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THE ARGUMENT

Broughton was born on the eve of the French Revolution and into a generation preoccupied with mob disorder and legitimate authority. His school days at Canterbury had him strategically placed by a camp for French prisoners and within range of tales that would heighten his sense of the drama which closed the eighteenth and opened the nineteenth centuries on the Continent. From Canterbury Broughton went to London, and into the midst of a parliamentary and pulpit debate on the ill-effect of religious dissent on good order and stable government. Whatever he picked up there was systematically arranged along with lively comment by Dr. Herbert Marsh, Professor of Divinity at Cambridge and champion of the Church Establishment against all loose thinkers who flirted with non-conformity. Broughton emerged from Cambridge in 1818 distinguished in scholarship and a firm highchurchman. He earned high praise for his diligence as a curate and good money for his success as a schoolmaster. Yet he yearned for more. He wanted quiet and seclusion for study and an increased emolument. He asked the Duchess of Wellington to find him the former, and the Duke of Wellington offered him the latter. So in 1829, for £2,000 a year, Broughton came to New South Wales as compensation for his failure to win a librarianship in the British Museum.

Before he left England Broughton received Scott's official papers and announced, when he arrived in the colony, that he would build on Scott's foundations that Church Establishment which would
secure the colony, and happily the whole Pacific region, for God as seen through the disciples of the English protestant reformers. On the eve of his departure the announcement of Catholic Emancipation added urgency to his task, while on the morrow of his arrival the news that the Church of England had lost its land endowment injected an element of desperation into his struggle. These two decisions, the work of an English Tory administration, provided the framework for the first of Broughton's two decades of service to the colony.

From 1830 to 1834 Broughton fought for the restoration of land endowments, and failed. Darling would happily have seen him succeed. Bourke was determined that he should not. The Tory administration in England which abolished the land grants intended replacing them with aid of equal value from other sources. Instead it was itself replaced by a Whig administration determined to spread the aid to all major denominations at work in the colony with the Church of England as the most favoured son. While this offer was available Broughton campaigned for a return of exclusive aid to the Church of England. By the time he came to accept it in 1834, Bourke had convinced the Colonial Office that aid must be made available to all churches on an equal basis. To reverse this decision and hopefully to regain some land, as well as to raise funds from English churchmen at large, Broughton returned to England in 1834. He departed with the threat to forsake the colony for good unless he could bring back from the Colonial Office a better deal for colonial Anglicanism than he left behind.

In England Broughton's attitude underwent a revolutionary change. He arrived late in 1834 and realised that the attack on church privilege and property was empire wide. He realised, too, that many churchmen
were attempting to extract the sting from the attack by rewriting traditional church doctrine and practice to accommodate the whims of Dissenters. Broughton abhorred the process and shuddered before the prospect. He abandoned all claims for land and decided to return to New South Wales as a bishop, and there to turn the Church of England into a citadel for the preservation of true doctrine and proper church order while a liberal madness swept the rest of the English speaking world. Broughton realised that the Church of England could no longer be an Establishment, and offered to resign his seat on the Legislative Council in the near future as a token of this belief. A day would come, Broughton continued to believe, when the colony disillusioned by its liberal experiment would appeal for a return to the older order and its stability. In that day Broughton's successors would throw open the doors of the citadel in which had been preserved the genius of institutions that had accompanied England's rise to eminence, and produce a body of men fit to serve the nation in church and government. This day may not be, he said, for two hundred years.

Broughton's determination to retain his seat on the Legislative Council for at least a year was a symbol of the policy he had decided to adopt for the immediate future. Although the Church Establishment was going, it had not gone, and Broughton intended using his dying powers and declining influence to drive as favourable a bargain as he could with government. Back in the colony in 1836 he raised no public objection to the Church Act because it provided him with money for churches and clergy in his citadel. Because Bourke's
proposals for national schools on the Irish system did the very opposite and took the education of Church of England youth out of the Bishop's hands, and thereby weakened his chances of forming a strong citadel, he joined with other protestant bodies to defeat it. Broughton not only believed Bourke's system dangerous to protestantism, but an improper interpretation of Glenelg's instructions on education. Broughton believed those instructions obliged the Governor to work in with the desires of the dominant party in the colony, and he set out to prove that the dominant party did not approve of the Irish system. Later he had to stave off an attempt by Gipps to merge his schools into a general protestant scheme of the type he had set up his citadel to resist. Broughton wanted a separate system of denominational schools for the Church of England. He was willing to concede the Roman Catholic community and other protestant bodies the right to their own separate systems. He insisted that he needed his, and under the terms of Glenelg's despatch on education he had the right to expect it.

Bourke blamed Broughton for the defeat of the Irish scheme, but most contemporary opinion denied him the honour. Protestant opposition had appeared before his return and independently of his urging. Moreover, the issue spread beyond education and became the rallying point for general opposition to Bourke. Class interests were as strong as religious interests, and for many the struggle had more to do with the right of government to tax landholders for the education of the poor, or put differently, to tax wealthy Protestants for the education of poor Roman Catholics, than with
systems of education. The *Sydney Herald* maintained that the opposition would have been as hot had Broughton thrown his lot in with Bourke. After 1839 Gipps behaved towards Broughton as though he had been the sole cause of the defeat of the second attempt to introduce a system of national schools, and yet in private admitted that Wesleyan determination to join Broughton in the struggle for denominational schools had finally collapsed his cause.

Despite his victories Broughton realised he lived on borrowed time. The defeat of each scheme in turn gave him a respite in which to grab a share of funds for citadel schools and churches. He believed the day was not far off when the government would succeed in its attempt to form National schools, and a partly elected Legislative Assembly would weary of the burden of financing an ever increasing array of new religious denominations and call a halt to the provisions of the Church Act. By that day Broughton hoped to have his citadel firmly established and able to survive on voluntary contributions.

Broughton was well received in the colony until 1833. Then, in a reaction to disappointments over the failure of the Colonial Office to liberalise the New South Wales Act, his salary of £2,000 was seized upon as an example of the inequity perpetuated by the patronage that Office held over the Colonial Treasury. It was likewise held up as one of the injustices a locally elected Legislative Council would speedily correct. Broughton was thereafter regularly criticised, consistently as an expensive functionary and only rarely
as a person. His place in colonial politics was complicated by his appearance in the company of men whose principles he did not necessarily share. He voted regularly with the landowners and exclusivists, yet he was in favour of emancipists having full civil rights and he proposed the rigid application of the new land regulations in the hope of dispossessing the great landowners of much of their property. He declined, in the 1830's, to use his influence as chairman of the Immigration Committee to limit the intake of Irish Catholic settlers, and he disassociated himself from the tone of the anti-Irish tirades of the *Sydney Gazette* and *Sydney Herald*. He had only unstable alliances because, as he realised, he and the landed gentry of the colony were only accidentally linked. One day the alliance would collapse and he would be alone in his struggle.

Broughton spent the first half of his first decade in the colony adjusting to the need to forego dreams of an Establishment, and the second half of that decade fighting for the right of the Church of England to survive as a witness to the protestant teachings of the English Reformers. He believed the adjustment wrong in principle but necessary in reality; and the *Sydney Herald* of 7 June 1839 caught this change of mood in its report of the Bishop's Visitation Charge:

> He then explained the provisions of the Church Act; which he considers is likely to have a very ill effect upon the religious welfare of the community, but still as it was the law of the land it must be treated with respect.
William Grant Broughton had a place in early histories of Australia. Then around 1910 he faded before a growing preoccupation with economic factors as the true substance of a proper story of early colonial life. The last decade has seen a change. In a series of religious, intellectual, and biographical studies a number of people, and among them Broughton, have been returned their roles in the colonial drama. Yet for Broughton it has not been a happy comeback. He has been cast in the role of a humourless and unbending Tory, and made out to be something of an absurdity in gaiters in a land of gum trees; eminently quotable for a good joke, but an undoubted sojourner who longed for an invitation to return to the land of his fathers, to its green pastures and settled ways. The tragedy of his life was that the invitation never came; and that too, it has been implied, was a tragedy for colonial life.

My interest in Broughton began with a suspicion that there could possibly be another and a different Broughton. When the Bishop died in 1853 the Annual Register, which jealously tailored its obituary space to its client’s social status, threw tradition to the wind and bade Broughton farewell with a notice worthy of the cousins of royalty. At the same time the picks and shovels of labourers were to be heard for the first time since the Reformation preparing in the nave of Canterbury’s Cathedral a home for bones. What some men said and others did was performed in honour of one who had been only a few months in England after fifteen continuous years of absence. What stirred men to honour Broughton in this manner? The explanation peeping through recent historical scholarship did not supply a
satisfactory answer. And this dissatisfaction was heightened by a realisation that this so-called sojourner came for a few years and stayed a lifetime. Moreover, he came for the rewards and lived to give half his annual salary away at a time inflation further reduced the value of the remaining half. Neither action spoke of a man who felt himself an exile in a strange land. They suggested the opposite; and told the tale of a man who came increasingly to identify himself with the colony and its people. So the problem of Broughton was born.

This thesis is an attempt to answer the straightforward question, Who was Broughton. The result is a biographical study chronologically arranged. To impose some form on the material collected I have shaped the story around four issues; the development of Broughton's own attitude to his task as a religious leader, the evolution of the colony's attitude to Broughton, Broughton's stand (as citizen and official Councillor) on some of the major issues affecting the domestic life of the colony, and finally, Broughton's political alliances in the struggle to win advantage for the Church of England in the colony. I have not made any attempt to weave into this the story of the domestic expansion of the Church of England. The biography is a study in New South Wales colonial politics rather than religious history.

In coming to such a study I soon discovered that the fairly good supply of material available on the Broughton of the 1840's was offset by a relative scarcity for the decade of the 1830's. If Broughton is to be conceded the privilege of a change of mind and heart from time
to time, or to grow weary in adversity and erratic under pressure or disappointment, I decided that the colourful and eminently quotable correspondence of the 1840's should not be imported back into the 1830's. My quest after the earlier Broughton began with a day to day search of the colony's newspapers, and a roll by roll investigation of all Colonial Office records likely to harbour the letters and reports Broughton sent the Governors and the Governor's sent on to the Colonial Office, but which the H.R.A. seemed invariably to list as missing or to have reserved for inclusion in other Series which never eventuated. In the manuscript holdings of the Mitchell Library and the New South Wales State Archives I looked at papers of any person or any subject that Broughton's shadow might have fallen on in the 1830's. The yield was not great. It was as if Broughton lived by the counsel 'Let another man praise thee, and not thine own mouth'. Yet the yield was sufficient to tell a story of the 1830's not indebted to the material of the 1840's; and which, if it stands up to the test, will provide a point of view for an interpretation of the letters and actions of the prelate's second and more distracting decade.

In the end the story of the 1830's came to dominate the study. Time to some extent dictated this. But had time alone been the determining factor the study might have closed with Bourke's departure in 1838 and Broughton's survival of what could be thought his most important contest with authority. Gipp's early years, culminating in his attempt to repeat Bourke's effort to establish National schools, seemed, however, equally as important and desperate
in Broughton's fight for survival. The date 1840 seemed therefore the natural breaking point. By then the Bishop had faced most of his great problems at least once round, and he had formulated the plan that would guide him until death or retirement removed him from office. The issue with Roman Catholics was to take on an intensity in the 1840's not witnessed in the 1830's, but the motive behind it was clear by 1839. Broughton was to turn increasing attention to the quest after ecclesiastical self-government, but the reasons for that, too, were rooted in attitudes formed before 1840, and particularly in his decision to form a citadel and his disenchantment with the liberal policies of ecclesiastical superiors in England. His most colourful contest over education did not come till he met Lowe in 1844, but that episode was a war of words and a clash of personalities that cannot be justly evaluated except in the light of what he had shown himself prepared to do in education in the 1830's.

Indeed Broughton's words can often be a poor guide to a fair evaluation of his activities. As a Bishop he maintained a barrage of criticism against changes he accepted in practice. He denounced what he lived with, and in public pledged himself to change what he privately confessed was irreversible. His profession and office demanded this pose of him. But those words do not tell the story of his life, only of his thoughts. In the study of the 1830's I have tried to balance the one against the other and to show the man in his environment and not only in his study, where, it must be admitted, he could fall victim to a maudlin and plaintive spirit. And yet the
doubt remains whether that plaintive Broughton was the real man. It may have been a Broughton turned on for English contacts and English subscribers and one designed to keep the money flowing in.
CHAPTER ONE

BEFORE NEW SOUTH WALES

How very much, I often think, of our character and principles is made up of these odd out-of-the-way impressions, picked up one hardly knows when or how, and remembered one cannot tell wherefore. No boys in New South Wales have any such reminiscences or regards. It would be well for them if they had.

W.G. Broughton
Dusk had fallen. Across the precincts a door opened. From a lighted hall a small group of boys filed on to dew damp lawns which crossed imperceptibly under the cover of darkness to the solid, immovable, perpendicular monument that had towered upwards almost a thousand years, an unrepentant memorial to England's Christian conversion. A clatter of eager steps soon mingled with others more weighty, more strident, more measured, to announce that the boys had met the masters in the cloisters and were moving towards a side entrance to the cathedral. Hush clothed the group. It formed itself into a tiny procession and moved two steps up past a stone still Archbishop Pecham, who had stood sentinel at the north door for five centuries with an eye alert for the curious Jew who might wander in. Then it wound down past the wily old prelate, William Warham. He had fixed his gaze on the spot where Becket fell and thanked God for the timely death that had spared him a martyr's death. Three stairs more and the group had passed from the organ encrusted chancel into the aisle which led down behind a dusty clutter of elaborately carved choir stalls to the transept where a lighted chapel awaited them.¹

They knelt. Some prayed. Then the Reverend Christopher Naylor, whose keen mind and flexible wrist had helped bring them

to this moment of glory, rose up, and calling each boy forward by name uttered the venerable bidding, introitum tuum et exitum tuum custodiat Dominus! At this sign, as if by some sacramental rite, the prim gown and purple tasselled cap, which outwardly decked each boy, was intended to move inward and fix in his heart a will to become part of the great enlivening purpose whose memory lay all around in tombs, effigies, plaques and shrines, Canterbury's unique possession.²

For the moment the boys were tired and their minds fatigued by long hours of examination. They were also very young. Ample time remained to teach them the meaning of their initiation; that as young scholars of the King's School, Canterbury, the cradle of Britain's Christian education, they had been singled out for moulding as custodians of a tradition at once sacred and national.³

The headmaster did not prolong the service in the chapel. With the completion of its formal requirements, he extinguished all candles but one, and guided them out again into the cold December

2. For the description of the making of a Scholar of the King's School and the environment of the school in general, see D.L. Edwards, A History of the King's School Canterbury (London, 1957), chaps. 4, 6, 7, 10 and 11; Walter Pater, 'Emerald Uthwart' in Miscellaneous Studies (London, 1920), pp. 207-26. A better source than either would have been, J. Shirley (ed.), The Reminiscences of the Reverend George Gilbert (Canterbury, 1938), being selections from Gilbert's, Horae Cantuarienses. Gilbert being Broughton's contemporary at the King's School would have sketched the environment exactly as Broughton knew it in the 1790's. I discovered the existence of this source too late for the British Museum to provide a copy in time for use in this thesis.

air. In the Precincts the boys divided. Some departed with the headmaster, the others accompanied the school's second master, the Reverend John Francis to his house. In the company of this group walked the young William Grant Broughton.  

It was the Advent of 1797. Young Broughton, now in his tenth year, had been born in the very heart of London's Westminster district, at Bridge Street, one year and one week after the First Fleet weighed anchor in Portsmouth's harbour.  

He belonged to an in-between generation, born too late to be comfortably at home in Regency laxity, and too early to be schooled exclusively in the ethical puritanism which Wilberforce was labouring to make fashionable. Paley's rational theology was still considered a virtuous means to an orthodox faith, and the Proclamation against Vice and Immorality, which George III foisted on the indulgent society of 1787, had begun to breed that distinctive style of propriety which subordinated

intellectual to moral excellence at all times.  

Part of the old, part of the new, broke in on those who acquired their stock of learning at the turn of the century. Some sped to the challenge to boldly embrace an unchartered future; others stood firm, determined to retain as the paramount good the excellencies of the past. At Eton, Shelley learned a little science and unlearned the doctrine of Original Sin, cursed kings, priests and statesmen as the source of all human misery, and dedicated his life to uncreate the gods which human pride had built out of its ignorance.  

Canterbury, pre-eminent symbol of the old, and for many the very best, was less disturbed by the newer fashions. Its school remained strictly and narrowly classical, boasting no lessons in science and few in the modern languages and mathematics.  

A fond ambition caused Broughton's parents to remove their son from the Grammar School at Barnet, just

6. As I understand it this is the theme of Muriel Jaeger, Before Victoria. Changing Standards and Behaviour 1787-1837 (Penguin ed., Middlesex, 1967). In chapter three the author cites the case of Harriet, the younger daughter of the Duchess of Devonshire, who grew up in the laxity of Devonshire House but under the influence of a prudish religious governess, Selina Trimmer. Harriet married a rakish friend of Byron's but was ill at ease travelling on Sundays; her correspondence revealed the deep influence of Miss Trimmer's religious views, but Harriet never ceased to regard her as a slightly 'funny figure'. For the struggle between intellectual and moral excellence in this period of transition, see John Henry Newman, Apologia Pro Vita Sua (edited, with an introduction and notes by Martin J. Svegllic, Oxford, 1967), p. 26.


north of London, to the King's School. The Broughtons were minor residents of their district, more honoured in their family connections than blessed in their means; so that the award of a King's Scholarship to their son was as gratifying for its pecuniary relief as cherished for its honour.\(^9\)

Eight exceedingly happy years in and around the privileged quiet of the Cathedral Precincts left a lasting impression on Broughton's mind. He came young, impressionable, and unformed, to a place where the *genius loci* was a strong one, and he yielded unreservedly to its memories. In the school-room, transformed from the ancient chapel of the pilgrims, Broughton sat long hours pondering the classical authors who, enshrined in a remote and impenetrable glory, were made to appear before the young as the Masters of an immutable knowledge. Outside, the Green Court, a playing field lined around with lime bushes, attracted him but indifferently. He preferred, as he grew older, when time was free to wander out through the age stained Gothic gateway into the old ecclesiastical city, and, passing down Butchery Row, to gaze back up through the gable lined street to the magnificent Cathedral tower emphatic against the heavens. Then to go on past hopfields and marshes till his lungs began to fill with the sea freshened air. There he could stand and gaze into the world beyond. In this vastness one uncle rode the waves an officer in the King's navy, another sweated in heathen India, paymaster to His Majesty's forces.

---

India, the epitome of the nation's concerns; a place for the adventurer, the rogue, and for the commercially talented to make their wealth. To the few fitted for sacrifice it sent a timely call to serve a Christian mission among an age hardened paganism and deadly fevers. This moving world of India ministered to the ambitions of many of the young, and had its moments of pull on the youthful imagination of Broughton.

Temperament and abilities seemed to fit him for other things. As he took his turn hearing the Latin lines of the juniors and correcting their blunders, he discovered an ambition to enter the ranks of the teachers and pastors of the Established Church. This turned his energies, in his final year at the school, to winning a place at one of the universities and a scholarship to supplement his family's slender means. His Housemaster came from a line of Cambridge dons, and naturally turned his mind in that direction.

