Banking Law, under which, without any special Act of Incorporation, new Banks can be established. He also announced, that the Government intend to introduce a Bill on the subject of the Currency. What will be the character of the latter measure, he did not state; the announcement respecting both measures having been incidentally made for the purpose of getting a motion of Mr. W. H. Boulton, for leave to bring in a Banking Bill similar to that which established the free Banking system in the State of New York. It happens somehow, singularly enough, that whenever a private member asks for leave to bring in a Bill, which is calculated to bring him some amount of personal popularity, the Ministry are always just on the point of introducing a similar measure. These coincidences are very curious; often wearing the aspect of official jealousy and official mendacity. In the present case, not a breath had been whispered about Ministerial intentions before the motion of Mr. Boulton was made. On the contrary, Mr. Boulton stated, that the Chief Commissioner of Public Works, who was present in his place, and by whom the Inspector General states the Banking Bill is to be introduced, had told him within a few days, that it was not the intention of the Government to introduce any general measure on the subject of Banking this Session. He also stated, that Mr. Hincks had himself told a deputation of Bankers, consisting of Messrs. Harper, Cameron and Morris, that the Government did not intend to introduce any Banking Bill this Session. The Inspector General was evidently cornered; and he tried to escape from his position by stating, that the Bankers in question did not wait upon him as a deputation, and admitting, that in a conversation with them, which he called casual and non-official, he did make the statement attributed to him. Whether it would be right non-officially, that which would be false if stated officially, is a point the Inspector General did not clearly elucidate. With regard to the statement attributed to Mr. Merritt, and which Mr. Boulton mentioned before referring to the statement of Mr. Hincks, the latter affected to believe it impossible that Mr. Merritt could have expressed himself so decidedly; evidently wishing to convey the impression, that the Government had long since determined to bring in the Banking Bill. Indeed, he went so far as to say, that they had had the Bill prepared for months. But when it became necessary that he should appear as having told a correct story to the deputation of Bankers, he then said that the Government had only that day decided to introduce the measure! Why then could Mr. Merritt not have stated to Mr. Boulton, a few days since, that the Government would introduce no Bill on the subject this Session? All this shows the desperate jealousy of the Government, and their determination to crush all independent efforts at legislation. It was ludicrous to hear the Inspector General complaining that Mr. Boulton desired to take out of the hands of the Government, a measure which, so far as the public knows, has never been in their hands! Mr. Boulton's motion was negatived on a division. Mr. Hincks stated the Government measure will differ a good deal from the Free Banking Law of the State of New York.

Mr. Hincks introduced a Bill to incorporate the Niagara and Detroit Rivers Railroad.

In answer to an inquiry of Mr. Robinson, whether it be the intention of Government to pay awards which may be made by the Commissioners appointed under the Act of last Session to ascertain losses sustained by the inhabitants of Lower Canada during the years 1837 and 1838, before the information moved for on that subject, during the present Session, is before the House, Mr. Baldwin said, the Government were not aware of any thing that would interfere with the operation of the Act.

Mr. DeWitt, seconded by Mr. Holmes, moved for leave to bring in a Bill to regulate the Wharfage Dues at the Harbour of Montreal. He said that the Wharfage exceeds the freight in many cases, and prevents the steamers from Longueuil from going to the wharf. Mr. Hincks asked for a postponement of the motion for a few days, as the Harbour Commissioners had lately sent suggestions regarding the Rates of Toll, and the Government had the matter under consideration. Mr. DeWitt then consented to postpone the motion.

Hon. Mr. Boulton's Bill to alter, simplify, and amend the Practice of the Law, and to diminish Law Expenses, was referred to the Committee on Law Reform, appointed on the previous night.

The Bill to Amend the Law of Slander and Libel was read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. Laurin for the second reading of the Bill to Amend the Act regulating the Measurement of Timber, some discussion ensued, in which it appeared pretty plainly that the only effect of the Bill would be to favor the Cullers, and trammel the trade. The motion was lost on a division.

