

# The Weekly Register

OF POLITICS, FACTS, AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

"BE JUST AND FEAR NOT."

VOL. II.

SATURDAY, MAY 18, 1844.

No. 43.

## THE POLITICAL REGISTER.

It is of great importance in a state—not only to guard Society against the oppression of its rulers, but to guard one part of Society against the injustice of the other part. Justice is the end of Government.—It is the end of civil Society.—HAMILTON.

## THE NEW SQUATTING REGULATIONS.

In supporting the new regulations for the occupation of Crown lands beyond the boundaries, which we have now the satisfaction of believing are becoming every day less unpopular, we have been guided not only by a sense of the manifest equitableness of the regulations themselves, but, as we stated from the first, by a strong hope and belief that they were only preparatory to a complete revival of the whole squatting system. We have at length the satisfaction of knowing that our hopes were not wholly without foundation. The Governor has permitted one of the members of the Legislative Council to make extracts, with a view to publication, from a despatch transmitted to Lord Stanley about the time the new regulations were published, in which his Excellency suggests a number of still more important changes in the system, and we are given to understand that the despatch itself discusses the whole subject at great length.

In the extracts alluded to, his Excellency proposes that:—

(1.) "After five years' occupation of a station under a license, the occupant shall be allowed to purchase a portion thereof for a homestead; the said portion not to be less than 320 acres."

This is the principle of the plans suggested by the Bishop of Australia and Mr. James Macarthur some years ago, and though it looks at first unfair to compel a man to purchase a certain number of acres, yet taken in connexion with what follows, it does not appear to us objectionable.

(2.) "Any permanent and useful improvements which may have been made during the five years, to be allowed in the purchase money; but the land cannot be put up at less than the established minimum price of £1 per acre."

The first part of this proposition is extremely favourable to the squatter; it is, in fact, paying him a high premium for his industry, and ought to go far to reconcile him to the high minimum price of one pound

per acre, which by most persons is held to be so very objectionable. Strongly, however, as we appreciate the motive for upholding this minimum price, namely, the concentration of the population, an object most desirable in every sense, it certainly does appear somewhat suicidal to charge a price for land in Australia four times as high as it may be obtained for in other new countries much nearer the grand sources of population. Were a fixed price of 10s. per acre adopted, and the system of selling by auction entirely abolished, we feel confident that the change would be for the better. The system of competition at auctions deprived many industrious persons of the means of purchasing those spots which they had selected for the purposes of settlement and cultivation; while the land thus diverted from its legitimate use, alienated but not improved, remains mortgaged for the payment of the borrowed money with which the original purchase was made.

(3.) "This purchase of a homestead shall give the occupant the undisturbed possession of his run for eight more years; but for the unpurchased portion, the usual license fee of £10 per annum must continue to be paid."

(4.) "If the occupant purchase further portions of his station (in lots of not less than 320 acres), each successive purchase will entitle him to an additional eight years' lease."

All this is undoubtedly most favourable to the squatter, particularly if the additional improvements made in the interim should be considered as part of the price, as in the first instance. This would also be a strong inducement to *personal residence*, which, while it would be thus facilitated and encouraged, should be made an *indispensable* condition of the contract.

(5.) "The crown will still retain absolute control over all lands not sold or granted; but at the same time the occupants will be undoubtedly secure from all capricious or unequal acts of the crown. The understood and stipulated terms will in no wise be departed from, except in cases where the public benefit is concerned."

The necessity of clearly establishing the right of the crown, both in theory and practice, to this control, must now we think be apparent to every one who is guided by a regard for the public good, and is not led

away by the monstrous idea of converting a squatting station into a freehold, without purchasing it. The leaseholder is also entitled to—and good policy requires that he should receive—as much security as is consistent with the interests of the public. The position, therefore, of both parties to the contract cannot be too clearly defined and determined under any new scheme that may be originated or adopted by her Majesty's advisers. On this, indeed, depends in a very great measure the future happiness of this country. The proposal at present in agitation of transferring the control of the waste lands to the Legislative Council appears most objectionable. The whole thing in that case would, we apprehend, become a job of the worst character, and the sovereignty of the country would be a mere fiction. Were we ripe for *independence*, which we certainly are not, the case would be essentially different.

