

the prisoner said he had assaulted first, but I did not see any marks on his person; I perceived a wound near the left temple of Sloane's head; between it and the ear it was bleeding; I saw also a watch over his right eye; I took on both to the watch-house, and with assistance I dressed Sloane's wounds, and succeeded in stopping the blood; he fainted twice under the operation; his trousers, shirt, and waistcoat, were full of blood; on the way to the watch-house Sloane accused the prisoner of stabbing him; I recollect the prisoner coming to the watch-house and accusing Sloane of assaulting him in a public house about ten minutes before; I heard the cries of murder on the road side, where they were scuffling; I saw two spots of blood, but did not perceive any sharp instrument or glass bottles; I had a light; Sloane's wife and the prisoner's wife were standing close by, when myself and constable Stanley first arrived at the scene of action; I searched diligently, and I could not find any instrument; it was a star-light night.

Examined by Mr. Stephen.—No one came after me the night in question to inform me of the row, but on proceeding about half way I met my own wife, who was coming to give me information; I heard Sloane had been fighting about two hours and a half before with a man named Conroy; the prisoner's house is nearest the watch-house; there are two allotments between Sloane's and the prisoner's; Sloane's house is situated in the most remote part of William's Town; I recollect that on about nine or ten months since, that the prisoner's house had been robbed; he laid the robbery on Sloane; the prisoner was on one occasion assaulted by Sloane, and he was fined for it; I do not know what feeling Sloane has towards the prisoner; I never heard him make use of any ill expressions towards him; I have no greater intimacy with Sloane than any other inhabitant in William's Town; I was not directed by Sloane to search for any knife, but I looked on the ground where the appearance of struggling had taken place; the prisoner was present when Sloane said he had stabbed him; what his answer was I do not exactly recollect, but I think it was, "that he did not."

Re-examined by the Crown Prosecutor.—Sloane was very faint at the time; I heard the cries of murder, that the prisoner came to the watch-house and preferred a charge of assault against Sloane.

Constable William Stanley, attached to the William's Town Police, corroborated the last witness's testimony, with the addition in his cross-examination, he admitted that the prisoner did say, "he had no knife; that the other (meaning the police), might search him;" the two witnesses were crying, but Sloane's wife threw a stone at the prisoner on the way to the watch-house.

Thomas Sloane.—I am a cooper; I know the prisoner at the bar; I saw him on the night of the 12th of May, as I was going home from a person's house named Hannev, where I had been to deliver a bill; I did not go into Lindsey's public-house; I did not see the prisoner there; my wife was with me; I had to pass the prisoner's house, to reach my own; on going up near to the prisoner's house, with my hands under the skirts of my coat, I heard a voice behind me, "heigh, hollon;" whilst in the very act of turning round to see from whence the voice proceeded, I saw the prisoner, who immediately stabbed me with some sharp instrument; I seized him by the right arm with one hand, whilst the other I laid hold of him by the collar of his coat; he tripped me; I fell beside him, and he rolled over me; he called out murder, when his wife came up; we held each other; his wife said, "Come away Mr. Jordan, for the constables are coming;" I never saw the prisoner all that day, and if Constable Drew has sworn I assaulted the prisoner before on that day, it is untrue; I cannot remember any thing after the constables came up, as I had fainted; I did not strike the prisoner before he stabbed me.

Cross-examined by Mr. Sydney Stephen.—Myself and the prisoner were neighbours; he accused me as the party who robbed him, on a former occasion, but not to my face; I am a peaceful man; I never struck any person in the eye, nor would not unless they struck me; I had drunk two glasses of ale on the day in question; I was on a former occasion fined for an assault on the prisoner.

The Crown Prosecutor objected to the mode of cross-examination pursued by Mr. Stephen.

His Honor decided that he could not enter into the merits of any former assault, he could only admit it as far as an assault having been committed by the witness on the prisoner.

