

THE MORNING COURIER, FOR THE COUNTRY, JUNE 30, 1836.

MONTREAL, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 29, 1836.
By the ship *Sparks* from Havre, Paris dates to the 24th and Havre to the 25th May, inclusive, have been received at New York. The news by her is unimportant. General EVANS was in daily expectation of a reinforcement of 1,200 Spanish troops, with which, and his other forces he would, it was expected, make a vigorous attack upon the Carlists.

We question if the present age has advanced much further in liberality in relation to politics and religion than the more confined of its vocabulary. Self-knowledge was among the highest and purest precepts of the heating philosophers; it is among the most prominent of Christian morality; but to know and especially to practice what is due to others is a still lesser effort, and a more rare attainment. This, however, is what true liberality aims at. To be liberal, is in fact, to practice the golden maxim of doing unto others as we would that others should do unto us. In how far is it yet generally observed to let the malignant fierceness of political party spirit, and the bitterness of religious dissensions that are more or less to be found in every country that is in any way civilized, bear testimony.

As already stated, the existing race is only sparing the language of liberality—it has advanced, but a short way in its practice. The prevalence of the language, however, must be taken as the sure precursor of the substance. During the French revolution, the slang of liberalism was very current, but it was not the language of sincerity emanating from principle; it was that of heartless empiricism. In Republic North America the phraseology in question has long been in use, though the insolence of power only partially moderated in its exercise by virtue, has imposed unwarrantable restraints upon the public expression of opinion on many important subjects. Serious contentions, however, as to matters of religion scarce exist there.

In Britain, the language of liberality is not only now more favourably received, but the principles are begun to be practised. We can say about as much for Canada. For long did a crew of low huckebyed tricksters in this country appropriate the language of principles which they did not practise; a language of which their habitual selfishness prevented them from appreciating the meaning. The consequence was, that men more liberal than they were aware of what had been so vilely prostituted. But, a change which has been for some time steadily at work in the public mind, is becoming every day more apparent. The language of liberality is neither schematically shunned, nor are the principles which that language indicates, without a considerable practical influence. Every thing gives promise of the commencement and continuance of a full flow of healthy public opinion.

Among the most unequivocal signs of the times, is the contemplated formation of a Society for the "Attainment and security of a Universal and perfect religious liberty and equality," to the prospects of which we the other day referred. The boldness of the language of this pamphlet, its lofty doctrine, and the spirit of perfect liberality which pervades it, may startle some, but its leading principles challenge investigation. The public is invited to judge of their soundness, by that rule which every man possesses in his own bosom.

We shall at present extract from it the propositions which form the basis of the doctrines to be advocated by the Society. Their axiomatic force and clearness, and their consistency, will, we are sure, be appreciated by every intelligent and right thinking member of the community. We shall continue to make, from time to time, extracts that will tend to give those who do not possess the pamphlet an opportunity of judging of the principles and objects of the Society.

Proposition 1.—It is not consistent for any human authority to interfere directly or indirectly, with the exercise of the sacred right of conscience, or to employ any other means of influencing or controlling the exercise of this fundamental right of every rational and moral being, save those which are purely and exclusively given up to the will of the author of his unshaded freedom.

Proposition 2.—This great and sacred privilege of man is violated, not only when a government usurps the power of suppressing liberty of conscience by direct punishment, but is also more easily inflicted, in giving to one or more persons, ecclesiastical or civil, the power of withholding from another, merely because the latter is in the equally conscientious exercise of the common right, may have led to the adoption of opinions and principles different from those of the former.

Proposition 3.—Even if it did come within the legitimate province of a government to promote or influence the religious creed of their subjects, or to blot their minds for or against any system of opinions or principles whatsoever, it is manifest that such an application of its power, could only be made with the greatest wrong, as, so as not to injure irreparably the one here, or to promote and sustain error on the other; and for those reasons it is obviously inconsistent with the very nature of a free and enlightened government, to admit any partial vindictive distinction, grounded upon the conscientious differences which exist in the minds of the subjects, and in the rights of the subjects.

Proposition 4.—All arguments in favor of exclusive religious establishments, which have been urged, founded upon the peculiar circumstances of France, &c., are wholly exploded by those of British America. Due to the present Country, an order of things has arisen wide

different from that which obtained at the time of the Reformation, when the establishments were founded; and many evils and inconveniences, which were unknown at that period, are now forcing upon Government the necessity of modifications and reforms in the constitutions of the Ecclesiastical Committee, connected with the State, of which it is an urgent duty to ascertain the final results. How extremely anxious and impulsive, therefore, is the attempt to force these establishments upon the Colonies of British North America, in which the state of society is not only widely different from that of Britain, but is also in every respect identical with that of the United States.