A more feasible proposition has been started by some gentlemen of moderation and experience, namely, to establish a local land board, to consist of an equal number of crown officers and members of the Legislature, the Governor for the time to be president: this board to have the authority in selling and leasing crown lands, which is at present exercised solely by the Executive Government. But the existence of such board, unless it were purely a royal commission, would be an acknowledgment that the royal prerogative is a fiction (which, if it exists at all, it ought not to be), and if the board were a pure commission, it would only amount to a second Executive Council, which would soon become as impervious to popular sympathy as the first. Upon the whole, a careful and unbiassed view of the matter forces us to the conclusion, that it is the duty of the Government to strengthen, rather than weaken, its hold upon these lands, while, at the same time, it affords every facility for their beneficial alienation and occupation.

The only objection that has been urged against this control of the crown is, that its exercise is an unconstitutional power of taxation. It is amazing with what perseverance this doctrine has been maintained by the opponents of the new regulations. Yet there never was a greater fallacy. A tax is an impost exacted for purposes of government, without any other equivalent. On the contrary, the party who pays for a squatting license receives the use of a large quantity of

valuable land, which enables him to feed his flocks and accumulate wealth. A police rate, for example, is a tax, because nothing real or profitable is received in return, and it would be unconstitutional to impose it without the public consent; but the money paid for the use of a house, or a farm, is not a tax, because a direct, substantial, and profitable equivalent is obtained for it. This is the position of the squatter: he holds land from the crown for which he pays a small yearly rent, which the crown, as public trustee, may increase or diminish, and is bound to increase or diminish, according to circumstances. It is not honest reasoning, therefore, to call this rent a tax, and argue from this that it ought to be imposed by the representatives of the people only.

If this fee was a rent 1839, it cannot be a "tax," an "impost," or a "tribute" now. But it is clear from the discussions that took place in that year on the squatting act; that it was then considered as a rent and not as a tax. We have first the report of the Committee of the Legislative Council, which states that a number of experienced persons had been examined upon the subject of an assessment on stock, but that a "rent" was preferred by some of the witnesses, "because the parties who propose it object to the principle of taxation." The Committee, however, intimate that "a crown land rent, for which an equivalent is given," could hardly be called a tax; and that, therefore, by the constitution of the Council, though they could impose a tax or assessment, they could not exact a rent.

And among the witnesses examined was Mr. W. C. Wentworth who objected "to the taxation clause" namely, an assessment on stock "because the the objects of the bill might be obtained by a rent" that is by what he now calls a tyrannical impost or tribute.

Mr. H. F. Gisborne who was also examined, objected *in toto* to the assessment, because it was a tax, and said he "should think it preferable if a fund is required, that it should be raised by renting the land."

Mr. Henry O'Brien, another member of the present Squatters' Committee, said, "A fund to pay such police force and the commissioners, should, I think be raised from rents on the crown lands, rather than by a tax."

Rents on the crown lands were, therefore, no tax in 1839, and we maintain that they are no tax now. To argue that they are such is to be guilty of weak, transparent sophistry, which can only impose on the dullest intellects; and that but for a time. But to proceed with the Governor's recommendations.

(6.) "If a person, after five years' occupation, do not avail himself (within a reasonable period, to be hereafter fixed) of the right of purchase conceded to him, he will be liable to have his station offered for sale, either at the pleasure of the crown, or on the demand of a private individual. But the value of any permanent improvements will be allowed to him in the event of a stranger purchasing the homestead."

(7.) "If a stranger purchase the homestead under the circumstances laid down, as above, he is to be entitled to the occupancy of the remainder of the run."

(8.) "All sales of land to be by auction, as

at present; the appraised value of improvements being added to the upset price of the land."

The sixth and seventh of these suggestions are perfectly just to the occupier of the station and to the public; for if the occupier of 12,800 acres is unable, at the end of five years, to purchase 320 acres of land, by means of his profits and improvements united, it is but right that the station should pass into other and better hands. By allowing him, in this case, the full value of his improvements, and charging the new occupier with the amount, justice is done to both parties, without injury to the public. As we have already stated, we disapprove of the system of selling land by auction, as tending to speculation and wasteful competition. The tenth suggestion, we hold, therefore, to be objectionable to this extent.