Examination continued.—It is now more than six months since I was charged with the said assault; I was taken out of a vessel proceeding to Gipps Land, and tried for the assault; I did endeavour to get away; I had scarcely time to see who it was that behind me, but I did see the prisoner and felt him stab me; I caught his right hand with my left; he tried to disengage himself, but I held him with my other hand by the collar; he tried to throw me by tripping me with my heels; I cried out murder as soon as I was stabbed; I did not see or hear the prisoner send any one for the constables; with his left hand he tried to draw me over his head; I saw positively I did not waver the prisoner the evening in question, or assault him in the former part of the day; I do not know where Mr. Greig is at present; I have heard he is now residing at Geelong.

By His Honor.—I had not spoken to the prisoner for some time; not since I was fined; I seized him the moment he stabbed me; I saw something in his hand, but could not see what it was; I did not know Mrs. Jordan came up; I had not spoken to or seen the prisoner the day he stabbed me in the evening; had no fresh quarrel since I appeared at the police-office; was not then bound over; I have never preferred a charge against him to the constables; I drank two more glasses at Lindsey's.

W. J. Thomas, surgeon.—I attended the last witness on the 13th of May last, professionally; I found him suffering from a cut about three-quarters of an inch long and two inches in depth near to the left temple; from its appearance I considered the patient's life was in danger; it must have been inflicted with great violence; I should say it was done with some sharp cutting instrument; from the appearance of the orifice there must have been a great loss of blood, and the probabilities are, that if it had not been dressed soon after it was inflicted, death would have ensued from loss of blood; I am of opinion that the wound was not inflicted by the party falling down on a rock, or a piece of a broken bottle; if so, the wound would have taken a different direction; the wound must have been inflicted when the parties were standing opposite to each other, face to face, unless the perpetrator was a left-handed man; the wound was perfectly smooth, having every appearance of being inflicted with a knife.

Cross-examined by Mr. Stephen.—The outward appearance of the wound appeared to be three-quarters of an inch, the bottom part of the wound was wide, which must have been occasioned by a second thrust of the knife; in a slanting direction the wound was two inches; it was in the direction of one of the temple arteries; in some cases of apoplexy, blood is taken from the temple artery by a surgeon who ties it up immediately after the operation; my real impression is, that it was not inflicted by a bone, but by a knife.

Constable Drew, recalled, and examined by His Honor.—It was about ten minutes before I heard the cries of murder, that the prisoner came to me at the watch-house, and said that Sloane had assaulted him opposite Lindsey's public-house; I did not believe what he said in consequence of knowing an ill-feeling existed between the parties; and the reason I did not interfere was, that I did not see the assault committed; I desired him to go home and not to interfere with him that evening, but to go to a magistrate in the morning and have him bound over; I did not see Sloane before that evening.

Mr. Joseph Greig, by Crown Prosecutor.—I saw the prisoner on the night in question at Lindsey's public-house; I did not see any assault committed.

Cross-examined by Mr. Stephen.—I saw Sloane and his wife at Lindsey's; he might not have seen the prisoner, and he might; they could not be above five yards apart; it was very dark.

By His Honor.—It could not be more than a quarter of a minute between Sloane and his wife wishing to go to bed, and my meeting Jordan coming out of the public-house. It was about half-past eight o'clock.

Re-examined by Mr. Stephen.—I know Sloane was being fighting that evening with a man named Conroy, but I did not see him commit any assault on the prisoner.

This closed the case for the crown.

