

# The Weekly Register

OF POLITICS, FACTS, AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

"BE JUST AND FEAR NOT."

VOL. V.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1845.

No. 111.

## 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.

### QUIT RENTS.

POPULAR ignorance is certainly one of the greatest evils that can exist in a free state. Beautiful as is the principle of representative government, it must be acknowledged that to heap franchises on a people that neither know the value nor the use of them is, after all, but to furnish them with weapons for self-destruction. To contemplate a people who are blind and deaf to their own obvious interests, is anything but an agreeable pastime. All are now satisfied that the object contemplated in 1844 by the Pastoral Association—the possession, rent free, of large tracts of the public lands—was one of spoliation, and fraught with danger to the future welfare of the country. Such is *now* the public opinion; but it was not so *then*, and it has cost both time and labour to effect the change. If the country had been polled twelve months ago, it would have been all but unanimous for the squatting interest.

Similar ignorance prevails at the present time with regard to the now agitated question of quit rents. Just as people then sympathised with the "oppressed squatters," they now sympathise with those that have large arrears of quit rents to pay, and nobody seems to reflect that there are two parties to be considered, the public creditor as well as the private debtor. That the debtors should look upon the fulfilment of their engagements as a "grievance" is natural enough. As Mr. Wilberforce once said with respect to the advocates for the slave trade—"Interest can draw a film over the eyes, thick as that produced by total blindness." It is no wonder therefore that persons in arrears with the quit rent collectors should seek to postpone or evade their payments, and even approach the legislature with propositions for shaking off the debt altogether, without payment. But what amazes us is that the public, who are really the creditors in this case, should be so ignorant of their rights and interests as to suffer such an attempt at spoliation to be persevered in without offering an opinion upon the subject. If there exists any public opinion upon this question it is all in favour of the public debtor; and men who would

prosecute their own debtors to the last "pound of flesh;"—men who never knew what it was to forgive their own tenants a single "holy dollar" are decidedly opposed to the levying of quit rents, and in favour of their total remission.

All this proceeds from the grossest ignorance, occasionally mixed with a morbid sympathy with friends who have fallen into arrears. Now this sort of sympathy is a very amiable thing in its way, but like all other amiable feelings, it requires to be regulated by reason and common sense. We should be the first to applaud any Sydney landlord who, in these hard times, would set the good example of remitting to his tenants a portion or the whole of their arrears of rent. This, on his part, would be an act of considerate kindness. But when he asks us to join with him in putting our hands into the public treasury to pay the rent of some old friend of his, a grantee of crown lands, who has been negligent in fulfilling the easy obligation which he incurred in taking possession of his grant—when he asks us to concur with him in robbing the many who have an interest in the quit rents, for the aggrandisement of a few who have received already too many public favours, especially in obtaining grants of land, which others, who would cheerfully fulfil the obligations which they have neglected, cannot now obtain, we denounce such spurious charity, and proclaim it to be barefaced dishonesty.

The attempt of a few old colonists to get rid of their quit rents does not excite our sympathy, but our indignation; that men who possess such vast advantages over their fellow-colonists of later arrival, in having obtained lands without purchase—lands which, with a moderate degree of industry on their part, should have long since rendered them wealthy and independent—should now turn round upon us and seek to be relieved from the trifling—the too trifling—obligation attached to their tenure. Why should we give so unjust a preference to these spoiled children of the olden time?

No one will pretend that the trifling yearly rent placed upon old grants was burthensome. Which of us would refuse similar grants upon such easy terms? Nay, we will go farther, and say that the granting of land on such terms was a shameful waste of the public resources, for which all subsequent colonists have had, and will have to suffer. But that

these highly favoured persons should, after all, refuse to pay their twopence per acre, per annum, for what cannot now be purchased under £1 an acre, is really altogether too extravagant. Yet, as we have said, public opinion—it there be any—goes with the defaulters.