Mathematics dominated at Cambridge; so Broughton took extra lessons outside the school to enhance his chances of selection. He succeeded, being awarded an Exhibition, a prize only slightly less prestigious than the coveted scholarship. It was by then the Advent of 1804.

In the first fortnight of that Advent man and nature cursed Europe; Napoleon turned emperor, Vesuvius erupted, Spain declared war on Britain, and the unrepentant Bourbon prelate, M. de Conzies, once the brightest star in France's ecclesiastical firmament, expired, exiled in poverty and broken by the news of 'the scandalous journey of Pius VII and the sacrilegious coronation of Napoleon I'. He could bear all but the sight of one lawful authority expeditiously divorcing another for the benefit of a favourable settlement that had the appearance of peace. He was not the last to bear that sight, or to be broken by it. The English establishment had so far been spared the spectacle at work in its own finely balanced fabric of religious and political rights. But a day could come when the spirit of the age would force its leaders to declare for the maintenance of principle or the expediency of change. If the present generation escaped that ordeal the coming one could scarcely hope to. Broughton belonged to the coming generation. He farewelled his school and Canterbury the day the Bourbon prelate died. If he succeeded well in his higher studies, he would have the honour of jostling for place and authority in a society which had escaped the fury but gathered the force of the change that had swept France.

Broughton did not arrive at Cambridge. Away from the environment of Canterbury he felt the pull of other careers. His uncle in India had exchanged the office of Paymaster to His Majesty's Forces for a post in the East India Company. His tales could have enkindled in

14. 16 December 1804; see *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. 39, 1853, p. 431.
the young lad a hope of turning his precocious talent to winning his way to a position of influence and a measure of wealth. The prosperity of his uncle contrasted starkly with the straitened means of his own family, and even with the Exhibition at Cambridge he would have needed family support at a time other children of the family had still to be educated. For two years Broughton remained in obscure employment. Then in April 1807 a hefty push from the Marquis of Salisbury, a family neighbour at Barnet, helped him win his way through to service in the East India Company. This new choice carried a prestige in commercial circles similar to that Cambridge owned in the academic world. Relatives helped his father raise a £500 bond, and Broughton went straight to a clerkship in the Company's treasury. Shortly afterwards his father was dead; and Broughton's income was essential for the family's welfare.15

The move to London took Broughton into the midst of a war time society preoccupied religiously and intellectually, as well as economically and politically, with the spectre of an 'ambitious and violent Bonaparte'.16 In all but the very lowest class the trend was increasingly towards a conservative style in many departments of living. For Sydney Smith it was a nightmare of a time; 'an awful period',

15. On the difficulties of establishing the course of Broughton's life at this particular point, see Appendix A. The point that Broughton's father's signature was on the bond was told me by Associate-Professor K.J. Cable, University of Sydney. This throws a difficulty in the way of the story that his father's death intervened to prevent Broughton's entry into Cambridge, see F.T. Whitington, William Grant Broughton (Sydney, 1936), p. 19.  
16. Annual Register, 1810, p. 430.
he said, 'for those who had the misfortune to entertain liberal opinions'.\textsuperscript{17} Reaction alarmed even Tories, and the more liberal among their number called on parliament to return 'to the more mild and liberal policies which adorned the earlier periods of His Majesty's reign'.\textsuperscript{18} The Whigs felt it safer to languish in the \textit{status quo} and abandoned all serious promotion of reform.\textsuperscript{19} England's doctrinaire Jacobins passed through the vale of disenchantment; Southey turned tory in the \textit{Quarterly Review}, while Coleridge's \textit{The Friend} became counsellor and confessor to a society dangerously adrift from fixed principles in politics, morals and religion.\textsuperscript{20} Even unrepentant reformers like Bentham, Cartwright, and Cobbett professed attachment to the existing order, and only preached 'reform for the sake of the constitution'.\textsuperscript{21} Men everywhere discovered a new fondness for England and things English, and few fostered the cause more than the rampaging Bonaparte.\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{18} \textit{Annual Register}, 1812, p. 31.
\textsuperscript{21} \textit{Quarterly Review}, vol. 1, 1809, p. 434.
\textsuperscript{22} Brinton, \textit{English Romanticists}, p. 106.
In the 1790's the prisoners' barracks around Canterbury had informed the pupils of the King's School that England was at war, but the variety of hatreds and excesses spawned by the Revolution in France were stories from a past Broughton and his companies were too young to remember. They learned of the pagan voluptuousness which auctioned the Cathedral of Metz at the third hour of the morning, that toppled church steeples which towered indecently above village roofs, that established a mundane tyranny by sewing altar linen into men's shirts and fashioning coin from sacred vessels, from a pulpit oratory set to declaim against the age as evil, adulterous, ignorant, apostate, and foppish. To temper the rhetoric of the preacher, a new literature urging a more profound assessment of the Revolution began to pour on to the market. Broughton with an ear to the pulpit and an eye for the publishers' lists, was admirably positioned in London to build up a point of view, partly intellectual, partly emotional, of this, the most

momentous event of modern times. Even more fruitful was the opportunity it afforded him to experience firsthand the public debate on Bonaparte; a debate never far removed from arguments about irreligion, immorality and mobs.

William Wordsworth contributed to this debate. He abandoned the poetic form in 1809 to produce a pamphlet on Napoleon and the French people. His moralist eye dismissed Napoleon as simple fare - an outrageous criminal talented only in his extraordinary ability to lay aside his conscience and utterly stifle all sense of moral restraint in his search for power. He could not so easily dismiss those early apostles of liberty, the French people themselves, whom Napoleon had beguiled into nourishing his lusts. The poet decided that nothing less than the foundation of French society had gone astray. Over the decades its men of letters had polished but narrowed French culture. They spun brilliant treatises on man and nature but in the process had exchanged the idea of conscience

25. For the impact of the French Revolution on the Church of England in the nineteenth century, see S.T. Coleridge, *Table Talk* (edited by W.G.T. Sheed, New York, 1884), pp. 262-3; S.C.Carpenter, *Church and People 1789-1889* (Seraph paperback ed., London, 1959), ch. 1; Alec R. Vidler, *The Church in an Age of Revolution* (Pelican ed., Middlesex, 1961), pp. 34-5. Broughton would have been present when the Bishop of Winchester stated that 'the awful character of the times in which we live may justly be considered as originating from that extraordinary revolution, which took place in a neighbouring kingdom at the close of the last century'; George Tomline, *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Winchester* (London, 1822), p. 8. Other examples likely to have come to Broughton's notice: William Howley, *A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of London* (London, 1814), p. 12; A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of London (London, 1818), pp. 9-10; A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of London (London, 1822), pp. 9-11. A tirade against Napoleon may have been one of the first sermons Broughton attended at Cambridge, see Herbert Marsh, *A Sermon Preached before the University of Cambridge on the Twenty-fifth of October, 1814; being the Anniversary of His Majesty's Accession to the Throne* (Cambridge, 1814), p. 3.
for a notion of good sense, and overthrown belief in an innate and infallible guide for calculations of expediency. The ill effects of this only gradually emerged allowing a vain and superficial learning to flourish for a time under the guise of a polished and aristocratic culture. The young reaped the penalty. They had no guide but passing fashion and no challenge beyond that of mastering the latest dictates of novelty stricken intellects. They possessed freedom but no anchorage, knowledge but no principles. So Wordsworth drew his moral: Englishmen could best avoid revolution and despotism by persevering in their tradition of anchoring the minds of the young in a fixed code of Christian principles without discouraging them from searching for inspiration and understanding in the works of the sages of all ages.  

The protestant soul of the former finance Minister under Louis XVI, Jacques Necker, offered the intelligent reader another diagnosis. A freak atheism had gripped France and put a whole generation of young Frenchmen under Napoleon's sway. For over a decade, from the outbreak of the Revolution to 1802, general education had languished and religious education all but disappeared so that three-fifths of France's soldiers and sailors had matured

---

bodily but with little moral or intellectual culture. France would soon recover Necker assured the world believing, with characteristic optimism, that French good sense was as sound as the franc. The lesson remained, however, that the affections of the irreligious and the ignorant were for hire to the vain, the rapacious, and the usurper of lawful authority.  

The discussion turned inevitably from Bonaparte to the Revolution, and on to the problem of political change in general. In this debate Edmund Bourke provided grist for everyone's mill. He comforted those who feared change with the moral reassurance that 'the spirit of innovation is generally the result of a selfish temper and confined views'. Those convinced of the need for some change he led to the garden for a parable; uproot it, he said, and it dies, leave it alone and it will move itself through 'the varied tenor of perpetual decay, fall, renovation and progressional'. Sound government required the skills of the farmer not the enquiries of the metaphysician. The human mind may speculate on where to lop a branch but not on the means of replacing the countryside. What had endured, he said, had served a useful purpose

29. Ibid., p. 37.
and ought not to be lightly uprooted.  

So Bourke warned Englishmen to leave their clergy free to educate the young in a traditional culture with 'standards of virtue and wisdom beyond the vulgar practices of the hour'.

Other discussions on the Revolution, Napoleon and the dire consequences of the wrong mode of change abounded in the London which escorted Broughton to his maturity. The theme common to them all was the danger of the mob: the mob, violent because it was irreligious; the mob, easily manipulated because it had no fixed principles; the mob, always master of its teacher; the mob, ignorant and fit only to destroy the good and the orderly in established society. Speeches in the House of Commons regularly rehearsed this creed, and it found its way into the peroration of sermons and the

---

30. Ibid., p. 67 and 107. Burke's technical term for the right of long standing custom to continue by virtue of its survival is 'prescription', and is discussed in, John Plamenatz, Man and Society (2 vols., London, 1966), vol. 1, pp. 341 and 355-7. This term occurs in Broughton's official report to the Governor of N.S.W. when he describes the colony as a place 'where prescription has so little force', see 'The Report of Archdeacon Broughton on the State of the Church and Schools Establishment in N.S.W., 29 September 1831', Despatches from Governor of New South Wales, Enclosures etc., 1832-5, p. 1132 (A1267/13, M.L.). This suggests Broughton had more than a passing acquaintance with the school of political theory Burke revitalised.


conclusions of tracts. Its frequency witnessed to its broad acceptance if not its truth. And when Sir Francis Burdett castigated it as the 'old bugbear' the gall was in its effectiveness more than its fiction.⁳³

Westminster, as Broughton knew it in his twenty-second year, buttressed the fears and theories of the conservative minded. At night on 19 February 1810 the British Forum, one of the debating societies meeting in coffee shops around Covent Garden, chose to debate which was the greater outrage on Englishmen's rights - Parliament's exclusions of strangers from the gallery or its recent attacks on the freedom of the press. The House of Commons recompensed the British Forum's manager for his trouble by voting him accommodation at Newgate and leisure for further reflection on the British Constitution. Burdett asked the House of Commons to repent of such unconstitutional behaviour, and found himself put down for a room at the Tower.⁴⁴

Both moves were designed to forestall expressions of a popular will against the supreme authority of Parliament. Together they succeeded only in demonstrating the unpredictable strength of the mob. Burdett barricaded himself away from the bailiff and a mob thronged the streets of Piccadilly for four days shouting, throwing stones, and 'obliging everyone that passed to take off his hat and

---

³⁴ Annual Register, 1810, pp. 92-104.
cry "Burdett forever". The bailiff finally moved in and Burdett reached the Tower under the escort of thirty policemen and a detachment of infantry and cavalry. Later as it returned to its barracks, the militia met a volley of stones, opened fire, and killed three of the crowd. The public raised a monument on the spot; and inscribed it with the jury's verdict, 'Murdered by a Life-Guardsman unknown'.

The mob had another day. It came to Tower Hill the day Parliament rose to bear Burdett away in a hero's chariot. Three thousand came mounted, three thousand walked, they carried banners, played music and wore the blue cockade reminiscent of another mob.

London seemed in the grip of a fourth power. In the same disturbed times fortune deflected a blow meant to decapitate the Duke of Cumberland in his bed. It moved less adroitly on the steps of Parliament and the Prime Minister, Spencer Percival, fell dead before an assassin's bullet. St. Paul's Cathedral lost seventeen hundred ounces of silver gilt, and Daniel Eton went to prison for publishing a 'blasphemous and profane libel on the Holy Scriptures, the works of Thomas Paine'. As men racked their minds for explanations, Lord Sidmouth rose in Parliament and called for the first of numerous reports framed to show that irreligion and unconstitutional behaviour went hand in hand with a drift from the Established Church to dissenting meeting houses. And so the

35. Ibid., pp. 105-6, and 'Chronicle', p. 258. (In some issues of the Annual Register the pagination of its various sections overlap, so I have prefaced with a section heading all references not from the principal narrative in the 'History of Europe').

nineteenth century was supplied with another of its leading ideas.  

In the midst of this turbulence Broughton realised he no longer cared for his career in commerce. His affections had returned to the Established Church. In 1813 the way opened for him to lay aside his responsibilities to the family and contemplate once more the prospect of Cambridge. On the 2 February that year his uncle in the employ of the East India Company died unexpectedly at the Tavistock Hotel, London. He was fifty-three and without heirs. Broughton received a legacy of £1,000. He returned to Canterbury and to his former mathematics tutor, regarnished his knowledge, formed an attachment for Sarah Francis, the daughter of his former House-master, and embraced sweet success. On 7 May the following year, at the age of twenty-six and almost a decade after leaving the King's School, he entered Cambridge with rooms in Pembroke College, his Housemaster's old College. He entered a pensioner, and swiftly advanced to the status and honour of a scholar.

Pembroke was a small but ancient element in an unreformed Cambridge. The eighteenth century had brought it few distinctions. Other times had been different. Nicholas Ridley hymned it on the road to execution as 'studious, well learned, and a great setterforth

37. Based on: Annual Register, 1810, 'Chronicle', pp. 261-3; Annual Register, 1812, pp. 75-6; Annual Register, 1810, 'Chronicle' pp. 295-6; Annual Register, 1812, 'Appendix to Chronicle', pp. 272-4; Annual Register, 1810, p. 148; 1818, pp. 2 and 130-2.
39. Whittington, Broughton, p. 20; Broughton, Sermons on Church of England, pp. x-xi; for a brief self-portrait of Broughton as a dashing lover in these days, see Broughton to wife, 5 March 1829 (Correspondence of W.G. Broughton and his wife, Ms.No. B1612, M.L.).
of Christ's Gospel'. In the days before that it had supplied a proud share of the occupants of greater and lesser Sees. After him it gave Elizabeth two architects of her religious settlement, Edmund Grindal and her 'black husband' Archbishop Whitgift. A little later, when Lancelot Andrews ruled as Master, the College conspired in the cause of James I and thereafter remained a Royalist, Laudian and a high church stronghold. For this the eighteenth century penalised it with obscurity. Masters with scant hope of preferment served long tenures; Broughton entered in Joseph Turner's thirtieth year. But the College remained sound in scholarship. The Elder Pitt singled it out for his son, and in turn the Younger Pitt loaned it a bright moment of patronage at the end of the century. Broughton entered in this glow of this, and found to his liking a community tory in politics, gentle in the arts, firm in scholarship, and a quiet champion of the alliance between church and crown. 41

Students at Pembroke belonged also to a wider university fraternity. Cambridge, though poised for reform, remained in the grasp of old traditions. Broughton came to it expecting to receive

well tested knowledge by time honoured methods. The old scholastic
curriculum lingered, radically rearranged rather than decisively
altered, and Broughton's task was to prepare for the ordeal of
disputing with his examiners, in Latin if he vied for honours, a
number of mathematical and ethical propositions. Religious tests
and celibacy underpinned the established order. University
authorities demanded due submission from all undergraduates in an
intolerably wide field of activities. They might, for instance, support
but not organise a local branch of the British and Foreign Bible
Society. They could form a debating society but not polish their
wit on political matters; and when the Cambridge Union dared do so
in 1817, Broughton saw the Vice-Chancellor disband it.

The new world had still to pay homage to the old. Few at
Cambridge saw it better illustrated than the men at Pembroke. Across
Trumpington Street and Pembroke Street the College looked out on
venerable tradition - the Church of St. Mary the Less, Corpus Christi
and Peterhouse. On the third and remaining side to which the confined
buildings had opening, residents had for centuries commanded a rural
aspect. In 1800 a new project, Downing College, disturbed it. With
splendid Doric porticos it heralded an assault on the rule and
curricula on the old university. It flourished for a decade then

Parliament against the reception of petitions from undergraduates
of Oxford or Cambridge for the sake of the 'discipline of the
two universities', see *P.D.*, new series, vol. 21, 10 April 1829,
col. 618-9.
languished. No stone was added for a half century from 1810. Its founders meant it as a monument to encourage reform. To Broughton and his contemporaries it served as a warning against it. Those who loved the old institutions and the traditional studies were strengthened in their belief that they were the best ways. 45

At Cambridge Broughton entered the most formative period of his life. A triumvirate of outstanding personalities awaited him at the University to help turn the romantic impressions of his school days at Canterbury into fixed theological principles and give him a theory of ecclesiastical policy. Each of the three expounded a different tradition. Herbert Marsh was a scholarly high churchman, Isaac Milner an equally scholarly evangelical, and Charles Simeon the brilliant exponent of a new and fashionable pietism. 46 All rigidly

45. Winstanley, op. cit., pp. 1-7, 352 and 386.
46. Herbert Marsh, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity (1807-39), Bishop of Llandaff (1816-8) and later Peterborough (1818-39). Isaac Milner, Jacksonian Professor of Natural Philosophy and later Lucasian Professor of Mathematics at Cambridge. He presided over Queens College at that University from 1788. Milner's qualities earned him the distinction of being the only evangelical to receive a substantial preferment in the decades of Tory domination, being appointed Dean of Carlisle in 1791, see W.L. Mathieson, English Church Reform 1815-40 (London, 1923), p. 3. Charles Simeon was Fellow of King's College and Vicar of Holy Trinity, Cambridge from 1793. He fell under the spell of religion while at Eton College and, being influenced by Dr. Rennell's explanation of the French Revolution as the fruit of a breakdown in religious education, devoted his life without stipend to the instruction of Cambridge undergraduates; see Charles Smyth, Simeon and Church Order (Cambridge, 1940), pp. 57, 75 and 120. In the chapter on religion in, Elie Halevy England in 1815, second (revised) ed. (London, 1960), pp. 389-485, which falls squarely on the period of Broughton's residence at university, the author finds a prominent place for Milner and Simeon at Cambridge, but not for Marsh (see Ibid., pp. 434-5). Halevy can establish no sympathy with high churchmen, and his portrait of them as a class with strong politics, a firm grasp on preferment, but no theology or devotional passion (see Ibid., pp. 391-4) is a distortion fashioned to bolster his theory, that the upsurge of religious fervour amongst dissenters and evangelicals absorbed the restless discontent that elsewhere turned to revolution.
upheld the ideal of a church establishment and supported the Book of Common Prayer without compromise. Of the three, Marsh, the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, held most sway over Broughton. As a theologian Marsh was preeminent among the Cambridge Divines; as a preacher he successfully vied with Simeon for the attention of undergraduates; as a controversialist he was without peer in the English Church till John Henry Newman peppered the air of Oxford in the 1830's. The liberal minded men of the Edinburgh Review charged him with 'raising up a storm in the English Church of which he has not the slightest conception; and which will end, as it ought to end in His Lordship's disgrace and defeat'. Marsh ended his days Bishop of Peterborough and one of the brightest jewels among a very limited collection of pre-Tractarian reformers. For Broughton he had the added attraction of being an old scholar of the King's School, Canterbury.

