

# The Weekly Register

OF POLITICS, FACTS, AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

"BE JUST AND FEAR NOT."

VOL. III.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1844.

No. 60.

## 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.

### EDUCATION.

SINCE our last publication a number of meetings have been held, both in favour of, and against, the proposed system of National Education; and zealous persons are industriously canvassing for signatures to petitions in support of their respective views.

If the question is to be determined by the comparative number of names attached to the petitions on each side, there can be no doubt that the opponents of a general system will carry the day. The influence of the clergy, and the interested exertions of the denominational schoolmasters, in addition to misrepresentations of the grossest character, have already secured the signatures and marks of some thousands of men, women, and children to the denominational petitions, and doubtless many more are yet to be procured by the same means. The advocates of the proposed system, on the other hand, have no such means at their disposal, nor have they any such tangible and pressing motives to exertion. They have not, moreover, thought it advisable to accept the names of children, nor the marks of illiterate persons to their petitions. If therefore the question is to be carried by a show of numbers, our exertions, for the present, will have been thrown away; but on the other hand, if the amount of intellect displayed on either side; if the argument of the question; and the general intelligence and respectability of the petitioners, are allowed that weight, which surely they ought to have, on a question, which, to give an honest opinion upon it at all, requires a greater amount of education and general information than falls to the lot of some of the speakers, and most of the petitioners, on the opposite side,—we think the Council ought not to hesitate one moment in adopting their Committee's report, and carrying its recommendations into immediate effect.

The petitions adopted at the Cathedral and at St. James's School, ought not to be considered in any other light than as the petitions of the Catholic and Protestant clergy, entitled of course to every respect as such, but not to be regarded as the petitions of these churches.

It is well known that most of the better educated laymen of both churches are for the general system, and have so declared themselves, although they have had the prudence and good sense to abstain from carrying their advocacy within the walls of the church and *coram episcopis*. Whether equal prudence and good sense have been shewn on the other side it is not necessary, at present, to determine. We only know this, that were we a clergyman, no man should say, that he held up his hand or signed a petition, against his own conviction, because such was our wish. And similar to this is the excuse that is just now in the mouths of hundreds who have signed the clerical petitions, though they are, in their hearts, favourable to an educational reform—such as is proposed by the committee.

Then if we compare the arguments, and the general display of intellect on both sides, the balance must be admitted, even by our opponents to be immeasurably in our favour. We will not allude to what has been written on the subject, but we ask fearlessly, what have our churchmen of either name opposed to the speeches delivered at the School of Arts on Saturday? Has anything appeared on the opposite side that can for one moment be placed in juxtaposition with the speeches of Mr. Lowe, Mr. Therry, and the Rev. J. Saunders? to say nothing of those of Dr. Ross, Mr. Rae, Dr. Lang, and Mr. Carmichael? The speeches delivered at St. James's were a complete begging of the question, from beginning to end; and those pronounced at St. Mary's were, if possible, still more destitute of argument. The clergy seem to have met only for the purpose of convincing their bishops that they had forgotten their logic; and in this they entirely succeeded, as may be gathered from the fact, that their lordships were both under the necessity of explaining the resolutions from the chair before putting them; so badly were they supported by the movers and seconders.

The St. James's petitioners are made to believe that it is the intention of the legislature to secularize education; to thrust out the bible, and the catechism, with imminent danger of having hymns to the B. Virgin substituted for them. If the thousands who have signed the petitions issued from this meeting know any thing of their motives for signing them, they are these, and such as these. The St. Mary's petitioners, on the

other hand, are persuaded to "let well alone;" to trust every thing to the clergy, who, it is said, have already done much in the matter, at a little expense, and who know more of the matter than Mr. Lowé (and the rest of the committee); that the parents are the best judges of what education is desirable for their children; that the board (composed partly of Catholics) *might be* hostile to their religion; that the morals of the children would be in danger; that previous to the existence of the national system the Irish "contrived to get a good moral and religious education;" (!) that "nothing good ever came from Lord Stanley;" that Dr. McHale had "flung the system to the winds;" that the clergy in the country could not attend the schools to give religious instruction; and consequently that it could not be imparted at all.

