

"From the same returns of the Crown Commissioners, I find that, reckoning one horse, ox, or cow, to be equal to eight sheep, the quantity of stock depastured by the three largest of the squatters, who called the meeting, is equal to seventy-eight thousand three hundred and sixty sheep, and the quantity depastured by the three smallest holders is equal to fourteen thousand one hundred and sixty-eight sheep; the small holders of stock, therefore, pay very nearly one shilling per annum for twenty-two sheep depastured by them on crown lands; whilst the large occupiers pay the same sum of one shilling per annum for depasturing one hundred and thirty-one, in each case exclusive of unwearied lambs.

"These calculations are made from the returns of land and stock held by the requisitionists only; were they taken from the whole body of squatters, far greater inequalities would be exposed. In papers now before me, respecting a disputed run in the district called "New England," it is stated by most respectable parties (one of them a member of the Legislative Council), that a single squatter (Mr. Hall) holds one thousand square miles of land, or six hundred and forty thousand acres; and by the Commissioner's returns, I find that he holds in one district (New England), and under a single license, runs which are estimated by the Commissioner at eight hundred and twenty square miles, or five hundred and twenty-four thousand eight hundred acres."

Is it possible for any intelligent colonist to read these statements, and afterwards to say that the new regulations were not urgently required?

His Excellency proceeds to combat with great force the objections urged against the new regulations, opposing to them arguments precisely similar to those put forth by ourselves at the time. He denies that the power of demanding rent from the occupants of crown lands is either despotic or unconstitutional; and surely the assertion is one of the most absurd that can be conceived. If it is despotic and unconstitutional to demand a small rent for crown lands, *à fortiori* it is despotic to sell them at their full price; and consequently every man who has bought lands of the government by auction or otherwise is constitutionally entitled to demand back his purchase money! The *reductio ad absurdum* is complete. But though it is denied that the power is either despotic or unconstitutional, his Excellency adds—

"It is in this colony a power of great magnitude, and one extremely onerous on the person who has to exercise it; therefore I shall most anxiously join with the parties about to approach her Majesty, and the Imperial Parliament, in humbly begging that the Governor of this colony may, if possible, be relieved from the burthen of it, or if this cannot entirely be done, that regulations for his guidance in the exercise of it, may at least be laid down by superior authority.

"Indeed, I cannot but anxiously hope that the Imperial Parliament, having passed an act for regulating the sale of crown lands in Australia, will complete its work by establishing statutory rules for the management of those which are unsold; and I feel that I ought not to conclude without expressing my strong opinion, that if this be not done, the Act of 1842, instead of being one for the

protection of the lands of the crown in this colony, will prove to be one virtually for their confiscation."

The *third* Despatch is also from Sir George Gipps to Lord Stanley, and is dated April 17, 1844. It merely encloses a letter to Lord Stanley, and some newspapers from Mr. B. Boyd. To these papers his Excellency added a copy of the *Weekly Register* of April 13, which Mr. Boyd, with the express view of persuading his Lordship that the press was "unanimous" with the squatters on this subject, withheld. If in this *suppressio veri*, Mr. Boyd did himself an injustice, he certainly conferred on the *Weekly Register* a great honour. In fact, there were truths in the *Register* of that date which Mr. Boyd knew struck at the foundation of the fabric which he and his compeers wished to raise. In calling Lord Stanley's attention to the *Weekly Register*, his Excellency very properly adds—"I, however, beg to repeat, what I have on a former occasion stated to your lordship, namely, that I have never in this colony, directly or indirectly, connected myself with any newspaper, nor is there any newspaper in the colony, which systematically either supports or opposes my government;"—a remark which, if we except the "systematic opposition" of the *Atlas*, is as true this day as it was in 1844.