Marsh restored the popularity of theology at Cambridge. With characteristic audacity he disregarded the provision of his Lady

47. Smyth, Simeon, pp. 290-9. Arguing this point in Simeon's favour is one of the main themes of Smyth's work.
50. Edwards, King's School, p. 120.
Margaret Chair, that Divinity lectures be delivered in Latin, and delivered them in English regularly before crowded undergraduate audiences. It ended an era. His predecessors had adhered faithfully to the Latin tongue and finally been relieved of the necessity of delivering lectures for want of an audience. Marsh also taught theology differently from his evangelical contemporaries. After studying for a number of years in German universities he returned to Cambridge in the 1790's eager to infuse into English theological studies the fruit of the German enlightenment. Without calling in doubt the Divine inspiration of scripture he invited students to consider its books as documents written by human hands, and with a keen eye sharpened by a critical mind, discover the literal meaning and intention of the individual authors. This alone, he maintained, could yield the true meaning of the text. He instructed his students to regard scholarship as the foundation of true piety and sound preaching, and invoked Dryden's ridicule on the generation of undergraduates who looked to the Spirit for the doctor's degree:

Study and pains were no more their care,
Texts were explained by fasting and by prayer.
This was the fruit the private spirit brought,
Occasioned by great zeal and little thought.

52. Marsh translated four volumes of German works on the New Testament and contributed, in the same critical vein, original works on the authority of the Pentateuch and the origins of the synoptic Gospels. In 1792 he published his views on piety and scholarship in, An Essay on the Usefulness and Necessity of Theological Learning to those who are designed for Holy Orders, see Annual Register, 1839, 'Appendix to Chronicle', pp. 337-8.
This profoundly affected Broughton. He resolved to eschew emotion in his sermons, to acquire the sophisticated tools of textual criticism, and to master the scholarly commentaries on the Scriptures. He chose a text, not for the opportunity it afforded his imagination to take flight, but for its aptness as a point of entry into an explanation of God's historic dealing with the old and new Israel. Subscribing as he did to the ancient poet's belief that there was nothing new under the sun, and in faith holding the history of Israel to be a paradigm of the history of all nations, he unfolded his explanation to convict his hearers that, though in a later age and on a different soil, they stood in the same posture before God as did the ancient Israelites. Furthermore, they were judged under the same laws, guilty of the same offences, and deserving of the same judgment. Broughton found in the story of God's historic dealing with his people, the substance of a life long study; and to the end of his days, he compiled his own biblical commentaries to discipline his scholarship and record his enquiries for use in preaching and prayer. Marsh could scarcely have had a more devoted pupil. 54

Broughton came to Cambridge in the wake of two controversies that spilled over the bounds of theology into politics. One centred on the education of the children of the poor, the other touched on

54. For the use of the theme of Israel as the paradigm of history, see W.G. Broughton, Religion, essential to the Security and Happiness of Nations (Sydney, 1834); for the compilation of commentaries, see Bailey, Mission Heroes, p. 24; for his use of the tools of textual criticism, see further on in this chapter; for his life long devotion to Biblical scholarship, see Broughton to Coleridge, 14 October 1839 (Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
the increased activity of the British and Foreign Bible Society.
The first began at St. Paul's Cathedral on 13 June 1811 when Marsh preached the annual sermon on behalf of the London charity schools. Marsh challenged churchmen to desist from contributing to the Royal Lancasterian Society, and condemned those who ignored his call for invoking, in effect, 'a principle of self destruction' on the Established Church. In Marsh's opinion the Royal Lancasterian Society had grossly erred in banning the Church Catechism from its curriculum on the principle that education ought not to be subservient to the propagation of the peculiar tenets of any sect. 'Children educated in such seminaries would acquire an indifference to the Establishment', Marsh argued. 'And not only indifference, but secession from the Established Church will be the final result.' He warned against a misguided philanthropy that would contribute to the withering away of the traditional order, and called into


being the National Society to redress the danger. 58

Marsh suspected the British and Foreign Bible Society of introducing among adults the same careless concern for the Church of England that the Royal Lancasterian Society planted in the young. 59

By its constitution the Bible Society forbade the distribution of confessional material along with its Bibles. As such, it functioned in opposition to the S.P.C.K. which dispersed copies of the Liturgy of the Book of Common Prayer with all scriptures. The Society believed that the Bible without explanation left the poor at the mercy of ignorant village teachers and a mass of delusions. 60

Marsh abided the activities of the Bible Society until it began recruiting in earnest among the future ordinands at Cambridge. He condemned it for being in Cambridge. 61 He attacked churchmen who took a lead in the matter, and framed the arguments against

58. On the foundation of the National Society, see Quarterly Review, vol. 8, 1812, pp. 1-6; for its early functioning, see the evidence of the Reverend T.T. Walmsley, treasurer of the National Society, 'Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee appointed to enquire into the Education of the Lower Orders of the Metropolis', P.P. 1816, iv, (427), 27-32; for a contemporary comparison of the systems of Lancaster and Bell, see Quarterly Review, vol. 6, 1811, pp. 264-304; for the feud that grew up between the two societies, see Edinburgh Review, vol. 21, 1813, pp. 207-19. A reading of M.G. Jones, The Charity School Movement in the Eighteenth Century (Cambridge, 1938) puts the National Society into a broader perspective than the many other writers on the history of education who tend to see it as a panic move on the part of the Church Establishment concerned with the growth of the Lancasterian Society. The National Society revived the work the S.P.C.K. had done in education until around the mid-eighteenth century; then a missionary interest came to dominate its activities.


60. Ibid., pp. 99-120.

61. Herbert Marsh, 'An Address to the Senate of the University of Cambridge, Occasioned by the Proposal to Introduce in that Place an Auxiliary Bible Society', Pamphleteer, vol. 1, pp. 83-8; Marsh, Consequences, p. 129.
co-operation with dissent which became the stock-in-trade of tory churchmen. He emphasised the unequal terms of the co-operation. Dissenters surrendered nothing in distributing the Bible alone, whereas churchmen who did the same had to hide away part of their distinctive inheritance from the English Reformation. Many churchmen maintained that men who possessed the Bible soon sought out the Liturgy. Marsh doubted it. If the Bible gave them anything, he said, it was a taste for a 'general protestantism'. As affection for the Liturgy weakened, the determination of the Dissenters to manoeuvre for a repeal of the Test Act strengthened. This was their aim, and some churchmen unwittingly abetted it, he said. And the walls of the Established Church once breached, he went on to warn, may fail to keep out other more dangerous enemies of true religion.

Broughton approved Marsh's arguments and made them his own. He patronised the S.P.C.K. and supported the schools of the National Society. In these same years at Cambridge he followed Marsh through two other controversies. In one, he saw Marsh carefully at work defining the differences between Canterbury and Rome in matters they seemed to hold in common. In the other he defined its

---

differences from Geneva. From both Broughton learned to insist on the integrity of the Church of England and its right to be respected as a distinctive religious tradition, catholic but not papist, protestant but not calvinist. He sat a disciple at Marsh's feet. Yet he did not pass through evangelical Cambridge without its leaving a mark on him. He steeped himself, as might be expected of a high churchman, in the works of Jeremy Taylor, William Law, Isaac Watts, and George Tomline, but he could also praise and revere the works of the formidable evangelical prelate, Beilby Porteus.

Broughton finished sixth Wrangler at Cambridge in 1818. He might have reasonably have hoped for election to a Fellowship at some College had he not determined on an immediate marriage to Sarah Francis. The Bishop of Salisbury ordained him on letters dimissory for the Bishop of Winchester, and on 16 February 1818 he was licensed in Hartley Wespall. There he served in succession

65. Herbert Marsh, A Letter to the Reverend Charles Simeon...in vindication of the efficacy ascribed by our church to infant baptism (London, 1813), and Herbert Marsh, A Second Letter etc. (London, 1814), cited in Annual Register, 1839, 'Appendix to Chronicle', p. 338. Broughton emphasised that a correct view of Baptism was the touchstone of religious orthodoxy, and conducted many a controversy on the issue, see Broughton to Parry, 12 and 26 November 1834 (Broughton and Parry Correspondence, Ms. No. B377, M.L.); W.G. Broughton, Baptismal Regeneration. Two Sermons, Preached at Christ Church, in the City of Sydney, on Sunday 22nd June, 1851 (n.d., Sydney); Broughton, Sermons on Church of England, pp. 97 and 104; Whittington, Broughton, pp. 208-10.

66. Beilby Porteus was Bishop of London, 1787-1808 and a leading figure in the Society for Enforcing the King's Proclamation against Immorality and Profaneness. Broughton chose one of his books as a school text in N.S.W., see 'Proposed Course of Study and Instruction (King's School, Sydney)', Sub-encl. No. 3 in Darling and Murray, 10 February 1830, H.R.A., I. xv. 362.
two pluralists; the aristocrat, the Honourable and Reverend Alfred Harris, and the redoubtable Dr. Keate of Eton College.  

Hartley Wespall, set in the rural quiet of Hants and a little back off the main road midway between London and Winchester, was an agreeable place to make a beginning. A large vicarage with three sitting rooms, seven bed chambers, servant quarters, and a farmyard, gave him space and an ample supply of poultry and bacon. He kept a horse, brewed his own beer, and turned the space into a profitable school. So from the inception of his ministry he planted together the dual interests which dominated his life, education and the ministry of the Gospel. As the school prospered and amplified his income, he took in servants and contemplated the purchase of a farm in the neighbourhood. 

He worked as hard in the parish as at the school. Keate praised his energy, but thought him a little tainted with Cambridge enthusiasm. Broughton once asked permission to turn Passion Week into a Lenten teaching crusade. After he had tolled the bell for Evensong, he thought he might throw open the doors of the church, and for that one week in the year deliver nightly instruction in the

---

67. Gentleman's Magazine, vol. 39, 1853, p. 431. Broughton's earliest biographers failed to uncover the date of his ordination but the records of Winchester did record the date of his licence, see Gilbert to James Broughton, 17 March 1853 (Item 2d, 'Correspondence of Reverend George Gilbert' in Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).

68. Broughton to Keate, 13 February 1826 (Broughton Papers 1824-98, Ms. No. 913, M.L.); for the size of his school and vicarage, see Broughton to Reverend H.M. Wagner, 6 February 1825 (Correspondence from W.G. Broughton, Ms. No. Ab 29/5c, M.L.).
fundamental truths of the Christian faith. Might this not reflect on the other clergy? Keate asked. It might; but Broughton argued that it did not exceed the bound of the Book of Common Prayer. Why had it ordered the tolling of the bell daily for prayer if the doors of the church were to remain shut? he asked the dubious Keate.

Despite an occasional difference a happy respect united Curate and Incumbent. Keate hoped Broughton would stay indefinitely, and promised to abandon the vicarage to his use even should he retire from Eton to the village. Broughton thanked Keate and confessed a deep love for the place and its countryside, but he hoped to build up his means and prevent the curse of insecurity, which had fallen over his youth, from visiting his own family. Hartley Wespall could never give him that. Few curacies under other incumbents could. He had been offered a fashionable and more lucrative charge at Margate, but the accommodation could not hold his school and he would not move without that indispensable part of his income. He wanted his own incumbency.

Broughton had turned thirty before being ordained priest, and needed to move quickly. He had no family connections to exploit for patronage and, in eschewing a university fellowship for marriage, he had by-passed the normal means which fed talent its opportunity.

69. Broughton to Keate, 13 March 1826 (Broughton Papers 1824-98, Ms. No. 913, M.L.).
70. Broughton to Keate, 13 February and 6 December 1826 (Broughton Papers 1824-98, Ms. No. 913, M.L.); Broughton to Reverend H.M. Wagner, 6 February 1825 (Correspondence from W.G. Broughton, Ms. No. Ab 29/5c, M.L.).
It remained for him to attract attention by advertising his wit in print. In 1823 he made an initial gesture in that direction. He put to work the tools of critical scholarship learned at Cambridge, and published an erudite work on the *Elzevir* text of the Greek New Testament. He took care to dedicate it to his Diocesan, Bishop Tomline. It was a purely academic flourish designed to illustrate that the *Elzevir* text owed more to Latin than Greek sources.71

Another effort followed in 1826. It had roots in an article the *Edinburgh Review* published in 1821 focusing attention on new evidence in Lambeth Palace archives which supposedly placed Bishop Gauden's authorship of the *EIKON BASILIIKA* beyond doubt. Many a dispute had raged over the origins of this work, with the disputants dividing suspiciously on party lines; Tory's supported Charles I's authorship, and the Whigs, Gauden's. By the end of the eighteenth century the Tories seemed to have the better end of the argument, and both parties were willing to bury the utterly spent contest. This new evidence may have passed quietly by had the reviewer withstood the temptation to brandish it as stunning testimony against 'Tory attempts to falsify English history'.72

The reaction at Cambridge was immediate and definite. Christopher

Wordsworth, the Master of Trinity College, an evangelical caring little for the Laudian prelate Gauden but a staunch Tory devoted to the memory of Charles I, compiled two massive volumes in defence of the traditional royal authorship.\footnote{Christopher Wordsworth, "Who Wrote EIKON BASILIKA?" Considered and Answered, in Two Letters Addressed to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury (London, 1824). This work is extensively quoted in, Quarterly Review, vol. 32, 1825.}

The work enjoyed a good reception but did not impress Broughton. 'Voluminous evidence', he said,'...commented on with a refinement often bordering upon that of the special pleader.'\footnote{W.G. Broughton, A Letter to a Friend touching the Question 'Who was the Author of EIKON BASILIKA?' (London, 1826), p. 3.} A better way of determining the authorship remained to be exploited and Broughton set about it. He sharpened his tools of textual criticism again, and undertook a comparative analysis of the language in the \textit{EIKON BASILIKA} and Gauden's known letters.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 57-87.} He found his scholarship at odds with his political sympathies. 'Whatever my earlier presupposition and wishes may have been', he wrote, 'I am compelled, after examining the case, to admit that few historical facts are established upon clearer evidence, or the admission of them attended with fewer difficulties than this - that Bishop Gauden was the author of "The Portrait of His Sacred Majesty in His Solitude and Sufferings".'\footnote{Ibid., p. 88.}

From this Broughton went on to draw a moral for his age. Gauden's action would be termed by the world a 'pious fraud', presumably because it ministered to the worthy hope of restoring
affection for the monarchy. But what good did it finally serve? It did not save Charles I, and the Restoration came despite it. Its one persistent fruit had been to cast a reproach upon those who laboured honestly in support of the monarchy and the church. Gauden and the statesmen privy to his scheme, Broughton continued intent upon drawing a wider moral, "unquestionably acted upon a maxim, even now scarcely exploded from the world, that in politics and in private life two different standards of morality were to be used". Events belied them, and had proved that a good cause never needs dishonest aid. 77

Broughton condemned the standards of statecraft which produced a Gauden, rather than Gauden himself. Though he held up to others and himself a rigorous moral code, the pamphlet revealed in Broughton a curious charity which desired to spare men the full condemnation of their failure. He seemed to sympathise with human frailty and to want to blame much error on a perverted environment. For that reason he believed intensely in the need for a national church to prod governors to rule well and so sanctify the national scene. If the nation had a sharp conscience then men might be accounted blamable for their misdeeds. If its conscience was bad, was it Broughton's place to apportion the degree of guilt in errant citizens? Broughton concluded his pamphlet, and his review of the debate, asking his readers to forgive Gauden his fraud and to purify their politics. 78

77. Ibid., pp. 88-9.
78. Ibid., p. 90.
Broughton of course approved the sentiments in the *Eikon Basiliaka*. 'The Martyr is here without reproach, faithful...to those principles of probity and truth,' he rejoiced to say, 'which, when banished from the world, should find their resting place in the heart of Kings.'

Kings were preeminently God's servants, appointed by Him to rule and preserve the Church. In an age which itched to circumscribe the rights of monarchs Broughton showed with uncompromising clarity as to where he took his stand. Despite his verdict for Gauden's authorship and the boost that gave to arguments originally advanced by dissenters and sustained by Whigs, dual alliances attractive neither to Broughton nor the patrons he wooed, the pamphlet bore the markings of a high churchman and a Tory, of a man with an incorruptible morality but a tempered charity. It exhibited fine modern scholarship, a comprehension in the argument that might have been the envy of a barrister, and a lucidity of expression that made the slender but tightly argued volume surprisingly readable. There were no touches of the imagination which had driven Wordsworth to wild suppositions. Broughton not only lacked but feared that quality. It lost him nothing. He won the patronage he coveted. Nine years of obscurity ended and set in motion the events which were to find him a prelate at the end of another nine.

On 17 February 1827 the Bishop of Winchester licensed Broughton to the cure of Farnham. Shortly afterwards, on 1 March 1827, he added from his own plurality a further licence as Master of the

Farnham free Grammar School, allowing Broughton to sustain his interest in education. The former Pembroke don, Tomline, was still Bishop of Winchester and there was a measure of personal affection in the move. The advowson of the Farnham parish church belonged to the bishop's private wealth and he maintained at Farnham, to Cobbett's annoyance, a magnificent estate in readiness for his retirement. The great prelate would only send to Farnham one with whom he could maintain a pleasurable association. It was a flattering appointment. At the same time the bishop intended that Broughton should have an incumbency of his own as soon as a suitable one fell vacant. In November of 1827 Tomline died in office. His successor, Dr. Charles Richard Sumner, was not bound to fulfil his predecessor's intentions.

80. George Tomline, born Pretyman and the son of a tradesman at Bury St. Edmunds, Fellow of Pembroke, Cambridge (1773), tutor to Pitt the Younger (1774), Bishop of Lincoln and Dean of St. Paul's (1787-1820). He was nominated for Canterbury by Pitt but rejected by George III. He was subsequently offered but declined London (1813) then translated to Winchester (1820), see Article, Tomline, George Pretyman, in Dictionary of National Biography, vol. 19, pp. 941-5. Tomline did not ordain Broughton in 1818 as stated by K.J. Cable, 'Broughton, William Grant', in Australian Dictionary of Biography, vol. 1 (Melbourne, 1966), p. 159, but it was he and not Bishop Sumner, as stated by Cable, ibid., who licensed him to Farnham. Information on dates and signatures on Broughton's licences supplied by Hampshire Records Office.