Such are the reasons, if reasons they can be called, which have been put forth in opposition to an enlightened and well considered measure; one that has been tested by the experience of Ireland, Holland, and Germany; and is now proposed for adoption here; in the spirit of perfect good faith and impartiality. But are these arguments in any sense well founded? We maintain that they are not. It is not the intention of the Committee to exclude religion, or the bible, or the catechism from the system, but quite the reverse. *The history and morality of the Bible are completely interwoven with the entire system*, in a manner that must command the admiration of any Christian who will take the trouble to examine the books; no matter what may be the precise limits of his creed. But this is not all. It is expressly provided that a certain time shall be set apart for instruction in the religion of the parents, and every facility is to be afforded to parents, or pastors, or catechists (as the case may be) for that purpose. What, then, is the meaning of the common-place twaddle about the parents being the natural instructors of the children? Who denies this? Who proposes that the parents should be deprived of this right? Surely not the Committee, whose most particular care, as well as its greatest difficulty, has been to guarantee this right. Is it not a gross delusion to instil the contrary opinion into the minds of ignorant persons? In the words of one of the witnesses examined by the Committee, does a lie "lose the odiousness of its character in such matters?" The system, we repeat, is amply imbued with reli-

gion and morality, and opportunity is offered for adding instruction in the peculiar tenets of each religious body—whether by means of the bible or the catechism, or both. But it is said the clergy have not time to devote to teaching, and are not sufficiently numerous. A mere bugbear. They are not more scattered or more occupied than the Episcopalian and Catholic clergy in Scotland are, and these men find time to give their people an amount of religious instruction such as those of the most wealthy and favoured churches of other nations have no pretension to. Why should it be otherwise here? There might then be less nicety about the cut of our clerical coats; fewer whips and spurs and vehicles; visits to Sydney might be less frequent; the caparisoned steed might give place to the more clerical donkey or mule; but the *work* would be better done. Such changes might or might not be necessary; at any rate, we believe that what is done elsewhere might be done here. "T'would be only necessary at most to "tighten the hoop," as Sam Slick says.

But admitting that in the remote interior it were impracticable for the clergy to attend all the schools personally, where is the difficulty in appointing a catechist in each locality, whose duty it would be in consideration of a small remuneration, or whose pleasure it might be without any, to instruct the children in religion, at least on the Sundays. There is surely no locality sufficiently populous to require a school in which there could not be found a single lay person of each creed sufficiently instructed, and disposed, either for love or money to, catechise the children of his communion! A state of things such as this was never heard of any where, and with all the anomalies that exist here, we do not conceive this to be one of them.

"Let well alone." But is it well, or rather is it not to be most deeply lamented that more than one half of the rising generation are growing up like savages? And even those who are said to be attending schools, will any one tell us that so many as one half of them are receiving any thing like a tolerable education, even in the all important point of religion itself? We, at least, *know* that such is not the fact; that the education given is mechanical; that the religion taught is just to repeat the catechism, as a parrot might be taught to repeat it; but that with very few exceptions, our youth are utterly unable to state the grounds of their belief in a rational way. This is not "well," therefore it must not be "let alone;"—it is unworthy of the age, and we must "reform it altogether."

With respect to the corruption of morals which the gentlemen of St. Mary's anticipate in the youth of the national schools, we cannot see by what process that conclusion is arrived at. It is not between the ages of four and fourteen that the passions are most difficult to control, but rather at that very period when the Archbishop himself proposes that youths of all religions should congregate together in the gymnasia, to be educated in the higher branches of an intellectual education. Unless, therefore, it can be argued, that morals are less necessary for youth than for infancy, and for the rich than for the poor, this argument of morality is groundless.

With great deference, we would feel disposed to trust rather less to the mechanical part of religion, and more to the moral feelings and the grace of God than some who have stated

their fears upon this subject. But however this may be, we must again repeat, that to our positive knowledge the morality of the present schools is at least as imperfect as it is possible to conceive it would be under a well regulated general system.

With respect to the argument against the system, on account of its having emanated from Lord Stanley, it is just as good as the argument urged against it in 1836, on the ground of its being called the "Irish System." Both are equally ridiculous, and those who urge either are little better than knaves, or fools.