The *sixth* gives an account of the meetings held throughout the colony in May, and encloses a copy of the "Recommendations" handed by the governor to Mr. Icely, and published in the papers of that date, together with the "Protest" of the Pastoral Association, and his Excellency's remarks upon that *je-june* production. In reply to the objection that by adopting the new regulations, the crown would retain to itself the power of taxing the people without the consent of their representatives, to an unlimited extent, his Excellency remarks—"Taxing the people, in the same way that a landlord does who takes rent from his tenants, or a butcher who makes his customers pay for their meat, or as the crown does when it sells land to a settler." In answer to the objection—"Because no compensation is offered for the risks incurred in proving the fitness of the run for the pasturage of stock, although it is well known that in making selections the best judges have been deceived, and forced to abandon them with a heavy loss of stock and capital,"—His Excellency humourously and justly remarks—"A man may make a mistake in choosing a run, as he may in choosing anything else, a leg of mutton, for instance, or a wife; but the Government cannot undertake to guarantee him against loss in the event of his choosing badly." With reference to the author of this protest, Mr. Boyd, the Governor says—"Had Mr. Boyd's several runs at Maneroo and Port Phillip (amounting together to three hundred and eighty-one thousand acres of land) been granted to him, without purchase, in the time of General Darling (the last Governor who had power to make grants), they would have been charged with quit rents amounting to £3175 per annum (2d. per acre),—whereas Mr. Boyd pays for them, in the shape of rent to the crown, only £80 per annum," and yet Mr. Boyd complains!

No. 7, merely encloses a letter from Mr. W. H. Suttor, which does not call for particular remark. Nos. 8 and 9, are despatches from Lord Stanley to Sir George Gipps.

The latter is dated 30th January 1845, and states that his Excellency's important despatches have been laid before the Commissioners of Colonial Lands, whose report is enclosed: that his Lordship is fully aware of the wealth, influence, and intelligence of the Squatters; and that he has strongly felt the convenience which it would have been to the Government to conciliate so powerful a class, but that he feels bound to decide against them, *under a strong sense of the obligation, which rests upon him, "not to sacrifice the interests of the colony and the empire at large, as well as the universally admitted rights of the Crown, for the purpose of disarming opposition, even in quarters from which a most effective opposition is to be apprehended."*

His Lordship proceeds—

"I begin with the question of right: and feel myself bound to protest, in the most decided manner, against the principles asserted and implied in the claims and remonstrances of those who represent the occupiers of Crown lands. Indeed, when I find Mr. Boyd, the Chairman of the Pastoral Association and the medium of communication with myself, holding language (which I understand you he did hold, at a public meeting of the 9th April, 1844) to the effect that he considered himself, and others, mere occupiers of Crown lands under yearly license (himself alone holding twenty-one stations, extending over upwards of three hundred and eighty thousand acres, at a total yearly payment of only eighty pounds), as having a fee-simple in the lands so held, *it is obvious to me that a decided stand must be made, and that in limine, against pretensions so unwarrantable; pretensions which would at once transfer to the first occupier hundreds of thousands of acres of the districts most accessible and most valuable for settlement, without even the expenditure of labour and capital which are required in America to make occupation profitable, but still are not allowed to give a title to the squatters.*

"I am well aware that the language used by Mr. Boyd cannot justly be assumed as that of all those whom he represents; but it is not only by the expressions used by him that I have been startled—I am equally so by the general arguments which have been adopted, and the grounds upon which the opposition to your measures are based.

"You are charged, not only in speeches, but in deliberate resolutions, passed at meetings of most respectable and influential colonists, with imposing taxes by your own authority, as the effect of the additional demand made by you for the squatting licenses, or more correctly, of the limitations you have imposed on the use of them.

"I cannot suppose that such a charge would be made by gentlemen of the talent and station of those who have advanced it, without grounding it on some foundation; but unless it is intended to be denied by them, that the right of property in the land occupied by them is vested in the Crown, *I am at a loss to conceive by what reasoning it can be established, that an increase on the license for occupying it, constitutes the imposition of a tax; I know, in fact, but of one explanation of the charge, namely, that the absolute right of property is vested in the occupier of the land, and that every payment demanded of him in respect of it, is in the nature of a land tax. I need scarcely say it is my duty to resist, most peremptorily, the establishment*

of such a doctrine, whether put forward directly, as done by the Chairman of the Pastoral Association, or impliedly, as done by the resolutions of the meeting on the 9th April; 1844, and by the Protest of the Pastoral Association of the 16th of May.