Mr. Sidney Stephen addressed the Jury at some length for the prisoner. He admitted that there was no doubt that, on the evening in question, the prosecutor had received a serious injury, but by whom, or how, it was by no means certain. He contended that the first aggressor was Sloane, in as much as he had assaulted Jordan outside Lindsey's public-house, some time prior to when the alleged injury was said to have been received. He contended that Jordan had no sufficient motive to commit the violence, in fact the whole of the evidence went, in his learned counsel's opinion, clearly to show that Sloane had an ill-feeling towards the prisoner for some time, in consequence of being accused by the prisoner with having broken into his house ten months previously, the truth of which, the evidence of Sloane himself established beyond all doubt, and further he proved that he had been fined on a former occasion for the sum of two pounds and costs for assaulting the prisoner at the bar, and that with a pair of compasses; under these circumstances he called on the Jury to reflect well upon their verdict before they came to a final decision, and it was an offence of a most serious nature, and it was requisite they should devote their most serious attention to the merits of the evidence which had been adduced before them. The learned gentleman then argued at considerable length on the probabilities of the case, and on concluding called the following witnesses.

Mrs. Bridget Drew.—I recollect going in quest of my husband who was a constable at the request of the prisoner.

Cross-examined by the Crown Prosecutor.—I heard Sloane cry out murder.

Dr. Cussen.—I have known the prisoner for the last six years; on one occasion I had more particularly than any other. It was his humane and kind treatment to a poor man when he was laying very ill in a desolate situation, and whom he took into his place. I am of opinion that the wound alluded to, might have been inflicted with a piece of bone or glass.

Cross-examined by the Crown Prosecutor.—I should be at a loss to account for the wound being inflicted, if no bone or glass could be found; but that it was done by some sharp instrument, I have no doubt of.

William Latham.—I resided some time since at William's Town, as clerk in the Water Police-office; I never heard any harm of the prisoner; I always considered him an honest, quiet, inoffensive, humane man.

Cross-examined by the Crown Prosecutor.—I was residing about ten months at William's Town; I never heard any harm of the prisoner.

James Conroy.—I am a baker, residing at William's Town; I know the prisoner; I always considered him a man of quiet and humane habits.

Cross-examined by the Crown Prosecutor.—I am not on good terms with Sloane; I was fined £2 some time since for assaulting him.

This closed the defence, and the Crown Prosecutor having replied.

His Honor summed up, and in putting the case to the Jury perspicuously explained the law of the case, as regarded the two counts in the indictment; the jury must be satisfied, before they could convict the prisoner on the first count, that he intended to commit murder; if they thought that in case of death the crime would in law only have amounted to manslaughter, then they could only find the prisoner guilty of an assault with intent to commit some grievous harm. There was an Act of Parliament by which that point was guided; but it was a point which required their most serious attention, involving as it did not only the prospects of the prisoner, but the community at large. His Honor concluded by recapitulating the whole of the evidence, commenting on it as he proceeded, and leaving it to the Jury to say whether the prisoner was guilty or not.

The Jury then retired, and after an absence of nearly an hour, returned into court, finding the prisoner guilty on the minor count, accompanied with a strong recommendation to mercy.

The court then adjourned till ten o'clock on Tuesday.

Tuesday, June 17th, 1845.

The Court opened at twenty minutes past 10, when His Honor the Resident Judge took his seat.

The following Jury were empanelled.—Messrs. Michael M'Namara, John Miller, James Murphy (foreman), James Mundell, William Mortimer, John M'Donald, Jacob Marks, Geo. Mould, James May, George M'Donald, and William Moger.

William Swords was indicted for having, on the morning of the 9th day of June last, or early on the morning of the 10th, feloniously and unlawfully entered the dwelling-house of James Brown, residing at Geelong, and stolen therefrom two pillows, value 5s.; two blankets, value 5s.; two sheets, value 5s.; and 1 quilt, of the value of 5s. The prisoner pleaded not guilty.

James Brown deposed.—I am a householder in Geelong; I am acquainted with the prisoner at the bar; I recalled the night laid in the indictment, on which occasion I discovered the prisoner in my bedroom and the window raised; this was about one o'clock in the morning; on questioning him as to his right of being there, he replied he had been sent by a constable; I found my child's bed-clothes lying on the ground, and I am quite positive, from their appearance, that they had been removed.

