

came occasionally and took as many as they thought fit, and tumbled their luggage into the boat like stones off a precipice. You would be sorry to see people's luggage smashed, and many thrown into the sea and lost altogether, and then charging 5s. a head for each person and extra for their luggage. Such a state of things I can scarcely describe.

Landed on the wharf. I had to pay £2 10s. for our luggage and 5s. each for passage. One woe past another cometh. To get lodgings was a greater undertaking than the voyage. After a great deal of toil in searching I got a room empty, and I pay 3s. a week for it, the room is about eight feet square—sleeping on our boxes arranged in the most comfortable way necessity can point out, overrun with rats, glad of any place to shelter, and the prices of things you will scarce believe. The next morning there was no less than four persons wanted me to go work for them, joiners being the best trade that comes here. I commenced next day at the rate of 25s. per day I have seen no one that has been unsuccessful, no doubt there are some that do not succeed. The day we landed I saw a lump of gold 5 lbs. weight—a very nice lump to get before breakfast. You will be astonished when I tell you the prices here of a few things:—Bread 6d. a lb., tea 2s. sugar 3l. to 5l., mutton 3l. to 5l., beef 4d. flour 7d. a lb. (strange and bread 6d.) the bread is the best I ever eat. potatoes 4d. a lb., a head of cauliflower only 2s. 6d., a little cabbage 1s. eggs 4d. each, butter 3d. a lb., salt do 4d., ale 6d. a glass, brandy and spirits 1s. a glass; in the majority of places you get no coppers, in fact money is of very little value here; cheese 2s. 6d. a lb. The shopkeepers are making fortunes over and over. Labour is well paid for here, and any one who will work can make no mistake in coming out. I will encourage no one here individually that would say by and by that you had been the cause of upsetting me. I only say one word for all—I wish every one I wish well were here, and fight their way to success. I calculate that labor of every kind, for men and women, is five times the price of that in England. This is under my own observation. I could tell many things I have heard, I will say nothing but what I do know.

A draper, or any sort of a shop hand, can get £250 and board yearly; tailors 1s 6d an hour, the price of making a pair of moleskin trousers is 15s making a dress coat £3, all materials found the workman; brick-makers and layers £1 a day; stone masons and carpenters £1 5s a day; and many I know who are making £2 by piece work daily. The reverse of every thing here to that in England—the employer is the miserably man the workman the independent. Being antipodes to you, the reverse of every thing—here it now is spring time and very warm.

Pots and pans are a great price here; 10s. for a jug and basin—20s. for a boiler, such as would boil a leg of mutton in, in fact everything outrageous. Bacon 2s 1b, and ham in proportion; the current coin is English, sovereigns and silver the same as at home, and the local £1 and £5 notes, coppers very few, as the people think they are of no value. House rent is awfully high, as a great favour I was offered a house a few days since for the sum of £3 a week, the smallness of it I cannot describe to you, because I am a carpenter I would get the preference, and would give me the highest wages to do the work, they can get £5 a week for it, I declined it being a back street where the mistress could do no business.

It strikes me very forcibly that England ought to send us out provisions or we shall be short, it would pay merchants fully as well as cargoes of human beings; think of 23 ships coming up one tide, all with passengers, every day 5 to 10 arriving. I should think at present there are above 160 sail of ships lying here, the greater number without crews; there has been very few deaths on board any of the ships that come here. It is calculated that 4,000 persons arrive in this port weekly, when it will cease I cannot say.—We are tired looking out for a house, and up to the present have not got one, I was asked this day £6 10s. a week for a house with four small rooms, if we could get one no doubt we would do well. Dressmaking is a first-rate business here, or any plain sewing; £1 for making a silk dress; bonnet and hat making is good.

The Great Britain has not yet arrived. Imagine Pharaoh's host leaving Egypt and you will then have a faint idea of the people leaving here for the gold diggings, armed to the teeth and well mounted.

DEBATE ON THE MAYNOOTH GRANT.

The debate which engaged the House of Commons for two nights of this week, on the motion of Mr. Spooner for the repeal of the Maynooth grant, affords striking and painful evidence of the difficulty—not to say the impossibility—of recalling false steps, by which nations as well as individuals are subjected to the moral retribution of being made to "eat of the fruit of their own way, and filled with their own devices." It was once the happy privilege of this country to have its government, its legislation, all its civil institutions, based upon the surest of all foundations, upon the recognition of the truth revealed from Heaven, upon the establishment of the Church—divinely ordained for the maintenance and propagation of that truth—as the teacher of the nation, and upon the tenure of the Crown itself under an express compact allegiance to the King of Kings. But like another nation, which in ancient times was similarly privileged, this nation having by degrees become weary of the righteous constitution under which it had grown great and prosperous, has cast off the obligations and restraints of the principles by which it was formerly governed, and adopted new principles and new systems, partly in imitation of other less

enlightened and less well ordered countries, and partly in deference to crude and untried theories of social optimism. The result is, that while the ancient structure of our noble Constitution in Church and State has been partially demolished, fragments of it only remaining to attest what once it was, the erection of the new edifice which was intended to take its place, is the subject of endless bootless, and ignorant contention between the advocates of the most antagonistic principles and theories of government.