Tomline's death did not shut off Broughton's hope for future patronage. Close by Hartley Wespall stood 'Strathfield Saye' the country estate of the Duke of Wellington. Broughton came to know the Duke's domestic chaplain, the Reverend Mr. Briscall, and, through him, the Duchess. He took an interest in the education of her sons and she in time came to confide in him. The friendship was an amalgam of business and pleasure Broughton once said. The Duchess asked for his prayers and he asked for the Duchess's patronage. 83

Early in 1826 he had picked up the rumour that new librarianships were to be created at the British Museum to care for a bequest of books from the late King. Broughton coveted one of these appointments. He appealed to the Duchess to open her ears to the conversation around her and to pass on any helpful information. 'One great step towards success I believe is to have timely knowledge of what is intended to be done,' he explained to the Duchess, 'and to whom the application ought to be made'. 84 He marshalled others, but no appointment came his way. 85 But when the Duke's hour came in January 1828 the Duchess did her part; she whispered in the ear of the new Lord Chancellor,

83. Broughton, Sermons on Church of England, p. xii; Broughton to Duchess of Wellington, 20 June 1827 and 25 May 1829 (Letters of William Grant Broughton, 1826-1829, Duke of Wellington Collection, m/f, M.L.); Duchess of Wellington to Broughton, 17 February 1828 and 1 April 1829 (Broughton Papers 1824-98, Ms. No. 913, M.L.).
84. Broughton to Duchess of Wellington, 4 March 1826 (Letter of William Grant Broughton, 1826-1829, Duke of Wellington Collection, m/f, M.L.).
85. Reverend A. Todd to Broughton, 6 November 1826 (Ibid.).
Lord Lyndhurst, and the former curate of Hartley Wespall was appointed a chaplain to the Tower of London. This gave him a pension, rooms in London, and a better footing in the church establishment. He calculated his income to be worth £1,000 a year, and with a certainty of preferment in the years ahead he confessed himself 'ampley satisfied'.

By this time other wheels were turning. Sometime after 30 August 1828 the Colonial Office agreed to accept the resignation of the Archdeacon of New South Wales, the Venerable Thomas Hobbes Scott. Governor Darling's despatches, as well as the letters of the Archdeacon, attested to the growth of renewed factiousness in the Antipodean archdeaconry. Scott could no longer contend against the strife and confessed he was not the man for the job. Darling confirmed that. The Duke of Wellington decided that the qualities Scott lacked were present in the former curate at Hartley Wespall, and on 27 October 1828 sent his domestic chaplain for a ride to Farnham to acquaint Broughton with an offer of the Archdeaconry of New South Wales. It was a novel turn in events and not what

86. Duchess of Wellington to Broughton, 24 April 1828 (Broughton Papers 1824-98, Ms. No. 913, M.L.). Ecclesiastical patronage of the Tower of London was in the nomination of the Lord Chancellor. Later in life when Broughton sought intervention in the House of Lords on behalf of the colonial church he turned to Lord Lyndhurst, not the Duke, see Broughton to Coleridge, 13 September 1839 (Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).

87. Broughton to Sir George Grey, 24 December 1835, C.O. 201/250, p. 253. This figure is hard to accept. Broughton produced it when disputing the justice of his being reduced to half-salary during his visit to England 1834-6. He probably included such items as house rent and travel, which he had to pay in N.S.W. but not at Farnham. Nevertheless the figure suggests an impressive level of income.
Broughton had expected. But for one who had joined the East India Company in search of a career a sojourn in the colonies would not have been a totally new thought. 88

Broughton had a copy of the Quarterly Review for January 1828 on hand and read with devouring interest its account of New South Wales. The bad days of colonial lawlessness had passed, the reviewer noted, and strangers were less likely to be cheated in Sydney than in London. The party feuds between free immigrants and emancipists had almost disappeared and the settlement had become a place of quiet, of industry, and of opportunity. The best of its inhabitants dressed in London fashions, while the rest delighted in a good exterior, seldom appeared sottish, and scarcely ever depraved. The native born showed a superiority of spirit, courage and morality. Hunt clubs provided recreation, usually in pursuit of the kangaroo, and the best hotels in George Street and at Hyde Park vied with any in English towns of the same size. A trip to Bathurst had its own prize, the taste of a cheese equal to any in Cheshire. In one matter only had the colonists failed; after thirty years contact with the white settlers, the shrewd intelligent race of aboriginals were still found prowling naked around the streets of Sydney begging tobacco and spirits from strangers and 'abusing

---

88. For Scott's resignation, see Twiss to Scott, 14 November 1828, encl. in Murray to Darling, 14 November 1828, H.R.A., I. xiv. 461; for Scott on his failure, see Scott to Arthur, 9 July 1826 (Arthur Papers, vol. 12, M.L.); for Darling on Scott's failure, see Darling to Bathurst, 1 May 1826, H.R.A., I. xii. 256-7, and Darling to Hay, 10 October 1826, Ibid., pp. 644-5; for Duke of Wellington's offer, see Broughton to Mother, 27 October 1828 (Item 2a, Early Correspondence of W.G. Broughton in Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
them in language more gross than the grossest Billingsgate' when refused. While this picture remained fresh in his mind, Broughton met Henry Dumaresq, Darling's brother-in-law on temporary leave in London, and over a hearty meal Broughton found his expectations grow even rosier.  

The Duke gave Broughton seven days to come to a decision. There were few informed persons whom he could consult in so short a time, so that the material terms of the appointment emerged as decisive. The salary doubled his present income; £2,000 in cash alone and such tempting extras as, 'local advantages' (whatever that might mean), a five year tour of duty, and after that a pension or further government preferment. 'A most noble offer', he wrote to his mother, '... and such as I could never have raised my thought to'. For the price of a brief separation from his homeland he could turn the terror of insecurity from his door for ever and do something to relieve his mother's impecunious widowhood. 'Everyone ought while they are young and able to make provision for their children; that in their old age they may not be troubled with anxiety what is to become of them', he reasoned with his wife. 'My appointment will quite protect us against this and enable us to provide for our dear children such a modest competency as will secure them from difficulty during their lives.'

90. Broughton to Wife, 24 January 1829 (Correspondence of W.G. Broughton and his wife, Ms. No. Be 1612, M.L.).  
91. Broughton to Mother, 28 October 1828 (*op. cit.*).  
92. Broughton to Wife, 24 January 1829 (*op. cit.*).
Scott had warned his ecclesiastical superiors in London to caution his successor against expecting gain from his appointment. He had himself repaired to the colony hopeful of mending his personal fortune and had failed in that as miserably as in everything else. 'With great economy and prudence and without the expense attending a family I have not been able to save out of my income more than one-tenth of it, - so heavy is everything here.' Even had he succeeded, the colony would have been nothing more than a gilded cross so much else did it take from him. The Duke himself, however, knocked some of the glitter off for Broughton. He had overstated the perquisites, he confessed. The appointment was for an indefinite period and was without pension or compensation in the event of death abroad, or of any guarantee of future government patronage. It was a one way ticket to the colony; the type of appointment, Broughton observed, that no man could congratulate himself on obtaining. He hesitated at the news of the adjusted terms, but decided he would ever reproach himself as 'backward and fearful' in his Master's service if he declined. He could be indifferent to success or failure, but not to going or staying;

95. Broughton to Mother, 4 November 1828 (Item 2a, Early Correspondence of W.G. Broughton in Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
97. Ibid.; see also Broughton to (Mother), n.d. (Item 2a, Early Correspondence of W.G. Broughton in Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.). This letter is a fragment only but is clearly written to his mother. It refers to his accepting the appointment 'tomorrow', and as he had asked for a few days only to think the matter over, it would be dated about 8 November 1828.
and the fate of his family, in the event of his untimely death abroad, he left in the hands of the Duchess of Wellington. 98

Broughton left Farnham on 28 December 1829 and took his family to Canterbury. 99 He spent a good deal of the next three months in London arranging his passage and outfit, dining with prelates and in consultation with officials of the Colonial Office. 1 He found it a rich time to be in the metropolis and close to the heart beat of the ecclesiastical world. He was there at the centre of affairs when in March 1829 the Duke of Wellington stirred the establishment with news of his intention to ask the king to emancipate his Roman Catholic subjects. 2 Men asked the meaning of it. If Roman Catholics were to be given full civil rights, the sanest of them argued, then it behoved the supporters of the Church of England to strengthen their cause and ensure that no ill followed in the wake of the Duke's measure. It suddenly dawned on Broughton that in the colony where he would be the senior ecclesiastical official it would be his responsibility to take the lead in the matter. 'I see the whole extent of the prospect before

1. Broughton to Wife, 24 January and 5 March 1829 (Correspondence of W.G. Broughton and his wife, Ms. No. B 1612, M.L.).
2. Broughton to Duchess of Wellington, 23 March 1829 (Letters of William Grant Broughton, 1826-1829, Duke of Wellington Collection, m/f, M.L.). This letter was written from Holmes Hotel, London, as soon as Broughton heard the news of the Duke's intention. Broughton's feelings on this subject are discussed in chapter 2.
me and shadows and darkness rest upon it', he wrote on the eve of his departure to a friend, the Reverend H.H. Norris. And so it came about the He who disposed the ways of men according to his own designs decreed that a man, who desired only to retire from the quiet of rural Surrey to the solitude of the British Museum, should be turned from his path to look Betsy Bandicoot and bold John Donohoe in the eye.
They change their clime, but not their disposition, who travel beyond the sea.

Horace.
On 21 April 1829 Sydney learned for the first time that the Reverend W.G. Broughton had succeeded to the Archdeaconry of New South Wales. The announcement was not an official one. The editor of the *Sydney Gazette* had gleaned the information from a copy of *John Bull*, brought into Sydney Harbour a few days earlier aboard the ship 'Mellish'.

The news created no stir. Scott alone received it with joy. It signalled a victory for him at the Colonial Office. Five years had passed since he arrived in the colony armed with the King's mandate to set in order the moral, religious, and educational welfare of the settlers. For almost four of those years he had annually begged permission to resign. He had succumbed very early to a sense of futility in his mission, believing he had been left to carry it almost 'single handed'. The free settlers had not supplied that leavening of wholesomeness expected of them, but

2. For Scott's strange preoccupation with the idea that he was sent to New South Wales on the mission of His Majesty the King, see the extracts from his Charge to the clergy of New South Wales in, *Howe's Weekly Commercial Express, and Miscellaneous Intelligencer*, 13 June 1825. This notion had unfortunate consequences, notably when Scott appealed to magistrates to punish local constables who failed to properly advertise his country visits which were carried out, he said, in obedience to the King's commands; see Scott to Cox, Brabyn and Bele, 25 August 1825 (*Scott Letter Book*, vol. 1, M.L.) and Scott to Darling, 17 June 1828 (*Scott Letter Book*, vol. 2, M.L.).
3. For the first rumour of Scott's resignation, see *Sydney Gazette*, 8 September 1825; for the first confirmation by Scott that he had submitted a resignation, see Scott to Arthur, 5 April 1826 (*Arthur Papers*, vol. 13, M.L.).
preferred to adopt the pernicious habits and unblushing immorality of those in servitude. Scott once reported despairingly to England, 'who within the short period of my residence have become the prey of the profligate and are as vicious as their advisers.'

There was a malicious and libellous press to contend against as well. Its insulting and often calumnious abuse of the 'Venerable and Co.' had begun almost the day after his arrival. Little was spared the clergy either. Their shortcomings were mercilessly 'posted in the Gazette for the public to gaze on'. At law the courts seemed determined to uphold his opponents, and to strangle his reforms by entangling his visitorial powers in a web of subtle legal restrictions, craftily woven, he said, to flatter the vanity of colonial lawyers rather than to

7. Other press names for Scott were, 'His Venerability', 'Priestcraft and Tyranny', see Scott to Hamilton, 21 May 1827 (Abstracts from Letters and Reports of S.P.G. re T.H. Scott, Ms. No. As143/4, M.L.).
administer justice. 10 The Colonial Office, hamstrung by the assumption that stable government could ill afford to gainsay its justices, offered him no support. Scott's head spun with amazement as, one by one, his expectations were reversed. 11 He never understood the conflicting claims for patronage and privilege that encouraged the Colonial Office in its confused sequence of decisions, and simply condemned it as utterly double-faced and worthless. 12 'They will support nothing calculated to do good', he bitterly complained. 13

The clergy too often disappointed him. 14 With effective ecclesiastical authority a safe distance away in Calcutta, they could indulge in factious behaviour with impunity. 15 Scott could not tame them. Scott could not win them. Scott failed. This Scott admitted; 'That I have failed is clear', he confided to Arthur, 'and I have taken it much to heart'. 16 In 1829 the Colonial Office had finally named another to take his place. To him Scott gladly surrendered the perquisites of office. 17 It was no sacrifice. He longed only for remote Northumberland, to love

12. Scott to Arthur, 8 January 1827 (Ibid.).
13. Scott to Arthur, 29 April 1827 (Ibid.).
14. Scott to Arthur, 6 May 1828 (Ibid.).
17. Scott to Arthur, 9 June 1829 (Ibid.).
and to be loved by his flock at Whitfield who, his sister
reassuringly wrote, eagerly awaited his return. The news of
21 April 1829 comforted Scott.

In Sydney nothing was known of Broughton beyond that he
had once resided at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge. His was, as yet,
only a name in the distance. Weeks later Scott could add nothing
to the enquiries of well wishers other than the rumour that
Broughton was already on the high seas and, somewhat to his
amazement, had forsaken the comforts of a convict ship in order to
arrive earlier on a private vessel, the 'Prince Regent'. The rumour had no foundation. Broughton and his wife, Sarah,
his two daughters Emily and Phoebe, and the family servants Samuel
and Hannah Halton, travelled out with all the comforts and distresses
of a convict ship. The party was originally scheduled to board
the ship 'Sovereign' and sail from Woolwich about mid-April, but
the sudden illness of one of the girls ended that. Instead he
accepted cabins on the 'John' set down to sail on 9 May. Delays
multiplied and the family lingered on in Canterbury. Then, two
weeks after the proposed sailing date they were called to Sheerness.
Then a gale blew up and confined them to a hotel at the water's
edge. Closeted from the weather Broughton wiled away the time

18. Scott to Arthur, 30 May 1829 (Ibid.).
19. Ibid.
20. W.G. Broughton, 'Diary of a voyage to New South Wales on the
'John' transport 1829', 26 May 1829 (Item 1, Broughton Papers,
m/f, A.N.L.). Hereafter referred to as 'John' Diary.
21. Twiss to Broughton, 14 April 1829, and Twiss to Commissioner of
22. Twiss to Broughton, 1 May 1829. (Ibid.)
composing a prayer for the Duchess of Wellington to utter on behalf of her highly exalted spouse. Pray every day, he said, 'that his purposes may be directed to the maintenance and security of the church and true religion'. That was his final act for England.

Around five o'clock on Tuesday 26 May he stepped onto an open boat to be rowed with his family to the 'John' at anchor off little Nore. It was a short, formidable journey through rolling seas left behind by the gale, Broughton's first taste of the sea, and not to his liking.

Once safely on board, Broughton found himself more relieved that the months of waiting had ended than excited by the prospects of the new life ahead of him. Since leaving Farnham he had had to support his family and outfit them for the journey, and pay as well the cost of many a trip to London, on what he considered a mere pittance of an allowance, £150. His impressive salary was not to start till he arrived in New South Wales. Had he departed in February 1829, as the Colonial Office first speculated, his spirits might have been more buoyant. But as one departure date yielded to another and the weeks of waiting expanded into months of delays, Broughton grew desperately short of money. Twice he was reduced

26. Scott's salary dated from the time of his appointment, 5 April 1824, though he did not arrive in the colony till 8 May 1825, see Bathurst to Brisbane, 21 December 1824, H.R.A.I.xi. 422, and Sydney Gazette, 12 May 1825.
to begging extra assistance from the Colonial Office, only once with any success. On 26 May that had at last ended. Yet, as Broughton spent some time along with his thoughts that evening, he felt himself strangely unmoved by the novelty of his circumstances. He was a man born and bred to the English countryside. He admired all that was finest in England's traditions, and was as faithful an example as Coleridge could have found of the country parson he extolled as the jewel in England's ecclesiastical establishment; 'a neighbour and a family man whose education and rank admit him to the mansions of the rich landholders, while his duties make him the frequent visitor of the farmhouse and the cottage'. From this congenial milieu Broughton had been called away. None of the expectancy that had fired a Paul, an Xavier, or a Wesley about to cross from one continent to another, seemed to have entered his soul. Like Isaiah, Jeremiah, and many others called to tasks for which they had never trained, he accepted this call as a burden laid upon him by his Lord. So at the beginning of the missionary venture destined to take him half way round the globe, he sought his first night's rest, not with joy flooding into his soul but, he coolly confessed, 'dispirited and uncomfortable'.

30. E.g., Jeremiah 1: 5-10, 17-19 and Ezekiel 2:3, 6-8. In 1835, when Broughton was heavy in dispute with the British Government over his salary, he made much of the fact that he never sought and never wanted the appointment, Broughton to Sir George Grey, 21 December 1835, C.O. 201/250.
The next morning the 'John' weighed anchor and sailed.
Broughton never sought out novelty or adventure but rarely failed
to take a keen interest in what was new and different around him,
and was up early to watch the procedure. To his landsman's eye
the decks appeared crowded and confused. The prisoners had been
brought up, chained one to the other, to take a last look at the
vanishing shores of the land that had stolen their liberty. 32
There were 188 of them, all males, 33 and the armed soldiers who
loitered around them had a nonchalant air that inspired little
confidence in the passengers. Shouts and tawdry oaths rang out from
many directions at the ragged looking seamen, whom rumour soon had
it were for the most part fresh and inexperienced recruits! 34 By
the time the timbers creaked and the rigging strained to carry the
vessel forward, Broughton had defined a ship as a 'dirty, noisy,
crowded machine of board'. 35

The coast and sights familiar to his boyhood and youth
accompanied the ship the first day, and only at sunset on the
second evening, after the red brick tower of the Dungeness lighthouse
had disappeared into the waves, was Broughton aroused to the acute
realisation that he had finally taken leave of the country he loved. 36
At night the loneliness of the open seas crept into his sleeplessness
and he began to contemplate the finality of deep waters. His thought

32. Ibid., 27 May 1829,
states 185 in 'John' Diary, 26 May 1829.
34. Broughton, 'John' Diary, 27 May 1829,
35. Ibid., 17 June 1829.
36. Ibid., 28 May 1829.
turned to death and judgement, and of what he might expect should Almighty God require his soul in the midst of this journey. 'My mind was tranquil', he found, 'and I was in consequence somewhat dissatisfied with myself.' 37 Was he insensible to the danger around him, or did he have the fruitful peace of a true faith? He prayed for time to consider. He prayed moreover, to be spared a watery grave. 38 That the sea would give up her dead he did not doubt, but he had firmly fixed hopes of awaiting the resurrection in a simple grave at Hartley Wespall beside the remains of his infant son. 39

By 3 June the ship was well out to sea. Broughton had few duties to discipline his days. On fine Sundays he preached to the ship's company, with the crew assembled on the quarter deck and the convicts penned up on the poop. As a rule he selected one of his old sermons and lamented the loss of familiar faces. He missed the amusing and flattering sight of old farmer Everard, standing erect on his two legs and leaning forward, straining his weak hearing, to catch the words of the sermon. 40 Not that there was anything to complain of in his present congregation. It was surprisingly attentive, and this encouraged Broughton to believe that a little more vigour in his sermon might effect a permanent reform in some of their lives. 41

37. Ibid., 27 May 1829.
38. Ibid., 15 June 1829,
39. Ibid., 29 May 1829.
40. Ibid., 31 May 1829.
41. Ibid., 14 June 1829.
Mr. Smith, the youthful and athletic second officer with every appearance of robust health, took ill a week after leaving port and died a week later. Broughton buried him, then wrote to console his widowed mother, and warned each member of the ship's company to be ready for the unnamed hour of their visitation. On another occasion Mr. Ketterick, an Irish-Catholic immigrant, approached Broughton to baptise his week-old daughter and secure for her a place in paradise should the uncertainties of the sea overtake her. Only trifling difficulties separated Rome and Canterbury Ketterick informed him. Broughton did not argue. He believed the differences between the two churches to be more substantial than that, but adhered to a belief all his life that a baptism, to be valid, need only to be administered by a believer. Broughton felt he qualified by those standards, and Ketterick's daughter received her name.