But the most surprising of all the arguments urged against this system is that of the Lord Bishop of Australia, namely, that because there is a certain book published by the Christian Brothers, who have nothing to do with the system; which book contains a hymn to the blessed Virgin, that the board by its very constitution never can approve of, therefore the system would be dangerous to the faith of the Protestant children. It is no wonder that clergymen are bad logicians when even bishops, from such premises, can arrive at such conclusions as this! It is true his Lordship supposes a way by which the book might accidentally reach the hands of a Protestant child, but this may as readily happen at present, and must ever happen, unless children of different denominations are forbidden to visit, or play together, which is carrying exclusiveness and precaution further, we presume, than his Lordship himself would propose. And, again, is the Puseyite Keble's Hymn to the Virgin, as quoted by Mr. Saunders, less inviting, less "idoltrous," or less *easy of access*, than the Catholic hymn? Be this as it may, it is enough for the advocates of a general system, and ought to satisfy all reasonable people, that neither the Puseyite hymn nor the Catholic hymn is admitted, or can possibly be admitted, into the books of the proposed system.

To those who have been deluded into the belief that there is something anti-religious or anti-scriptural in this general system; and who may be yet desirous of undeceiving themselves upon the subject, we would recommend the perusal of the following extract from a book published by one of its most strenuous supporters, Mr. Wyse, M. P.

"When I speak of moral Education, I imply religion; and when I speak of religion, I speak of Christianity. It is morality, it is conscience, *par excellence*. Even in the most worldly sense, it could easily be shown that no other morality so truly binds, no other Education so effectually secures even the coarse and material interests of society. The economist himself would find his gain in such a system; even if it did not exist, he should invent it. It works his most sanguine speculations of good, into far surer and more rapid conclusions, than any system he could attempt to set up in its place. No system of philosophy has better consulted the mechanism of society, or joined it together with a closer laption of all its parts, than Christianity. No legislator who is truly wise, no Christian will for a moment think, for the interests of society and religion, which, indeed, are one, of separating Christianity from Moral Education \* \* \* \* \*

In teaching religion and morality, we naturally look for the best code of both. Where is it to be found? There are many excellent. No nation has been without gleamings of the

light, in the noon of its darkness; without occasional vouchsafings from Providence of the truth. Yet the merit even of the purest is relative. They were wonderful for the time, singular in the nation; their glory is to have anticipated, or to have approached, the best. But where is that best to be found? Where, but in the Holy Scriptures? Where, but in that speaking and vivifying code, teaching by deed, and sealing its doctrines by death, are we to find that law of truth, of love, which has been the thirst and hunger of the human heart, in every vicissitude of its history. From the mother to the dignity, this ought to be the Book of books; it should be laid by the cradle and the death-bed; it should be the companion and the counsellor, and the consoler, the Urim and Thummin, the light and perfection of all earthly existence. But, in earnestly insisting on the teaching, I am not insensible to the manner in which it should be taught. On this depends everything; this it is, which makes it good or bad. It is not enough to teach the Scriptures; we must remember *whom* we are to teach, and by *what* instruments we are to teach. We are to teach children, and very young children. We are to teach by the means that God has put into our hands. These means are not extraordinary, they are human intellects and human affections, but the same in each, they are not equally developed in the man and in the child,—each in reference to his own actual condition, if we expect that each should feel and each understand. A child is all sensation, therefore materializes, localizes more rapidly than we do; we spiritualise and abstract with more rapidity than a child. There are, therefore, different routes to the same end. The ideas of every human being are limited by his experience; a child's are very contracted—ours the reverse. Yet we can only build with the materials we have got: to comprehend new ideas, we can only employ the ideas which we have. A child's vocabulary is even more circumscribed than its ideas, a man's more enlarged: yet through vocabularies only can we come at ideas, through words only can we be taught what others feel and understand. Change the statement as we may, to this position we must come at last. This is the point where all these statements must end. Had we the making of the young spirit, we might have ordered it differently; but such it is, and as it is we must take it, and manage it as we can. Now let us apply these principles to Scripture teaching. Are the ideas of a great portion of the Scriptures such as are familiar to a child? is the language in any analogy with his actual intellectual condition? in a word, will any teacher acquainted with Scripture knowledge and mental science conscientiously declare, that a child can feel or understand either this language, or these ideas? Hence it has always appeared to me a perfect contradiction, or a degree of ignorance, the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, in the hands of youth. The intentions may have been excellent, but there is a total misapprehension of the means. It is right it should penetrate, but the best way to make it penetrate, is not to drive in the wedge by the broad end first. Nor is it only that by such a process we communicate no knowledge and no feeling—that for things we give words, and for religion its mockery, this is only omission of good; and were this all, there might be palliation. But this is