In this deplorable condition, the whole body politic being in a state of disorder,—the whole "head sick, and the whole heart faint, and from the sole of the foot even unto the head, no soundness in it."—we can hardly feel surprised that the course of a debate on a subject which touches all the deepest foundations of government, should be characterized not only by much contradiction and bitterness of feeling, but by much inconsistency and false reasoning, the whole terminating in an erroneous conclusion arrived at on erroneous premises. For this erroneous conclusion we frankly own that Mr. Spooner himself is in some measure responsible. He must, one should think, have seen and heard enough of the views by which Honourable Members are influenced on the question which he submitted to the decision of the House, to have known that by demanding at once the repeal of the Maynooth grant, instead of contenting himself with a motion for inquiry, he was sure to alienate from himself many votes which would have supported him if the latter had been the course proposed by him.

Lamentable though the fact may be, it is certainly not sufficient now-a-days to demonstrate to the House of Commons that Popery is a system based upon error, upon superstition, upon idolatry, that it is contrary to the revealed word of God. There are numbers who will contend in reply, that these charges are mere matters of opinion, which the Legislature cannot entertain; that if men are willing to adopt for their religion a system which to others appears erroneous, superstitious, idolatrous, that is entirely their own affair, and is not cognizable by others, least of all by Government and the Legislature; that if men choose to wrest and to misunderstand the Word of God, they have an unquestionable right to do so. Nor is it, to confess the truth, easy to see how, reasoning upon this basis, the endorsement of error by a State can be objected to, provided there be a certain number of members of the body politic by whom that error is regarded and held sacred as truth.

The only ground upon which, as it appears to us, the objections to the Maynooth grant can be sustained, in the present low and perverted state of the political and legislative mind, is the impeachment of the system for the inculcation and propagation of which the College is confessedly established, as a system which is radically anti-social, opposed to those first principles of human conduct, upon which all human society is, and, if it is to endure, must be founded. That impeachment, kept studiously free from all admixture of religious objection, however well founded, would, if followed up by evidence calmly tendered and dispassionately weighed, prove fatal to the claim of Maynooth to public support. As for the evidence it would be forthcoming in abundance, if a tribunal to receive it, and to adjudicate upon it, were once established.

We need not go far for proof that the Supremacy of the Pope is a fundamental principle of Popery, and that this supremacy is set forth in the public documents of the Romish Church, and inculcated in her Seminaries and manuals of theology in a manner which renders it morally impossible that any Papist should bear true allegiance to any Sovereign who does not bend his neck under the foot of the Pope, or live peaceably under any social organization in which the Papal Church is not either exclusively established, or at least absolutely dominant.

Again, we need not go far for proof that wherever the Papal Church has gained the position which until she has gained, her members are religiously turbulent and seditious,—she has invariably made use of the power ceded to her, for the purpose of encroaching upon the prerogative and authority of the rulers, and of trampling under foot the rights and liberties of the people. All the Potentates who have given in their adhesion to the Papal creed have found themselves involved in an incessant struggle against the usurpations of the Papal power; and all the nations that have embraced that creed have groaned under a system of grinding spiritual tyranny and ecclesiastical oppression. The history of all Europe abounds with proofs that this is the case.

Again, we need not go far to prove that the Papal system is subversive to all truth and good faith in the dealings between man and man. The Church which has set up the maxim that no faith is to be kept with heretics, has given ample demonstration to the world that no asservation of her members is to be believed, and no promise given by them to be relied on,—no, not even under the sanction of an oath,—whenever it is to her interest that the truth should be denied, falsehood asserted, or the most solemn pledges violated. That this is no exaggerated picture of the systematic iniquity of the Papal Church and of the moral obliquity which she engenders in her members, may easily be shown. We need not go further than the House of Commons itself, on the benches of which more than one "Honourable Member" is sitting who openly avows that he will never rest till he shall have accomplished the spoliation and overthrow of the Protestant Church, although, before he took his seat, he had by a solemn oath to bind himself not to use the power entrusted to him as a Member of the British Legislature, for the purpose of subverting or even weakening that Church, as by law established.

