

CHARTISM! UPROAR.

On Monday evening, at eight o'clock, a full convention of the Chartists rambled together in the Temperance, or Teetotal Hall, Queen Street, to discuss the important question of moral and physical force. The parties were pretty equally matched on the outset, but a lot of heckler laddies, tobacco boys, and such like, coming in towards the end, quite overturned the position of the meeting. Mr Legg, Mason, held the chair; and without entering into his sentiments in the meantime, we say that he conducted himself with honour to himself and credit to the Association. Mr Mitchell was the most prominent "moral force" advocate, and although we disagree with many of the arguments he advanced, we consider him worthy of the character of an honest and independent (though perhaps a little self-conceited) stickler for what he considers the just rights of his fellow-men. We do not mean to enter into Mr. Mitchell's arguments—passing them over by merely stating that he repudiated physical force altogether—more particularly as moral force had not yet been found to be insufficient, in as much as the national petition had not yet been presented; and the result depended upon its reception. He earnestly urged, before having recourse to the lamentable experiment of bloodshed, to again petition and re-petition for the honest and long-withheld rights of millions. He sat down amidst cheering from all quarters of the room.

There followed then some physical and moral force men, but as John Miller of the Loch'ee, when living, said of Reform, so we say of the Chartists it is not at all in our way." We heard the speakers throughout with our usual patience, and really, take them in general, they are a lot of misguided men. We say it more in sorrow than in anger; for we depend more upon the working classes for our living, than we do upon the aristocracy. We do not, however, hesitate to record our opinion that chartism is a dangerous doctrine, that some of the chartists are dangerous members of society, and that their manifesto, the charter, is fraught with the most destructive propositions. Let us not be misunderstood. We would rejoice in seeing the intelligent though working portion of the community having their just rights. We grant that such of them as are thought capable of exercising honestly and impartially the elective franchise should be possessed of it, and have a voice in the councils of the nation, for the expenditure of which they are deeply, and in some instances shamefully taxed. We willingly allow all this—we will even go chartist-length, and say that the productive classes ought to have their fair share in the representative house, and should be consulted in matters connected with what they term their just rights; but we can never go the whole hog with such determined and unseasonable dogmas as are contained in that useless bombast and nonsense, the people's charter.