The question for the second reading of the Bill, introduced by H. J. Boulton, to abolish Imprisonment for Debt, having been brought up, a rather long discussion ensued. Solicitor-General McDonald opposed the motion for the second reading, on the ground that the measure would take from the creditor, in many cases, the only means of enforcing payment of his claims. Mr. Cameron (of Kent) supported the Bill. He denounced Imprisonment for Debt as an outrage upon humanity. It was worse than the old practice of selling the body of the debtor to satisfy the claims of the creditor; and, for his part, if he were given a choice, he would prefer being sold to work in the open fields, to being immured in a dungeon. In the United States they had abolished Imprisonment for Debt, and had gone so far as to exempt from Execution for Debt the Homestead of every family in ten of the States. Mr. H. Sherwood supported the Bill. He characterized the practice of imprisoning a man for his misfortunes as cruel and unchristian. Mr. Sherwood (of Brockville) also supported the Bill. Mr. Cameron (of Cornwall) thought the present law such as ought to exist in every commercial country. Mr. Merritt denounced the law for imprisonment for debt as a relict of barbarism, which had been swept away in the United States, France, and Germany. Mr. Willson raised a question of fact, denying that imprisonment for debt now exists, and alleging that it is always fostered by the Attorney-General West, tried his hand at ridicule. If we were going to establish a new state of society, it would become a question, whether all laws for the collection of debts should not be abolished; but, in the present state of things, he could not support the "revolutionary" measure. He backed up, and Mr. H. J. Boulton denied the statement of Mr. Willson, that imprisonment does not now take place for debt, but only for fraud. Mr. Cartier said the debtor was treated worse than the thief, as he is often imprisoned longer than he would be if he had stolen so much money from the pocket of his creditor. Mr. Lafontaine, to do him justice, of all the speakers, was the only one to take a really philosophical view of the matter. He laid it down that, if there is fraud, there is crime, and the party should be punished criminally. But the power of imprisonment should never be exercised for the purpose of enforcing contracts. No individual should be allowed to wreck his vengeance upon another by having the power to imprison him—a power that belongs solely to society for the punishment of crime. The second reading was carried by a vote of 62 to 7—Baldwin turning round and voting with the crowd.

X.

TORONTO, June 15, 1850.

The only subject that occupied the attention of the House last night, was the Seigniorial Tenure. As this question is of great interest in Lower Canada, I have thought the better way would be to send you a brief report of the debate.

On motion of Mr. Lafontaine, the House went into Committee on the Seigniorial Tenure. Mr. Lafontaine moved the following Resolutions:—

Resolved,—As the opinion of this Committee, That the Seigniorial Tenure in Lower Canada is a matter of public concern, which it is the duty of the Provincial Legislature to take into consideration, more especially now that the subject has attracted the public attention in a high degree; and that it is, therefore, important to effect, at as early a period as possible, the conversion of the said Tenure into a Free one, taking care that all the interests concerned are protected and equitably adjusted.

Resolved,—As the opinion of this Committee, That such Commutation of Tenure can only be effected by securing a fair indemnity to all parties whose just rights it will affect.

Resolved,—As the opinion of this Committee, That the foregoing Resolutions be referred to a Select Committee of Members, to report the different plans hitherto suggested for effecting the said commutation, together with their own opinions; with power to send for persons, papers and records, and to report from time to time; and that Messrs. [illegible] and the mover be of the said Committee.

Mr. LAFONTAINE spoke in French. He represented the Seigniorial Tenure as unsuited to the present condition of the country; and calculated to paralyze its industry. That tenure was well adapted to the settlement of the country; but society had outgrown the institution. He represented the necessity of taking the subject into consideration; but we did not understand him to propose any definite remedial measure.