rot all; positive and enduring evil is effected. Children form their associations with a rapidity quite marvellous—they form them in despite of their teachers, in despite of themselves. A child who meets obscurity where he ought to meet light, and pain where he ought to find pleasure, recollects the difficulty and fears the pain, in after life, and these associations cling, no matter what others follow, for ever after to his Scripture reading. Is this just, is this moral, is this religious? No teacher, no minister of the gospel, truly such, would, I am convinced, for a moment wish to overlay Scripture knowledge with such egregious disadvantages. But ought he to risk the chances? Ought he to raise a barrier in childhood, which he cannot be certain he will be able to remove in after-life? Is he not accountable, by such a course, for all the indifference, and disgust, and ignorance, which must necessarily ensue. Is this teaching gospel truth? Is it not rendering such teaching *impracticable*?

“What, then, is to be done? and how is it to be done? Follow the law of God and nature. The Scriptures are to be taught—but, to be taught, nature peremptorily declares they must be *understood*. Such parts only as can be understood should then become the subject of Scripture teaching. There must then be *selection*, consequently *exclusion*. But the selection must be guided by two rules: 1. Perfect adaption to the capacity of the child. 2. As little variation as possible from the order and phraseology of the text. The first implies both *note and comment*, either *viva voce* from the master, or in print, and of the two the latter is more accurate, uniform, and steady, therefore preferable; the second, the adoption of the very words of Scripture, when they are not unintelligible, or to a child inexplicable. Both these rules must, of course, vary according to the age and understanding of the pupil. As education proceeds, the sacred volume itself may be entrusted to their study and inquiry, but the student will come to its perusal with far different preparation, both of mind and heart, from what he would have brought with him under any other process.”

#### CENSURE OF THE GOVERNOR.—GRIEVANCES.

“Place the governors in subjection to the governed \* \* \* that, said he, is the last bond of union between Great Britain and her colonies.”—Sam Slick.

If the acute writer from whom we have taken the above sentence had lived in New South Wales instead of Nova Scotia, he could not have more accurately described our present political circumstances than he has done, without either knowing or intending it. “The restlessness of the colonies,” he says, “proceeds not from grievances, for with the exception of a total absence of patronage, they do not exist. \* \* \* Men seldom avow the real motives of their actions. A littleness of feeling is often, in reality, the source of conduct that claims to spring from a virtue. A slight, an insult, or a disappointment, jealousy, envy, or personal dislike, often find a convenient shelter in agitation, and a more respectable name in patriotism. He who rebels in the hope of amending his fortune, ascribes his conduct to an ardent love of country, and a devotion to the cause of freedom. Grievances are convenient masks under which to hide our real objects.”

Who does not see in these extracts the

moving causes of all the mischievous wrangling between the legislature and the executive that has marked the present and past sessions of our Council? Is it possible to read or listen to the speeches of Messrs. Windeyer and Wentworth without seeing that “personal dislike” has infinitely more to do with their opposition than economy or retrenchment? Even if we did not know for facts, as we all do, that there have been “slights” and “disappointments” in the case, would not the conduct and language of the honourable and learned members prove it to the mind of any dispassionate inquirer? Admitting that such an inquirer might find in the policy of Sir George Gipps much to differ from—and this is to admit far more than we think probable—it is utterly impossible that he could find any thing to justify censure, “impeachment,” the use of language unknown to gentlemen in society, and that perpetual cavilling, and imputation of motives which disgraces our present legislation. In this eternal snarling at the representative of the Queen, we can discover nothing but that “littleness of feeling” and that personal resentment so admirably pourtrayed by the worthy clockmaker above cited.