On a smaller scale the same callous familiarity with perjury is to be met with in every Court of Justice in Ireland, where all the safeguards of the administration of justice are nullified; where the seditious Priest boldly assumes the character of prosecutor, and places the guardians of the public peace in the felon's dock, by means of the evidence which a whole population is ready to offer upon oath, in the very teeth of truth and fact, "for the good of the Church."

It is by forcing such facts as these upon the attention of Parliament and of the country, by exposing the Papal claim, destructive of all other authority, and the Popish code of ethics, subversive of all social morality, in all their hideousness, that the advance of Popery must be combated. Let, as is proposed by the Earl of Winchester, a committee of inquiry be appointed,—let the authentic documents by which the policy of the Papal Church is governed, and the standard of instruction by which her members are guided, be subjected to a searching investigation,—let the influence of Popery upon the social and political condition of other nations be ascertained,—let above all, the inquiry be thrown open for the production of any evidence which may tend to illustrate the practical working of Popery among the Irish population, and to verify the sayings and doings of Popish representatives in the House of Commons, and we will be bound to say that numbers of men who voted against Mr. Spooner's motion under the impression that it proceeded from religious antagonism, or that it was untenable on the ground of equal justice to all creeds, will record their votes in favour of any measure calculated to put down so tremendous a social nuisance, and to disarm, in simple self-defence, a system which has vowed implacable hatred, and is carrying on war to the knife, against this Protestant kingdom and nation.—*John Bull.*

FUNERAL OF THE LATE BISHOP OF SYDNEY.

On Saturday last, Feb. 26th, the remains of the late lamented Bishop of Sydney were committed to their appropriate resting-place in the nave of Canterbury Cathedral, close to the Bust of his schoolfellow and friend, Sir George Gipps.

Arrangements had been made for the conveyance from Ashford of the mourners, who came from London by the express train. Soon after eleven o'clock they assembled in the Chapter-house, and the procession being formed, moved in the following order through the cloisters into the Cathedral:—

The Masters and Boys of the King's School, in which the late Bishop received his education.

- The Choristers.
- The lay Clerks.
- Minor Canons.
- Canons.

THE BODY.

The outer coffin was made of English oak, highly polished, and studded with three rows of nails. It was covered with a handsome crimson pall, upon which were placed the insignia of the deceased Bishop. The plate on the coffin bore the following inscription:—"William Grant Broughton, D.D., Bishop of Sydney, Metropolitan. Born April 1788, died, 20th of February, 1853."

The pall being borne by the Bishop of Quebec, Bishop Carr (Bombay), the Rev. Edward Cole-ridge, the Rev. Ernest Hawkins, the Warden of St. Augustine's College, and George Gipps Esq. (of Howletts).

Then followed the mourners—Jas. Broughton, Esq., the Rev. J. P. Francis, William Gibbs, Esq., —Gibbs, Esq., Selwyn Smith Esq., J. Leslie Foster, Esq., and others.

Afterwards came the Professors and Students of St. Augustine's College, in their academical dress.

Nothing could be more suitable and solemn than the whole of the ceremonial. The sentences and psalms were chanted by the choir, and the service was read by the Venerable Archdeacon Harrison.

It was impossible but that a strong feeling should be excited among those who, for the most part, and without previous acquaintance, were gathered round the grave of one to whom the Church owes so much—who had come home in reference to questions deeply affecting her interests—and who was carried off at a moment when his wisdom, his experience, and his counsel were so much needed. No one could, without emotion, see the young students of St. Augustine's, the future missionaries of the Colonial Church, looking down upon the coffin of one who had finished his course and was now resting from his labors. Doubtless his tomb will often be visited by those who may be emulous of running a like race.

After the conclusion of the solemn ceremony, the friends and mourners withdrew to the house of Archdeacon Harrison, and agreed to adopt measures to raise a fund, with the twofold purpose of erecting some monument over the remains of the deceased metropolitan, and also of endowing one or more scholarships to bear his name at St. Augustine's College.

It was also resolved to "tender the cordial thanks of the friends and mourners to the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury, for the very considerate and handsome manner in which they offered the cathedral as a suitable resting place for the remains of the late lamented Bishop of Sydney, and for the excellent arrangements which they made for the funeral."

Bishop Broughton was highly distinguished (being sixth wrangler) in a very good year at Cambridge 1818. He possessed vast stores of patristic and theological learning, and was remarkably familiar with the best classical authors. It is surely to his honour that these accomplishments of the scholar and divine were, in a manner, put out of sight by the abundant labours of the Episcopate, by that which came upon him daily—"the care of all the Churches."