Dr. DAVIGNON then addressed the House as follows:—If I rise this night to ask for some more instructions to the Committee named by the Resolutions of the Hon. Atty. General of Lower Canada, it is because I feel that I have a duty to perform in this House. Having charge, Mr. President, during the last Session, of Petitions from 45000 electors, praying for an immediate reform of those abuses committed in certain Seigniories in Lower Canada, I should consider myself unworthy of their confidence if I did not employ all my humble talents to obtain the attention of this Honorable House to the complaint. Another reason, Mr. President, which induces me to claim that justice, is the great number of Petitions presented during the last Session by many hon. members of Lower Canada. Those Petitions perished in the fire, but I have taken a memorandum of them, in order to show the number of Petitions, and also the number of signatures attached to them—and this will show that it is a general demand for redress in Lower Canada, particularly in the District of Montreal. Those Petitions show a number of 32,000 signatures, and I will say that it is the greatest number of electors who have addressed this House on a single subject, and I will also say that all these petitioners expected from this House the attention due to their claims, and that if we are their true Representatives, it is our duty to inquire if it is in our power to render them justice. During the recess, Mr. President, I will remark to this House that Conventions were held in the District of Montreal and Quebec. The Convention of Montreal was composed of 150 delegates, representing every Parish in the District of Montreal, and they adopted a Resolution that I will read to this House. (He then read the Resolution.) I say, Mr. President, that an immediate commutation is impossible. The failure of our crops in Lower Canada has rendered it impossible for farmers to raise any capital—and a commutation at this present moment will benefit only the rich, and it is the poor that we must relieve, because it is the poor who suffer. Those new rentes are established over the new lands, and these new lands belong to the poorer habitans; but if the commutation is impossible at this present moment, shall we stop there? Is it not our duty to put an end to these abuses, and, to use the words of my hon. friend from Saguenay, in his letter to the Commissioners of 1841—to those exactions in certain Seigniories? I do not believe that the House will refuse it, and if it is unfortunately the case, Mr. President, I will say that the people of Lower Canada will take that ticket at the General Election, and that such a ticket will have an effect as great as the ticket of the last General Election. Many of my honorable friends are perhaps surprised to see my exertions on this subject, especially the Upper Canadian members, and the members for the District of Quebec, because in this part of the Province they have no Seigniories, and in the District of Quebec those abuses are not so much complained of as in the District of Montreal. And it is for that reason that I will enter into some details and explain before this Committee those exactions committed every day in certain Seigniories, and, to use again the words of my honorable friend from Saguenay, which are sanctioned by the silence of our Courts of Justice, and by the indifference of our authorities, who have suffered our ancient laws and ordinances to be set aside. Before I proceed to show to this honorable House those abuses, I must explain to the Committee what we consider the real rents due to the Seigniors, and payable to them. Of course, Mr. President, I must have recourse to the opinions of persons more able than myself, to explain the intention of the law. The first document to which I shall refer honorable members, is a Report of the Committee of the House of Assembly for Lower Canada in 1821. That Committee was presided over by A. Stuart, a man of talent, and reputed honesty. That Committee says, that, according to the laws of the Province, the Seigniors have no right to charge, in any instance, more than two sols per arpent in superficie. Another document to which I will refer honorable members, is the Report of the Commission named on that subject in 1841. That Commission was composed of Messrs. Buchanan, Taschereau and Smith; two of those gentlemen are now Judges, the other is known as one of our first jurisconsults. I will also refer this House to the opinion of Chief Justice Sewell, who was consulted by the Governor on the merits of Petitions addressed to him by persons complaining of the very same abuses. It seems to me, that with such opinions, there was no doubt that such was the law, and that the Courts of Justice, although very competent to decide the merit of those complaints, have put aside the real intention of the law, and that was the opinion of the third Commissioner that I have mentioned; let us read their opinion. But some say that