And then the reason that they give for seeking this relief is not less extraordinary. "They have fallen into arrears," they inform us, "because the government had not pressed them for some years." But why should they have required to be *pressed* to act honestly by their fellow subjects? This delay in their payments might be a good reason (had the government taken the precaution so to stipulate,) for their forfeiting their grants altogether, but surely it can be no reason for defrauding the public revenue of the arrears due, and at the same time obtaining confirmation of *grants, which, in nine cases out of ten ought never to have been made at all.*

The government was highly culpable in allowing these quit rents to fall into arrears, and it ought to be proportionably strict in enforcing them for the future. We can see no hardship in the enforcement of these claims except in cases where the land has passed by purchase into the hands of a third party—the buyer being ignorant of its being burthened with arrears quit rents. But it is impossible that the government can ensure persons against acts of simplicity of this kind. A man may purchase land not being aware of its being burthened with a mortgage, subject to dowry, and the like, but what have the public, or the government to do with thoughtless transactions of this kind?

Far, therefore, from joining in the popular outcry against quit rents, we maintain that they are but a fraction of the sum that ought to have been produced to the public from the lands subject to them, and that the original terms of the grants having been too favourable to the grantees, the government is the more bound, in justice to the rest of the public, considerably of course, but most decidedly, to enforce payments.

When the people open their eyes to the real state of this question, as in the case of the squatters, they will be amazed that they could have consented, even tacitly, to allow parties to continue in the occupation of valuable lands, obtained upon such easy conditions, conditions which colonists of the present day would literally jump at, if they were within

their reach, but which easy conditions these improvident or unprincipled grantees have failed to comply with.

#### MUNICIPAL LEGISLATION.

THERE are some points on which the warmest antagonists in every contested field will readily unite. Thus we happen to agree with our polite contemporary the *Atlas*, that "great ignorance is not unfrequently allied to great presumption," and we grant also that the observation is not inapplicable to the discussion now pending between us; for when a writer ventures upon an assertion so extravagant as that "municipal legislation is always an evil," one is certainly at a loss to say whether the ignorance or the presumption predominate. Ignorance of the deepest kind must exist in the man who could in the face of all history, and all authority in political science, put forth such an opinion; and he who, conscious of his ignorance on so grave a subject, yet gives out his own crude opinions as axioms thereon, must be as presumptuous as he is ignorant. It also happens, sometimes, (though our contemporary may not be conscious of it) that an ignorant and presumptuous person is very unthankful for information conveyed to him by those who, having had better opportunities of acquiring knowledge, may be qualified to set him right; and is it seldom, indeed, that such a person has the magnanimity to acknowledge his error.

In the case of our contemporary, however, if he exhibits the usual amount of unthankfulness for the lessons we gave him, he virtually shows that he has considerably profited by them. With reference to our quotations from Lord Durham, as to the policy of municipal legislation, upon subjects of a purely local nature, the *Atlas* is quite prepared to admit the general correctness of his lordship's sentiments, though he tries hard to cover his former error, by attempting to establish a distinction between "the management of roads and bridges," and "legislation." But as he does not condescend to inform us how roads and bridges are to be managed without laws of some sort, we are content to take this admission of the necessity of local institutions, as an awkward, but undeniable acknowledgment that, in his former article he erred in pronouncing municipal legislation to be "always an evil."

The *Atlas* continues—"It was to the vast variety of topics adverted to by Mr. Wilshire's thirteen divisions—to the extensive code which that gentleman spoke of—that we alluded, when we denounced the evils of municipal legislation, and, we will venture to say, that no writer of any eminence can be found to deny the correctness of what we stated. Among other matters, Mr. Wilshire spoke of repealing the Police Act, in order to enable the City Council to pass a code of by-laws in its stead. This is the sort of municipal legislation which we dislike."

Here indeed is a mighty change. We understood our contemporary to allude not only to "the vast variety of topics"—not only to the "thirteen divisions"—not only to the "extensive code" of Alderman Wilshire—not only to some particular "sort of municipal legislation"—but to all municipal legislation whatever. Had the writer confined himself to Mr. Wilshire's code of thirteen divisions, we should have left him in the Alder-

man's hands. But he told us that "*municipal legislation is always an evil,*" and "*as it is unnecessary in this colony it ought not to be tolerated.*" It was impossible to misunderstand language so clearly comprehensive. If then we have brought our contemporary from this sweeping doctrine to the admission of Lord Durham's sentiments as quoted by us, we think we have done him a service which ought to be requited in terms which, among other accomplishments, our contemporary, it seems, has yet to be taught the use of.