By the prisoner.—You were in liquor, but not stupidly drunk; I would not allow any man to come and raise my window. I was perfectly sober.

By His Honor.—I retired to bed about 10 o'clock that evening; it was about 1 o'clock when I discovered the prisoner in my bedroom.

William Hutt.—I am watch-keeper at Geelong; I recollect the prisoner being brought to the watch-house; I did not consider him drunk.

This was the case for the Crown.

The prisoner called no witnesses, and in his defence declared his innocence, and said that no party could receive any justice at Geelong, for that they would do as they like there; he had a large family to support, and since he had been in the prison, he had been guilty of a breach of the laws, though he had certainly been accused of doing so.

The jury, without retiring, returned a verdict of guilty of having burglariously entered the dwelling-house with intent to rob. Remanded.

Henry Williams was indicted for having, on the 17th day of April last, feloniously forged a certain order for £3, purporting to be drawn by one James Cain, with intent to defraud J. C. M'Learen, Esq., of the Union Bank. A second count charged the prisoner with uttering and publishing the said order, with intent to defraud the said James Cain. The third count charged him with uttering with intent to defraud G. Nicholson.

The prisoner pleaded not guilty.

Nicholson; the cheque now produced he received from Mr. Nicholson.

Mr. G. Nicholson, by the Crown Prosecutor.—I recollect the prisoner at the bar coming into my shop, on the evening of the 18th of April, and requesting me to cash a cheque for him; it being unusual for me to do so, I asked him if he wanted any groceries, and from whom he got the cheque; he replied he might require groceries in the morning, and that Captain Cain gave him the cheque; I eventually gave him £2 cash, and an IO U for £1; he endorsed the cheque as "Henry Watson," in whose favour it was drawn; I never saw him before; he said he resided near the Farmer's Hotel; the following morning he returned and told me he was going to the bush, and would not return for a day or two; I sent the cheque to the bank and it was dishonored; the prisoner at the bar is the party from whom I received the cheque; I am positive he is the man.

Cross-examined by the prisoner.—I noticed nothing in your manner when you came to my shop that excited my suspicion.

James Cain, Esq., merchant.—The cheque produced is not in my hand writing; I have an account open at the Union Bank; I have funds there; never had any dealings with the prisoner. Nigel Greig, accountant of the Union Bank.—Captain Cain keeps an account at the Union Bank; the cheque produced is a forgery.

This closed the case for the Crown.

In his defence, the prisoner said, he did not deny altering the cheque, but denied all knowledge of it being a forgery—he called no witnesses.

His Honor summed up, and the Jury after a few moments consideration, returned a verdict of guilty on the 3rd count, and not guilty on the 1st and 2nd. Remanded.

[This man was tried and convicted at the last April Sessions for a similar offence, and received a sentence of seven years transportation, which sentence had been cancelled by the Sydney Judges, on the grounds of its being contrary to law.]

In Regina v. Downs.—The Crown Prosecutor moved, on affidavit, that this trial might be postponed till the next sessions, on the ground that he could not place Downs at the bar in consequence of the absence of one of the principal witnesses for the Crown (a Mrs. Candy) being near her confinement.

Mr. S. Stephen made no objection to the motion, but submitted that he was prepared to allow the affidavit of Mrs. Candy to be read, and to forego his right of cross examination, and let the trial proceed at once, or he was ready with bail.

A long desultory argument ensued between the counsel, but His Honor decided that the Crown Prosecutor had a right to refuse bail if he thought proper, and therefore ordered the trial to be postponed till the next sessions.

Mr. S. Stephen moved for an order for the return of the *Warrant*, which was granted, and the Crown Prosecutor moved, on affidavit, that this trial might be postponed till the next sessions, on the ground that he could not place Downs at the bar in consequence of the absence of one of the principal witnesses for the Crown (a Mrs. Candy) being near her confinement.