(9.) "The Regulations of the 2nd April, in so far as they relate to the extent of area to be occupied by each separate station, to continue in force; except in cases where the Commissioner of Crown Lands shall certify that the extent is not sufficient in ordinary seasons for depasturing 4000 sheep, or 500 head of cattle. The extent, while it may be so increased, is on no account to be reduced below the limits of 12,800 acres. If, however, a station may be found capable of depasturing more than 4000 sheep, the occupant shall pay £1 for every 1000 sheep beyond the 4000. This will obviate the necessity of taking out an additional £10 license, when the stock on the station may exceed the limited number."

It must be satisfactory to the squatters' after the froth that was spent at the Royal Hotel about the hardship of compelling the poor squatter to take out a new license the moment his sheep exceeded 4000, to learn from the above suggestion of his Excellency that no such thing is intended, and it must be amusing, as well as instructive to Lord Stanley, to read at the same time the speeches delivered on that occasion, and the despatch from which the above suggestions have been extracted.

It has been stated by a contemporary that these suggestions should have been published before, in order to allay the excitement produced at that meeting. But surely it is carrying the love of publicity too far to expect a Governor to publish his private despatches before they reach their destination. Besides it was perhaps better to let the "reverberating yells" subside, in order that people might judge calmly of these suggestions, which they were not likely to do while under the influence of the mania excited on that occasion. In allowing this excitement to give way to the discussions that have arisen upon the subject, his Excellency has been guided by the same good sense which Lord John Russell endeavoured, in vain, we fear, to instil into the late Governor Hobson, in a despatch which contains the following passage:—"The utmost possible publicity should be given to every project of a law, which it may be designed to submit to the Local Legislature. If the counsels which may thus be invited should often reach you, as will probably be the case, in the unwelcome form of party civil and uninvited displeasure, you will recollect that these are unavoidable evils in the formation of public opinion. WITHOUT TURNING ASIDE

TO REFUTE SUCH REMARKS, you will endeavour to carry with you the good sense and good feeling of the community, and to impress the conviction on all, that you are working for the benefit of all."

The proceeding of Sir George Gipps has been in accordance with this advice, and we venture to prophecy that the time is not distant when the "conviction will be impressed on all" that the changes proposed in the squatting system are intended "for the benefit of all"—even of the squatters themselves.

It is clear that the "fixity of tenure" proposed by the Governor to be given to the occupiers of crown lands will have an indirect tendency to improve the moral aspect of the squatting system. But there is, we must say, something more wanted than this. There must be something positive introduced into the regulations upon this subject. In a despatch which is said to discuss the whole subject at length, it is impossible that this part of it should have been passed slightly over. What may be his Excellency's suggestions on this point, it is, however, impossible to say, but we are willing to hope they will be found upon the whole as satisfactory as those which have, by a very proper condescension, seen the light. It is, we know, a delicate, as well as difficult thing, to frame laws in accordance with civil liberty, and calculated at the same time to regulate public morals. It is perhaps still more difficult to render such laws operative; and yet, as desperate diseases require potent remedies, we are persuaded that some very stringent measures must be adopted for this purpose, if we wish our descendants to rank among the civilized nations. In a moral point of view, the position of the wild savage is often far, very far, superior to that of the Australian bushman. Two generations hence, the latter would himself be the wildest of savages. There is even now a total disregard of religion, education, morals, and we might add, of human nature! What then is to be done? It occurs to us that *personal and family residence* must be a *sine qua non* to the holder of a squatters' license. Unless this is insisted on, we do not see one single effectual step that can be taken in the way of moral advancement. This being effected, we have at all events a responsible party on the spot, whose interest, moreover, it is to maintain good order on his station. The next step that must be taken is to put a stop to the "single males" system of shepherding. This process would perhaps be a little difficult, but it is practicable in several ways, and we believe it is necessary. This accomplished then, the "schoolmaster" must be sent "abroad"—a bush school may be very humble, and yet very useful;—and although it is out of the question for the present to talk of building two or three churches on every station of twenty square miles, provision must be made somehow for itinerating missionaries, of different denominations, whose duty it will be to perambulate their respective districts, and to appoint subordinate catechists among the employers, shepherds, and stockkeepers, capable of conducting public prayer in their absence.