The *Atlas* says—"we are quite prepared to admit the general correctness of the sentiments expressed in the quotations which our contemporary has given from his [Lord Durham's] report." One of these was that "A general legislature, which manages the private business of every parish, in addition to the common business of the country, wields a power which no single body, however popular in its constitution, ought to have—a power which must be destructive of any constitutional balance"—just the reverse of the opinion at first put forth by the *Atlas* that the "minutest details" of local legislation should be effected by the supreme legislature.

Another of Lord Durham's sentiments which the *Atlas* is now "quite prepared to admit" is that "*The establishment of municipal institutions for the whole country SHOULD BE MADE A PART OF EVERY COLONIAL CONSTITUTION, and the prerogative of the crown should be constantly interposed to check any encroachment on the functions of the local bodies*"—just the reverse of all that the *Atlas* had previously put forth on the subject, and an answer to all that he subsequently adds as to the utility of corporations having ceased with the overthrow of feudalism, and the establishment of representative government.

With all his desire to abuse his preceptor, it is, indeed, surprising how much the *Atlas* has profited by our last instruction on this subject. We referred him to several great writers who treat upon the benefits derived from municipal government—among the rest Robertson. The flowery style of this writer has captivated our tyro, and accordingly he recites Robertson by whole pages, all of which go to prove the value of municipal institutions, in promoting and securing the liberties of the people. The *Atlas* insists, however, that Robertson speaks of them only as "*first expedients* employed for the introduction of equal laws and regular government. As such first expedients he gives them all the credit to which they are undoubtedly entitled, but he nowhere says that when liberty was once established, their continuance was any longer necessary. Neither Robertson nor any other writer of equal eminence or authority, speaks of municipal institutions otherwise than as the *first steps* towards freedom."

But this is far from correct. Robertson does not, indeed, deal with the subject as a politician; he only speaks as a historian, of the past, but the other writers to whom we referred, Guizot and De Tocqueville, speak of their present utility. The latter, in particular, says that "*those who are unacquainted with the institutions are the only persons who censure them;*" and we have seen that Lord Durham, whose sentiments the *Atlas* is "quite prepared to admit," holds that they "should be made a part of every colonial constitution."

Besides these great writers we might have quoted fifty others of equal note, including every modern economist, whose opinions are held to be of authority—all being unanimous in favour of entrusting the management of local affairs to local elective institutions.

M. Say, one of the most luminous writers on these subjects, says that what is chiefly wanted for the agricultural improvement of France is the institution of "local administrations, chosen by the inhabitants," having for their chief object the "multiplication of small canals and cross roads well maintained," or, in other words, municipal legislation by district councils, such as the besotted people of this country allow their "thirty tyrants" to protest against. (Letters to Malthus by J. B. Say, III., 44.)

The same subject is handled in a masterly way by M. Dupin, who, in his remarks on the roads of France and England, shews clearly that the inferiority of the former to the latter arises from the circumstance that they are not managed by local institutions, but are entirely under the control of the general government.

Again our own M'Culloch in his valuable Treatise of Commerce, p. 22, says that "It is the duty of Government to furnish assistance towards the formation of roads and bridges in parts of the country where they are necessary, and when the funds required for their maintenance cannot otherwise be obtained." But even in this extreme case he says it is "*extremely desirable, in order to prevent the Government from being deceived by interested representations, that those more immediately interested in the undertaking should be made to contribute a considerable portion of its expense*"

This be it observed is his opinion with respect to parts of the country when it is impossible to raise the whole funds required by local taxation. With respect to the country generally M'Culloch says (p. 23), "*It is abundantly certain, that when the formation of the great roads is left, as in Great Britain, to the care of those, who, either by themselves or their tenants, have to defray the greater part of the expense of their construction and repairs, they will be managed if not with greater skill, at least with far more economy, than if they were entrusted to the agents of Government.*"