Mr. S. Stephen made no objection to the motion, but submitted that he was prepared to allow the affidavit of Mrs. Candy to be read, and to forego his right of cross examination, and let the trial proceed at once, or he was ready with bail.

A long desultory argument ensued between the counsel, but His Honor decided that the Crown Prosecutor had a right to refuse bail if he thought proper, and therefore ordered the trial to be postponed till the next sessions.

Mr. S. Stephen made no objection to the motion, but submitted that he was prepared to allow the affidavit of Mrs. Candy to be read, and to forego his right of cross examination, and let the trial proceed at once, or he was ready with bail.

A long desultory argument ensued between the counsel, but His Honor decided that the Crown Prosecutor had a right to refuse bail if he thought proper, and therefore ordered the trial to be postponed till the next sessions.

Mr. S. Stephen made no objection to the motion, but submitted that he was prepared to allow the affidavit of Mrs. Candy to be read, and to forego his right of cross examination, and let the trial proceed at once, or he was ready with bail.

A long desultory argument ensued between the counsel, but His Honor decided that the Crown Prosecutor had a right to refuse bail if he thought proper, and therefore ordered the trial to be postponed till the next sessions.

Mr. S. Stephen made no objection to the motion, but submitted that he was prepared to allow the affidavit of Mrs. Candy to be read, and to forego his right of cross examination, and let the trial proceed at once, or he was ready with bail.

A long desultory argument ensued between the counsel, but His Honor decided that the Crown Prosecutor had a right to refuse bail if he thought proper, and therefore ordered the trial to be postponed till the next sessions.

Mr. S. Stephen made no objection to the motion, but submitted that he was prepared to allow the affidavit of Mrs. Candy to be read, and to forego his right of cross examination, and let the trial proceed at once, or he was ready with bail.

A long desultory argument ensued between the counsel, but His Honor decided that the Crown Prosecutor had a right to refuse bail if he thought proper, and therefore ordered the trial to be postponed till the next sessions.

Mr. S. Stephen made no objection to the motion, but submitted that he was prepared to allow the affidavit of Mrs. Candy to be read, and to forego his right of cross examination, and let the trial proceed at once, or he was ready with bail.

A long desultory argument ensued between the counsel, but His Honor decided that the Crown Prosecutor had a right to refuse bail if he thought proper, and therefore ordered the trial to be postponed till the next sessions.

Mr. S. Stephen made no objection to the motion, but submitted that he was prepared to allow the affidavit of Mrs. Candy to be read, and to forego his right of cross examination, and let the trial proceed at once, or he was ready with bail.

A long desultory argument ensued between the counsel, but His Honor decided that the Crown Prosecutor had a right to refuse bail if he thought proper, and therefore ordered the trial to be postponed till the next sessions.

Mr. S. Stephen made no objection to the motion, but submitted that he was prepared to allow the affidavit of Mrs. Candy to be read, and to forego his right of cross examination, and let the trial proceed at once, or he was ready with bail.

A long desultory argument ensued between the counsel, but His Honor decided that the Crown Prosecutor had a right to refuse bail if he thought proper, and therefore ordered the trial to be postponed till the next sessions.

Mr. S. Stephen made no objection to the motion, but submitted that he was prepared to allow the affidavit of Mrs. Candy to be read, and to forego his right of cross examination, and let the trial proceed at once, or he was ready with bail.

A long desultory argument ensued between the counsel, but His Honor decided that the Crown Prosecutor had a right to refuse bail if he thought proper, and therefore ordered the trial to be postponed till the next sessions.

Mr. S. Stephen made no objection to the motion, but submitted that he was prepared to allow the affidavit of Mrs. Candy to be read, and to forego his right of cross examination, and let the trial proceed at once, or he was ready with bail.

A long desultory argument ensued between the counsel, but His Honor decided that the Crown Prosecutor had a right to refuse bail if he thought proper, and therefore ordered the trial to be postponed till the next sessions.