Except for these small duties Broughton occupied his time in his own way. Each day, under an umbrella when necessary, he took a calculated 220 turns on the poop. He ate well of the plentiful supply of plain, but coarse food. To his amazement it did not in the least affect his children, and he made his own share palatable with a regular measure of wine. Apart from leaky water-buckets he had little to complain of and was surprised at his own contentedness. By the middle of June he even felt easier

42. Ibid., 15 and 21 June 1829.
44. Broughton, 'John' Diary, 16 June 1829.
45. Ibid. 13 June 1829.
46. Ibid., 16 June 1829.
47. Ibid., 1 June 1829.
about the security of the ship. When he first observed the ill-disciplined behaviour of the guards he adopted for his protection the motto, 'my trust is in the tender mercy of God for ever and ever'. Then he discovered that convicts would betray one another for any little gain or favour. Whilst it is difficult to commend such infidelity, Broughton frankly admitted, 'it is a great source of security to the ship and passengers'.

Peace and fine weather soon induced him to study. Among the books Broughton had packed to fill in his leisure and waiting were the immensely popular narratives of Bishop Heber's Indian journeys. Broughton and Heber had a good deal in common. Both had quit the agreeable peace of an English rural parish to answer the call of the extravagant distances of the Diocese of Calcutta; Heber in the sordid heat of its Indian archdeaconries and Broughton in the vast and remote loneliness of New South Wales. Neither had found it an easy decision. Heber confessed that he had only managed to accommodate his emotions on the journey out from England by never turning a backward glance at a homeward bound vessel. He landed in India in October 1823: three years later he collapsed and died from exhaustion. His wife published the saga of his short episcopacy for an English public. Men applauded. Some awarded

48. Ibid., 12 June 1829.
49. Ibid., 16 June 1829.
51. For an account of Heber's reactions and misgivings over his appointment, see, Quarterly Review, vol. 35, 1827, p. 456.
Heber the title of 'saint in lawn'; some quoted his views in Parliament as precepts in support of legislation; others suggested that Presbyterians would bow to episcopacy should the virtues of Heber become widely diffused on the English bench. This lavish praise did not move Broughton. 'I do not quite find my idea of an apostolical bishop realised', he recorded in his diary.

Heber combined the zeal of a missionary with the inquisitiveness of a tourist. He preached the Gospel: Broughton approved of that. But when he visited old temples and mingled with the crowds gazing on the colourful spectacle of ancient religious festivals Broughton jibbed. Heber might think of them as mere 'shows' long since emptied of their religious content, but do the Hindus and Moslems? Might not the sight of the Christian leader gazing at temples and idols, with interest rather than abhorrence, imply to them that heathen practices were not so very objectionable after all? The Christian's burden was to denounce the ways of other religions 'regardless of consequences'.

Heber's school system contained the same amalgam of good and bad. Broughton agreed with Heber's decision to put education in the

54. *Quarterly Review*, vol. 43, 1830, p. 366.
55. See, Speech by Marquis of Lansdowne on Catholic Emancipation, *P.D. new series*, vol. 21, 10 April 1829, col. 684.
57. Broughton, *'John' Diary*, 26 June 1829.
58. A good example of Heber's attitude to which Broughton took exception: 'on returning to the stable-yard, our conductor asked if we wished to see the temple? I answered of course "anything more that was to be seen".....Heber, *Narrative*, vol. 2, pp. 418-9.
60. Broughton, *'John' Diary*, 26 June 1829.
forefront of his objective belief that the education of the people and the conversion of the nation were inseparable goals. But his system of giving the Indian native the Bible for general moral teachings only would delight Whigs but convert few Indians. The system was established, he said, 'a compromise and a suppression of the most awful portions of our faith'. He feared that instruction in the moral precepts of the Gospel without accompanying tuition in the doctrinal sanctions on which they were founded, opened the way for a type of convert who preserved, under an outwardly pleasing exterior of moral conformity, sufficient of the old superstitions as to finally hinder the formation of a perfect faith in Jesus Christ.

The style of Heber's episcopate also troubled Broughton. The Indian bishop had died a hero because he exhausted his mortal frame in unremitting travel. Yet the greatest of the missionary

61. Heber, Narrative, vol. 1, pp. 73-4; Broughton, 'John' Diary, 26 June 1829.
62. In a letter to Wilmot-Horton in March 1824, Heber wrote; 'Nor is there any measure from which I anticipate more speedy benefit than the elevation of the rising generation of females to their natural rank in society, and giving them (which is all that, in any of our schools, we as yet venture to give,) the lessons of general morality extracted from the Gospel, without any direct religious instruction.'; Heber, Narrative, vol. 3, p. 357.
64. Broughton, 'John' Diary, 26 June 1829.
65. Ibid. Heber's own comments show that he was more amused than disturbed by the pomp of his journeys; 'I could not help thinking that since the days of Thomas a Becket or Cardinal Wolsey, no English Bishop had been so formidably attended...', Heber, Narrative, vol. 3; p. 20.
Apostles had said, 'Into whatsoever city ye enter there abide'. Could Heber have left any permanent impression on the places he visited? So it came about, that months before he put foot in his own vast archdeaconry Broughton reached the important conclusion, that rambling visitations were wrong in principle and harmful in effect:

Let him (the bishop) be at all events permanently settled somewhere during the greater portion of every year...distant points must I admit upon this system be deprived for some years at least of their bishop's presence...for this the blame must fall not upon the bishop but upon those who appoint a single man to fill a position too wide for any one human being...it is better to do real good within a contracted sphere than to aim at the reputation of appearing to do it upon a much more extended theatre.67

Heber and Broughton were High Churchmen of widely differing temperaments. The one had a measure of romance and poetry in his soul that had eluded the other. Heber passed the time on board ship writing hymns and verse, or reading the novels of Scott and the acidulous prose of Voltaire. Broughton had no such catholicity of taste. At the same time he was far from possessing a narrow or restricted intellect. He had a keen intellectual curiosity and gave it full reign over a wide range of theological and historical literature, often in areas promulgating views widely different from his own. He had his prejudices, but tried to face them frankly and never suffered them to limit his reading.

66. Broughton, 'John' Diary, 26 June 1829. The italics are Broughton's.
67. Ibid.
For a short time he took up the essays of the Calvinist theologian, Elisha Cole, determined 'to give his system a fair hearing and an impartial judgement so far as I am able; not suffering if I can help it, my preconceived notions to bias me against what he can reasonably urge.' That was no light task for an admirer of Tomline and a pupil of Marsh. Broughton put the book down without finding a sufficient argument in its pages for confining the possibility of redemption to the elect, yet, he did admit to coming across a great fund of other spiritual knowledge. In this manner he approached all his reading; alert for what was useful and profitable, and where he found reason to disagree, he set himself the task of clarifying his own mind by setting down the grounds and causes of his dissent.

The eighteenth century theologians provided him with many hours of argumentative scribbling. He paid a good deal of attention to their writings convinced that the problem which had occupied their minds, the role of reason in a religion founded on revelation, remained an important one for his own generation. Broughton repudiated the priority many of the older theologians had given to the authority of reason over the authority of

69. Broughton, 'John' Diary, 3 July 1829.
70. Ibid. See also entry for 25 June for a similar remark on another work to which Broughton had many fundamental objections but from which he felt he had also learned much.
71. For entries containing extensive critical remarks, Ibid., 5, 25 and 26 June, and 1 and 13 July 1829.
72. Little of Broughton's personal library remains. Of the 28 surviving volumes in the Broughton Library, Moore College, Sydney, 10 volumes are the works of John Jortin and Samuel Clark, rationalist theologians of the 18 century.
revelation. It appeared to him to lead to scepticism and ultimately to the denial of all dogma, and that in turn had undesirable moral consequences for members of the Church of England.\textsuperscript{73}

He took Hoadly and his sceptical disciples as an example.\textsuperscript{74} These men had not accepted the traditional doctrines of the church yet believed that for the good of the church they should occupy its highest offices. How had they reconciled their scepticism with the need to subscribe to the Thirty Nine Articles? They began, Broughton observed, with some simple 'helps to prevarication'. The idea of a mental reservation became one early favourite. Then as the work of rewriting doctrines progressed there developed a need for a more sophisticated device to justify the growing disparity between old and new beliefs. So the concept of a 'tacit reformation' emerged accompanied by an independent intellectual discipline to explain it.

'Surely a Christian, and above all a minister of the Gospel professing his assent to the doctrine of his church, may speak the truth from his heart without all these refinements, reservations

\textsuperscript{73} Broughton, 'John' Diary, 25 June 1829; Broughton, Letter to Friend, pp. 88-92.

\textsuperscript{74} Benjamin Hoadly (1676-1761) Bishop of Bangor and popular preacher at the Court of George I and George II. He denied bishops the right to impose an interpretation on the Thirty Nine Articles, and was accused of denying the right of king or parliament to exact religious tests. An attempt by the Lower House of Convocation to debate this in 1717 was directly linked with the demise of Convocation as a deliberative body for the next century and a half. Hoadly was suspect of Arian sympathies. On Hoadly, see Article, Hoadly, Benjamin, in Dictionary of National Biography, vol. 9, pp. 910-15; Norman Sykes, William Wake. Archbishop of Canterbury (2 vols., Cambridge, 1957), pp. 146-56; Norman Sykes, From Sheldon to Seeker. Aspects of English Church History 1660-1768 (Cambridge, 1959), ch. 2.
and subtle distinctions', Broughton said. But the popularity of such subtle deceit was not so easily checked, and delivered up the Church of England to its day of trial. And what was the origin of this? Broughton asked. It had begun by standing revelation at the bar of reason. If that was a proper practice Broughton concluded, then the questionable causistry which followed in its wake would not have been necessary. Man had received his reason, Broughton affirmed, to elucidate reason not judge it.  

When Broughton switched his attention from theology to history he turned from the eighteenth to the seventeenth century, and to England's Civil War in particular. He felt 'all Englishmen ought to have their minds well made up about this period'. The causes of political dissension, like the causes of religious heresies, he argued, were ever present in society, and could emerge with 'trifling variation' at any time to disturb the peace. Every Englishmen for his own security if for no other reason, had good cause to discover what errors had allowed the

75. Broughton, 'John' Diary, 25 June 1829. The idea of a 'tacit reformation' went hand in hand with an idea that the meaning of the Thirty Nine Articles was not to be taken from the obvious construction of their wording. Each reformer developed his own system of doctrine and justified his action by pointing to the political stranglehold on legal change. Thus they were not killing religion by circumventing honesty, as their opponents alleged, but keeping it alive by circumventing a legal impasse. Their assent to the Thirty Nine Articles preserved intellectual integrity; see Leslie Stephen, History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century, 3rd ed. (2 vols., London, 1902), vol. 1, pp. 421-6.

76. Ibid., 5 June 1829. For another view of a nineteenth century historian who felt the force of a similarity between the times of Charles I and Britain in the late 1820's, see the Preface to I. Disraeli, Commentaries on the Life and Reign of Charles I, King of England, new and revised edition (2 vols. London, 1851).

77. Broughton, 'John' Diary, 5 June 1829.
political differences of the seventeenth century to degenerate into bloodshed.

In 1829 the debate over Catholic Emancipation, with its mixture of religious and political emotions somewhat reminiscent of the passions that raged in the period of the Civil War, gave poignancy to the problem. The Duke of Wellington had urged his fellow peers to see the measure as a choice between a timely concession and civil war.\(^7^8\) The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Howley, analysed it differently. He saw the issue as one of conscience versus expediency, of affronting the Divine to appease the human. He and likeminded peers argued that the state had a duty to support the best and purest in Christianity. Any watering down of England's protestant constitution not only meddled with what was the best and purest in religion, but tampered with the structure of the body politic which had brought England her greatness at home and abroad. They asked which was the greater, the folly of it or the ingratitude?\(^7^9\)

At first Broughton found himself snared in a dilmenna on emancipation. The idea frankly horrified him, but he believed the Duke of Wellington indispensable to England's safety and in need of staunch support. As the debate proceeded and he saw the issues

\(^7^8\) P.D., new series, vol. 21, 2 April 1829, col. 46.
\(^7^9\) Ibid., 4 April 1829, col. 359, and 2 April 1829, col. 60-1; A brief sketch of the variety of motives as they influenced the votes of the prelates in the House of Lords is to be found in O. Chadwick, The Victorian Church (In two parts, London, 1966), Part 1, pp. 7-24.
defined, he came down uncompromisingly against his patron. 'Upon that one great question that divided brethren and kinsfolk and friends', he confessed to the Duchess of Wellington, 'I had the misfortune to entertain a different view from his.'

It was too early to speculate on what disasters might follow in the train of the Duke's reform. But Broughton decided to put some of his vacant mid-ocean hours to profitable use probing for principles to govern compromise and resistance in a state beset by demands for political and religious change. He took up Harris's life of Charles I to explore the errors and mishaps of that monarch's unhappy reign. He found he approved of the men in parliament who had sought to abridge the King's prerogative where it affronted their constitutional rights to freedom of person and property, but condemned their later enlarged catalogue of demands as a piece of mischievous provocation. He admitted a strong sympathy for the King's early belief that 'the real liberty and security of all classes' could be best attained by preserving his prerogative, yet he unreservedly condemned the monarch when he


81. Broughton, 'John' Diary, 5 June 1829. The work Broughton read was almost certainly, W. Harris, History and Critical Account of the Life and Writings of Charles I, King of Great Britain; after the manner of Mr. Bayle. Drawn from original writers and State Papers (London, 1753). Harris's works were republished in a collected edition in 1814. He was a non-conformist minister in Cornwall and his historical writings were considered 'not impartial'. Broughton found it necessary to comment on this feature of his work. On Harris, see Article, Harris, William, in Dictionary of National Biography, vol. 9, p.28.
brought in men as cruel as Laud and as despotic as Strafford to resist change at all cost. The problem Broughton decided was how to accommodate change in its early, moderate stage rather than by resisting it risk its inflation. So he named intransigence the mortal sin of a statesman and an ability to recognise the shape of a judicious compromise his prime and fundamental virtue. Fail in that, he said, the the small demands will turn to greater ones before they vanish. And the greater the demand for change the stronger the desire to resist it; and so bloodshed arrives. The whole history of the Civil War, he wrote in his diary for further meditation,

affords a warning to future statesmen that where a violent outcry and opposition is raised against a government both as to theory and practice, they must not strive by rigor and severity to withstand every demand for change, but take an enlarged view of the real condition of affairs; examine impartially what is really wrong in their system, and right in that of their opponents; and so timely and prudently amend the one and adopt the other, whilst the voice of reason and moderation can be attended to, as to prevent animosities from arising to that pitch which produced all the calamity and bloodshed of the Civil War.  

So Broughton wrote one law. A popular alternative maintained the opposite; concede a small point, it said, and a greater one will be asked for. Which, then, was the more perfect way? Resist change to save the state, or concede it to preserve it? It was the dilemma of the conservative spirit.  

82. Broughton, *John* Diary, 5 June 1829.
Broughton seemed to want to be on the side of the moderates. Would he act differently when he landed and stepped into the shoes of the ecclesiastical statesman?

It was a wild guess as to what England's troubles would amount to in remote New South Wales. Distance was sure to stamp some change on them. It did on everything else Broughton noticed, somewhat anxiously, as he saw his shadow fall for the first time in an unfamiliar line to the south.  

He did, however, carry with him the comforting knowledge that his archdeaconry would not suffer should the seals of the Colonial Office go to a Roman Catholic. The Archbishop of Canterbury had given good warning that the chief incumbent of the Colonial Office had sufficient sway in ecclesiastical matters to allow a Roman Catholic, or any other enemy of the establishment 'to discourage, to a most alarming degree, and even almost to extinguish the Church of England, in many of the colonies'.

Earl Bathurst assured the Archbishop that it would be a misdemeanour for any Secretary of State to attempt such a thing. Parliament reassured him better by transferring to the Archbishop the

---

84. Broughton, 'John' Diary, 16 June 1829.
85. P.D., new series, vol. 21, 2 April 1829, col. 65, and 8 April 1829, col. 552; see also speech by Bishop of London, ibid., 8 April 1829, cols. 553-5.
86. Ibid., 8 April 1829, col. 553. For its protection the Established Church was forced to rely on several provisions which made it a punishable offence for a Roman Catholic to offer advice to the King on matters connected with the disposal of ecclesiastical benefices, see, Statutes at Large, vol. xi, 'An Act for the Relief of His Majesty's Roman Catholic Subjects', 10 Geo. IV, cap. 7 (13 April 1829), clauses, 2, 12, 15, 17, 18, and 24.
ecclesiastical patronage of the Colonial Office whenever the
King took the seals out of the hands of a churchman. 87 Most
routine matters, such as the appointment of chaplains and school
masters, rested with an Ecclesiastical Board. This Board,
though the creation of the Colonial Office, had come to be
acknowledged as autonomous, and suffered no interference from
anyone at the Colonial Office. 88 For the general prosperity of
the Colonial Church in other matters Broughton had to rely on the
good sense of Englishmen to persevere in the tradition, perhaps
a little shaken by the recent events, that it was the 'duty of the
state spontaneously and of itself to support an Established Church,
independently of the principle of reciprocity'. 89

Broughton did most of his reading and serious thinking in
the first half of the journey. Once the 'John' entered tropical
waters he began to feel the strain of the long, somewhat tedious
journey into unfamiliar conditions. Heat, a breathlessly still
air, a smooth sea that rocked the ship in an endless, lazy,
see-saw motion without pushing it onwards, sorely tried his patience. 90

87. Ibid., clause 17.
88. Evidence of the Reverend A. Hamilton, 'Report from the Select
Committee on the Civil Government of Canada (together with)
Minutes of Evidence', P.P., 1828, vii, (569), 185-9. 'If the
fact is enquired into, and not the theory, I should answer that
in point of fact the Ecclesiastical Commission is substantially
patron of all the church preferment of the government in the
colonies'; 'Evidence of James Stephen to the Select Committee
on the Civil Government of Canada', ibid, p. 223.
89. From Lord Eldon's speech on Catholic Emancipation, P.D., new
series, vol. 21, 4 April 1829, col. 359. It accorded
precisely with Peel's views, see, N. Gash, Mr. Secretary Peel,
p. 590.
90. Broughton, 'John' Diary, 18 and 22 June 1829.
At night the place took on something of a 'shocking experience' as porpoises darted about the ship cutting an immense serpentine pattern on the luminous sea. Slowly but firmly Broughton felt a general debility overtake him and sap him of the energy or will to apply himself to an occupation with any constancy. He soon succumbed to boredom. 'We have neither heard, seen nor done anything worthy of record' was the fruit of a week's observation.