All these, and similar suggestions that might be made, though attended with difficulties under present circumstances, are perfectly practicable; they are, at any rate, less

impracticable now than they would be years hence; and it appears to us absolutely necessary that they should be at once carried into effect, if it is intended that this country shall become a great nation, and that wool shall continue for the present, its staple export.

### Original Correspondence.

#### THE HIBERNIAN FATHER.

To the Editor of the "Weekly Register."

SIR—Having seen in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of this day, a letter signed "Tisias," impugning, in the strongest terms, the originality of the tragedy of the *Hibernian Father*, I beg leave to solicit, at your hands, the insertion of this reply, in the pages of your truly valuable journal, and trust that your own sense of justice will induce you to stretch forth the shield of your protection over an unjustly attacked and unfriended author, and lead you to comply with my request.

In the first place, I am perfectly aware that a tragedy called the *Warden of Galway* was produced with the greatest success at the Theatre Royal, Dublin; but it is equally true that I never saw the piece played, neither have I ever seen a copy thereof. In the year 1831, when it was produced, I was residing in Paris, and the only information I received respecting this tragedy, was the details of the plot as given in one of the Dublin journals, which I met with in the reading room of Galignani, in the Rue Vivienne. On my return to my native country, in 1832, the transient popularity of the *Warden of Galway* had subsided: it was only played once within my recollection, and on that occasion other engagements prevented my witnessing it; and I thus lost the only opportunity afforded of seeing that tragedy, with the daring piracy of which I have been unjustly charged.

It was my friend Mr. Nesbitt's matchless performance of the character of *Brutus* that reminded me that my own country could offer as sublime an instance of impartial justice as any recorded in the boasted annals of imperial Rome, and happening to meet with Prince Puckler Moskqua's *Travels of a German Prince*, wherein the narrative is detailed, I commenced my tragedy of the *Hibernian Father*, of which I lately placed in your hands the first rough MS. Mr. Nesbitt, Mr. Griffiths, and various other members of the company, can testify that I was nearly fifteen months engaged in this work. I can produce the testimony of many respectable parties who have witnessed the performance of the *Warden of Galway*, and also of the *Hibernian Father*, who can prove the utter dissimilarity of the two pieces, both in plot and language. The testimony of Mrs. Coppin, who has performed in the *Warden of Galway*, must tend to support my assertions; and, finally, I will be happy if any gentleman who has seen both plays, will satisfy himself by a perusal of my MS.; that whatever be the demerits of the *Hibernian Father*, its claim to originality cannot be shaken.

I cannot conclude without expressing my deep gratitude to Mr. Knight for his gentlemanly and liberal acceptance of the piece, and the anxiety he has evinced for its success; to Mr. Lazar for his untiring zeal in con-

ducting its management; and to the ladies and gentlemen of the company for their friendly exertions in my behalf; and I deeply regret that my production should have been made a cloak for the unjust attack upon the management which has appeared in print, from the pen of an anonymous correspondent.—I am, Sir, most respectfully, your obedient servant,

THE AUTHOR OF THE HIBERNIAN FATHER.  
May 17, 1844.

### City Council.

MONDAY.

Alderman Allen brought up a report from the By-laws Committee, accompanied by two by-laws, one fixing stands for hackney coaches, and another for the preventing the ringing of auction bells at night. The report recommended also that certain improvements should be made to the gates of the George-street market, by placing a *cheveau de frise* over each gate, in order to prevent the recurrence of robberies similar to those which had previously taken place.

Alderman Broughton said that he thought it would be better that the report should be referred back, in order that the committee might fix the fares for the hackney coaches.

Alderman Allen stated that it was the opinion of the City Solicitor that the Council had not the power to do so.

The Mayor observed that, notwithstanding the opinion of the City Solicitor, he was of opinion that the Council had the power to make such a by-law, and that there could at all events be no harm in submitting such a by-law to the Governor, in order that the opinion of the Attorney-General might be obtained.