*"If the objection be good against a right to charge a rent for unsold land of the Crown, it must equally prevail against the sale of it, wherever a license to occupy has been granted, and the immediate result must be the passing the right of property in enormous tracts of country, for a return almost nominal, from the public to private individuals."*

From the question of right his Lordship proceeds to notice the regulations themselves :

"That these regulations are just in one respect, namely, in apportioning the payment to be made by occupiers of Crown Lands, according to the amount of benefit to be derived by them, appears to me scarcely to admit of denial. It is true that Mr. Wentworth, who moved the first resolution, at the Meeting of April 9, 1844, complained that the effect of the Regulations would be, that, as he held fifteen stations he would be required to pay £150 a year, instead of only £20, which payment now covers the whole fifteen runs. And I perceive further, that Mr. Boyd, the Chairman of the Pastoral Association, as he is the holder of twenty-one stations, but pays only for eight licenses, will have an increased charge thrown upon him of £130 per annum : but as you justly observe, the real question is, whether the sum charged for one license is exorbitant or not—for, if not, the existence of the anomalies which you point out, in your Despatches, No. 84, of the 16th of April, and No. 107, of the 17th of May, 1844, far from furnishing any argument against a change, calls loudly for a remedy. *It is manifestly unjust that, as in the instance which you cite, one party should pay £10 per annum for the exclusive possession of a tract of country on which he maintains three thousand cattle and thirteen thousand sheep; and another the same sum for twelve thousand eight hundred acres, on which he keeps one hundred head of cattle.*

"I proceed, therefore, to that which I consider to be the only question really open to discussion on this branch of your measures, namely, whether the terms which you propose to demand in future, as the condition of granting licenses to occupy unsold crown lands, are reasonable or not. And adverting to the information before me, I find it is impossible to come to any other conclusion, than that they are reasonable. I might, in fact, almost assume such to be the case, from the remarkable circumstance to which you advert, in your Despatch, No 84, that even at the meeting of the 9th of April, at which such strong language was held on the subject of these Regulations, no one "was bold enough to assert, that £10 per annum, for the use of twelve thousand eight hundred acres of land, or for the depasturing of four thousand sheep in an excessive charge;"—but when I perceive, from the calculations with which I have been furnished—that the rate of charge is actually one-tenth of the quit-rent, which even under the old system of Free Grants, would have been payable annually for the enjoyment of the same extent of land, under a Free Grant, and little more than one-tenth of the interest,

*on the lowest price ever contemplated for Crown Lands, it is impossible not to feel, that if any interests are unfavourably dealt with by you, they are the interests of the public, and not those of the Squatters."*

"I perceive by the protest of the Pastoral Association, of the 16th May, 1844, that an absolute right would be as you justly observe in your Despatch before alluded to, to give to the occupier an absolute right of occupation up to the time when such right of pre-emption would commence, and it would give him also the power, in fact of effectually defeating all competition in the purchase of land, by the means it would afford him of selecting and appropriating whatever spots he might think most for his interest to possess.

"I think, however, you have judged rightly, at the same time that you are seeking to give facilities to the occupier to obtain the localities he has improved, in confining this provision in his favor to a reimbursement of the fair value of those improvements, and I concur, therefore, in the principle of these regulations. I assent also to the major part of the details by which you propose to work it out, although I have to draw your attention to the observation of the Land and Emigration Commissioners, respecting some of them, in their report of the 30th September, and I agree with them in thinking it might be advisable to adopt the amendment they have proposed on the 7th of your regulations, subject to the contingent additional payment specified by them; still it is not my wish to fetter your discretion by any positive instruction as to the adoption of it. *Even had I not had previous proofs of your judgment and firmness, those qualities as displayed by you in conducting the difficult questions now under discussion, would indispose me from interfering with your freedom of action on such a point.* The object which I know you to have at heart, is to combine a due regard and allowance for the interests of the licensed occupiers of crown lands, with that consideration which your duty demands from you for the interests of the colony, and of the empire at large; that object is the one at which I aim, as well as yourself; and believing, as I do, that the regulations you propose, afford as equitable a solution as can be devised of the difficulties which these conflicting claims give rise to, *I have felt no hesitation in submitting to her Majesty, for her approbation, the course you have pursued, and have now the honor to be the medium of signifying that approbation to you.*"

(Signed) "STANLEY."

The observation of the Commissioners above referred to, and the only alteration they propose in the regulations is, that the Squatter should have positive assurance that by buying the allotment, he would be entitled to the depasture on the adjacent run.

#### THE OPPRESSED SQUATTERS.

WE have just heard, upon undoubted testimony, that a gentleman in Sydney who has a squatting station to dispose of, has, within the present week, refused £600 for his right of occupancy. What a merciless Governor we have to charge £10 for a yearly license, which, even without "fixity of tenure," is proved to be worth something above £600! Verily, Sir George, the Squatters may complain that your screw is tight!