the Seigniors were not bound to follow those laws—that those laws have no more force in these Provinces since the Conquest; but I will refer the Committee to the instructions given to the Governors since the Conquest, and I will read also some extracts of the Report of the Commissioners. I think, Mr. President, that with all humility these 32,000 Petitioners have certainly reason to say, that those abuses are against the laws of the Province. I must now prove what are those abuses, and this, Mr. President, is very easy. Let us ask the honorable members for Beauharnois, Vaudreuil, St. Hyacinthe, Dorchester, including myself, and we shall very easily prove before this Special Committee, that in many Seigniories we pay from 2 sols to 20 sols per arpent. They will inform the Committee of other taxations from the Seigniors. I will now ask from the honorable members of this House, principally those members who represent the District of Montreal, if we can refuse the immediate reform of this injustice!—can we, in justice to our constituents, who have their eyes upon us!—can we refuse to adopt the resolution that I have the honor to propose? Such law will not prevent the commutation proposed by the Hon. Attorney-General. On the contrary, it will help in making uniform all those rentes, and it will also establish the basis upon which that communication will be established. We say, Mr. President, that such law would be a great injustice to those Seigniors who bought the Seigniories with the persuasion that they will give such revenue; but, Mr. President, how can those Seigniors pretend to say, that they were so sure, when the country has every year, since 1805, protested against those augmentations—yes, Mr. President, since 1805 there has not been a Parliament where the House have not protested by resolutions, by laws, that were always rejected by the Upper House, against those intentions of the Seigniors. I hold in my hand, Mr. President, a list of the years when such laws and resolutions were passed—and, Mr. President, do you suppose that these abuses would exist if somebody did not profit by them; and with such a principle we are unable to correct those abuses, because it will do harm to those that profit by them. I make only a difference. Mr. President, in favor of those Seigniories in which there is only a similar tax established. Such a law, Mr. President, would not be a new thing in this country; let us see what passed in 1813—in that time there was a despotic Government, composed of a Governor and Committee; and now that the people have a Representative and a Responsible Government, we expect that the representatives of that people will listen to them. The principle of a declaratory act has been admitted last Session by the Honbles. Attorney-General and Solicitor-General. I have no intention to embarrass by my Resolutions the operations of the Committee, but I say no commutation can take place without fixing those rentes; let us abolish those abuses and pass a law by which the Censitaires will have the right to choose his Seigniors.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON said the facts had been ascertained that by the grant of the French King the Seigniors were entitled to charge only two coppers per acre rent, and that some of them now charge 1s.; it required no very uncommon degree of judgment to see that they were acting wrong. He wished to become acquainted with all the facts of the case; and he hoped the subject would be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. CHRISTIE said the heavy *rentes* were an intolerable burthen on half a million of people. Petitions, signed by 30,000 persons, had been presented on the subject last Session; and he ventured to say that 200,000 persons petitioned the Lower Canada Legislature before the Union, to have the *rentes* fixed at the original rate. In the District of Quebec the *rentes* have not been much raised; but in the District of Montreal every Seignior has raised the *rentes* double and treble, and in some instances a hundred fold. The evil was not so much in the tenures as in the abuse of it. The first great burden is the *lods et rentes*. If a farm be sold every week, and goes from the family in possession of it, the *lods et ventes* must be paid every time. The *Censitaire* cannot use the water on this land; the Seignior not only has the right to build a mill on any stream, but of going on the land and taking timber out of which to construct it. From this custom have originated most of those burdens that the Seigniorial Tenure has hung around the necks of the *Censitaires*. The burden of *lods et rentes* is the twelfth of the amount of the purchase money. They are paid upon annuities for life, and also for ten years. The member for Norfolk had spoken in favour of referring the question to a Select Committee. He (Mr. Christie) did not think this necessary. All the information that could be had on the subject was to be found in the Journals of the House.