Alderman Allen withdrew the report so far as it related to the by-law.

In pursuance of the recommendation of the By-laws Committee, the Town Clerk was directed to write to the Commissioner of Police, calling his attention to the nuisance created by carts, &c., which congregate in George-street on Saturday night.

Mr. Cowlshaw brought up a report of the Finance Committee, recommending the payment of sundry accounts, amounting to £70 11s. 5d.

The report was received.

Mr. Cowlshaw presented another report from the same committee, relative to payment to Mr. Charles Roberts, for certain alterations made by him to the premises occupied as the Town Hall. The Committee gave an account of the matter so far as they had been able to ascertain it, and requested that it should be taken into consideration by the full Council.

The Town Clerk read a letter from the District Surveyor, reporting the progress which had been made in the numbering of the houses in the city, and requesting further instructions: and was instructed to request the District Surveyor to be in attendance at the next meeting of the Council.

Mr. Agars moved that the report of the Board of Works relative to the cut in Argyle-street be referred to the Finance Committee for their report.

Alderman Flood seconded the motion.

Alderman Allen opposed the motion, on the ground that it would be dangerous to do so, as hereafter it might be taken advantage

of as being a consent of the Council to undertake the work.

Alderman Broughton thought there was no danger of any recommendation in favour of the work, as it was well known that there were no funds.

After a brief conversation, Mr. Agars withdrew his motion until after the drainage question should be settled.

A committee, consisting of the Mayor, Aldermen Macdermott and Flood, and Messrs. Thurlow, Holden, and Coyle, was appointed to prepare rules and regulations for the guidance of the Ward Committees which might be appointed to prepare an assessment.

Mr. Holden suggested to the Mayor, that it would be highly conducive to the convenience of the members of the Council, if the meetings were held only once a fortnight or once a month, instead of weekly, or even oftener, as at present, and that the business might be equally well performed.

The Mayor replied that, under the present rules of Council, such a course would lead to great inconvenience. In cases, for instance, when the Corporation was indebted, the Financial Committee had to bring up their report; that report had to stand over to the next meeting for consideration, and if that meeting did not take place for a month, parties would be kept so much the longer out of their money.

Mr. Cowlshaw brought under the notice of the Mayor the very inefficient distribution of the police force, instancing the Surry Hills, Strawberry Hills, &c., to protect the whole of which portion of Cook's Ward there were only two constables. Thus, although £450 was raised towards the police rate in that Ward, not more than £100 was expended on it, while on Theatre nights, in Pitt-street, ten or fifteen constables might be seen strolling about. On the night of the late attempt at robbery, when Harrison was shot at, one of the constables from this road was on duty on board the *United Kingdom* emigrant ship, the other heard the shot as he was returning from the repeal meeting at the Cockatoo Inn. He was aware that it was argued that the Council had nothing to do with the management of the police, but they had at least at right to complain, when the safety of the citizens was so much neglected.

Mr. Jenkins reiterated the complaints of Mr. Cowlshaw, and suggested that the best mode of proceeding would be to levy no rates for police purposes after the 1st of August; if the Government wanted a police they might keep them, and the citizens would cheerfully pay special constables for their own protection.

The Council adjourned to Monday next.

### Domestic Intelligence.

BERBIMA.—Friday, the 10th instant, being the day fixed by law for finally closing the election for the office of District Councillors, the following was the result of the poll:—John Nicholson, jun., 24; James Harper, 24; James Coomer, 21; John Morrice, 21. Messrs. Nicholson and Harper were therefore declared duly elected.

Sir Maurice O'Connell was gazetted, on the 15th January, Colonel of the 80th Regiment.