From these extracts which might be, multiplied to any extent, it will be seen what value is to be attached to the flippant assertion of the *Atlas*, that "neither Robertson, nor any other writer of equal eminence or authority, speaks of municipal institutions otherwise than as first steps towards freedom." Durham De Tocqueville, Say, Dupin, M'Culloch,—all speak of modern institutions for local government similar in their constitution to our city and district corporations, and we again defy the *Atlas* to quote an author of eminence on the opposite side. But in common sense, if the old corporations, as Robertson shews, and the *Atlas* admits, were instrumental in advancing the liberties of the people, why should not the modern institutions contribute to the security of these liberties? It is useless for the *Atlas* to refer to the corruption and abuses into which the old corporations fell previously to their being reformed. The *Atlas* cannot point out a single human institution coeval with them, whether Monarchy, Republic, or any thing else, that did not like them degenerate.

If this then were an argument against modern corporations, it would be equally fatal against all government whatsoever—a plea for anarchy and confusion, and a persuasive to renounce civilization and embrace the savage state.

### THE "HERALD."

AMONG the masses of useful matter presented to us in the columns of our daily contemporary, there occasionally appears an original article made up of the most unmitigated nonsense that ever was penned. Of this description is the article in Thursday's *Herald* relative to the possession of elective seats in Council by officers of the government, and the decision of Lord Stanley that such members are expected to support the government on questions of moment. On this the *Herald* pronounces that—

"In the first place, no gentleman in office, having any regard for his own character, or any respect for the dictates of conscience, would either ask or accept this great popular trust on terms so dishonourable. And, in the second place, if any paid servant of the crown could be so base as to solicit a seat in Council with the intention of wearing the legislative manacles described in Lord Stanley's despatch, he could find no constituency mad enough to elect him."

We repeat that grosser nonsense than these two propositions was never put forth by a public writer. "In the first place," will the *Herald* pretend to say that all the representatives in the House of Commons who support Sir Robert Peel are "dishonourable," and destitute alike of "character or conscience?" Or even that officers of the government who hold seats in the House of Commons, and who, consequently, are expected to support the ministry for the time being, have neither honour, character, nor conscience? The thing is too ridiculous to be argued. What then should prevent a gentleman of character holding office in New South Wales, who approves generally of the measures of his government, from accepting a seat in the Legislative Council. If he should afterwards become conscientiously opposed to the measures of government, of course he would either resign his office or his seat.

"In the second place" supposing a constituency to approve at once of the candidate and of the government which he serves, (and presuming that the people will not always be led by a faction, this is no impossible supposition,) why should they be considered mad if they elect him, thereby strengthening a government in which they have confidence? Were the electors of Tamworth mad in electing Sir Robert Peel, knowing as they did, that as premier, he was pledged to support the government? Even Lord John Russell would not say so; or if he did, Peel might readily retaliate upon the citizens of London who sent Lord John into the house knowing that he was pledged to support the late whig government.

The electors themselves will always settle this point to their own satisfaction. If they confide in the government they will strengthen it, particularly against a factious and interested opposition, and if they disapprove of its measures they will not readily send a requisition to one of its officers, to accept of a seat.

We are almost ashamed to combat such puerilities as the above, but when we find

them in the leading columns of the leading journal of the colony—*aliquando bonus dormitat Homerus*—we must not suffer them to pass without animadversion.

### THE SCAMPER OF LIFE.

"All run,  
They know not whither—in a chaise and one."  
Pope.

Avast, ye restless things! where are you all thus running to?  
To nothing! at a pace as though you all were funning too!  
And with a giddy noise that really is quite stunning too!

Crack! there goes J—y L—e with his donkeys both in hand!  
And there the Flying Piemen, skeltering on as loth to stand!  
Which shall be first I wonder, by and by, in Nothing-Land?

A Beauty scampers past—a ripe and rosy wonder rare!  
Perhaps her smiles may buy, if she can keep them fond and fair,  
A lift o'er the last stile—but not a worm beyond it there!

And whence are yonder group, with care and scheming pale and bit?  
Wool-samples in their fists, all eager to make sale of it!—  
I wonder what King Death will offer by the bale for it?