Week by week he shortened the Sunday services and still found them more exhausting than a full Sunday's duty at Farnham. The elements finally played havoc even with these. Sometimes he tried holding a service below deck. Sometimes he abandoned it altogether. No sooner had the 'John' cleared the tropics that it ran into a gale. For over a month, from the end of July to the end of August, the ship suffered a severe buffeting from heavy, boisterous seas and strong rain drenched winds. Broughton's misery took on a plaintive note. He stopped communicating with himself in his diary, except for an occasional entry to lodge a complaint. A number of falls had bruised and shaken him. He was bitterly cold and chillblanes covered his fingers. Water had flooded his cabin and it seemed constantly damp. At night the roar of the seas

91. Ibid., 21 June 1829.
92. Ibid., 7-11 July 1829.
93. Ibid.
94. Ibid., 12 July 1829.
95. Ibid., 2, 9, 16 August, and 6 September 1829.
96. Ibid., 27 and 28 July to 1 August 1829 in 'Ship "John" Latitude and Longitude from London to New South Wales. A Daily Record of Position and Weather', 21 July to 1 August, 15 August, 5 September 1829 (Broughton Papers 1824-98, Ms. No. 913, M.L.).
robbed him of his sleep. There was not so much as a consoling
glass of wine at meal times so long as the ship wildly pitched
and rolled. Nature possessed no charm in the fortieth parallel.
Even the Albatross looked to have an inelegantly short neck!
A mere shadow in reality of the poet's 'flying swan'.

Broughton's miseries came upon him despite the style and
comfort of his quarters. Those below the deck lived in truly
wretched conditions. Huge waves frequently broke in on them
drenching their clothes and leaving their bedding damp for days
on end. There is no indication that Broughton was stirred to
a compassionate ministry among those so much more unfortunately
situated than himself. Once, quite early in the voyage, he had
managed to save a prisoner from the pain of thirty-six lashes.
Broughton knew the man to be a 'confirmed rogue' but calculated
that some general good might come from the act. 'My purpose',
he wrote that night in self examination, 'was by this beginning
to show the prisoners I felt an interest in them, and this to
acquire an influence which may be turned to better purposes'.
He failed to find a way of following this up. Convicts as far
as he could see fell into two classes: the first-offenders who had
erred from 'bad counsel, bad example, or through very powerful
temptation'; and the rest, who lived in 'settled and inveterate

97. Broughton, John Diary, 5 August, 10 August to 1 September,
   27 and 28 July, 1 and 9 August, 4 August and 3 August 1829.
98. Ibid., 2 August 1829.
99. Ibid., 30 May 1829.
malignity'. Only among the first-offenders did Broughton hope to find his converts, and only with words, his Sunday sermons, did he go after them. His mistake was to begin by telling them that worse things were in store for the unrepentant. This passed their imagination.

The bankruptcy of ideas in Broughton's approach to the adult convicts was in large part a measure of the novelty of his contact with such a class of people. His failure to do anything to benefit the convict school on the ship's lower deck, was less excusable. He knew boys well. Mr. Finn, an accomplished teacher whose life was a shadowy dream passed back to him at the foot of the gallows, taught the boys in daily classes to recite parts of St. Matthew's Gospel and the Psalms with 'creditable correctness'. All the same, Broughton was neither pleased nor impressed. The classroom might ring with the sacred chorus 'Hallelujah, Praise the Lord', but the whole ship rang with the shocking tales of the boys' wicked behaviour. The exercise bordered on the profane. 'I am greatly in doubt whether to offer any encouragement, knowing how great a deficiency of religious principle there is among them,' he recorded once again in his evening self-examination. 'Can I but apprehend that it is teaching them to assume the form and language of godliness without the power; a perversion which in the present day there seems no necessity to encourage'.

1. Ibid., 5 July 1829.
2. Ibid., 14 June 1829.
3. Ibid., 6 June and 6 July 1829.
4. Ibid., 6 July 1829.
son lay dead in the innocent grave of childhood and for the boys on the 'John', who possessed no innocence of life, he could arouse neither sympathy nor tenderness.\(^5\)

In the early days of the southern spring, the 'John' sailed into calmer weather. By 2 September its captain, Mr. Robert Norsworthy, was hopeful of making a speedy passage through Bass Strait but two days later, just before reaching King Island, adverse winds struck up and forced the ship to detour around Van Diemen's Land. On 6 September the southern tip of that Island broke the early morning horizon and gave Broughton the first glimpse of his archdeaconry. Nothing stirred in him. It was just a piece of strange territory in a great southern region that had done little for months on end, but impress him with its strangeness and awful sunsets. The turn northward brought no relief. The coast of New South Wales stood out as a wild inhospitable loneliness where only an occasional column of smoke stirred upwards to suggest the presence of its primitive inhabitants.\(^6\) The approaching end of over a hundred days of irksome confinement brought relief but no joy. The end of the voyage could bring no end to strangeness. 'Where we are going', he wrote in his diary, 'there are none of those whom we desire to see.'\(^7\)

At half past eight on the evening of Saturday 12 September, while the passengers were enjoying a supper, the chief officer

---

5. *Ibid.*, 29 May 1829
announced that the beacon by the entrance of Port Jackson had been sighted. Broughton went on deck with the others but, strain as he might, his eyes saw nothing but the black emptiness of unending distance. He tried to settle down and await the morning but sleep never managed to penetrate the crowd of thoughts that jostled for a place in his mind. Shortly after midnight he went on deck again. This time the beacon was bright and plain. He stayed for some time. And as he gazed at its regular, steady light a new sensation stirred in him, a 'kind of mysterious feeling of wonder and thankfulness'. He suddenly felt welcome. The beacon spoke to him like a friend telling him that the perils of the journey were over, and should he step ashore he would find a people 'capable of making great attempts and succeeding in them'. After that he slept. 8

He arose early next morning and, finding the ship drifting off the Heads waiting for a pilot to come on board, he occupied his leisure moments examining what he could see of his 'appointed land of sojourn'. Strangely, he felt the dreariness was all with nature's yellow sandstone cliffs, and the stunted and gloomy coloured foliage. Man had applied the cheering touches; a lofty stone lighthouse tower, and a scattering of white buildings up and down the rock had put some colour into nature's weather beaten face. Later in the morning, and below deck for the pilot had finally arrived to guide the ship in, Broughton preached on St. Matthew VII:13. It was an apt text for

a congregation so varied in its condition and diverse in its prospects: for it spoke of an enduring principle that applied with equal force in new as in old lands, in the strange parts of the world as in those well settled; from the good will come good fruit, it said, and from the evil, bad fruit. The law was old and unchangeable; only their opportunities were new.\(^9\)

When the service concluded Broughton's shipboard ministry ended. He returned to the deck to take his first look at the inside of the harbour, and settled back to enjoy the last moments of the journey towards a safe anchorage. At half past one, just opposite Sydney Cove, it all ended. The 'John' dropped anchor. Four days earlier, when Broughton contemplated this moment, he had seemed overwhelmed by anguish. He did not despair, not quite, but he could have. 'Eheu: Deus adsit: Deus adjuvet', he wrote then in his diary.\(^{10}\) On Sunday 12 September a new spirit was in him. He could see light and shade and colour in what surrounded him; see the movement in little things, and feel the gentleness of breezes.

\(^9\) Ibid., 13 September 1829.
\(^{10}\) Ibid., 7-10 September 1829.
CHAPTER THREE

ARRIVAL, RECEPTION, AND A PROCLAMATION THAT THE COLONY

SHALL BE REDEEMED BY CHRIST'S BLOOD AND BRITISH INSTITUTIONS

It is the counsel and pleasure of God I repeat to raise up here a Christian nation.

W.G. Broughton 1829.
When the 'John' dropped anchor Scott and the respectable citizens of Sydney Town, who had strictly observed the Sabbath, were still seated at their dinner tables. Colonel Dumaresq came out alone to meet the ship. He boarded bearing the Governor's greetings and a large basket of fresh fruit and eggs for the traveller whom he had met earlier that year in London. 1 Dumaresq's arrival and departure exhausted Broughton's list of colonial acquaintances. None but strangers awaited him on shore, and these he arranged to meet on Wednesday.

In the meantime Broughton landed unofficially to meet Scott. For two whole days, from the morning of Monday 14 September till early the following Wednesday, the two men closeted themselves in the retiring Archdeacon's residence at Woolloomooloo and exchanged information and opinions. 2 Scott emerged well satisfied. 'They have made a most excellent choice', he told his one remaining confidant, Colonel Arthur. 'He appears active and methodical and Liberal, and very amiable but I think firm.' 3 All the virtues were commendable, but the last especially so; for Scott had long insisted that his successor had the unenviable task of measuring out strong discipline to an increasingly refractory clergy. 4 After all, had not he, Scott, failed because he was 'far too easy', speaking sternly

2. Ibid.
perhaps but ever forgiving and indulgent at the last moment?\(^5\)

When Broughton took leave of Scott early on Wednesday morning to return to the ship and prepare for the official landing, he arrived at the moment for which everything in his past life had been but a preparation. In heart and head he was well prepared; his affections were firmly fixed on things above and his mind as well schooled in the principles of reformed Christianity as the best of England's places of learning could provide. But in the most indulgent moments of self gratification, that such a rapid rise to high office might induce, Broughton could not have but realised that the first forty-one years of his life had left him untried and untutored in the skills of public office, its administration and its politics. He would need wit as well as prayer to survive and prosper. His conversations with Scott must have put a good deal of light and shade into the rather whimsical portrait of colonial life which had appeared in the *Quarterly Review* about the time of his appointment.\(^6\) But Scott's point of view could have been as misleading as it was enlightening. Darling knew Scott well and still wilted before the difficulty of disentangling opposition to Scott's ecclesiastical policy from plain opposition to Scott as a person. Broughton could not hope to come to any settled opinions after two days of discussion with such a man.\(^7\)


\(^7\) Darling to Bathurst, 6 March 1826, *H.R.A.*, I.xii.211; Darling to Bathurst, 1 May 1826, *ibid.*, pp. 256-7; Darling to Hay, 10 October 1826, *ibid.*, p. 645.
What Broughton needed on that cold crisp September morning as he gazed from the ship across to the houses, streets, and buildings, where civilization seemed to have but a toe's hold on a vast land still jealously guarding her mysteries, was a few months of peaceful retirement in which to come to know this 'young city of a deserted wilderness'.

Fortunately in the latter half of 1829 the colony was enjoying a rare, well deserved, rest from the bitter political joustings that had left so many scars on the previous two years. The frenzied agitation whipped up in a desperate effort to win some liberal concessions in a new Act to provide for the Administration of Justice in New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land had spent its force. Wentworth, bitterly disappointed with the Act, led a few of the hardy malcontents in a bitter reaction. They made a cause célèbre of the Sudds and Thompson affair, and spread it abroad as far as the halls of Westminster that this was the style of tyranny which flourished in at least one of His Majesty's colonies. By September 1829 even this matter had gone as far as it could in the colony and all parties,

8. 'Lines Written in the Cove of Sydney', Australian Almanack (Sydney, 1832), p.xix. The engraved frontispiece of Robert Burford, Description of a view of the Town of Sydney, New South Wales (London, 1829), displays the Sydney skyline exactly as it would have appeared to Broughton. It was drawn so close to the time of his arrival that it shows the ship H.M.S. 'Success' at anchor. This was the vessel Scott sailed in about six weeks after Broughton's arrival.


10. 'Mr. W.C. Wentworth to the Right Honourable Sir George Murray, K.C.B., His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies', Encl. no.1 in Darling to Murray, 28 May 1829, H.R.A., I.xiv.859.
the maligners and the maligned, were settling down to await news of the reaction at Westminster.

For the most part the population of New South Wales was more preoccupied with the tyranny of the heavens than the illiberality of the Governor. The heavens had become as brass and the earth as iron, and for want of rain the pastures themselves looked like beaten highways. But the voice of the optimist could not be silenced. In forty years Sydney had grown into the largest town south of the Tropic of Capricorn: in forty more, it was confidently proclaimed, she would be Queen of the South and rival anything this side of the Equator, Lima and Rio included.

To this land, to these people, and into such hopes, Broughton moved at the middle hour of Wednesday 16 September 1829 as the governor's bargemen rowed him to the landing stage in Sydney Cove where 'all the first people of the colony' had gathered to welcome him. The scarlet of the law and the black of the church mingled with the red and decorated uniforms of the colonels of the regiment; there stood Mr. McLeay, Mr. John McArthur and the members of the Council; there, too, stood the black gaitered figure of Archdeacon Scott, erect and defiant, with the ageing Reverend Samuel Marsden on one side and the benevolent Reverend Richard Hill, Chaplain of St. James' Church, on the other, waiting to assist Broughton and

his family ashore the moment they arrived.\(^{13}\) Just on twelve noon a battery of canon, kept a little to the west at Dawes Point on the far side of the Cove, peppered the air with a bit of military pomp Broughton 'would much rather have dispensed with', and it was known that the new archdeacon had landed.\(^{14}\) Once on colonial soil Broughton met the senior officials and quickly filed off on foot to Government House where Darling waited. Darling saw at the head of the procession a man of modest stature, broad in the shoulders but not tall, and afflicted with a distinct limp.\(^{15}\) Something stirred in the Governor at the sight of the new Archdeacon; he broke protocol, left the verandah where he had been standing with his aide, and walked down the path to greet a new friend and fellow worker. Together they walked back to the great red and brown stone building, which looked more like an ancient overgrown cottage than the residence of a Governor,\(^{16}\) and into its large reception hall. There, as the *Sydney Monitor* put it, 'the ceremony of swearing in Mr. B. took place in the usual manner'.\(^{17}\)

Once Broughton had taken the oaths and made the requisite Declarations he and his family left with Scott for Wooloomooloo,

\(^{13}\) *Ibid.*, 17 September 1829; *Sydney Monitor*, 19 September 1829.


\(^{15}\) Broughton's physical stature may be judged from his preaching robes which hang in St. Andrew's Cathedral, Sydney. He developed a limp after an accident at Cambridge; see Whitington, *Broughton*, p. 20.

\(^{16}\) Lang, *New South Wales*, vol. 1, pp. 276-7.

\(^{17}\) *Sydney Monitor*, 19 September 1829.
where they were to remain until a suitable residence could be fixed up for them. In the meantime, Darling intended that they should return to Government House for a dinner party to meet their fellow workers under less formal circumstances.  

Broughton wasted little time choosing a residence. He loved space. In Sydney the market was scarce and he found his choice narrowed to a single house at the western end of Bridge Street. It had a sufficient supply of rooms but they were all badly arranged, he complained, and the front garden was little more than a sand pit. By way of compensation the property afforded its occupants a magnificent view of the harbour; a grand sheet of water, he told his mother, just like the picture he left behind with her in England. The one real drawback was the locality; the house sat uncomfortably close to the Rocks area, a place so notoriously wild and unruly that the government had considered making every publican there an ordinary magistrate and charging each with responsibility for keeping his own premises in order. Broughton took a lease for one year.

19. As is evident from Broughton to Reverend H.M. Wagner, 6 February 1825 (*Correspondence from W.G. Broughton*, Ms. No. Ab29/5c, M.L.) and Broughton to Coleridge, 19 October 1837 (*Broughton Papers*, m/f, A.N.L.).
22. Broughton later shifted to Bunker's Hill, see the alphabetical listing of 'Sydney Directory' in *Australian Almanack* (Sydney, 1834).
The Archdeacon found the colonists kind and attentive, and the press as respectful as he could have dared hope. E.S. Hall, the editor of the *Sydney Monitor* who had gingered Scott's life, had no use for bishops, archdeacons or any ecclesiastical dignitary, though heaps of time for the Christian gospel, was prepared to welcome Broughton as a fellow Christian and for the moment keep his peace. What most impressed Hall about the Archdeacon was the timing of his appointment. In recent years nothing had stung Hall's pride so much as the unceremonious manner in which Stott had locked him out of his pew in St. James' Church in July 1828. It proved to Hall's satisfaction that Scott was unfit for his office. 'To convert the Secretary of State of a Secret Inquiry into a Bishop, was, to say the least, a crooked policy', he told the Secretary of State for Colonies, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, and everyone else who cared to read the *Sydney Monitor* for 5 July 1828, and suggested that the crooked be made straight in the one proper way - by Scott's dismissal. He despatched copies of his paper to Whitehall and Lambeth, and calculated that they would have reached their destination in November of that year. The very month, Hall noted with deep satisfaction as Scott's 'retirement' from office. Hall was not one for boasting, but he hoped the colonists would appreciate that his newspaper had served their interests well in ridding the colony of a bad and scandalous appointment, and in bringing out a man

23. For Hall's views on ecclesiastical order and the over organised state of Christianity see *Sydney Monitor*, 26 October 1831, 18 February and 1 April 1835.
properly and regularly bred to his profession to head the church
and restore preaching to the colony's pulpits.  

The *Australian* did not try and compete for laurels, and was content to introduce
the new Archdeacon to its readers with a bit of that corn it
occasionally sprinkled over its pages:

Archdeacon Broughton, we hear, has expressed his intention
to promote public harmony in more ways than one, and among
others by patronising, with his presence, Mr. Levy's next
concert. We give the Venerable Gentleman every praise for
his friendly intentions.

From an office in George Street, Sydney, the editor of the
*Sydney Gazette* extended Broughton the truly friendly hand. He
pledged the Archdeacon genuine support in all his Christian
endeavour and warned him against the polite embrace of the
opposition papers, as many dubbed the *Sydney Monitor* and *Australian*.
Papers which had built their circulation on a policy of spirited
opposition to constitutional authorities, lay and ecclesiastical,
could ill afford to start patronising them. 'When the invidious
motive for the present civility shall have passed away', the editor
of the *Sydney Gazette* ventured on to predict, 'be he eloquent as
Apollos, zealous as Paul, and mild as Barnabas - (he, Broughton)
will not escape the calumny of the press.' Hall didn't like
having his motives impugned and told the editor of the *Sydney
Gazette* to stop pulling at the Archdeacon's cassock like a little

---

27. For the use of the term 'opposition papers' and a critical
description of their role in the colonial community see Lang,
*New South Wales*, vol. 1, pp. 229-40.
baby trying to attract his countenance. And so it came to pass that in this manner Broughton was introduced to the colonial way of doing things.

Broughton stood in no need of Mansfield's timely reminders. His own two eyes were sufficient. He read the attacks on Scott as they continued to the bitter end, and was present on the landing stage at the water's edge when an attorney delivered Scott Hall's parting gift, a summons to the retiring Archdeacon to appear the following week in an action to be heard in one of His Majesty's courts, Sydney. Scott preferred to board H.M.S. 'Success' and leave the dead to bury their dead. Nor did Broughton have long to wait before witnessing the spectacle of having one of his senior priests posted, not in the 'gazette' as in former days, but in the Australian for 'apparent nonchalance' at Mrs. Pittman's funeral.