**INSOLVENTS' CERTIFICATES.**—The certificate of Georgiana Kinnear was withheld, on the ground that she had not kept reasonable accounts of her receipts and payments, so as to enable her creditors to discover how she had been acting; she having produced no cash-book, or journal, or bank pass-book; also, on the ground that the disposal of the furniture of the inn at Port Macquarie was such a disposal as is prohibited by the 73rd section of the original Act. The following applications were opposed, but granted:—John Baptist Verda, Ousley Condell, and Michael Gaynor. The following being unopposed were also granted:—George Scott, John Cameron, Moss Marks, Sarah Lowe, Hugh R. Craddock, Stillingfleet Lockyer, Gilbert M'Arthur, Joseph Jones, Peter Egan, John Thompson, Christopher Lawson, John Lumley, John George Lynch, John Garrett, and Henry Vaughan. The following being opposed, were adjourned:—Daniel Hatfield, John Ross, Edward Youngman, and Patrick Hickey: John Holden did not answer. The following were postponed on the understanding that they are opposed, viz.:—Richard Martin, Humphrey Thorn, James Waller, Herman Bryce, Edward Adams, Vernon Puzey, B. A. Phillips, and Edward Bartlett. The certificate of John Rostron was refused—1st. Because the insolvent had not kept reasonable accounts, inasmuch as it appeared from his books, that he there took credit for £1500 in the Union Bank of Australia, which he never had been possessed of. It was no excuse which he had set up, that it had been entered in order to prevent his clerk from prying into his affairs. If it had been given in evidence that the insolvent had ever obtained credit by such a statement being in his books, he would have felt bound himself to have sent the case to the Police Office. Another ground on which the certificate was now refused, was, that the insolvent had given an undue preference by remitting £600 to his brother in England, in liquidation of his claims, in preference to those of the other creditors. The Chief Commissioner refused the certificate of J. R. Hatfield, on all the grounds, that the insolvent had not made a full and fair disclosure of the state of his affairs; that he had not kept reasonable accounts from which his creditors could gather how he had acted, and that he had given an undue preference to some of his creditors.

**STREET ROBBERY.**—On Wednesday night last, about half-past nine o'clock, as a woman was passing along Gloucester-street, she was knocked down by a man, who snatched from her a bundle of groceries she had just purchased, together with 7s. in silver; she shouted out for the police, but got no assistance except from some of the neighbours, who commenced a close pursuit, aided by some dogs; but the fellow escaped by leaping over some of the fences.

**NEW INSOLVENTS.**—Robert Wood, of George-street, Sydney, merchant: debts, £10,164 2s. 1d.; assets, landed property £75, personal ditto £2887 14s. 6d.; good debts, £754 13s. 10d., bad and doubtful debts £5000 1s. 6d., valued at £200; balance deficiency £6246 13s. 9d.: John Walker, official assignee. Thomas Cannon Potts, of George-street, Sydney, rectifier: debts £1886 11s. 1d.; assets, landed property £330, personal property £60; outstanding debts £1022

4s. 1d.; doubtful debts, £40 14s.: balance deficiency £478 7s. 5d. The Trust Estate of John Jones, late of Miller's Point, but now of New Zealand, merchant, on the petition of Andrew Blower Smith, Edward Knox, and William Dawes, trustees under the deed of assignment: Edward Knox, official assignee. A petition was also filed for the sequestration of the estate of the above John Janes, by J. C. M'Laren, Manager of the Union Bank. James Crisp, of Myrtle Creek, in the County of Camden, innkeeper, on petition and affidavit: Hutchinson Bell, official assignee. Alexander Watt, of Bathurst, farmer: debts, £2381; assets, landed property £2050, personal property £50: balance deficiency £281. John Joseph, of Mitchell's Plains, district of Bathurst, farmer and grazier: debts, £686 19s. 9d.; assets, personal property £609 2s. 6d.; balance deficiency £77 17s. 3d.

**SURRY HILLS.**—In consequence of the present insecurity of life and property in this part of Sydney, arising from the inadequate number of constables and watchmen who can at present be stationed there for the protection of the inhabitants, on Thursday morning nearly all the respectable inhabitants residing on or near the Surry Hills met his Worship the Mayor, in the magistrates' room, when a desultory conversation took place on the subject of the Sydney Police, its numerical force, employment, distribution, and efficiency, and the necessity for its being augmented. It appeared from the statements of the Chief Commissioner of Police, that the whole effective force of the Sydney Police consists at present of but seventy men, to do all the duties in the town and district, namely, 4 inspectors, 12 sergeants, 8 acting sergeants, 42 men, 2 police runners, and 2 constables at the Surry Hills. Satisfied of the inadequacy in regard to number of the present force, twenty of the gentlemen present came voluntarily forward and were sworn in as special constables, for the express purpose of forming an augmentation to the present police force stationed in that quarter. The Chief Commissioner, as a proof of his willingness to assist the gentlemen present in their object, stated that until the arrangements for a regular night patrol of special constables was completed he would endeavour to send three more men in addition to those already stationed there.