#### THE ATLAS AND THE DISTRICT COUNCILS.

Je ne suis point, mon frere, un docteur revêré  
Et le savoir chez moi n'est pas tout retiré;  
Mais en un mot, je sais, pour toute ma science,  
Du faux avec le vrai faire la différence.

Moliere.

It is said to be a practice among a certain class of legal practitioners, when they have in hand a decidedly bad case, to instruct their counsel in something like the following terms—"No defense in this case; *abuse the plaintiff.*" Our learned brother of the *Atlas* seems to have had some practice of this kind, for being unable to defend his bad *law*, relative to the District Councils, against our unprofessional *common sense*, he sets to work in earnest to abuse us. We are pronounced to be "pertinacious," "open to very serious imputations," "very corrupt," "very obstinate," "very ignorant," destitute alike of "intellect, common sense, or genuine independence;" "outrageously absurd," an "obtuse organ of the Executive," guilty of "most deliberate and premeditated falsehood," "unfortunate," a propounder of "naked iniquity," and one who "has forfeited all claim to be considered an independent journalist!" This is to "abuse the plaintiff" in earnest; and, indeed, if the cause is to be gained by arguments of this kind, we must be satisfied with a nonsuit; for if we were to attempt a competition with the *Atlas* in this line, our vocabulary would certainly fail us. There are to be found, however, persons who attach more importance to facts and logic than to hard words, and so long as such persons exist, despite this effort of the *Atlas* to smother us with epithets, we feel our position to be as good as ever. The *Atlas* says—"The pertinacity which the *Weekly Register* has, for the last twelve months and upwards, evinced in defending every measure of Sir George Gipps, without exception, has lain the Editor of that journal open to very serious imputations." Why so? May not good measures be supported without subjecting a man to "imputations," even if they proceed from Sir George Gipps? Were we "open to serious imputations," when we supported the General Education scheme, even against Sir George Gipps? That scheme was concocted by the opponents of Sir George Gipps; it was carried through the Council by them, and rejected by him, and yet we supported it with tenfold more zeal than any other writer in the colony. We did so till the last, and we are ready and willing to do so again, in the face not only of Sir George Gipps but of many others whom we hold in high respect; and if we should happen, like the chief writer in the *Atlas*, to address any of the country constituencies with a view of obtaining a seat in Council, we shall not, like him, conceal our sentiments upon this subject, in order to obtain a few votes. The measures of his Excellency that we have supported, during the period in question, are the Squatting Regulations and the District Corporations, and so far are we from forfeiting our "claim to be considered an independent journalist" on this score, that, (had we not on a previous occasion, as every one knows, sacrificed an income of £400 a year to our political principles,) we should be ready to base our claim to independence upon our support of these two measures. We say without hesitation, and we defy contradiction, that the stand we made against the pastoral movement in April, 1844, was the most perfect

act of editorial independence ever performed in New South Wales. In taking that step, we lost much; we expected to gain nothing—we have gained nothing!

Nulla emolumenta laborum,  
Res hodie minor est here quam fuit, atque eadem cras  
Deteret exiguis aliquid.

And who is it that taunts us with want of independence? He who, as the price of a few paltry votes, notoriously suppressed his real sentiments in addressing the electors of St. Vincent? Or, allowing him the concealment of his vizor, is it the journal, who, according to the published testimony of Mr. Nagel, one of its acknowledged editors, "dare not refrain from abusing the Governor, lest it should lose all its subscribers"? Is it for an avowedly mercenary print like this to talk to us of independence? To us who have been six years prominently before the people of this colony, as a writer, and who dare the boldest of them to tax us with a single mercenary act?

Having disposed of the groundless insinuations and foul epithets of the *Atlas*, there is little else in the article before us to reply to. The distinction made between the notification in the *Gazette* and the correction of the Sydney District Charter, by which he tries to impugn our "veracity" is simply ridiculous. Our statement that the result of Mr. Thurlow's motion can only be the discovery "that a blunder was made in defining the boundaries of the district, and that it was rectified as soon as discovered, all which was known to the readers of the *Government Gazette* many months ago," is strictly correct, and we defy it to be shaken by any sophistry or hair's-breadth niceties.

The *Atlas* is not more successful in his attempt to combat our assertion, that it is the duty of Corporation Officers to "stand by their order," rather than to vote themselves objects of contempt. In fact this is acknowledged to be the duty of all public men. Without this principle of self-respect no public body could exist. Nor is it any refutation of this principle that the old corporations, to which we referred by way of example, were rotten and corrupt. This *esprit de corps* is as essential to the House of Peers as it is to the bandit gang, and to all intermediate bodies.—"It's natur", as Sam Slick says. Moreover the *Atlas* is not ignorant that the Australian Corporations are not founded upon the rotten borough system, but are exact transcripts, as far as practicable, of the Reformed Corporations of Great Britain.