And Pinch'em, after all the bargains thou hast brought about,  
What shalt thou have to do, when Life's poor fight thou'st fought it out,  
There, where no Sugar's stored, and Tea is never thought about?

And what shall Wentworth's weigh-bill say, when he's done sharking here?  
"Good! people there below, don't let this blade come carking near!  
He bites; and all he bit went (like B—ll B—n) barking here!"

And what shall Windeyer's passport plead for his sad cavilling,  
And patriotic fume, when he too shall have had his fling!  
"The bearer did his best—being only formed for 'bladderling!'"

"Then what is Life I cried," said Shelly in the vapours all;  
And what is Life? say I, if such are but its capers all!  
And its first fiddles only—Folly's cat-cut scrapers all!  
C. H.

*Leichhardt's Grave, an Elegiac Ode, the Poetry by R. LYND, Esq., the Music by J. NATHAN. Sydney: BAKER, 1845.*

As we have just had intelligence of the safety of Captain Sturt, whose death was reported upon evidence similar to that upon which we have the melancholy report of the death of Dr. Leichardt, a possibility—though scarcely a hope—exists that the latter may be still alive. In this case, should the Doctor return to Sydney, he will have the satisfaction of hearing his own requiem chaunted, in a style too, which as regards both the poetry and the music would not be unworthy any of the famed poets and musicians of his own country. Mr. Lynd's beautiful verses have already been admired by our readers, and we are bound to say that the music to which they are now united will do them no discredit. Every stanza has its own music, at once displaying variety of effect and unity of design. If there be a fault to find with the melody, it is that the author's characteristic playfulness sometimes find its way into a subject which required unaltered gravity. The harmony however is good throughout, and the piece altogether is worthy of a more extensive study than it is likely to receive at present in our latitude.

### Berrima Circuit Court.

MONDAY.

Before his Honor Mr. Justice A'Beckett.  
Joseph Wood and Thomas Holland, both of Arnprior, were indicted for having, on the 15th day of March last, stolen eight head of cattle, the property of Stewart Ryrie. Holland not guilty—Wood guilty, to be transported for ten years.

James Green was indicted for having, on the 16th April last, at Albury, on the Murrumbidgee, stabbed Mr. Robert Brown, with intent to murder him; a second count charged the offence as having been committed with intent to do some grievous bodily harm; and a third one charged it as a common assault. Guilty on the second count—to be transported for fifteen years.

Daniel Ryan, of Yass, was charged with killing a sheep at Burrowa, the property of Mr. Edward Ryan, of Geelong. Not guilty—discharged.

Patrick and Mary Toole, both of Shelley's Flats, were indicted, for having, on the 15th of August last, broken into the hut of one Patrick Durkum, and stolen there from a petticoat, an apron, a child's frock, two small petticoats, one pound of tea, one of starch, and two and a-half pounds of ration sugar. Not guilty—discharged.

TUESDAY.

James Astell, of Yass, was indicted for the wilful murder of William Berry alias William Barry, at Gundaroo, on the 13th of March last, by shooting at him and inflicting a mortal wound, of which the said Berry alias Barry died. There was a second count charging the offence as manslaughter. Guilty of manslaughter—to be confined in Parramatta Gaol for eighteen months.

James Pendergrast and John McGuire, both of Goulburn, were indicted for highway robbery, with fire-arms, on the person of John Dalton, at Norton, in the month of March last, and having both pleaded guilty, were, on the application of the Attorney General, remanded for sentence.

Michael Cooghlan was indicted for having on the 17th November, at Mutt-mutt Billy, stolen two head of cattle, the property of Mr. Septimus Carter, of Millbank, near Lake George. Guilty—to be imprisoned in Parramatta Gaol for two years.

WEDNESDAY.

Before his Honor Mr. Justice a'Beckett and a Common Jury.

James Gormon, late of Picton, was indicted for having, on Sunday, the 23rd of March last, at the crossing place over the Creek at East Bargo, violated the person of Frances Oxenbridge, the wife of Henry Oxenbridge, labourer, residing at the Pass, at East Bargo. Guilty—sentence of death recorded, with a recommendation that the same be commuted to that of transportation for life.