**APPREHENSION OF A BURGLAR.**—On Wednesday, police runner Burrows, of the Sydney Police, having heard of the robbery of Graham's public-house, early that same morning hearing that a quantity of cigars had formed part of the plunder, proceeded to one of the skittle grounds on the rocks, where he ascertained some had been previously purchased, and got a description of the vendor, John Jones, who was soon after apprehended, and turned out to be one of the fellows who attends a skittle ground close by Graham's public-house. A button having been found in one of the rooms which had been stripped, it was compared with those on the prisoner's coat, which, however, had its full complement, but on close inspection it was evident that one exactly similar had been newly sewed on, in the place previously occupied by that found in the room; when brought up on Thursday, the coat was again examined, when it appeared that between his apprehension and being placed in the dock, the prisoner

had, by rubbing the stitches of the newly sewed on button, endeavoured to make them have an old appearance: he was remanded till Friday. On Thursday, Inspector Molloy succeeded in taking a man named Smith for being concerned in the same burglary. Smith was also a constant attendant in the skittle ground adjoining Graham's.

**COMMITTAL FOR FRAUD.**—On Thursday, a man named Scott, who has been for some days in custody of the Sydney police, was fully committed for trial, on a charge of obtaining money under false pretences. The circumstances given in evidence were, that the prisoner, who had been in the employ of Mr. Baker, engraver, King-street, was directed to go to Mr. Phillips, watchmaker, Castlereagh-street, for a gold watch, which he had been repairing; the prisoner did so, but instead of returning it to Mrs. Baker, took it to the shop of Mr. Cohen, watchmaker, adjoining the Royal Hotel, requesting that it might be fitted with a glass; while Mr. Cohen was doing so, the prisoner, after some chit-chat, stated that he had already been put to considerable expense by the watch for repairs, and would prefer changing it for a silver one, even if he should sacrifice a part of its value; after considerable higgling, Mr. Cohen gave him a silver watch, with twenty shillings in exchange. The prisoner went away for a short time, and returned with a plated gold watch-key and a cut black glass necklace, which he also sold to Mr. Cohen for four shillings, and subsequently brought another silver watch, which he said he had no occasion for, but whether it was sold or not did not appear.

**PORT PHILLIP MAIL.**—On Tuesday, the 7th instant, the nomination of four Councillors for the District Council of Bourke, in the room of Dr. Macarthur, and Messrs. G. S. Airey, and Henry Dendy, retiring by rotation, and Captain M'Crae, who had resigned, was conducted before the Warden, when there being no competition, Dr. Macarthur was declared duly re-elected, and the other vacancies were filled up by Messrs. Thomas Wills, Edward Curr, and Edward Eyre Williams.

**NEW PAPER.**—The first number of a new paper, entitled the *Total Abstinence and Temperance Advocate*, appeared this day. It is neatly printed by Mr. Reading, and appears to be judiciously edited.

**ROBBERY.**—On Wednesday last, the house of Mr. John Whelan, of Parramatta, was robbed of money to the amount of £118 18s.—ten £10 notes, and a cheque for £18 18s. drawn in his favour payable to bearer, and bearing date January 1, 1844. The following are the numbers of each note, which are on the Union Bank of Australia:—Nos. 563, 1364, 1266, 1298, 1423, 1455, 1472, 1499, 3040, and 3056.

**COMMITTALS.**—Yesterday, Wm. Holmes, late a drayman on the Queen's Wharf, was fully committed for robbing the Rev. Mr. Allwood's residence, at Kissing Point, of a quantity of silver plate found in his possession. The same prisoner was also committed for burglary, and shooting with intent to kill at Mr. Harrison, in his residence on the Surry Hills. Thomas Birch was likewise committed for forging and uttering a £6 note, and thereby defrauding Mrs. Davy, of Hunter-street.