Though the opposition press gave a little space to Broughton's presence in the colony, apart from a few innocuous remarks about his discourses being sensible and highly moral, it continued to cock an ear at what he said and kept an eye fixed on his movements. Its editors were keen to assess his prejudices and politics in order to know where he might stand in the event of renewed strife with the Administration. A chance, but false, rumour that the Archdeacon

29. Sydney Monitor, 3 October 1829.
30. Sydney Gazette, 24 October 1829.
31. Ibid., 27 October 1829 and Sydney Monitor, 3 October 1829.
32. Australian, 3 February, 1830.
33. Ibid., 4 November, 1829.
did not intend to take a seat on the Legislative Council flushed them into the open; and Broughton to his delight, or dismay, read a touching plea that the colony needed him very much in its politics:

An honest man is not one to be readily dispensed from a Colonial Council constituted as this is; and we trust that so long as the colony is condemned to have a body of men, over whose election the colonists have no choice or control, the present Archdeacon may continue to hold a seat with advantage to the community and therefore with credit to himself. 34

On 12 October the heavens relented and poured rains on the just and the unjust. Water flowed everywhere, through the streets and over drains: it filled up ditches and swept away the anxieties of the parched colony. 35 The people rejoiced to see the end of three years of heart-breaks and uncertainties, and the Governor, mindful of duty and decorum, proclaimed 12 November a public holiday so that the inhabitants of the colony, on their way to market, could call at a church and thank Almighty God for ending the severe drought and averting from the colony his threatened judgment. Even the Australian, calculating that there were 'solid benefits in store for all from the Almighty's change of heart', commended the Governor's gesture and urged its patrons to join in the spirit of the occasion. 36 Rarely before had the wolf and the lamb agreed to feed together in the House of the Lord, and Broughton, who was to preach the principal sermon of the day, before the chief officers of government assembled in the Church of St. James, could count on an unusually receptive

34. Ibid., 20 January, 1829.
35. Sydney Gazette, 15 and 20 October 1829.
36. Australian, 6 November 1829; see also Sydney Gazette, 14 November 1829.
congregation. It might not remain so for long; soon the soft earth would yield harvests, and the cattle grow fat by running creeks, the merchants gather the wool, and man again consume his days in vanity. Before that day returned, Broughton poured forth his vision of the wondrous ways of God.

It was just after mid-day when on Thursday 12 November, Broughton mounted the pulpit in St. James' Church and, in the lucid and balanced phrases characteristic of a scholar, announced as his text Isaiah 46:10; 'My counsel shall stand, and I will do my pleasure'. He spoke of the 'inseparable connection between obedience and prosperity' as God's way of making his pleasure prevail over man. This theme was pith and marrow to Israel's history; and the melancholy records of peoples, nations, and whole empires given up to punishment and decay as soon as they had proved themselves unqualified to fulfil the purposes of God proved, he said, that Israel's history was a paradigm of world history. No kingdom of the past had been excepted from this judgment, nor would any to come. So it behoved all people in every age to enquire into their elected destiny, fearful lest, ignoring their calling, they forfeit their prosperity eternally.³⁷

Then the preacher exploded with an exhilarating message.

³⁷ W.G. Broughton, The Counsel and Pleasure of God in the Vicissitudes of States and Communities. A Sermon, preached in the Church of St. James, Sydney, on Thursday, November 12, 1829, being the day appointed for a General Thanksgiving to Almighty God, in acknowledgment of His mercy in putting an end to the late severe drought, and in averting His threatened judgment from this colony. (Sydney, 1829) pp. 1, 3 and 9.
'If there be any present', he said,

...who have witnessed the exaltation of the English nation, and its gradual extension of power to the limits of the habitable world without ever considering this but as effected in the course of things, and not, as it assuredly is, by the particular and evident providence of the Lord, for the fulfilment of His own purposes; if such there be among us, let them I say, awake and take new view of passing events...\(^{38}\)

He told them of the greatest of all passing events; the astonishing extension of the English name to the east and to the west, to the north and to the south. He told them of the great event passing that very hour before their eyes; the extension of the English name to the shores of New South Wales as the resistless word of God incorporated yet another land into His grand design for redeeming the world. Why should a great continent left in darkness for so long be suddenly peopled by a new race, if it was not for some purpose? Why were vast tracts of land, desolate since the beginning of time, suddenly made to blossom like Eden, unless the Lord had commanded it? 'We are therefore to consider ourselves not as placed here accidentally, nor even for the fulfilment of a temporary purpose,' he told them all, for the design was too grand, 'but as conducted by the providence of God to bear our part in the execution of that eternal purpose which was laid in Christ Jesus before the world began.'\(^{39}\)

So much for the colony's beginnings. What could be said of its response? Here the preacher had a less felicitous tale to

\(^{38}\) Ibid., p. 10.
\(^{39}\) Ibid., p. 12.
recount; a tale of vice and lewdness, of drunkenness and unchastity, in almost every quarter of the settlement, so that the colony's predicament could be justly described as chosen of God but unfit. As with Israel of old, there was only one solution to this; first the Lord would visit the land with one of his four sore judgments, the sword, the noisome beast, the pestilence, or the famine, and allow a time for repentance. Should that fail to work a correction, He would then withdraw His favour, and allow the land to be given over to decay after whatever means it cared to fashion for itself. The rains, Broughton encouraged his congregation to understand, were more than water; they were the sign that the Lord had suspended His judgment and still wanted the colony to play a role in His great plan to have His glory cover the whole world:

   I discern with the plainness of demonstrative evidence, the final end of all that calamity which the sovereign Lord of all so lately threatened us. Well was it qualified to awaken among us those Christian dispositions in which we are all too manifestly wanting...It is the counsel and pleasure of God, I repeat, to raise up here a Christian nation.40

   The sermon lasted full fifty minutes. Broughton drained each to the limit in an effort to save the infant colony falling short of its destiny. Darling, who had invited men to hear it, had himself departed Sydney for a tour of the country before the day of fasting had arrived. But he later read the sermon and felt a wiser and a better man. For some time he had watched an evil principle take root in the colony and mature, corrupting one by one the press, the courts, the army, and almost every branch of civil

40. Ibid., p. 17.
life. He had tried to curb its extravagances only to meet with vexacious frustrations and outright humiliations. One judge opposed shackling the press; another agreed that it was improper even for a governor to impute unworthy motives to Mr. Wentworth; and, as for putting irons on poor Sudds and Thompson, almost everyone seemed to agree that that was no way to go about restoring discipline in the ranks of the militia.\textsuperscript{41} Was all this protesting just a healthy dose of liberty, such as every Englishman had a right to express, making its long delayed appearance or was it an evil principle at work?\textsuperscript{41a} If Darling had any misgivings, the great news of 12 November was that God felt the same way as the Governor. There was an evil spirit in the land. Darling wanted the whole colony and the Colonial Office to know this, and to know that God was on his side in doing battle against it; so he ordered that Broughton's sermon be published and put on sale throughout the colony.\textsuperscript{42}

Broughton would be indeed fortunate if he managed to arouse the interest and assistance of Darling in his work. The Colonial


\textsuperscript{41a} 'His Excellency's Reply to the Landed Proprietors and Merchants of New South Wales', 4 July 1829, Encl. No. 2 in Darling to Twiss, 7 July 1829, \textit{H.R.A.}, I. xv. 73.

\textsuperscript{42} For Darling's early appreciation of Broughton see Darling to Murray, 26 January 1830, \textit{H.R.A.}, I. xv. 345. For official patronage in publication see title page of pamphlet.
Office and its officers abroad had a very sorry record in the work of assisting forward the propagation of the Word of God. 'I fear the Lord has a controversy with us', the Reverend Robert Newton confessed after inspecting that record.  

And well might the Lord have a controversy with any Christian nation which had closed the doors of India to missionaries till 1813, and taken the black man from Africa to the West Indies only to sink him in a mire of degradation unknown elsewhere in the English speaking world. Behind this dismal record lay a tragic absence of vision. The Englishman's zeal for religious purity so valiantly protested in the sixteenth century remained largely a domestic affair. It went some distance into the lowlands of Scotland and across to Ireland, but it weakened in resolve every step it trod. It never took to the seas. A few individuals, a John Wesley in the eighteenth century, and a William Wilberforce or Robert Southey in the nineteenth, urged England's rulers to cast their eyes to further continents and carry into other hemispheres their zeal for that orthodoxy without which man shall perish everlastingly. 

46. For early nineteenth essays on this topic see Quarterly Review, vol. 32, 1825, pp. 1-40, and ibid., vol. 45, 1831, pp. 144-5. Southey was a sympathetic biographer of John Wesley and collaborated with Wilberforce in his parliamentary attack on British policy towards West Indian missions, P.D., first series, vol. 26, 1 July 1813, footnote to col. 1069-70.
England's rulers in church and state remained unmoved. Even that most zealous prelate Marsh, who prized all things English, denied that England's church had a greater responsibility abroad than 'the members of all other churches dispersed throughout the world'.

Broughton's vision of the divine invasion of the Pacific belonged neither to him alone nor to the people as a nation, but to a select few. The Reverend J.D. Lang had seen it before him and accepted the challenge on behalf of Scotland and the Presbyterian Church. Progress was slow, and when Broughton seized the challenge for England and its reformed Christianity he believed the work was about to begin. And yet, those who heard him preach of his prophetic vision mistook his purpose if they received his words as national flattery. He had taken his stand in the pulpit to stir their watchfulness, not to titilate their pride: to awaken them not to glory but to a grave responsibility and to a knowledge of the fearful consequences of neglecting it. What he had to say he had learned as much from meditating on the sands of Israel as in contemplating the condition of the globe. But for those who could read between the lines the sermon was more than a personal confession. It foreshadowed the principles by which they could expect to find the Archdeacon disposing of the powers of his office, in the church, in 'the Parliament of the country... (and) on the Governor's Privy Council'.

47. Marsh, Consequences, p. 117.
48. J.D. Lang, Narrative of the Settlement of the Scots Church, Sydney, New South Wales (Sydney, 1828), p. 1.
He would support nothing calculated to hinder the sanctification of the colony, but rather, like the prophets of Israel, denounce and oppose it with every fibre in his person. On 12 November 1829 before a public gathering in the colony Broughton stated his belief; the colony belonged to God. There were others, some present, who had been there longer than he had, and they were in the habit of regularly publishing a different conviction; Vox Populi, Vox Dei, they said. 50

Three weeks later Broughton had the chaplains riding into Sydney for his Primary Visitation. It too was held in St. James' Church and attended by all the first people in the colony, including this time the non-conformist clergy who nodded their approval as the Archdeacon charged his brother clergy in measured tone to abide close by the 'spirit of the Apostles and the views of the Reformers'. Set aside the modern trend to deliver general discourses from the pulpit, he said, and utter unceasingly this truth- that since Jesus Christ the Redeemer has paid an inestimable ransom for man's release no man, in or out of the colony, is at liberty any longer to live otherwise than in subjection to God's will. 'We hear it sometimes maintained that the preacher who thus frames his discourses with constant reference to one leading truth, must acquire a contracted style of thinking', he continued. 'Such apprehension I must consider

50. As printed on the title page of every edition of Sydney Monitor.
as founded either in prejudice or mistake.  

He charged them as pastors to strive for the honour of being chosen the family adviser in spiritual and temporal matters. To win this honour, he told them to be among their flocks during the week as habitually as they were over them on the sabbath. Their own districts were their first concern, but he reminded them of the remoter settlements where piety had decayed and the sabbath passed unobserved for want of a ministry; 'Much practical good I am satisfied may be done by periodical visits to such districts as lie beyond the reach of your regular and ordinary ministry'. He reminded them that as priests, they had been ordained for the guidance and instruction of other men and could expect their conduct to be narrowly and jealously observed. He welcomed that scrutiny and prayed that from every quarter he would hear of the diligence, the uncorruptness, the habitual piety, and of the edifying example of the clergy of the Established Church'.

He further charged the clergy to bestow their assiduous care and encouragement on the colony's parochial schools, the real source of Australia's future greatness and security so long as they continued to diffuse religious impressions and virtuous habits along with the rudiments of ordinary learning. What Scott had zealously established virtually single-handed and in the face of many difficulties,

51. W.G. Broughton, A Charge, delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of New South Wales, at the Primary Visitation, holden at Sydney, in the Church of St. James, on Thursday, the 3rd of December, 1829 (Sydney, 1830), pp. 9 and 10; Sydney Gazette, 5 December 1829.
52. Broughton, Charge 1829, pp. 17 and 34.
he hoped they together could maintain and expand with an equal zeal. With the mention of Scott's name he felt compelled to add a little more. Scott, like everyone else was liable to err, but after enquiry into his plans and achievements Broughton felt constrained to make a personal testimony in his favour; 'I do not hesitate to express my persuasion that a man of purer intention, stricter principle and less under the bias of self interest, never trod this shore'.

Finally he charged his clergy to have a special regard for two groups in the colony, its convicts and its original people. He asked for a keen ministry among the convicts so that as many as were victims of ignorance or some momentary weakness, rather than a settled malignity, might amend their unprofitable pasts and be restored to the community, not simply as servants, but as beloved brothers. No spectacle, he continued, had revolted him more at the time of his arrival, or since, than the condition of the aboriginal people. At best they remained in their original benighted and degraded state: all too often they had been reduced to a state of barbarian wildness by a fondness for intoxicating liquor, a habit they had imbibed from the Englishman's example. It was an appalling legacy for a half century of contact with a Christian people. It did


54. Broughton, *Charge 1829*, p. 27.
even less credit to a Christian nation, he said, that it should have abandoned, under the weight of failure and despair, all attempts at converting these natural occupants of the country. If the Christian religion had overcome the obstinate superstition of the Jews and the philosophic arrogance of the Gentiles, it could subdue the erratic habits of the Australian native. Despair was not a fitting sentiment for any Christian, and on this note he drew his Charge to a close:

Every advancement of the Christian religion, from its first origins to this day, has been effected in opposition to difficulties which, in a natural sense might be termed insuperable. Its excellency and its derivation from a heavenly source has been best demonstrated by surmounting such opposition.55

By and large Broughton had revealed himself content to follow the policies of his predecessor. He promised nothing new, nothing different, and seemed mainly concerned to encourage his brother clergy in a more diligent pursuit of their pastoral ministry, an emphasis Scott might well have encouraged him to adopt. By avoiding rash comment on the colony at large he had not succumbed to Scott's initial error, and if there was little sign of any enthusiasm for what he had said, there was none of that adverse criticism which had come close to driving Scott from the colony in 1825.56 It was, too, a less anxious, a more homely and a more amiable Broughton who spoke out on 3 December. A zeal for good works had replaced the earnestness of the prophet with its overtones of threatened judgment. The

55. Ibid., p. 29.
56. Sydney Gazette, 23 June and 18 September 1825.
difference did not pass unnoticed. He appeared amiable, pious, benevolent, and to have 'the happiness of the people sincerely at heart', the *Sydney Gazette* remarked. \(^57\) Behind that amiability Broughton had nevertheless managed to deliver a firm rebuke to Scott's critics and possibly even to have offended them a little. For some reason the opposition press snubbed the occasion. The *Australian* acknowledged that the Archdeacon had held his Visitation but, having devoted lavish space to an account of the guests and speeches of the St. Andrew's Day dinner and its toast list where the name of Lord Brougham was singled out for special mention as the champion of the people's education, the editor regretted that he had left himself no space to report what the Archdeacon had said. \(^58\)

In his charge the Archdeacon had managed to touch on one matter that was currently exciting renewed interest in the colony, the state of its education system. If, in Broughton's most sanguine estimate, Scott had managed to bring near to perfection a system of primary schools, neither Scott nor anyone else had been so fortunate as to secure the permanent foundation of one school of higher learning. In his original plans, sent down from Whitfield to London in 1824, Scott had proposed the erection of one centrally situated establishment of higher learning in each count\(y\). \(^59\) The Colonial Office approved the idea, the Governor gave it his enthusiastic support, Scott even had a

\(^{57}\) 2 February, 1830.  
\(^{58}\) 5 December 1829.  
\(^{59}\) 'A Plan for the permanent provision of the Church Establishment' (dated Whitfield, 30 March 1824) in *Despatches of the Governor of New South Wales 1823-1824*, vol. 5, pp. 742-3 (A1194, M.L.).
teacher lined up for the first school, one planned for Parramatta and another at Windsor, and all the text books sitting in a store in Sydney, but the project collapsed. Like so many other schemes it was denied access to funds. Yet bitter though Scott was over that, he frankly admitted the presence of another factor equally as disastrous, 'a strange perversion of character of the population of this colony, who seem generally to prefer persons of their own class to educate their children than the more respectable persons.'

Scott's failure to put his resources to work was the more regrettable because the Sydney Free Public Grammar School, set up by a group of public spirited colonists in November 1825, had collapsed at the end of 1826 for the want of a satisfactory teacher. Had the two groups combined, one good Grammar School may have come into being before 1830, but neither group seemed prepared to abandon its ideal (the one standing for the tradition of ecclesiastical control and the other for the more whiggish ideal of management being invested exclusively in the public sponsors of the school) so long as it was clear that each might succeed at some future date. If

60. Marsden to Coates, 12 September 1826 (Bonwick Transcripts, Missionary, Box 53, vol. 5, pp. 1694-6, M.L.); 'Copy of the Minute of the Venerable Archdeacon Scott submitting to the Trustees of the Clergy and School Lands the Establishment of a Grammar School at Windsor and two Exhibitions at the English Universities', dated 4 January 1828 (copy in Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.); Scott to Arthur, 5 September 1828 (Arthur Papers, vol. 13, M.L.).


their differences impoverished the provision for higher education in the colony, they had the comfort of knowing that the desire for it was insipid. In the meantime anything above primary education had to be bought at a number of academies, like Timothy Cape's Classical Seminary in King Street, or Captain Beveridge's Merchant and Naval Academy.

In February 1829 many of the masters of these private schools came under fire publicly for 'intellectual murder'. 'Latin, Greek, mathematics and other elements of a refined education', ran an editorial in the Sydney Gazette, 'are pompously professed to be taught by individuals in no degree qualified for an adequate execution of the task.' These remarks released a suppressed sense of outrage in the colony. Letters soon poured into the newspaper's office: some abused, by name, many of the colony's teachers and suggested that the newspaper itself perform a public duty and expose their chicanery for the benefit of all colonists; others wanted all teachers to be licenced; still others advocated the formation of citizens' inspection committees; finally the editor returned to the scene suggesting that the 'criminal negligence of parents is... the real gangrene in the vitals of the community'. We urged parents to enquire carefully before enrolling a child in a school, and thereafter to study its progress, and attend without fail the public examination at the end of the year.64

This episode served to focus attention on the inadequacies

63. 4 February and 16 March 1829.
64. Sydney Gazette, 24 February, 5 and 24 March 1829.
of the colony's higher education and stimulate enquiry into what other colonies were doing to meet their needs. The Reverend J.D. Lang had received a copy of the Prospectus of an impressive venture undertaken by the Dutch Reform Church in the Cape Colony just before Broughton delivered his Visitation Charge, and managed to persuade the editor of a newspaper to publish it. Whether Lang intended it or not, the editor took the liberty of putting the scheme on Broughton's doorstep; 'it would not be unreasonable to indulge the hope that with so enlightened and so liberal a director as the Venerable Archdeacon Broughton, the Clergy and School Corporation of this colony would appropriate a portion of their funds towards the salaries'. When two days later Broughton delivered his Charge without even a passing reference to higher education in any form the *Sydney Gazette* quietly took him to task. It agreed with Broughton that the colony certainly was not deficient in the lower branches of education, but reminded him of how lamentably poor it was in all means of developing the full enjoyments of the intellect. As things stood, the editor summed up the situation, the young had no prospect of growing up any different from 'the backwoodsman of America, dead to all that is worthy of immortal man, and engrossed by the one isolated sense of mere animal existence'.