It is not our intention to enter into a defence of those ministerial or rather *literary* delinquencies which, during the present week, have brought upon the Governor’s head the censure of the Council. There is in truth nothing to defend. The statements both in the message and the despatch are substantially and literally true, although like all *brief* statements of a *long* case, they are liable to be cavilled at. They were sufficiently clear for the intelligence of statesmen and legislators, though not, perhaps, calculated to defy the captious distinctions of practiced pettifoggers. They need no further remark. Our object in alluding to the subject is to impress upon the colonists the wisdom (and necessity, if we would retain at once our loyalty and our franchises) of putting a stop to the leadership of Messrs. Wentworth and Windeyer in the Legislative Council, and of *giving a new tone and character to the representation of the colony*. If we do this we may retain our present freedom, and greatly enhance it by slow and proper degrees; if we do not, it is as certain and inevitable as darkness after sunset, that our abused franchise will be withdrawn. Britain will not permit that we “place the Governor in subjection to the governed”—no ministry dare permit this; and the result of the factious conduct of our representatives, unless we speedily change the system, will be an Act of Parliament to annihilate our representative system, and restore the despotism of former days; a result which, though unavoidable under the circumstances, we should most deeply deplore.

Then as to alleged “grievances,” where are they? Is it a grievance that the government stands between the colonists and the grasping designs of the squatocracy? Is it a grievance that the executive will not permit the gentlemen of the Pastoral Association to parcel out the lands of the territory among one another to the injury of the other colonists; to the ruin of all prospects for future colonists; and to the creation of an oligarchy which would trample upon the necks of our children for generations yet to come? These are not grievances but blessings. There may, indeed, exist grievances in the colony.

The shareholders of the Bank of Australia, and other sufferers by similar rascality, doubtless are aggrieved; but if we wish to find an answer to the question, where are our *political* grievances? that answer will be found in Sam Slick: they are the “masks under which our legislators hide their real object”—the unjust acquisition of the public property.

#### EDUCATION MEETINGS.

##### FRIENDS OF THE GENERAL SYSTEM.

A meeting of the friends and supporters of the General System of Education, as recommended by the Committee of the Legislative Council, was held on Saturday last, at three o’clock, in the School of Arts, Pitt-street, the Right Worshipful the Mayor in the chair.

The meeting was addressed at great length by Mr. R. Lowe, Mr. G. K. Holden, the Rev. Dr. Ross, Mr. John Rae, the Rev. Mr. Saunders, Mr. C. H. Chambers, Rev. Dr. Lang, Mr. R. Therry, Alderman Macdermott, and others; the resolutions and petition published in last week’s *Register* in favour of a general system were unanimously adopted; and a Committee was appointed, consisting of the Right Worshipful the Mayor, Alderman Flood, Alderman Hill, Alderman Macdermott, Councillor Jones, Councillor Thurlow, Councillor Cowlishaw, Councillor Brown, Rev. Dr. Ross, Rev. H. Carmichael, Rev. J. Saunders, G. K. Holden, W. A. Duncan, G. A. Lloyd, James Thompson, John Rae, S. P. Hill, Richard Hill, John Stirling, F. Gaunson, — Walker, Chas. H. Chambers, and Jeremiah Murphy, Esquires, with power to add to their number, for the purpose of carrying out the objects of the meeting.

##### ROMAN CATHOLICS.

A public meeting of Catholics was held at the Cathedral, on Monday, the Archbishop in the chair, at which the following resolutions were adopted:—

Moved by the Rev. Mr. Coffey, seconded by Mr. John Coyle:—“That we express our satisfaction at the measures already taken by the Legislative Council to procure evidence on the important subject of education; but that, without presuming to dictate to the legislature, we deem it our duty distinctly to assert our conviction that the state ought not to sanction any system of public education, not in accordance with the wishes of the community.”

Moved by the Right Rev. Dr. Murphy, seconded by Dr. Tierney:—“That the system of education most agreeable to the wishes, and most suitable to the wants of the Catholic community, which comprises one-third of the population, is one that will enable us, through the co-operation of the state, to give our children a sound practical education, leaving to the parents, the natural guardians, and to the pastors, the appointed instructors, to determine the circumstances of time, place, and manner, in which religious instruction should be imparted.”