The "naked iniquity" with which we are charged by the *Atlas*, consists in our supposing an impossible thing, in order to shew the folly and absurdity of the *Atlas's* "apprehensions for the safety of the public records,"—a wish, in ridicule of these apprehensions, that his Excellency could lay his hands on the Agricultural Company's Charter, and cut off a slice of their grant.—Just as if any one would be foolish enough to hand over his parchments to the Governor for such a purpose; and as if such a fraud by whomsoever committed, were not punishable by law!

After all, that which we alluded to in jest would have been made a stern reality in Solon's days, and would probably become one in ours, if the *Atlas's* proposed division of the territory were to take place; namely, that "the quantum of appropriation should be left to the discretion of each individual!"

## THE DEVIL AND THE EDITOR.

Declare  
Who is his master? Is he too a slave?  
All Spirits are enslaved which serve things evil.  
P. B. SHELLY.

(Editor alone in his sanctum.)

EDITOR.—And *He* has triumph'd, and by truth, while I

Must hide in my fierce heart the monstrous lie,  
Which by a hundred tongues was widely told,  
That *we*, the Squatters, were oppressed and sold;

That *we* and those we represent, were fooled  
By the harsh tyrant who the country ruled,  
And that the People were such "slaves" in grain,  
That though they groaned, they dared not rend their chain.

Alas! the hours which I have spent, the thought

Which I have lavished has then led to nought;  
Or worse than nought, the triumph of my foe,  
And my disgraceful, and dark overthrow:  
While *they*, the Public (curse them, vulgar knaves),

They too begin to rail at me—"the slaves"—  
While on each citizen's loquacious tongue  
For me, some biting vulgar taunt is hung:

"Fie on his lips," exclaims the portly dame,  
"That could so trifle with a lady's name;"  
"And then so meanly," adds her manly mate,  
"To shrink before an outraged brother's hate;

"Quick with the tongue, but tardy with the hand,  
"And not a match for either Mac or Bland."  
Yes! they may "prate," the "things," the "paltry sneaks,"

But

(*He throws himself back in his chair, then starts up suddenly.*)

Hallo! who is there, I say, who speaks?

(*Satan emerges from a volume of smoke.*)

DEVIL.—'Tis I, my friend; nay do not start, I pray,

I've brought no message, I'm not Mr. Way!  
I've just dropped in to have a little chat—

Why—what the devil are you staring at?  
I have a hoof no doubt, and so have you,  
Nor mine the deeper cloven of the two:

Well! *these despatches* have quite taken aback  
You, as I see, and all the Squatter pack,  
But you will nothing lose, though wounded pride

Still festering sticks, Bob! in your beating side.

EDITOR.—What nothing lose! and are the moments lost

In all I've said, and written, of no cost?  
That *He* with his small brains—

DEVIL.—Bob! not so small,  
He's cursed keen and ready, and of all  
The fellows whom I know the hardest hitter,  
And when he likes his words are quick and bitter:

And then the people whom you thought to lead,

Begin to weigh, I find, each public deed;  
*They say* that you were hired, and had you won,

That they and theirs for ever were undone:  
That if this "fixity of tenure" scheme,

Of which you daily rave, and nightly dream  
Had come to pass, and Wentworth and the  
*Boyd*

Had held in fee the land too long enjoyed,  
That *Liberty* were lost, and those who toil  
Were "slaves" for ever on their native soil.  
No doubt the scheme is such as I admire,  
A land of "slaves," Bob, is my heart's desire,  
For every crime which crowds the vales of hell,  
Clings to that land where Freedom scorns to dwell.

EDITOR.—"All is not lost," as you once said, for still

"The study of revenge," th' unconquered will  
Is ours; and for this hapless overthrow,  
We'll strive at any rate to crush our foe:  
And you are with us! what do you propose?

DEVIL.—Why, I am one, as you well know, of those

Who have no moderation in my hate;—  
Were the case *mine*, I should assassinate:  
But you and your's at such high game might falter,

And puling, tell me something of a halter:  
Remember Brutus who made Cæsar bleed!  
Has not the world for ages praised the deed?