Col. GUGY read the answers he had given to interrogatories put to him by a Committee of the House in a previous session. He said he was a Seignior; and there were but two other in the House, out of 42 members for Lower Canada. (Here several voices cried out, four, six, twenty.) Well, there were in the House twenty tenants to one Seignior. He intimated that this was an attempt to perpetrate a monstrous spoliation. Some were for taking the property of the Seigniors with a strong hand: he did not charge the member for Berthier with such an intention; but he confessed he was afraid of him. Some of the Seigniors derived their rights from their ancestors who received them from the Crown of France, for military or other services; others purchased seigniories with ready money. Would it be fair or reasonable that they should be deprived of that property one or ten years after? There was an attempt to do so. The law had settled the rights of the Seignior, and it was not for the Legislature of United Canada to commit an act of spoliation. In every one of the instances in which property was held under the feudal tenure there was the solemnity of a contract, binding both the landlord and tenant.

Mr. CHRISTIE said the Seigniors were not proprietors, but only trustees.

Col. GUGY (very much out of temper) said the member who spoke last was profoundly ignorant of the subject; he had stated what was not correct.

Mr. CHRISTIE reminded Col. Gugy of a requisition got up in the Town of Sherbrooke, calling on him to resign his seat.

Col. GUGY complained of the interruption. He had used the terms landlord and tenant, not in their absolute sense, but as being the English representative of Seignior and Censitaire. He should not resign his seat, but go back and be re-elected in spite of those who signed the requisition. He repeated that there is a contract entered into by both parties under the Seigniorial Tenure, with a full knowledge of their rights and liabilities. Every tenant has a deed. The member for Rouville based his plans upon exposé facts laws that were passed not by a Legislative body, but by the Courts, which under the despotism of the French Government had Legislative powers. These ordinances which the member had quoted were passed in 1711 and in 1732, restricting the Seignior to one penny an acre rent; but he (Col. G.) denied that these ordinances are law. The points decided by judgment were not those now brought before the House. No maximum was fixed by the judgments. The Seigniors were directed by the king or the king's representative in this country not to sell the lands in a wild state. The power granted to the Legislature he admitted was in the nature of a trust. A Seignior having refused to grant his land on application was brought before the Court, and the Court adjudged that the land should revert to the Crown, who then made the grant directly to the applicant. The Seignior having refused to concede the land, the Crown did it for him, and obliged the tenant to pay the rent that was paid by other Seigniors. That was all the judgment of the Crown decided. It was admitted on all hands that the Seigniorial Tenure was admirably adapted to a new country. A man wanting to settle was not obliged to go to chaffering with the owner of land; he goes with his axe, clears a settlement and demands a right to the land on the payment of an annual rent. The property is his; no human being can touch it. He (Col. G.) knew very few cases where rent paid is more than a penny an acre. Supposing the ordinance had decided upon a maximum of rent. The consequences would be to compel the payment of the same amount of rent on all land good and bad. The bad would be cultivated by serfs or abandoned. The value of money was ten-fold greater now than at the time these rentes were first imposed; and this was a circumstance that should be taken into account. How would gentlemen holding lands in Upper Canada like to be told that in virtue of an obsolete ordinance they must give their good lands for a fixed value. He maintained that no law could, under the Constitution, compel any man to part with his property for less than its market value. He would now refer to another branch of the subject. It had been said that there were 30,000 petitioners on the subject. It made no difference whether there were 30,000 or 60,000. He did not take into account the number of petitioners. Petitions could be got up on any subject, if you will pay well for it. It costs the petitioners nothing. He ventured to say that out of every thousand petitioners nine hundred and ninety-six were dupes, and the other three were what he would not say. He concluded by saying that he should support the Resolutions.

Mr. ARMSTRONG said, the great complaint in the country was, that the *Censitaires* had been imposed upon. The Ordinances that had been referred to not only compelled the Seignior to concede his lands, but to concede them at the rates they were then worth. The question was, what these rates were? There were several instances in which the Seigniors had sold the lands for four or five dollars an acre, and afterwards demanded rents in addition, from the parties who purchased.