Moved by the Rev. J. M’Encroe, seconded by the Rev. Mr. Lynch:—“That as Lord Stanley’s plan of education has been recommended principally on account of its economy, that it is the opinion of this meeting that a modified plan of education may be devised and carried out at as little expense to the state as that system of expensive machinery.”

Moved by the Rev. Mr. Brennan, seconded by Mr. Blanchard:—“That a Committee be

appointed to draw up a petition, founded on the principle embodied in these resolutions, to be presented to the Legislative Council by John Hubert Plunkett, Esq."

The speeches delivered at this meeting were very brief, excepting those of the Archbishop, and of Mr. C. H. Chambers, who opposed the second resolution at some length.

#### CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

An adjourned meeting of Members of the Church of England was held on Monday, in the School-room, Castlereagh-street, the Bishop of Australia in the chair, at which a resolution was passed, upon the motion of the Rev. Dr. Cowper, seconded by the Rev. W. B. Clarke, returning thanks to the Parochial Associations for their exertions in collecting signatures to the petition against a general system of education. Speeches of great length were delivered by these gentlemen, and by the Rev. R. Allwood, and the Rev. J. Elder, against the proposed scheme.

#### WESLEYAN METHODISTS.

A meeting of this body was held on Monday evening, at their Chapel, York-street, Alderman Allen in the chair, when the following resolutions and a petition based on them were adopted:—

Moved by the Rev. Mr. Draper, seconded by Mr. James Byrnes:—"That this meeting is of the opinion that a large proportion of the children of the colony are growing up in sin and wickedness, from want of general education in connection with moral and religious training, and that it is the duty of the Wesleyan Church to do all that is in its power to remedy the evil."

Moved by the Rev. R. Mansfield, seconded by Mr. Macarthur:—"That this meeting does not approve of the plan of public education called the Irish System, as it does not admit the whole of the Sacred Scriptures, but only extracts, and because it excludes prayer."

Moved by the Rev. J. McKenny, seconded by the Rev. E. Sweetman:—"That this meeting considers that denominational schools are best suited to meet the wants of the rising generation in this colony."

Moved by the Rev. J. Innes, seconded by the Rev. B. Hirst:—"That a petition be respectfully addressed to the Legislative Council, expressive of the views of the Wesleyan body on the subject of Education, and requesting adequate provision to be made for the support of Wesleyan schools, and that the petition now read be adopted."

**APPOINTMENTS.**—His Excellency the Governor has appointed Alfred Cheeke, Esq., Barrister at Law, to be Chairman of the Courts of Quarter Sessions of this colony for the residue of the present year. His Excellency has also appointed Thomas Callaghan, Esq., Barrister at Law, to prosecute, in his own name, all crimes and offences tried before Courts of General and Quarter Sessions, in the counties of Cumberland, Camden, Bathurst, and Northumberland, in lieu of Alfred Cheeke, Esq., appointed Chairman of Quarter Sessions, and during the time Mr. Cheeke shall be such Chairman.

**PROVINCIAL SYNOD.**—On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, the Archbishop of Sydney, and the Bishops of Hobart Town and Adelaide held their first Synod in the Cathedral, Hyde Park.

#### JACK SQUARESAIL'S ADDRESS TO THE PORT PHILLIP ELECTORS.

Electors of Port Phillip, I,  
None of your "small" and unknown "fry,"  
Would wish just now my hand to try  
At legislation.

Your Representative, the Knight,  
Whose lofty soul, and honour bright,  
Disdained control, as well it might,  
Has left his station.

And I, who might have sat before,  
But shunn'd the open Council door,  
Now that you need me more and more,  
Would be your member.

Electors! should you chance to find,  
Than me a man of loftier mind,  
Of nobler aims—my seat resigned,  
I'm off—remember!

But if I should assume my seat,  
I'll give the Colony a treat  
Of eloquence and wit, and beat  
A drum like thunder.

I'll ope my most puissant lips,  
Against that naughty tyrant, G. . . . ,  
I'll dog his heels, and if he trips,  
I'll keep him under.

I was his friend, you know—till he  
Levelled his April-fool's decree,  
Against the high "Squatocracy,"  
Of this fair land.

