

THE



STAR,

AND CONCEPTION BAY JOURNAL.

Vol. II.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1835.

No. 76.

Conception Bay, Newfoundland:—Printed and Published by JOHN T. URTOV, at his Office, CARBONEAR.

(From the Morning Herald.)

When the late Mr. Grattan linked the more rhetorical portions of Mr. O'Connell's speeches to "such tawdry flowers as a drabbed girl would pick up in Covent-Garden, stuck on with the taste of a kitchen-maid," he scarcely did justice to the wretched style and matchless vulgarity of the sordid and unprincipled Agitator, whose intellectual taste is quite upon a level with his political morality.

If in the whole range of the "cheap literature" which has emanated during the last fifty years from the classic regions of the Seven Dials or St. Giles's any productions can be found more mindless and vulgar, more utterly brutal and barbarous than some of the Agitator's recent attacks on the House of Lords, which his highly "intellectual" audience in Scotland—ay, even in "modern Athens"—are represented to have laughed at, admired, and cheered, we should like to know upon what moral dunghill it is to be picked up. If Scotchmen can really feel anything but contempt for the obnoxiousness of Mr. O'Connell, stuffed as it is with vile slang and hyperbolic nonsense as the substitutes for sense and reason, the country north of the Tweed must rather resemble the Bœotia than the Attica of the empire. But we do not think so poorly either of the intellect or taste of Scotchmen, as to believe that one in fifty, even of the populace who listened to him, felt a higher degree of admiration and mental pleasure than what he would have received from an exhibition of the absurd drolleries of that popular actor PUNCH, showing sport in the market-place, to entitle him, like DAN, to collect a "rint" by sending round the hat for the per cent.

Need we tell the "modern Athenians" that the ancient and polished people whose name they are ambitious of assuming, knew how to distinguish between the pretensions of a PERICLES and a CLEON—knew how to consecrate to everlasting fame the cultivated eloquence and enlightened patriotism of the one, and to hand down to the scorn of posterity the coarse minded declamation, the pestilential liberalism, and braggart insolence of the other. O'Connell must surely have mistaken the market for his trash, when he carried his virulent abuse of Peel to "modern Athens;" there, at least, the modern Cleon must find it a hopeless task to attempt to injure the reputation of the ablest living statesman, and most finished orator of his country.

We exalt O'Connell too much when we compare him to Cleon; for if the Athenian Coryphæus of the mob had been half so coarse, the very rabble of Athens could not for a moment have endured him. In one of his tirades against the House of Lords, touching their mode of dealing with the spoliation clauses of the Municipal Reform Bill, O'Connell said that the Lords, like nasty boys, spat in the cup to render it undrinkable by the Liberals or Whig Radicals of the Commons, yet, he said, the latter strained the nauseous draught, and having made it as palatable as they could, drank it down. Now, upon his own showing, the Whig Radicals must be very nasty fellows to swallow such a disgusting draught at all—except upon compulsion, as "mine ancient Pistol," after talking in mock heroic strains of his own prowess, was compelled to swallow the leek, solacing himself at the same

time, for the savoury mastication, by vowing, as Dan and his faction did, that he would "most horribly revenge."

It was, we presume, in fulfilment of this Pistol-like vow of being horribly revenged upon the Lords that Dan made his tour of agitation to the north, where he compared their lordships of course such aristocrats as Lord Melbourne, Lord Holland, and Lord Lansdowne, among others to "soaped pigs." "There they are," says this accomplished orator, "from father to son, something like the race in established in Ireland, where the pigs are turned out with ears cut off and tails soaped, to become the prize of the first person that can hold them—there they are the soaped pigs of society the real swinish multitude, as obstinate, as ignorant, and as mulish (quare piggyish) as their prototypes. Like the pigs bought at Naas, there was no hope of their reaching Dublin but by driving them in an opposite direction." Having once caught hold of this soaped pig metaphor by the tail, Dan was resolved to run through all its moods and tenses, though the absurdity of the thing was utterly unrelieved by a single glimmer of wit or humour. So he proceeds—"Off went Londonderry grunting and snorting—Winchelsea gave a pious groan, with more sanctity than ever pig evinced before—Newcastle, in congenial sounds, recorded it—Wellington of Waterloo became the ewine herd general. They have flung themselves literally in the mud;" but it disgusts us, as it must our readers, to go on with the scurilous and nonsensical trash. Suffice it to say that he, in the course of this elaborate rigmarole, calls the Lords the two footed "pigs," and talks of banishing swinish propensities from the Legislature. He then asks his enlightened hearers if they "will leave the picture half a man and half a hog as at present?" Thus the soaped pigs turned out to be only half pigs and half men. Did any one ever hear before such atrocious absurdities palmed upon a Scotch mob for something very humorous and eloquent?

But, supposing the House of Lords instead of defending the Protestant church and Constitution against Dan's attempts to subvert both, they had like Lord Melbourne and his colleagues gone the whole hog with the Popish Agitator, would Dan have poured out upon them a volley of low abuse that would have disgraced an Irish pig-jobber?—far from it. They would have had their reward for the betrayal of their high and sacred trust in Dan's fulsome and hollow hearted flattery for a time, and the contempt of their country for ever. The "kitchenmaid with her broom," another of the Agitator's favourite figures, would have been reserved to belabour them, if ever upon any future occasion, either stung by conscience or ashamed of their company, they should relapse into virtue and make atonement for submitting, like the King's Ministers, to the insolent dictation of the man whom not long before they had denounced from the throne as the enemy to the peace and prosperity of his country.