Mr. PAPINEAU said, the rights of the rich must be protected, or those of the poor could not be long maintained. The rights of three-fourths of the Seigniors were absolute; as much so as those who held by free and common soccage. The system of tenure against which the cultivators were raised, was founded in wisdom and justice. It was a pure compact. The Seigniors had sold the lands for four pounds ten a supposition, that the parties could compel the Seigniors to concede the lands, whether the Seigniors liked or not. Merchants of popularity had told the people, "you ought to have the land for a penny an acre." It was no wonder that they succeeded in producing an effect, when they addressed an interested audience; and it was surprising that the whole country had not been thoroughly demoralized, when the people had been under such teaching. This House could not act as an appellate tribunal from the unanimous decisions of the regularly constituted Courts for half a century. It mattered not that the wrong came from the tyrant million. The French law granted the Seigniories on the condition that the Seigniors should settle them in three or four years. The grants were at first unconditional; afterwards, there were new grants with this condition, that the lands should not be sold, but rented; but no rate of rent was fixed. The first action of the Government in the matter was in 1711, by an edict of the French King. Some of the Seigniors had sold their lands, in contravention of the grant on which they received them; and the Government interfered, only to compel an observance of the terms of the grant. The sum to be charged for rent was not fixed by the Government, only it was to be the same as that held by the surrounding *Censitaires*.—Those were the terms of the edict of confirmation. The Seigniors were at liberty to receive any rent they could obtain. The tyrannical Act of the Special Council of Lord Sydenham, interfering with and robbing the Seminary of Montreal, was a monstrous violation of the rights of property. Would it not be monstrous to say, that the institutions that had been endowed by our ancestors for the teaching of Catholicism should have their property taken from them? Those who hold property under the Seminary of Montreal were lately permitted to commute their dues at a very reasonable rate; and only thirty of them had availed themselves of the offer; a fact which showed, that the people were not ready to rise and rob, and throw away all sense of decency. To attack one kind of property, was to attack all kinds; he was an ardent reformer, and held that every people had a right to seek happiness under those political institutions that were best for them; but the rights of property he would always maintain. Sullivan and Bedard's opinion had been referred to; but both of them had been feed by the Seigniors, and advocated their claims; they had also been feed by the *Censitaires*, and then they advocated their claims.

Mr. DEWITT addressed the House, but in so low a tone that we could not at all distinctly understand what he said.

Col. PRINCE looked upon this as one of the most important questions that had occupied the attention of the House. It was the harbinger of the Clergy Reserves question, and he would warn the members from Lower Canada against being trapped into this measure, which had an ulterior purpose. He looked upon it as an interference with the rights of private property, and he would strenuously oppose its passage. The Hon. member had no right to demand a Special Committee to enquire into the right of property. The language of the Resolutions contained an assurance that there was an intention, on the part of the desired Committee to rob the proprietors of those lands of their legal properties. It was absurd to allege that the Seigniors could not divest themselves of their property; it would be unconstitutional for any King to grant to parties property of which they could not divest themselves. There were but two Petitions against the feudal tenure before the House, and he was, therefore, justified in assuming that there was not a great number of the inhabitants of Lower Canada desirous for the abolition of that tenure. The Resolution was so general and unmeaning, that he could not understand it. All who voted for it would sanction the principle of despoiling all the Seigniors of their property. He held it to be indisputable that the House had no power to interfere with the tenure.