Fool that he was to brave our wrath,  
To stand a moment in our path,  
As if we were mere things of lath—  
Mere ropes of sand.

I hardly can restrain my tongue!  
The wrong, the injury, he has flung  
Upon us, well may make us young,  
And "mad as hatters."

He wants to wring from us "ten pound,"  
For twenty thousand acres round,  
Of miserable grazing ground.  
Alas! poor Squatters.

And with his vile Commissioners—  
Confound those well paid saucy curs,  
They stick to us as close as burs—  
I say confound them.

As soon as I begin to sway,  
(In Council I must have my way),  
I'll sweep them root and branch away—  
I'll—I'll "surround them!"

The evils of this government,  
Its crying evils I'll resent;  
I'll shake the British Parliament,  
If they support it.

A Lion roused, is terrible,  
A Squatter roused, is far more fell;  
No human tongue his wrath can tell,  
No press report it.

On board the *General Hewitt* (Oh!  
How hot and cold some ways can blow)  
I strove to let the nation know  
Sir George's glory.

I said that since the world began,  
There ne'er had been so great a man,  
Wiser than Solon, juster than  
"The Just" in story.

I said the people owed him more  
Than any Governor before;  
Whose loss they deeply would deplore,  
For well they like him.

But Bob Lowe put my speech in rhyme,  
So full it was of flattery's slime,  
It looked such blarney at the time,  
I fain could strike him.

But what I said on board the *Hewitt*,  
I now unsay—and deeply rue it.  
I think—and I ere long will shew it,  
As clear as chips—

That he's of Governors the worst,  
With whom this Colony's been curs'd,  
And that of men from last to first,  
There's none like G. . . .

Now, dear Electors, if you want  
A boy who cannot rave or rant,  
Who is co-sistent, scorneth cant,  
I am the boy.

The people here, in truth's despite,  
Say that I am a "blatherskite,"  
Led by the nose by Quaker-wight,  
The Doctor's toy.

But 'tis not true, L. . . . does not lead  
My little R. . . . . indeed,  
Nor does he me, tho' we're agreed  
Upon all matters.

But most in this—that come what may,  
As long as I have stiff to pay,  
Tho' the *oi πολλοι* may decay,  
Up with the Squatters!

JACK SQUARESAIL.

#### Domestic Intelligence.

**DEANE'S CONCERT.**—Mr. Deane gave his family concert at the City Theatre on Wednesday last. The performers, instrumental and vocal, were Mr. Deane, five sons, and Miss Deane. We certainly never remember to have seen a family where so much harmony seemed to prevail. The house was not so completely filled as we could have wished, but all present gave loud and frequent manifestations of their enjoyment of the evening's performance. We give our decided preference to the instrumental portion, of which Onslow's quartetto at the commencement of part two was the gem. We never heard this beautiful composition more smoothly or correctly played.

**THE MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE.**—On Thursday a public meeting was held at the Royal Hotel, the Mayor in the Chair, at which Mr. James M'Eachern moved, Mr. Joseph Simmons seconded, and Mr. G. R. Nichols supported, the following resolution: "That the clause proposed to be introduced into the Corporation Amendment Act by Mr. Wentworth, makes the qualification of a voter dependant upon the production of a receipt or receipts for the payment of six months' continuous rent, is one which is utterly inconsistent with all safe and wise legislation, and one which whilst it would have reference only to the contracts between landlord and tenant, with which the Council has nothing to do, would disfranchise many well qualified voters, and be a source of great hardship and grievous injustice to all classes." Mr. Thurlow next proposed, and Mr. Jenkins seconded, a resolution to the effect that a petition, embodying the foregoing resolution, be prepared, signed, and afterwards forwarded to the Legislative Council. Both resolutions having been unanimously adopted by the meeting, after the usual vote of thanks it dispersed. There were about 300 persons present.

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.**—His Excellency the Governor has by letters patent, under the great seal of the colony, appointed John Lamb, Esquire, to be a Member of the Legislative Council, in lieu of Robert Lowe, Esquire, until her Majesty's pleasure shall be known.

**VACANCY IN THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.**—Mr. Blaxland resigned his seat in the Legislative Council yesterday.