

THE CARBONEAR STAR, AND CONCEPTION BAY JOURNAL.

Vol. I.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 21, 1833.

No. 34.

NOTICES.

NORA CREINA.
PACKET-BOAT BETWEEN CARBONEAR
AND PORTUGAL COVE.

JAMIS DOYLE, in returning his best thanks to the Public for the patronage and support he has uniformly received, begs to solicit a continuation of the same favours in future, having purchased the above new and commodious Packet-Boat, to ply between *Carbonear* and *Portugal Cove*, and, at considerable expense, fitting up her Cabin in superior style, with Four Sleeping-berths, &c.—DOYLE will also keep constantly on board, for the accommodation of Passengers, Spirits, Wines, Refreshments, &c. of the best quality.

The *NORA CREINA* will, until further notice start from *Carbonear* on the Mornings of MONDAY, WEDNESDAY, and FRIDAY, positively at 9 o'Clock; and the Packet-Man will leave *St. John's* on the Mornings of TUESDAY, THURSDAY, and SATURDAY, at 8 o'Clock, in order that the Boat may sail from the Cove at 12 o'Clock on each of those days.

TERMS AS USUAL.
Letters, Packages, &c. will be received at the *Newfoundland Office*.
Carbonear, April 10, 1833.

DESIRABLE CONVEYANCE TO AND FROM HARBOUR-GRACE.

THE Public are respectfully informed that the Packet Boat EXPRESS, has just commenced her usual trips between *Harbour-Grace* and *Portugal Cove*, leaving the former place every MONDAY, WEDNESDAY, and FRIDAY Mornings at 9 o'Clock, and *Portugal Cove* the succeeding Days at Noon, Sundays excepted, wind and weather permitting.

FARES.	
Cabin Passengers	10s.
Steerage Ditto	5s.
Single Letters	6/.
Double Ditto	1s.
Parcels (not containing Letters) in proportion to their weight.	

The Public are also respectfully notified that no accounts can be kept for Passages or Postages; nor will the Proprietors be accountable for any Specie or other Monies which may be put on board.

Letters left at the Offices of the Subscribers, will be regularly transmitted.

A. DRYSDALE,
Agent, Harbour-Grace.
PERCHARD & BOAG,
Agents, St. John's

Harbour-Grace, April 5, 1833.

BLANKS of every description for sale at the Office of this Paper.

(From the *Morning Chronicle*.)

We have more than once alluded to the injury which the liberal cause throughout Europe has received from the appointment or continuance in office, by a Whig Ministry, of Tories to represent the country at the various Courts of the continent. We are willing to make every allowance for the difficulties in which Ministers are placed in many respects, but we are not aware that there can be any difficulty in the way of a selection of Ministers able and willing to promote their own views, and to further the policy to which they are themselves attached. The people of the continent cannot believe that the Whig Government has a secure tenure of office, while they almost every-

where see that Government represented abroad either by Tories or the creatures of Tories. We are led to make these remarks from a letter which we have just received from Switzerland, written by a gentleman of that country well known to us, of whose talents and honour we have the highest opinion:—

"You know, perhaps (he says), that we still are, in Switzerland, in a sort of unsettled state. The Constitutions of the greater part of the Cantons have been reformed on a democratical principle; but the Federal Constitution is the strong hold from which it is difficult to drive out the spirit of aristocracy. Austria and Prussia combine with our old rotten aristocracy to prevent every reform of our Federal Constitution. But it is a matter of surprise that the English Minister cuts such a pitiful figure among the Foreign Ambassadors. He is a Methodist (his name is Morier), and the crest-fallen patricians of Bern have great hopes from him. He does not give himself any great trouble to make himself acquainted with our affairs, and a Baptist missionary would be quite as efficient in his place. In many cases he acts with such a complete neglect of diplomatic decency, that a private individual would be blamed for it. You have heard I dare say, that the patricians of Bern lately conspired to overturn the new government. The conspiracy was detected, a criminal prosecution took place against several of the conspirators: but judgment is not yet pronounced. However, some of the more distinguished patricians have been released from prison, with an injunction not to absent themselves from town. Now, Mr. Morier had lately a grand party, to which he invited several Members of the new Government, but also at the same time several conspirators, who had been liberated on their *parole d'honneur*. When the latter entered the room, the former left it, quite indignant at the insult offered to them by the English Minister. All the Swiss papers cry shame at this conduct of Mr. Morier, and many insist that the English Government ought to recall him. It is certain that, by his misconduct on the above and many other occasions, he has lost all influence with the liberal party. We have now about 500 Poles in our country. Austria and Prussia are alarmed. France will not receive them, and we cannot keep them for any length of time. Several of our Governments pay a certain sum for their maintenance, and some aid is given to them by private subscriptions.—What will become of them I know not."