Mr. S. Stephen made no objection to the motion, but submitted that he was prepared to allow the affidavit of Mrs. Candy to be read, and to forego his right of cross examination, and let the trial proceed at once, or he was ready with bail.

a party to work for me, I said I should like to see her first, on doing so, I took her out of charitable motives.

Cross-examined by Mr. S. Stephen.—During the time I had her, I never saw any impropriety in her conduct; she was a very good girl whilst she remained with me; I never allowed her to go out.

This closed the case for the crown.

Mr. Sidney Stephen rose, and in a very luminous and appropriate speech, addressed the Jury on behalf of the prisoner, and having concluded, proceeded to call the following witnesses.

Sophia Lavinia Ellerby, examined by Mr. Stephen.—I am daughter of Sarah Ann Ellerby; I have known the prisoner about ten months; I have been in service; Miss Blessington has been teaching me to make straw bonnets; three or four I let my mother to go to trade with her (Miss B.); the reason I left my mother's house was in consequence of her wanting me to drink and sleep with her, and other bad ways; I used to bring in drink for her; my mother placed my left hand in the prisoner's right, and said he might do as he liked with me; I left my mother on Monday evening because she wanted a bullock-driver into the house, and brought me to sleep with him, and as I would not, she struck me on the head, and I then left; the prisoner was also gone, but I ran after him; on the night I left I went across the river into the bush; I remained by myself all day, and at night the prisoner was with me; he did not take me away, and when I came up to him he advised me to return; on Wednesday night he took me to Miss Blessington's.

Cross-examined by the Crown Prosecutor.—The prisoner took me to Miss Blessington's; he also put me across the river, and remained all night with me; I told Mr. Sugden's servant that my mother was a drunkard, and that if they would let the prisoner out of prison, I would go in for seven years; I resided at New Town in the service of Mrs. Taylor; she sent me out for an errand, and I left; my mother joined our hands before I went to New town; my mother used to keep me locked up, and give me nothing to eat; the prisoner gave me money to buy ribbon for my bonnet; the prisoner used to visit me for about an hour and a half of an evening at Miss Blessington's; I never remained on board of the steamer with the prisoner.

By His Honor.—My mother said to me, there is a bullock-driver from your mother, and I refused to go; I saw him standing in an empty house; my mother gave me a slap on the head and sent me in; I then went away.

By Crown Prosecutor.—I have had no conversation with Hewitt the mate of the steamer; Mrs. Turner spoke to me about this case and advised me not to be afraid, but to speak the truth; Mr. Sugden told me I was to be in attendance at any day, and I called at Mr. Sugden's; he told me I should have to give my evidence here to-day; I saw the same party speaking at the police office to the prisoner; I am fifteen years of age; I have not always been under the protection of my mother; my sister to-day said so to many things; she ought to have said yes; one of which was, that the deaf man had not slept with my mother, and I say he did; part of her statement was correct, the other incorrect; I heard it, I was in Court, and the steamer was gone; my mother sent me down to the prisoner for money, and when I refused to go, she sent my sister; I would never have left the protection of my mother had she behaved to me as a mother ought; the prisoner used no violence, or held out any inducement, to induce me to leave my home, but he advised me not to come after him, as it would cause a disturbance.

Cross-examined by Mr. S. Stephen.—I have had some communication with the gentleman with the large whiskers (Crown Solicitor) respecting the case to-day.

By His Honor.—It was in the presence of my mother, sister, deaf man, and the prisoner, (in our house in Flinder's Lane) that my mother placed my hand in his; this occurred about six or eight weeks after I first became acquainted with the prisoner.

George Swindell, sergeant in the police, sworn.—Dupon, that he knew Sarah Ann Ellerby, and that she was a bad character; she was a prostitute, a habitual drunkard, and a liar; he had known her as such for the last nine years.