Sol. Gen. DRUMMOND said, he had the misfortune—he owed it to an accident—to be a Seignior. He thought there was always danger in interfering with private rights; but there were various kinds of danger, and we must take into account the temper of the times, and inquire into the popularity of a tenure. Yes, he went so far as that, and although he was reluctant to yield to popular prejudices as a general rule, he thought there were occasions on which attention should be paid to it. He differed from those members who thought that the amount of rent to be paid by the Censitaires had been fixed by the Kings of France. Out of the 240 Seigniories, the rent was specified in but one of the grants. The grants were made unconstitutionally up to a certain time. Subsequently conditions were imposed. First, the seignior was to pay fealty and homage to the King, or to his Representative; next, he was bound to give a statement of his lands, the number of his Censitaires, and all the rights he held under the grant. No conditions were imposed till 1763, when the amount of rent was fixed for the Seigniory of Two Mountains. He denied that under the custom of Paris the Seigniors were bound to grant their land to any one who should demand it. He agreed with the member for St. Maurice, that the feudal tenure was the best that could have been devised for the settlement of the country. The road laws under the feudal tenure had required every man to make a road in the front of his farm, and the good effects of this practice was yet visible. He believed that if Lower Canada had not been under that tenure, it would not have advanced one-tenth part as fast as it had. But although he thought this an admirable tenure for the settlement of a country, he thought the time had now come when that tenure, with its *lods et rentes*, was a drag upon the march of civilization. He believed this tenure must go by the board. But while he thought so, he hoped no one would desire to do anything to violate the rights of the Seigniors. The Seignior is not the proprietor of the land; on this point he must differ from the member for St. Maurice. Although he did not agree with those who say that the Seigniors are mere trustees, he did say that those Seigniors who had held the party refusing to grant it, and who have now several miles square, ought to be stript of it. One Seignior had sold three or four miles square to his brother, who was now reselling the land at about £20 a farm. This conduct was perfectly atrocious. Other Seigniors, as it had been stated, had affixed to the Seigniorial rent a ground rent; a practice which he did not think wrong. As to the alleged maximum for rent, there existed no such maximum. He conceived that the Feudal Tenure in Lower Canada was not the same as that in France. The only obligations on the *Censitaire* were to pay his rente, the *lods et ventes*, and to go to the Seignior's mill. No man, he believed, would be more glad to get rid of the tenure, for a fair compensation than the Seigniors themselves. The imputation of motives, to which they were constantly subjected, was so galling, that they would make some sacrifice to be restored to their position in society. Mr. Drummond concluded, by stating what he conceived would be the proper remedy, and which amounts to this, that all the rights of the Seigniors should be reduced to a fixed annual rent, which the *Censitaires* should be at liberty to redeem.

The Committee then rose, and asked leave to sit again.

X.

Medals granted for service in the field will be withdrawn from soldiers when sentenced to transportation, or to be discharged with ignominy.

The Secretary-at-war has ordered that £90,000 be appropriated for the conversion of buildings to receive soldiers convicted of military offences.

BY TELEGRAPH

VIA MONTREAL AND PORTLAND.

TORONTO, June 17.

On Friday evening the [illegible] fontaine's Resolutions was [illegible] mittee rose and obtained [illegible] The Committee on Ri[illegible] solutions to recommend the [illegible] ernor-General's salary to be [illegible] £500 a-year; the Members [illegible] discussion has taken place [illegible] Robinson's motion to [illegible] prevent the payment of [illegible] nity Act until the [illegible] the other evening stood [illegible] Motion lost. House [illegible] lutions on Mr. Boulton's [illegible] the Constitutional Act.

COMMITTEE DIVISION [illegible] LARY.—MAJORITY [illegible] ron, Cartier, Chabot, [illegible] neau, Sherwood.

MINORITY.—Bell [illegible] Macdonald, McLean, [illegible]

AWFUL DISASTER.—SEVEN [illegible] BURNT!—200 Lives [illegible] despatch says, that the [illegible] way from Buffalo to Erie [illegible] below Cleveland, [illegible] fire and burned to the [illegible] who swam ashore, rep[illegible] those saved thereon [illegible] Captain Roby, with [illegible] last. There were 150 [illegible] The accounts differ [illegible] report gives the number [illegible] stand that Mr. Franklin H[illegible] dren are among the lost [illegible] sided in this city, [illegible] York. Horace Falkner, [illegible] fice, Toledo, was lost.

Advices from Havana [illegible] Spanish Government's [illegible] tions of our Consul, [illegible] thorities, passed through [illegible] have liberated the [illegible] sailed for New York [illegible]

THE QUICKEST TIME [illegible]

WONDERFUL EFFECTS [illegible]

RALWAY'S READY RELIEF

FOR CURING [illegible]

JAS. STEWART, at the [illegible] Street, has been [illegible] for several days. On Friday [illegible] he was quite unwell; he [illegible] him; felt pain in the [illegible] Heaviness, Cold Chills [illegible] Low Spirits and Sleepy [illegible] to take a few drops of Ra[illegible] RELIEF—he took 25 drops [illegible] like a charm. [illegible] Cold Chills and Heaviness [illegible] poor gave place to a genial [illegible] and a happy flow of spirits.