Would that we could say that Switzerland formed an exception to the rule according to which our diplomatic appointments are filled up. We believe, however, that, with few exceptions, all the appointments of Lord Palmerston are of the same description. It is but charity to his Lordship to suppose that he is himself a genuine convert to Whig principles; but, be this as it may, it is certain that, were he determined to select only such individuals to represent the nation abroad, as, from their principles or their imbecility, are calculated to injure the Government, he could not improve upon his present appointments. Our correspondent terms Mr. Morier a Methodist. This is not strictly correct. He is, we believe one of those equivocal personages termed saints—*i. e.* personages who would support all abuses in church and state, but at the same time subject all their neighbours to inquisitorial annoyances—who would abet Sir A. Agney and Mr. S. Perceval. How this party should have influence enough to induce a reforming Government to maintain a Minister at a station where a Charge d'Affaires would suffice, and cost a third of the money, is a mystery to us. It would seem, however, that the Saints have had interest enough with Lord Palmerston to prevail upon him to select Mr. David Morier to the Swiss mission, although his only claim (beyond his fanaticism) to employment resulted from his having been Private Secretary to the late Marquis of Londonderry, and his having been by him placed in the most agreeable and best paid sinecure under the Crown—the Consul-Generalship in France. When this delicate abstraction ceased, poor Mr. D. Morier was reduced to a

pitiful pension of one thousand pounds a year; but as he had for eighteen years been in the habit of expending his £1,600 a year in creature comforts, it was urged that he ought not to be curtailed, and he was accordingly selected to represent the liberal Government in the regenerated Helvetic States. The only substantial services ever rendered by the Moriers were *Hajji Baba* and *Zohrab the Hostage*, and these were amply repaid by Mr. John Murray in money, and by the press in praise; and yet this family is in the enjoyment of a rent-charge on the country of £4,800 a year. So much for the Moriers. But the opportunity is fitting for asking whether it is the purpose of Government to continue Mr. Cartwright (son of the Tory Member for Northampton) as British Minister to the Diet at Frankfort, and Sir George Seymour, a man of the same principles, at the Court of Tuscany?

(From the *Morning Post*.)

We have lately thought it our duty to notice the growing dissatisfaction that has sprung up throughout the country at the arbitrary and obnoxious conduct of the Post-office. Nearly all the large commercial and manufacturing towns have had meetings; and we understand that prosecutions to a frightful extent are at this time in progress. We have reason to believe that solicitors' parcels have been opened with a view to detect letters of instructions for the executing of the deeds they contained, and in cases in which such letters have been found that the parties have been threatened; that whilst invoices without letters are charged as letters, letters with invoices are charged double; that whereas 8d. additional is paid on letters brought to the post-offices at the outports by foreign vessels, which was understood to be in lieu of 6d. extra paid on their going out, these letters are now made liable also to 5d. additional charge on going out, and this although they are transmitted by foreign vessels neither at the expense nor under the power of the post-office. But what is worse than all the rest, the secrecy of private correspondence is said in many instances to have been broken, in order to find out the address of the writer. In all this there is undoubtedly much that requires investigation. Possibly the petition of the London newsmen to the House of Commons may lead to some useful hints upon the subject. We shall not go into the grievances complained of in that petition, but merely express our hope that all the income derived from office fees and privileges in the post-office department may be brought into the national treasury.

(From the *Times*.)