Several witnesses were called, the whole of whom spoke of the prosecutrix being a woman of bad repute.

This closed the defence.

His Honor summed up, and in conclusion recapitulated the leading parts of the evidence.

The jury after an absence of fifty minutes acquitted the prisoner, observing they did so, as they could not place any reliance on the testimony of the prosecutrix.

The crown prosecutor having another charge to prefer against him, he was remanded till this morning.

The court was then adjourned till ten o'clock this morning.

Original Correspondence.

To the Editor of the Melbourne Courier.

Sir,—Sixty of Tenure!! Sixty of Tenure!!! What a ridiculous idea says the editor of the "Patriot." What absurdities of the "Prince Herdman," and the "Prince Shepherds," goeth the great world of champion of "My Gentle Public." It is a splendid "whore" edited by the editor of the Sydney Morning Chronicle, it would be to do the squatters—the pillars of the Colony of New South Wales. The squatters—the hinges upon which turn the future prospects of Port Phillip justice. Unto those who only read the "Port Phillip Patriot" here, or the "Morning Chronicle" in Sydney, the Squatters appear as a grasping, avaricious, and selfish people; aiming at riding rough shod over their fellow colonists, and monopolizing the whole of the territory for the benefit of the few, to the prejudice of the many. Now, for the sake of argument, suppose the squatters were granted "Sixty of Tenure," on the following terms.—That any person possessing stock, be assigned by an impartial Crown Land Commissioner as much land, taking the seasons into consideration, as would feed his stock, and the increase of three years. Should the stock holder not dispose of his surplus stock, he would be driven to seek another run, and thus contribute to the crown revenue. But when we see the power placed in the hands of the Crown Commissioners abused, by as is too notorious, glaring favoritism, then we naturally become indignant, and cry out for a change in the system.

But how should the change be effected, so as to render it a public benefit? Why? By taking out of their hands the unlimited powers they possess, and making them responsible to an elective government. Thus effectively neutralizing their present oppressive, unconstitutional, and Algerian modes of justice.

Then, allowing Sixty of Tenure. How would the community be benefited? The answer is, first—That instead of so many make shift huts, and tenements the squatter being certain of a long lease of his land, would make his first place of abode a real homestead. Secondly—it would promote a natural desire of establishing himself as a rational, and civilized member of society; enjoying the comforts of his own domestic circle, and completely annihilating the present system of bush celibacy, that only tends to cause a retrograde movement in civilization. Thirdly.—The squatters having families to rear, and educate, would as a matter of course feel their imperative duty, to cause by their united efforts, to be erected schools for the education of their growing children, and places of worship for themselves and families, and provision made for the maintenance of their pastors, and masters. Fourthly.—The increase of population and their wants, in the country, would bring about a large increase in the demand of all articles of consumption for their use; consequently the various manufacturers and artisans, in the different towns would soon find that they were too few to supply the growing demands of

an increasing domestic population in the bush. Fifthly.—The working population of the towns increased by the demands of the country would bring about the desired consummation of the increase of a healthy agricultural population.—More farms would be cultivated for the raising of produce to supply the consumption of the towns. The farmers meeting with encouragement, would of themselves tend materially to advance the benefits of trade generally, by their own increased means of purchasing many articles of luxury, of which they are now obliged to deny themselves.

This a very small share of natural sagacity is required to know in what the benefits of "Sixty of Tenure" would consist. If the promotion of the useful arts—the reclaiming of the present state of society in the country—the establishing of domestic firesides, and domestic circles—the rearing of virtuous families, and encouragement held out to colonial enterprise, and industry are benefits; then let us have Sixty of Tenure. If not, oppress the squatter, drive him from the country—trade and commerce. The merchant, and the artisan must follow, and leave the country as they found it, a desert and a wilderness.

Your's respectfully,

TYRO.

Melbourne, June 10th, 1845.