We question if the present age has advanced much further in liberality in relation to politics and religion than the more confined of its vocabulary. Self-knowledge was among the highest and purest precepts of the heating philosophers; it is among the most prominent of Christian morality; but to know and especially to practice what is due to others is a still lesser effort, and a more rare attainment. This, however, is what true liberality aims at. To be liberal, is in fact, to practice the golden maxim of doing unto others as we would that others should do unto us. In how far is it yet generally observed to let the malignant fierceness of political party spirit, and the bitterness of religious dissensions that are more or less to be found in every country that is in any way civilized, bear testimony.

As already stated, the existing race is only sparing the language of liberality—it has advanced, but a short way in its practice. The prevalence of the language, however, must be taken as the sure precursor of the substance. During the French revolution, the slang of liberalism was very current, but it was not the language of sincerity emanating from principle; it was that of heartless empiricism. In Republic North America the phraseology in question has long been in use, though the insolence of power only partially moderated in its exercise by virtue, has imposed unwarrantable restraints upon the public expression of opinion on many important subjects. Serious contentions, however, as to matters of religion scarce exist there.

In Britain, the language of liberality is not only now more favourably received, but the principles are begun to be practised. We can say about as much for Canada. For long did a crew of low huckebyed tricksters in this country appropriate the language of principles which they did not practise; a language of which their habitual selfishness prevented them from appreciating the meaning. The consequence was, that men more liberal than they were aware of what had been so vilely prostituted. But, a change which has been for some time steadily at work in the public mind, is becoming every day more apparent. The language of liberality is neither schematically shunned, nor are the principles which that language indicates, without a considerable practical influence. Every thing gives promise of the commencement and continuance of a full flow of healthy public opinion.

Among the most unequivocal signs of the times, is the contemplated formation of a Society for the "Attainment and security of a Universal and perfect religious liberty and equality," to the prospects of which we the other day referred. The boldness of the language of this pamphlet, its lofty doctrine, and the spirit of perfect liberality which pervades it, may startle some, but its leading principles challenge investigation. The public is invited to judge of their soundness, by that rule which every man possesses in his own bosom.

We shall at present extract from it the propositions which form the basis of the doctrines to be advocated by the Society. Their axiomatic force and clearness, and their consistency, will, we are sure, be appreciated by every intelligent and right thinking member of the community. We shall continue to make, from time to time, extracts that will tend to give those who do not possess the pamphlet an opportunity of judging of the principles and objects of the Society.

Proposition 1.—It is not consistent for any human authority to interfere directly or indirectly, with the exercise of the sacred right of conscience, or to employ any other means of influencing or controlling the exercise of this fundamental right of every rational and moral being, save those which are purely and exclusively given up to the will of the author of his unshaded freedom.

Proposition 2.—This great and sacred privilege of man is violated, not only when a government usurps the power of suppressing liberty of conscience by direct punishment, but is also more easily inflicted, in giving to one or more persons, ecclesiastical or civil, the power of withholding from another, merely because the latter is in the equally conscientious exercise of the common right, may have led to the adoption of opinions and principles different from those of the former.

Proposition 3.—Even if it did come within the legitimate province of a government to promote or influence the religious creed of their subjects, or to blot their minds for or against any system of opinions or principles whatsoever, it is manifest that such an application of its power, could only be made with the greatest wrong, as, so as not to injure irreparably the one here, or to promote and sustain error on the other; and for those reasons it is obviously inconsistent with the very nature of a free and enlightened government, to admit any partial vindictive distinction, grounded upon the conscientious differences which exist in the minds of the subjects, and in the rights of the subjects.

Proposition 4.—All arguments in favor of exclusive religious establishments, which have been urged, founded upon the peculiar circumstances of France, &c., are wholly exploded by those of British America. Due to the present Country, an order of things has arisen wide

different from that which obtained at the time of the Reformation, when the establishments were founded; and many evils and inconveniences, which were unknown at that period, are now forcing upon Government the necessity of modifications and reforms in the constitutions of the Ecclesiastical Committee, connected with the State, of which it is an urgent duty to ascertain the final results. How extremely anxious and impulsive, therefore, is the attempt to force these establishments upon the Colonies of British North America, in which the state of society is not only widely different from that of Britain, but is also in every respect identical with that of the United States.