The vote of the House of Commons on Friday evening, whereby the 14th clause of the Irish (Church) Temporalities Bill was expunged, we consider a lamentable circumstance. It must be recollected, and indeed was recalled to mind by more than one Member in the course of that discussion, that Ministers had, on first introducing the Coercive Bill, declared their determination to resign if they could not carry the *Church Reform Bills*, as well as the Bill of Coercion. This was a pledge, and a pledge the more sacred because it held out to adverse parties a condition, which, in reliance on the good faith of Government, those adverse parties have fulfilled. The Coercive Bill, we repeat, was supported by many of those who would otherwise have opposed it, in full confidence that the Bills of conciliation relating to Church affairs would have been carried also, and neither sold nor compromised.—For some time previous to Friday's vote rumours had been in circulation, and the matter of them was announced in this journal, that the Tories in the House of Lords, impatient at their exclusion from office, had decided on the immediate overthrow of Ministers, which was to be effected by that of the Irish Church Bill. A hostile vote of the Peers was therefore ordained, and a consequent resignation of Lord Grey's Ministry was reckoned on. The question, therefore, for his Majesty's Government was, whether they should maintain their Church Reform

Bill intact in the House of Commons, where they were powerful, leaving upon the Tory Peers the responsibility of rejecting it elsewhere, and so disgusting the country; or whether they should submit to be beaten without fighting on that field where they had the victory already in their own hands, and, under the name of a "compromise for the sake of peace," yield to their enemies what they would take care to represent as a signal triumph. The latter branch of the alternative was that which the Ministers, we think unfortunately, believed themselves justified in accepting. They made out what they deemed was a compromise, but what the Conservatives loudly boast of as a complete surrender of the whole point in dispute—*viz.*, the "inalienable" nature of church property. The 14th clause of the Bill contained a provision, that any surplus arising from the conversion by purchase of Bishops' twenty-one-year leases into perpetuities, should, after securing certain ecclesiastical objects formerly provided for by the vestry cess, be "applied to such purposes as Parliament shall hereafter appoint and direct." Apart from all special pleading on the subject, Mr. Stanley, by giving up this clause, has given up, in fact, the assertion of the original and fundamental principle of all church reform, namely, the power of dealing according to the supreme will of Parliament with any and every portion of that property which the state had itself originally appropriated to the temporal uses of its religious establishment. The recognition of this principle was essential to the legitimacy of any measure of temporal church reform. It is that without which not even a commutation of tithes, or a charge for poor-rates, or a property tax on the tithe-owner, can be rendered valid. If there was not an Irish Protestant layman from north to south of the island to-morrow, the temporalities of the superfluous church could not be touched by Parliament without a declaration of the one great *datum*—that "church property is disposable by the State." And this is the ground which Ministers have abandoned, and, upon their own showing, what does their inducement amount to? Says Mr. Stanley "There may be no surplus whatever; why, therefore, prematurely regulate its application?" To this we answer, that although the proposal for a tax on existing incumbents has been withdrawn with the general assent of the House, there still remains, besides the income of the suppressed bishoprics, the whole fund to accrue from the conversion of terminable Bishops' leases into perpetuities. Such conversion is authorised by the Bill, the manner of it is prescribed, and its results are minutely calculated and provided for by several successive clauses. Is it not, therefore, mere trifling with the country to tell us that because there is no fund *in hand* at the present moment, save only what proceeds from a reduction in one Bishop's income, and from the suppression of another, yet that the fund, prospective and eventually certain, which *must*, in the nature of things, arise from an extensive, if not universal, buying up of Bishops' leases in perpetuity, is no way worthy of being taken into account by Parliament, but is to be treated as a pure abstraction, and left to the chances of future, or merely possible, legislation? Mr. Stanley avows, however, that Ministers have given way on this occasion as a peace-offering to the Tory Lords to avoid "a collision of which all must deplore the consequences." But why that collision? If Mr. Stanley's statement of the case be true, he has sacrificed nothing whatever to the Tory Lords—literally *nothing*—because, in his opinion, the assertion of a naked principle is not worth contending for. Then, let us ask the Right Hon. Gentleman, whence could arise a collision with the other House of Parliament? What materials are there for a contest? If the thing be not worth a single straw, why should the Lords insist on it in such case? Or, if the principle be just in itself, why is it the Government and the House of Commons that should give way, and the enemy that should have cause to sing *Te Deum* for a victory? The truth is, that the Conservative party do not so undervalue the immense importance of that night's pro-