[Our correspondent has no occasion to be alarmed; the Patriot is obviously licking up its vomit as fast as decency will permit. On Monday our contemporary gulped up, "Sixty of Tenure," and in a day or two, we dare say, if he is only left alone, he will swallow "the right of pre-emption."—Ed. M. C.]

"OURSELVES."

To the Editor of the Melbourne Courier.

Sir,—Travel has not mended you, nor misfortune, nor an anxious desire to correct old vices appearing in a new dress. You assume your abandoned motto, the promise to speak truth, ("I am in the place," &c.,) and with it your never abandoned practice of falsehood. You deprecate calumny in the abstract, you complain of calumny inflicted upon yourself, and you calumniate me, all in a breath. I never wrote, nor was in any manner connected with the writing of any letter to any person in Sydney of which you were the subject. I did not know of the existence of the person who you designate as my correspondent. I never had any participation whatever in any attempt to get Alderman Kerr to carry up to Sydney a parcel of the "dinner scene caricatures." Every syllable respecting me in the paragraph I refer to is a groundless falsehood, and the intense baseness of the invention points to you as its probable author.

EDWARD CURR.

17th June, 1845.

[Mr. Curr must excuse us for asking him to look again at the paragraph he writes of in such very courteous terms. We do not think he will find there it stated that he had any participation in the attempt to get Alderman Kerr to carry up to Sydney a parcel of the "dinner scene caricatures"—that was the work of his brother-in-arms, Mr. George Cavenagh. But we did say, and we reiterate it, notwithstanding Mr. Curr's denial, for men in his circumstances must not expect to receive the privileges of the station they have forfeited—that Mr. Edward Curr was a party to the sending up of an epistle, such as we spoke of, to the person we referred to; which epistle, moreover, contained within its folds one of those same caricatures. Personal cognizance of the fact, of course, we have not; but we know it on evidence, which we would at any time believe in preference to Mr. Edward Curr's, and which we receive the more readily in this instance, that we know Mr. Curr to be quite capable of embarking in any dirty work of the kind.—Ed. M. C.]

For Sydney,

TO SAIL IN ALL THIS WEEK,

THE A 1 first-railing British-built brig "PRINCESS ROYAL," 350 tons register, Captain Reed, will leave for Sydney as stated above. For passage, either cabin or steerage, her accommodations being very superior, apply to the Captain on board, or to DUNLOP, MACNAB, & CO. Melbourne, 16th June, 1845.

Wanted to Purchase,

LIVE Bacon Pigs, of good quality, in any quantity, for which cash will be paid, at per head or per lb., as may be agreed upon with the undersigned.

M. W. MORTIMER, Collins and William-streets, June 16, 1845.

Notice to Debtors.

THE Undersigned having ceased to possess any interest in the Port Phillip Patriot newspaper, it is necessary that persons indebted to him on account of that journal should take immediate measures for the settlement of the various amounts, in order to the winding up of the accounts.

All sums due to the Patriot office to the 31st March, 1845, must be paid at the Melbourne Courier office, Collins-street, adjoining the Bank of Australasia.

WILLIAM KEIR, Melbourne, 16th June, 1845.

THE Undersigned having disposed of his Tannery and Currier's business to Messrs. Pattinson and Thompson, they now have from this date the exclusive right of receiving all moneys due to him while in the above business, and whose receipt will be binding on

WILLIAM JOHNSON, Melbourne, May 22d, 1845.

PATTINSON AND THOMPSON respectfully solicit a continuance of the patronage of Mr. Johnson's friends. Mr. Pattinson having from the commencement of the South Yarra Tannery, had the management of its mechanical department, begs to assure the public generally, that with the co-operation of his partner Mr. Thompson, the business will henceforward be so conducted as to warrant a liberal share of their support.

South Yarra Tannery Warehouse, Elizabeth-street, Melbourne.

To the Public.

J. C. PASSMORE, PAINTER, PAPER-HANGER, &c. &c., Corner of Queen