IN FIVE MINUTES [illegible] HE DANCED [illegible]

For he was completely cured.

Let all who suffer [illegible] be RHEUMATISM or DIARRHŒA, BONES or the BOWELS, [illegible] STRAINS or SPRAINS, WEAKNESS [illegible] HEART BURN, SWELLING, [illegible] DOLEREUX, TOOTH ACHE, [illegible] Worm, Rush or Tetter, [illegible] lief, either externally or internally, [illegible] warrant them a safe, speedy [illegible]

I certify that the above [illegible] W. L. [illegible]

I saw the said James [illegible] Ready Relief, and witnessed the [illegible] effects it had upon him.

(Signed) W. [illegible]

Radway's Ready Relief is [illegible] MAN & Co., ALEX. URQUHART, [illegible] and R. W. REXFORD.

June 14.

The *Transcript* will please [illegible]

A CARD.

MRS. R. WILSON & SON [illegible] opportunity of returning [illegible] THANKS to their FRIENDS [illegible] who so opportunely exerted themselves [illegible] their PROPERTY from the [illegible] late CONFLAGRATION in GRIFFINTOWN, [illegible] especially to JOHN MATHEWSON [illegible] C. DORWIN, Esq., the former of whom [illegible] only personally exerted himself in the cause [illegible] but also brought his own Fire Engine [illegible] men, who succeeded, by the [illegible] saving the Property from the [illegible] and removing the Furniture in safety.

Montreal, June 18, 1850.

FOR SALE:—

A few Barrels REFINED SUGAR [illegible] "ed Loaves) a superior article [illegible] use.

A. F. SASSE[illegible]

June 18, 1850.

WANTED, IMMEDIATELY—A [illegible] JOURNEYMAN HAIR CUTTER [illegible] WIG MAKER, to whom liberal wages [illegible] stant employment will be given. A [illegible] BOY. Apply to

J. MACROW,
13, Great St. James Street.

June 17.

WANTED, IMMEDIATELY [illegible] Smart BOYS. Terms liberal. Apply [illegible] the *Courier* Office, St. François Xavier Street, Montreal, June 8, 1850.

WANTED,

$5,000 IN SPANISH QUARTERS [illegible] Apply to C. DORWIN [illegible]

June 15, 1850.

WANTED.—A Smart Active YOUNG MAN [illegible] who would make himself generally useful. None need apply who cannot produce a [illegible] rate character.

JOHN LEVIT,
Notre Dame Street.

June 13

TATTERSALLS.

FOR SALE.

A PAIR OF CARRIAGE HORSES. [illegible] and Chesnut, 16 hands high, 6 and [illegible] old,—sound, kind in double or single harness, both excellent saddle and capital large [illegible] well matched in action. Will be sold separately or together. Apply at

"TATTERSALLS"

FOR SALE,—A SINGLE PHAETON, [illegible] Patent Leather Hood, Patent Axles [illegible] and Shafts, built by THORNTON. May be [illegible] cheap. Apply to

JOHN JONES,
"Tattersalls."

June 17.

THE Subscriber begs to inform the Public [illegible] he has now OPENED his LONG [illegible] for the reception of such articles that may be [illegible] fered for Public or Private Sale. He can, without contradiction, state that he has the largest and [illegible] situated Rooms in this city (being ninety feet [illegible] length,) for Sales of Household Furniture [illegible] Miscellaneous articles, where plenty of room is required. He flatters himself that with such accommodation, and his known punctuality and [illegible] ness, he will receive a share of public patronage.

JOHN JONES.

June 17.

FOR SALE, ex "Earl Powris," lower [illegible] 20 cwt. very Superior LING FISH.

LEMESURIER, ROUTH & Co.

June 17.

SEA-BATHING.

RIVIERE DU LOUP AND KAMOURASKA.

THE Steamer ROWLAND HILL, W. B. JARVIS, Master, will leave the NAPOLEON WHARF, QUEBEC, for RIVIERE D