James Gallagher and William Brooks, both of Yass, were indicted for having, at Yass River, on 8th of April last, feloniously entered the house of one John Cooney, and stolen therefrom sundry articles of wearing apparel, and other property, to the value of £5, part of the property of John Cooney, and the rest belonging to another inmate of the same hut, named Martin Grany. Guilty—remanded.

## Domestic Intelligence.

**SCHOOL OF ARTS.**—Mr. John Rae delivers a lecture on Elocution, in the Theatre of the above Institution, on Monday evening next.

**THE BAR.**—Among the passengers by the *Hooghly* are Mr. J. S. Dowling, barrister-at-law, eldest son of the late Chief Justice, and Mr. E. J. Brewster, who was formerly Commissioner of the Court of Requests for the District of Port Phillip.

**NEW INSOLVENT.**—Joseph Bates, late of the South Head Road, butcher: debts, £375 18s. 2d.; assets, landed property, £250; personal, £13; outstanding debts, £16 17s. 3d.; balance deficiency, £96 1s.; Edward Knox, official assignee.

**DEATH BY DROWNING.**—On Sunday morning the body of a young man named Zaunders, a native of Holland, was discovered in the water at the Commercial Wharf, King-street, West. The body was subsequently removed by the Coroner's direction to the General Hospital, and an inquest was held on it at Mr. Driver's, on the following day, when it appeared that the deceased had arrived in the colony as an ordinary seaman, and, having purchased a boat for himself, commenced business as a wood dealer. On Saturday night he went to see some of his former shipmates on board the *Maitland*, steamer, and became intoxicated. It is supposed that he met his death in the attempt to cross the plank communicating with the wharf. The jury returned a verdict of "found drowned."

**UNSEAWORTHY SHIPS.**—Some months ago, the *Sydney Herald* published several articles respecting unseaworthy ships, in one of which were passed some stringent remarks upon the conduct of Mr. Isaac Simmons, with regard to the brig *Caroline*, a vessel which he had despatched for London. For making these remarks, Mr. Simmons brought an action against the proprietors of the *Herald*, who pleaded a justification that the plaintiff did send the *Caroline* to sea in an unseaworthy condition. The case came on on Friday the 29th ult., and lasted the whole of that day, and until eight o'clock on Saturday evening, when the Jury, after half an hour's absence, returned a verdict for the defendants—a verdict in which every one must concur, who has attended to the subject.

## GREAT BRITAIN.

By the arrival of the *Novel* at Port Phillip we have English news to the 26th April.

The Queen and Royal Family were well, and were to visit Ireland, embarking in July.

Parliament was almost wholly taken up with the discussion on the subject of the grant to Maynooth College, which had caused considerable excitement. After a debate in the Commons of six nights, the House divided, as follows:—

For the grant..... 323  
Against it .. 176 .

Majority in favor of the bill..... 147

Coupled with the measure is another for the creation of a scheme of Academical Education in Ireland. Colleges are to be erected at an expense of £30,000 each, and endowed with an annual grant of £6000, in the towns of Cork, Galway, and Derry. The instruction is to be purely secular.

In a letter to Dr. John Sheil, Ballyshannon, county Donegal, Father Matthew writes:—"That truly great and good man, Sir Robert Peel, is fulfilling all the anticipations I formed of his administration. He will soon pacify and calm Ireland, and make our unhappy country prosperous."

With reference to the Oregon question, the *Liverpool Journal*, of 19th April, says:—"The arrival of the *Great Western* will be looked for with some anxiety. She is to leave New York on the 24th, six days probably after the receipt of Sir Robert Peel's anti-Polk speech, and will be due here on the 6th or 7th of next month. She will bring the 'impression' made on the Americans by an apparent misapprehension of the President's inaugural address."

The annexation of Texas question was creating considerable interest. The Mexican Ministers had closed their relations with the United States, and it was fully expected that a war would take place between the two countries.

A paragraph appeared in several of the London papers, to the effect, that it was intended that a learned gentleman already in the colony should have the appointment of Chief Justice of New South Wales.

The House of Commons rejected Mr. Hutt's motion for the admission of Australian Corn into England on the same terms as Canadian Corn, by a majority of one hundred and forty-seven to ninety-three.