EDITOR.—Oh! no, whenever I see blood, I'm sick,

I'll not consent to that, indeed, friend Nick!  
The very name of *pistol* makes me faint,  
And half inclined at times to ape the saint;  
I'm the most chicken-hearted of all men,  
But—I'll assassinate him with the pen.

*The Devil departs in disappointment: the Editor sits down to write a leading article which is to appear in "The Atlas" of this day, on the subject of the Despatches.*

5th July, 1845.

## Original Correspondence.

To the Editor of the "Weekly Register."

SIR,—I address you, not because I agree with you in opinion, but because I admire the consistency of your paper,—its fairness, its temper, and its fearlessness in the causes which it advocates—qualities, however, which do not appear to me to characterize any other paper in Sydney, which is avowedly one published for gain.

If I form a right estimate of your views, you will agree with me, that where honesty of purpose is apparent, we should not be over-nice, even in respect of the most untutored freedoms; but where ill-will, as well as ill-breeding, evidently are commingled, there can be no reason why we should voluntarily undergo the annoyances inseparable from an intercourse (whether in person or by letter) with those who are ignorant of the ordinary courtesies of society.

Again, to argue with men incapable of judging aright, as to the rejection or the admission of articles sent to their pages, is only a needless waste of time—for their incapacity affords equal protection to truth and error.

Again, for a churchman to appear, *proprio nomine*, in pages which as regards theology, are utterly heterodox, is scarcely creditable.

Again, for a supporter of the constituted authorities, to appeal to the organ of faction, would be equally out of place.

Besides, if I were to resort, on the present occasion, to any other paper than your own, it would be shewing a tame submission which I for one am most desirous not to be suspected of.

These various reasons lead me to your columns, simply because I believe them to be closed against whatever is underhand, and open to what is fair and aboveboard.—Not I repeat, because I agree in your opinions, but because I rely upon you for justice.

I trust sir, with this frank avowal of my motives, I may be allowed through the medium of your honest paper, to avow the Editorship of the Southern Queen. I make this avowal, lest it should be said or thought that I would even anonymously write or become responsible for that to which I would hesitate to affix my signature.

The immediate object however of my letter is, to say that I have resigned that post—an office I have filled gratuitously.

My professional engagements render it necessary I should adopt such a course, did not other motives make it also incumbent upon me to do so.

I can entertain no feeling of regret, as you will readily imagine, in retiring from duties so harassing and perplexing, and more especially as I have well grounded hopes, that those who possess, and justly so, in a far higher degree the confidence of the public in church matters, will be able to blend that very important topic with other points of colonial interests in the pages of a new church paper.—I am, dear Sir, yours very truly,

CHARLES LOWE.

Sydney, July 4, 1845.

#### TAHITI.

We have received during the present week a file of *L'Océanie Française* to the 4th May inclusive, from which we collect the following facts. The female chief Teri-Taria (otherwise named Ari-Paia) the aunt of Queen Pomaré who ordered the flag of the French Protectorate to be struck at Ouahine, not satisfied with this feat, caused the chiefs who had recognised the Protectorate to be apprehended and carried to Raiatea where they were tried and condemned. The Queen wished them to be put to death, but this was opposed by the principal chief of the Island. Teri Taria obliged all the natives of Ouahine to construct a fort, and to shut themselves up there.

The island of Ouahine was subsequently visited by the steamer *Phaeton*, Captain Maissin, who learnt that with the exception of one man, who was drunk at the time, not one of the natives of the island had assisted the followers of Teri-Taria in cutting down the flag of the Protectorate.

Queen Pomaré was still at Raiatea, and her partizans were still encamped at their settlements at some distance from Papeitè. The latter appear, however, to be losing all hopes of support from England, which the missionaries had held out to them, and it is expected will shortly give up their opposition to the Protectorate. A grand fête was given by Governor Bruat on the King's birthday, May 1st, at which upwards of seventy of the native chiefs were present.

On the 8th May a legislative assembly of the chiefs was held in the house formerly occupied by the Queen, for the purpose of

revising the laws of the Tahitian code. The Chief Justice Hitoti was elected president.

Captain Hamond, of the British war steamer *Salamander*, was present at the festivities of the 1st May, and entered into them with feelings becoming the servant of a friendly Power.