STANDARD.—It is because a House of Commons may go wrong—may obstinately and fatally persevere in wrong—and because as all experience proves it inevitably will go on to the destruction of the country, with a velocity proportioned to

the popular character of its construction; it is because of this, that a House of Lords is necessary to resist and control it, by collision if required. It doubtless is above all things convenient that, to borrow Sir Robert Peel's happy figure, the adverse powers of the constitution be not strained, and therefore there is considerable value in whatever circumstances obviate "impetuous recoil" on any part. It is as well that most of the Peerage receive their political education in the House of Commons—it is well also, that so many members of the House of Commons have family connexions in the House of Lords. But we must not lose sight of essential uses in accidental accommodation. The essential uses of the two Houses are, as regards each other, to promote the public good by reciprocal jealousy, and when the occasion shall arise, by even hostility. The constitution looks to the personal interests of the adverse parties for its own safety, and for the safety of the public. With Mr. Fox, it "denies all distinction between the politic or official capacity of the House of Lords, and the natural and human capacity of the persons composing that Assembly." If the individual members of the aristocracy honestly dislike the measures of the House of Commons it is their duty to resist those measures as members of the House of Lords and it is the duty of the people to support them in such resistance.

This we contend, is the theory of the constitution as it has existed; and this is the only theory upon which any constitution involving a second chamber can be rationally defended. A dependent House of Lords were merely an illusion practised upon the people, and a virtual disqualification of the rank and property of the country.

(From the John Bull.)

The following is from an excellent provincial paper, called the Hull Packet—we must say that the language is rather strong:—

The most atrocious attempts against freedom in modern times, are as nothing compared with that which was made in the British House of Commons, on Wednesday the 19th of August, 1835. Two or three ruffians, who call themselves legislators, and whom portions of a free people have sent as their representatives to Parliament, to degrade their country, and dishonour her once glorious name, must not be, indeed, taken as samples of the whole; thank God we are not yet so utterly "put to shame," as to find many with brutal looks, and more brutal language, supporting a proposition to send an armed officer into the dwelling-house (the Englishman's castle) of a British subject "to SEIZE HIS PRIVATE PAPERS." We have read of such doings in England—but the practice of the Star Chamber cost a Sovereign his head, and deluged the country in her own rich and valuable blood. We have heard such acts recorded in later times—but they were recorded of France—of France where liberty is a mere sound; or of Russia, where the will of a despot.

Bad as we considered the Radical abettors of O'Connell and his band—we could not have believed it possible that among them there would be found one wicked enough to hint even at such a monstrous proposition. Yet good may

come out of evil—we have thus a proof not to be mistaken of the tender mercies of the ultra Radicals—of the trust we are to put in their professions of regard for public and private rights—of the value they attach to the high and proudly boasted privilege of an Englishman—the right to consider his house as his castle better guarded by the laws than if it were surrounded by battlements; more safe from invasion than if a hundred armed men stood ready at its gate.

Let the people of England take warning in time—let them know what they must expect, if they place the power to suppress freedom in the hands of such men as those who in the House of Commons, on the 19th of August, 1835, obtained for themselves an infamous immortality.

An abstract of the debate should be at once printed and circulated throughout the country—printed without note or comment, the good sense and honest principles of Englishmen will supply both;—and circulated wherever such Englishmen can be found to read or hear.

If the ultra Radicals have given the poison, they have supplied the antidote. How true is it that those whom God permits to be wicked, he generally ordains to be fools—that so vile purposes may be defeated, and intended victims be but for a while within their grasp.

We care not who, or what this Colonel Fairman may be. From what we hear of him indeed, we consider he would do but little credit to any cause. This does not however, change the position in which the democratic leaders of the House of Commons have placed themselves. Our view of the case would be precisely the same, if either Mr Warburton, Mr Wallace, Mr Hume, and Mr Roebuck, had been the aggrieved party; if against them, or either of them an "order" had been issued to break open doors and seize papers before such order had received the sanction of the three estates of the realm.

We therefore look upon the circumstance as of very vital importance—as the first distinct and not to be mistaken avowal of principles hostile to British liberty on the part of those who already determine the balance of parties—and who seek to rule England as well as Ireland, according to their own base and un-English notions.

We trust it will be borne in mind by the electors throughout the country—and by those in Middlesex in particular—until the day of reckoning arrives.

We yesterday received later dates from Lima, a week later than the previous advices. The situation of Peru was daily becoming more desperate. The utmost confusion prevailed in the capital, and bands of robbers infested the whole country, and with such impunity that they had even penetrated into the middle of Lima; and it was generally believed that Peru would be divided into two Republics, or that the departments of the South would join Bolivia, of which the Republic General Santa Cruz was President. It was further said that an armed intervention, on his part, had already been solicited.

General Miller, the Governor of Cuzco, had declared for Obregoso, as had General Nieto in the northern provinces. President Obregoso was at Arequipa, all communication with which had been