On the 21st April Lord Stanley laid on the table of the House of Lords papers relating to the Legislative Council of New South Wales, but what their nature was is not stated.

The friends of South Australia were forming an Australian Mining Company, with a capital of £400,000, for the purpose of working the mines in South Australia.

Governor Fitzroy has been recalled from New Zealand; and it was understood that Colonel Wakefield will be removed from his post by the New Zealand Company, and that Mr. E. G. Wakefield will retire from the Directorship of the Company.

A Bill called "The Colonial Passengers Bill," had been read a third time in the House of Commons.

In the Obituary we notice the names of the Marquis of Downshire, the Earl of Stamford, Lord Carberry, Admiral Sir D. Milne, and Sir G. Hoste,

## PORT PHILLIP.

**VAN DIEMEN'S LAND PROBATIONERS.**—Already has Melbourne begun to feel the presence of the Van Diemen's Land probationers, and it would be only fair for the Tasmanian government when they send us the off-scouring of its prison population, to let us have something in the shape of a pecuniary grant to enable us to maintain the additional police force we will necessarily require by the presence of so many of our neighbours. The "batch" brought by the *Swan* has far outvalued any former cargoes, for they played some pranks through the town on the night of Monday which would do honour even to so many Norfolk Islanders. It appears they scattered their division in various parts of Melbourne,—the first act being the hunting from his beat Tyrrell, the watchman in Little Bourke-street, and upon his

remonstrating with them, and saying he was only a private watchman, one of them replied, that as he was a sort of a trap, he might expect the same treatment as any other b——y constable. About two o'clock on Tuesday morning, as two gentlemen were passing the post office, they were assailed by a shower of brick-bats, and had a most providential escape. There is one peculiarity attending this newly imported gang,—namely, that they have introduced with them some of the fair sex, one of whom enacted the part of an infuriate demon through Little Collins-street the same morning. She was in a state of the most savage intoxication, and her desecration of the Almighty was most horrifying. In such a state of things, a single constable is worse than powerless, and it is therefore evident to our chief constable that no matter how wedded he may be to the "solitary system," he must give way to circumstances. In the case of the last occurrence to which we have alluded, this woman was cursing and swearing in the presence of some dozen men, all of them equally drunk and debased as herself; but of what use would one constable be? Could he attempt to apprehend any of them? If so, it would be almost an act of madness on his part. Something, however, must be done to render the constabulary as efficient as possible. The abstraction of three district men will be a material weakening of the force. At all events it is too bad that the people of Melbourne should be subjected to insult and outrage by the arrival of scores of persons who came here for no other purpose than to indulge those lawless acts with impunity, which a penal settlement in a great measure restrains.—*Port Phillip Herald*.

## VAN DIEMEN'S LAND.

The Legislative Council have rejected the proposed Municipal Act, after having confirmed the "principles" by voting its second reading.

**MORE BUSHRANGING.**—The notorious *Jacky Jacky*, by name Wedgewood, has taken the bush, with two other men. On Friday or Saturday night they visited Mr. T. Y. Lowes's hut at Glenorchy, and took away a gun, some ammunition, and some provisions. The next night, or early on Sunday morning, they called at the Museum at Kangaroo Bottom, where they robbed Mr. White of one double-barrelled and one single-barrelled pieces, two braces of pistols—one a duelling set—a silver watch, chain and seals, some wearing apparel, a bag of flour, a pair of blankets, some tobacco, and some shot. They were partly armed, we understand, before they went to Mr. T. Y. Lowes's, and, with their additional arms, they already constitute a formidable party. From what we hear of Jacky Jacky, and many of our readers must have known him in New South Wales, this bold and daring man, if not speedily captured, will be a terror to the interior; and every exertion that the government can make ought to be immediately adopted. The cause, as we hear, of Jacky Jacky taking the bush, appears to have been trifling. Wedgewood, having returned from Port Arthur, was a probationer at the Glenorchy road party, and was sitting down smoking a pipe, when the overseer abruptly pulled it out of his mouth; that evening Jacky Jacky was absent, with his two companions.—*Colonial Times*.