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, March 4.

CLERGY RESERVES (CANADA) BILL.

(Speech of Sir J. Packington, Concluded.)

He would now deal with that which was the real question before the House—namely, what was the obligation, on the one hand, and what was the answer on the other. He would not, in so doing, trouble the House by any extended remarks upon the history of this question, but he would only remind them of the vast length of time over which these appropriations were spread; and of their continued devotion to one sacred aim. (Hear, hear.) In 1774, only 14 years after the date of the conquest, the first Quebec Act was passed, and under that act the rights of the Roman Catholic Clergy to their dues and tithes were fully recognized; but it was the pleasure of Parliament at the same time to recognize the rights of the Protestant Church in that Country, and the Clergy, like those of the Romish Church, were allowed to collect tithes from those of their own denomination. In 1791 the 31st of George III. was passed, by which the tithes, so far as the Protestants were concerned, were virtually repealed, and one-seventh of the land was set apart in lieu of those tithes, in order to support the Protestant worship in the colony. The next important act was that of 1827, allowing these reserves to be sold; and this act completely recognized the endowments of the Protestant Church. For some years afterwards the Legislature of the Upper Province—and this was, he would remind the House, an Upper Canada question—"Oh, oh!" from Sir W. Molesworth.) He did not understand the groan of the right hon. Baronet; and he must repeat that this was an Upper Canadian question, (Hear, hear.) or, although it was true there was a portion of these Reserves in the Lower Province, the great bulk of them was in the Upper Province. (Hear, hear.) For a long series of years, then; this question had become a question of party conflict: there was constant disputes about the mode of dealing with this property, until at length the troubles of 1838 came on. Afterwards the desire on the part of the noble Lord to unite these Provinces was made known, and it was felt that the settlement of this reserve question was essential before the reunion took place. The Legislature of Upper Canada in 1839 expressed a desire that the Crown should deal with and dispose of these Reserves, and they passed an act vesting them in the Crown. When the act, however, came over, Lord J. Russell would not advise that the assent of the Crown should be given to it, and he left it to the Province to decide in what manner these reserves should be disposed of. The right hon. Baronet (Sir W. Molesworth) probably fancied that this was an admission that the right to deal with these reserves was in the Canadian Parliament;—but he must remind him that it was the Legislature of Upper Canada that was to deal with the reserves, and that it was a very different thing to leave the united Canadian Parliament to deal with these reserves in the Upper Province. In 1840 the Legislature sent over an act reserving the property for religious purposes, dividing the greater portion between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland, and giving the rest to other denominations. The opinion of the judges was against the legality of that act, and subsequently, in the same year, the act of 1840 was passed, the provisions of which are identical with the measure which had passed the Canadian Parliament, except as regarded the alterations necessary in consequence of the opinions of the judges. Up to that time these reserves had been devoted to the Protestant religion; and he challenged disproof when he said that this country was bound by the most sacred obligations to respect that arrangement so far as its principle was concerned—viz, the dedication of this property to religious uses, and that this Parliament was not at liberty, except by a tyrannical exercise of power, to divert this property from those religious uses. He wished now to examine the real value of the grounds taken up by the Government; that the right of self-control was paramount with the obligations not to interfere with the act of 1840. And here let him enquire, in passing, whether the present bill did not in itself violate this very principle of self-government? The answer of the Government would no doubt be that the Parliament of Canada had itself suggested the second clause which ensured the rights now enjoyed by private individuals. They pretend that a sense of justice allowed them to plunder the Church, and then to say that they would be careful to maintain the rights of A and B, was a perversion of a sense of justice which he need not insist. But then Government, ought to have drawn this bill without their second clause, if they wished to carry out their principle of the sacredness of local self-control, and trusted to the Canadian Parliament to carry out its due regard for vested interests. He claimed for the late Government—and he did not say it boastingly—that they had as great a regard for this principle of self-control as could justly be claimed by any Government whether that of Lord J. Russell, Lord Melbourne, or any other that he remembered. The noble lord (J. Russell) upon several occasions distinctly violated this principle, upon the ground that there were imperial considerations which overruled the acknowledged right of self-government. The Legislature of New Brunswick in 1848 passed a law giving a bounty upon the cultivation of hemp. This was disallowed by the noble lord's government, and the colonists remonstrated with Lord Grey upon this infraction of the principle of self-control. The Vagrant Act passed by the Legislature of New South Wales, in 1850, appeared to relate to a subject of exclusively local interest