We question if the present age has advanced much further in liberality in relation to politics and religion than the more confined of its vocabulary. Self-knowledge was among the highest and purest precepts of the heating philosophers; it is among the most prominent of Christian morality; but to know and especially to practice what is due to others is a still lesser effort, and a more rare attainment. This, however, is what true liberality aims at. To be liberal, is in fact, to practice the golden maxim of doing unto others as we would that others should do unto us. In how far is it yet generally observed to let the malignant fierceness of political party spirit, and the bitterness of religious dissensions that are more or less to be found in every country that is in any way civilized, bear testimony.

As already stated, the existing race is only sparing the language of liberality—it has advanced, but a short way in its practice. The prevalence of the language, however, must be taken as the sure precursor of the substance. During the French revolution, the slang of liberalism was very current, but it was not the language of sincerity emanating from principle; it was that of heartless empiricism. In Republic North America the phraseology in question has long been in use, though the insolence of power only partially moderated in its exercise by virtue, has imposed unwarrantable restraints upon the public expression of opinion on many important subjects. Serious contentions, however, as to matters of religion scarce exist there.

Society of Friends.—A determination on the part of the British Government to persist in the ill-judged policy of introducing into those Colonial religious establishments, which do not comprehend within their joint pews area, a society of Friends, is an attempt to antagonise and impede, the efforts of the Colonies to secure the independence of their Colonies, and to establish, in every respect identical with that of the United States.

We question if the present age has advanced

ALEXANDER MEADE, June 23.
Flour.—We notice a slight improvement in

Flour. The wheat price yesterday was \$6.20.

The CLOTHES OF THE UNITED STATES.—Very

full details are given in Pennsylvania of the na-

ture of the wheat crop. For some time

past the crops have been recog-

nized that the crop has been ruined. From Da-

vis, Bucks, Lynching, Montgomery, Lehigh,

Northampton, Lancaster, Lebanon, York, Cum-

berland, and other adjoining counties of Penn-

sylvania through Maryland, all losses are

now considered as being

the same calamity to be deplored.

The CLOTHES of Montreal, though under a

French Government, are not considered as being

the same calamity to be deplored.

The CLOTHES of Boston, though under a

French Government, are not considered as being

the same calamity to be deplored.

The CLOTHES of Newburyport, though under a

French Government, are not considered as being

the same calamity to be deplored.

The CLOTHES of Newburyport, though under a

French Government, are not considered as being

the same calamity to be deplored.

The CLOTHES of Newburyport, though under a

French Government, are not considered as being

the same calamity to be deplored.

The CLOTHES of Newburyport, though under a

French Government, are not considered as being

the same calamity to be deplored.

The CLOTHES of Newburyport, though under a

French Government, are not considered as being

the same calamity to be deplored.

The CLOTHES of Newburyport, though under a

French Government, are not considered as being

the same calamity to be deplored.

The CLOTHES of Newburyport, though under a

French Government, are not considered as being

the same calamity to be deplored.

The CLOTHES of Newburyport, though under a

French Government, are not considered as being

the same calamity to be deplored.

The CLOTHES of Newburyport, though under a

French Government, are not considered as being

the same calamity to be deplored.

The CLOTHES of Newburyport, though under a

French Government, are not considered as being

the same calamity to be deplored.

The CLOTHES of Newburyport, though under a

French Government, are not considered as being

the same calamity to be deplored.

The CLOTHES of Newburyport, though under a

French Government, are not considered as being

the same calamity to be deplored.

The CLOTHES of Newburyport, though under a

French Government, are not considered as being

the same calamity to be deplored.

The CLOTHES of Newburyport, though under a

French Government, are not considered as being

the same calamity to be deplored.

The CLOTHES of Newburyport, though under a

French Government, are not considered as being

the same calamity to be deplored.

The CLOTHES of Newburyport, though under a

French Government, are not considered as being

the same calamity to be deplored.

The CLOTHES of Newburyport, though under a

French Government, are not considered as being

the same calamity to be deplored.

The CLOTHES of Newburyport, though under a

French Government, are not considered as being

the same calamity to be deplored.

The CLOTHES of Newburyport, though under a

French Government, are not considered as being

the same calamity to be deplored.

The CLOTHES of Newburyport, though under a

French Government, are not considered as being

the same calamity to be deplored.

The CLOTHES of Newburyport, though under a

French Government, are not considered as being

the same calamity to be deplored.

The CLOTHES of Newburyport, though under a

French Government, are not considered as being

the same calamity to be deplored.

The CLOTHES of Newburyport, though under a

French Government, are not considered as being

the same calamity to be deplored.

The CLOTHES of Newburyport, though under a

French Government, are not considered as being