DISCOVERY OF A NEW ISLAND.—The *Journal de Tahiti* of the 16th March contains an account of a beautiful island hitherto unknown, discovered by Captain Morvan, of the French ship *Adolphe*. The latitude is 9° 26' 24" south, and the longitude west from Paris is 173° 25' 54". Captain Morvan gave it the name of Clara.

#### City Council.

MONDAY.

On the motion of Alderman Broughton £217 14s. 6d., being the amount of salaries due to the officers of the corporation on 30th June, were ordered to be paid. Also £62 10s., the quarter's rent, due 30th June, for the Town Hall.

Mr. Driver suggested that the Legislative Council should be petitioned to add a clause to the Corporation Act, empowering the Mayor and City Council to fix a price on bread, and make other regulations with respect to the trade in bread. At present the materials used by the bakers were such as they chose to use, and often deleterious, while the loaves did not weigh what they were sold for; and as he saw by an advertisement that a bone-mill was about to be set in operation, it might be that the citizens would be supplied with ground bones in their bread in addition to the variety of material already used.

Alderman Wilshire said, that there already existed powers in the police magistrates to regulate the quality and weight of bread—as to the price no power of regulation existed in the Corporations of England of the present day. With respect to bones, the Council need not be alarmed, as it was not likely that any bone-mill would grind bones sufficiently fine to be used in bread.

Mr. Cowlshaw, moved the adoption of the Report of the Water Committee, dated 24th February last.

Alderman Flood objected to the reception of the report, on the ground that there was not sufficient evidence to show that there was an absolute necessity for laying down at Lachlan Swamp an 18 inch pipe or two 12 inch pipes, from the water reserve to Hyde Park, in order to supply the city with water. If the £50,000 or £60,000 expended by the Government to convey the water was thrown away it was most lamentable. But whatever might be the fact, he thought the Council should have more evidence before it assented to a course which would involve the enormous expenditure which the report contemplated. He was willing to give the committee every credit for their ability and their zeal, but he thought they ought to have gone further than they had done, and taken more evidence than they had, or at all events had laid before the Council.

Mr. Sillitoe objected also to the adoption of the report; the grounds on which he had formerly objected were strengthened now; the former recommended two twelve-inch pipes—this report was referred back for further evidence, and now the report without giving any further reasons recommended

instead of two twelve-inch pipes one of eighteen inches. The report had been referred back for information, to show the Council on what grounds the Committee came to the conclusion that such pipes were necessary. He was aware from information of his own that placing twelve inch pipes would be throwing away money. The committee in their second report recommended one pipe of eighteen inches instead of two of twelve inches, and if the report were referred back again, it might be, on proper evidence being taken, that the Committee would report that no piping at all was wanted.

Mr. Holden said, that he thought the safer course would be to oppose the adoption of the report; the only portion of it that he could understand was that which recommended the survey of the parts of the tunnel where pipes were urgently required. He thought that the committee would have done better had they laid some information before the Council, both as to the necessity and expense. It was, however, too serious a matter to neglect, and he would rather support a vote of any sum of money, than that the city should be put to an inconvenience from a want of water.

Alderman Macdermott said, the report merely was intended by the Committee to point out that there was a danger that the tunnel might, at some time, be stopped, as even a small portion falling in would stop the supply of water. At the same time, the Committee did not mean that there was any immediate danger. If the Council decided on a survey, without laying down pipes, the supply of water must be stopped while the survey was going on. If the pipes were laid, then the survey might be held, and afterwards the city would have the advantage of both in future times. With respect to the report, the committee cared little about it, except that by it they informed the Council that there was a danger, however remote, that the supply by the tunnel might fail. One principal object of the Committee was to obtain the sanction of the Council for negotiating a loan of £6000, on security of the water rate. This had been done in another way since, and he was willing that the Council should do as they pleased with the report.

After some further discussion the Mayor decided that the report could not be adopted until had been laid before the finance committee.

The Council took into consideration the levying of a City Rate.

The Mayor said, that in order to assist members he would state the result of a memorandum, which he had caused to be prepared by the City Surveyor for the purpose. The probable amount of the expenditure for the half year, ending 31st December, 1845, was £4700, but the total amount required was £6250. The probable amount of receipts was £1742, and there was now to the credit of the Corporation £569, making together £2311. There would be required then £3939 for the estimated expenditure, in addition to the sum of £1550, the reserve police fund, which the Corporation had been spending, and of which the balance of £569 was a portion. The aggregate amount of property assessed in the city was £247,000, and a rate of 1d. in the pound would amount to £1029 3s. 6d.