It was no comfort to Lang or to the editor of the *Sydney Gazette*

67. 12 December 1829.
to learn, about the same time, that the Trustees of the Sydney Free Public Grammar School intended to try once again to re-establish their foundation. They had made two attempts in the last two years and neither succeeded. Moreover, the absence of any religious principle in its organisation made its value suspect to Christian gentlemen; 'highly as we prize intellectual cultivation we should be sorry to see it imparted after the model of ancient Greece or Rome, whose academic institutions...left the minds of their pupils to roam unchecked among the endless mazes of philosophy and atheism'.

These anxieties were relaxed a little on 19 December when the first news leaked out that the civil and ecclesiastical authorities were about to do something about higher education. Little information was available, but rumour had it that any schools set up would admit 'all ranks in the community, and all denominations within the wide pale of Christianity'. Lang immediately waited on Broughton to search out more particulars, and left pleased with what he learned. Broughton, too, was pleased to have the interest and co-operation of Lang. But few were more pleased with this turn in events than the editor of the Sydney Gazette who had given the Archdeacon such unstinting encouragement since the day of his arrival.

This editor was the Reverend Ralph Mansfield, a resolute and resourceful young man just thirty-one years of age, whom sorrow had managed to bow but not break; in less than ten years he had carried

68. Sydney Gazette, 12 December 1829.
69. Ibid., 19 December 1829.
70. Ibid.; see also Ibid., 21 January 1830.
to the grave five of his six children.\footnote{Vivienne Parsons 'Mansfield, Ralph', in \textit{Australian Dictionary of Biography}, vol. 2 (Melbourne, 1967), pp. 204-5.} Mansfield, a Wesleyan preacher at odds with his superiors as well as a journalist, was driven by a mixed and often antithetical set of ideas. Though he had earned the wrath of his superiors for disregarding Wesleyan etiquette by preaching in opposition to the Parish Church in his district, he publicly advocated the extension of Religious Establishments and the proliferation of colonial bishoprics as the only efficient means of Christianising new settlements.\footnote{Sydney Gazette, 22 September 1829.} Though an unrepentant Wesleyan, he believed the Church of England was rooted in 'the immovable basis of Scriptural Christianity' and fully able to stand 'the keenest investigation of reason and philosophy'.\footnote{Ibid., 30 August 1831.} He believed, too, that England's bishops were the divinely inspired leaders of the age in the struggle against infidelity.\footnote{Ibid., 5 February 1831.} He defended the Church's right to receive tithes, and thundered against all reforms that weakened the Church Establishment. 'Let the ark be demolished - let the Established Church be broken up', he preached to his readers, 'and of England it might truly be recorded, "Her Glory is departed".'\footnote{Ibid., 30 August 1831 and 15 March 1832.} A dissenter, yet he despised radicals as 'seven times heated Whigs'. He hailed Wellington as the saviour of the age and an aristocracy as the only secure basis for a society.\footnote{Ibid., 7 and 22 May 1829.} What gave him greatest
strength of all in 1829 was a firm conviction that in England, under
the guidance of men like Bishop Blomfield, Churchmen and Dissenters
had mended their differences and acknowledged only one common enemy
- infidelity. 78 Broughton, 'our present worthy and universally beloved
archdeacon' as he called him, was in this tradition, and Mansfield
put his paper at the Archdeacon's disposal, a favour the Archdeacon
was willing to accept and to use. 79

While Broughton discussed his plans and his friends congratulated
him on his initiative, the Trustees of the former Sydney Free Public
Grammar School acted quickly. They met on 14 January, renamed their
venture the Sydney College, and, with a covetous eye on the patriotic
sentiment only 26 January could provide and a wise eye on the spirit
of optimism that the rains had put into the commercial world, they
arranged to set the foundation stone of the new College in less than
two weeks, on the coming anniversary of the founding of the colony. 80

Nothing which happened that day could have convinced Broughton

78. Ibid., 5 February 1831.
79. Ibid 20 March 1832. There are two incidents which suggest a
close liaison between Broughton and Mansfield. On 21 January
the Sydney Gazette published Broughton's private circular to the
clergy about the new schools. Broughton probably gave it to
Mansfield to offset the publication of a Prospectus of the Sydney
College at the same time. There was at that time no prospectus for
the King's Schools. In 1831 when Lang was in public dispute over
his desertion from the Sydney College, Mansfield published an
account of his dealings with Broughton and the King's Schools which
only Broughton could have supplied, see Sydney Gazette, 13
December 1831.
80. The story of the revival of the venture which became the Sydney
College is told in Prospectus of the Sydney College; With a
Short Statement of the Proceedings of the Committee of
Management. (Sydney, 1830).
that he and the Sydney College Trustees should work together. The
day's celebrations began in the saloon of the Royal Hotel two hours
in advance of the time set for the ceremony. At about 11.45 a.m.,
when the gathering was about eighty strong, the Chief Justice arrived
and led them off in a procession which 'resembled one associated for
similar patriotic purposes in the purest days of Greek and Roman
Virtue'.\textsuperscript{81} Then on a one and a half acre site by the Domain, and
in a straight line between the Catholic Chapel and the racecourse,
the Chief Justice set the foundation stone of the Sydney College to
the accompaniment of a salute of twelve rifles.\textsuperscript{82} He told the
three hundred people gathered around that this college 'would be the
means... of forming dutiful subjects to the Mother Country; subjects
who would imitate her loyalty, her literature, her justice, and her
glory'. The people then stood, far too long for a hot sunny day
according to the \textit{Sydney Monitor}, while Dr. Lang, who had decided
against co-operation with Broughton, blessed the venture with
fervency and pathos, reminding those present that, if the Lord was
its builder, the College would be one means of delivering the heathen
in these uttermost parts of the earth into God's hands.\textsuperscript{83} Few
present cared for the heathen, and none but Lang looked upon the
College as a mission outpost in the heart of the Pacific, but to
them all it was a sound educational venture long overdue, a gift

\textsuperscript{81} \textit{Australian}, 27 January 1830.
\textsuperscript{82} R.S. Watsford, \textit{Sydney Grammar School from its Earliest Days}
(Sydney, 1924), pp. 8-9.
\textsuperscript{83} \textit{Sydney Monitor}, 27 January 1830.
from this generation to the next, and 'the best and grandest work this colony has been engaged in since the public meeting to petition Parliament for Trial by Jury'.

Broughton stayed away from the ceremony to attend a conveniently arranged meeting of the Executive Council. He did not disapprove of people with ideas differing from his own being active in the cause of education. This he made clear; 'I would wish distinctly to disclaim the assumption of any right to call individuals to account for the opinions they may entertain', he wrote to Lang, 'or to interfere in any way with the exposition of the principles on which they believe education may be best conducted'. He stayed away from the ceremony on the 26 January because he wished to avoid any appearance of giving public approval or commendation to a venture whose consequences he feared. Education, like that to be offered at the Sydney College, which fell only a little short of totally excluding religion from among its business, worked, in Broughton's estimate, an evil effect upon the community. The school by giving an appearance of laxity in religious teaching certified to its pupils that revealed truths were not things of supreme value worthy of close study, and, as a consequence, turned out young men defective in moral knowledge and satisfied to remain so. Then, as year by year

84. *Australian*, 27 January 1830; see also, *ibid.*, 2 January 1830.
85. Darling summoned the meeting for the crucial hour of 12 noon rather than the normal 2 pm., and the matters dealt with were routine. It also made for a fifth meeting that month which was two above the ordinary. See Minute No. 5, 26 January 1830, *Proc. Ex. C. (N.S.W.)*, C.O. 204/3.
the colony received into its adult population a new group of young men who knew little and cared little for moral excellence, the community would be confirmed in the corruption of its ways.86

The defenders of the College argued that each boy was provided with a Bible and time in which to read it, and that this was a sufficient provision in line with the grand principle of Protestant Christianity 'God is his own interpreter, and he will make it plain'. This allayed none of Broughton's fears. He viewed man in a strictly pessimistic light as a creature who loved vice better than virtue, and would seek where possible to excuse the delinquencies of the one rather than enforce the discipline of the other. The past was not without examples of how Scripture itself, abounding as it did with ambiguities and obscurities, could be artfully construed to yield just those excuses man desired for the covering over of his baseness. Broughton believed this practice would persist wherever the Bible was put into the hands of the young without accompanying instruction from elders schooled in an understanding of the highest notions of virtue in its pages. Ignorance of Scripture was to be deplored, but the exploitation of it in support of an evil cause was to be abhorred above all else. For reasons such as these Broughton confessed that he had opposed liberal trends in education in England, though he admitted they were winning fashionable approval there in many quarters. He felt himself bound to oppose them even more strongly in New South Wales, for, whereas England possessed many

well established institutions to counteract the ill effects of
the new style of ideas, the young colony possessed none. 'If
they', Broughton wrote of Sydney College and any other schools
built after the pattern of it, 'should ever obtain general
acceptance in this colony, (they) will render it, I venture to
predict, the most frightful moral spectacle that has ever been
exhibited upon earth.'

The day before Judge Forbes placed the foundation stone of
Sydney College in its allotted position, the Committee of the
Trustees of the Clergy and School Lands forwarded to Darling
detailed copies of plans for two other schools of higher education;
the first, it hoped, in a system of establishments that would one
day be spread over the whole colony. The Committee pointed out
that the schools would be under the direction and control of the
Established Church, as provided for in Section XXVIII of the
Corporation's Charter. And lest any should doubt the wisdom of
that provision, the Committee, five of whose members were laymen,
testified that in their opinion it was still to be reckoned as the
most effective means for securing good order in the colony.

The idea that Broughton should, so soon after his arrival
busy himself in setting up Grammar Schools belonged to the Colonial

87. Ibid.; see also Sydney Gazette, 16, 19, 23 and 26 January 1830,
and Australian, 2 and 22 January 1830.
88. Darling to Murray, 10 February 1830 and Enclosures, H.R.A.,
89. 'Plan for the Formation and Regulating of the King's Schools
Preparatory to the Institution of a College in New South
Wales', Encl. No. 1 in ibid., p. 358.
Office rather than to Broughton. Since the suggestion had been made to him at the time of his appointment, he probably arrived in the colony with the plans well in hand. Once in New South Wales his principal task was to measure the support such schools would receive. He undertook this as early as 8 December 1829 and despatched a circular letter to the clergy enlisting their aid in taking a local census of likely candidates from the 'good families' in their areas. Broughton stressed 'good families' because he had read in Scott's melancholy reflections on the failure of the Corporation's original plans for a Grammar School, a suggestion that the fee-paying upper classes in the colony had objected to their children mixing with the sons of humble or immoral parents, brought to the school by scholarships, for fear of being contaminated by the association. In less than a month, the chaplains returned figures which encouraged Broughton to believe that 'very few parents would hesitate to avail themselves on their children's behalf of the means of good instruction, if the same were made easy of attainment both as to locality and expense'. Scott's enquiries and Scott's experiences had told a strangely different story. But Broughton was confident that with goodwill at the Colonial Office and the support of a local Committee of the Trustees, six of whose nine members were

91. A copy of the circular letter is in *Church and Schools Corporation Minute Book, No. 3, 1829-1830*, pp. 216-8 (Ms. No. 7/2704, N.S.W. S.A.).
92. Scott to Darling, 1 September 1829, Encl. in Darling to Murray, 18 October 1829, *H.R.A.*, I. xv. 220-1.
members also of the Legislative Council, a vigorous new beginning could be made.  

Then for a moment on 26 January his optimism faltered. From out of the new shadows cast by the setting sun that evening, there crept into his mind a haunting doubt that the economically minded men at the Colonial Office might rest satisfied that their concern for higher education in New South Wales no longer need exist now that the foundation stone of the Sydney College was fixed in its place. Before retiring that evening Broughton took to his study and wrote Governor Darling a long letter; a supplement to the plans recently submitted by the Corporation, in which he set out a number of arguments for the colony being put in possession of the type of school the Trustees of the Corporation had proposed. Broughton hoped that, by arming Darling with as many good reasons as he could construe, the Governor would be better able to state a favourable case to 'induce His Majesty's Government at home to lend the sanction and support which are requisite for carrying into effect and consolidating such a system'.

The syllabus of Sydney College, with its provision for a museum and a department of natural philosophy, and the South African scheme that Lang favoured, both looked set to follow the path of the

94. Members of the Committee of the Trustees of the Clergy and School Lands also members of the Legislative Council of New South Wales were, W.G. Broughton, A. McLeay, M.C. Cotton, W. Lithgow, R. Campbell and R. Jones.
96. Ibid., p. 362.
modern theorists who advocated enlarging education with a liberal study of the sciences. A widespread school-boy interest in science was in evidence at Shelley's Eton as early as 1809; and by 1830 the itinerant science teacher, with his travelling laboratory, moving around from school to school delivering series of lectures to pupils at a guinea a head, was an accepted part of the general school scene. The man of science, however, was not without a flaw in his reputation. If he looked to have a head of gold, stored with the pure knowledge of a wonderful world around and above him, he appeared all too often to possess the clay feet of a radical. His stock in trade was often mere cleverness; sometimes applied with Mephistophelean grandeur as in Shelley's Queen Mab. This prophetic epic, which in the 1820's became the bible of the Owenites, professed, in all sincerity to foretell from a study of tropical fossils and the slope of the earth's axis, the approach of another age in which men would live free from priest, king, and the 'icy chains of custom'. When the itinerant science teacher turned up at Rugby and Arnold sent him packing, it was a sign that, in some quarters, it had been decided that a premature acquaintance with science seriously threatened the proper development of a boy's

97. Prospectus of Sydney College, p. 10; for the syllabus of the South African College, see Sydney Gazette, 5 December 1829.
98. The cleavage between the churchly and scientific temperaments in this period is discussed in J. Barrell, Shelley and the Thought of His Time (New Haven, 1948) pp. 69-70.
1. Shelley, 'Queen Mab' canto I, line 127 and Shelley's notes on 'Queen Mab', Shelley. Poetical Works, pp. 764 and 803-34.
It was the Archdeacon's opinion that schools should do two things well, exercise a boy's reasoning powers and instil in him the habits of patient investigation. The study of science did neither, it aimed simply at stocking a boy's mind with a great variety of facts, and as a result the lad left school with a well trained memory but a poor sense of judgment. That was a disaster, Broughton said, both intellectually and morally:

The learner, being thus enabled to make a display of information, is elevated in his opinion of his own powers, and experience proves that persons, so educated, are prone to contravene all established opinions, to despise the authority of former times, and to decide without any hesitation upon points which have exercised for Ages the minds of the most reflective men.3

Broughton feared that the 'disposition to dogmatise upon questions relative to Government and Religion', the spirit of the Shelleys, the Godwins and the Owens, was already in embryo in the colony and needed to be checked. Broughton advised Darling that the system of classical studies long established in the Public Schools of England, perhaps with a little more mathematics, for Broughton was a good product of Cambridge, would provide some measure of restraint. At the very least, it would ensure that before the young took off in imaginative flights of their own they would have spent a considerable time contemplating the wisdom of their fathers, and perhaps, happily, have learned to respect it.4

4. Ibid.
With thoughts such as these Broughton tried to show that, so long as men treasured the spirit of English institutions, the presence of Sydney College confirmed rather than disposed of the need for the Corporation to put one of its colleges in the same town in opposition to it. He proposed building there a school to cater for 100 day scholars. The second, a mixed day and boarding establishment, was to be strategically placed at Parramatta, for no less a purpose than fostering the growth of a class of landed gentry. In his tour of the County of Cumberland, early in January 1830, Broughton had learned of the levelling effect of life in the interior where the uncertainties of distance and isolation made each man's closest neighbour his most needed friend, whether a property owner, a hired labourer, or an assigned convict servant. This constant mixing of the classes augured ill for the future of the colony. 'In too many instances', he wrote of that class which would inherit the large properties and occupy future stations in the country, 'I have heard of their sacrificing all their respectability and influence by associating habitually with their own convict servants. Such a forgetfulness of what is due to themselves and society, I need

5. For place and size of the schools, see 'Plan prepared by the Venerable Archdeacon Broughton, upon which to form Grammar Schools and eventually a College in New South Wales', Sub. encl. No. 1 in Darling to Murray, 10 February 1830, H.R.A., I. xv. 359; Broughton to Darling 4 February 1830, Encl. No. 3 in Darling to Murray, 10 February 1830, ibid., p. 366-7.

scarcely remark, could not occur, if their minds were duly cultivated. 7

Broughton saw the future of New South Wales through English eyes: he had none other through which to see it. The peace and sobriety of England rested on the willingness of the gentry, small and great, to serve on juries, act as Justices of the Peace and magistrates, and to sit in the House of Commons. 8 The present generation of property owners in New South Wales had few of these responsibilities but, with a Bill providing for trial by jury in civil cases almost through the Legislative Council, and further agitation for some form of elected Assembly constantly in the air, their sons could hardly escape some measure of it. 9 To prepare them Broughton had first to get them away from their home environment, a proposal Scott had strongly advocated, 10 and then by filling their minds with sound learning awaken a yearning for excellence that would flow into good government. The establishment at Parramatta was just for this purpose.

Since Broughton saw his schools as of decisive importance for the general welfare of the colony, he felt bound to do everything

---
9. Sydney Gazette, 20 October 1829; Australian, 10 February 1830.
possible to make them attractive to all boys, whose parents' position or wealth set them apart as potential leaders in the community, irrespective of their religious backgrounds. Accordingly, he stipulated that a willingness to abide by the school regulations would be the one qualification for enrolment. These regulations included attendance at daily morning prayer, attendance at a place of worship on Sundays, and participation in classes of general religious instruction. There would be no religious tests, no subscriptions, and no compulsory classes in confessional religious teaching. 'Every individual, maintaining a good character and a correct behaviour', Broughton promised, 'shall be at liberty to avail himself of the means of instruction...for any period of time.'

Though the repeal of the Test and Corporation Act and the Emancipation of Catholics made it no longer possible to force the Established Church on the future ruling classes, Broughton was determined to do everything in his power to make certain that New South Wales had at least had a general Christian Establishment. This became the guiding principle of the schools, and in abandoning themselves to it the Trustees were conscious of a breach with the general tradition of the past where Church Schools existed to train up the young in loyalty to a specific religious body. On the other hand the Trustees did not abandon all hope of building up a strong Established Church in the colony. Rather, when faced with the

11. 'Plan prepared by the Venerable Archdeacon Broughton...' Sub-encl. No.1 in Darling to Murray, 10 February 1830, H.R.A., I.xv.358.
alternative of remaining exclusive and possibly driving many into the nurseries of the infidel, or becoming liberal and retaining them, the Trustees 'considered it the soundest policy to trust the extension of the Established Church to the influence of a general persuasion of her desire to promote the good of all', and be liberal.  

Though liberal, the schools were intended for 'the sole honour of Almighty God...by training up the rising generation and all succeeding generations in this Colony forever in the Faith of Jesus Christ'. And so religion became an indispensable element in their constitution. To the ninety-five or so Jews and nineteen pagans resident in the colony, as reckoned in November 1828, this was doubtlessly unacceptable and illiberal, but by and large Broughton did manage to make the schools, in the words of his fellow Trustees, 'as little exclusive as the very nature of the case would permit'. His proposals were more liberal than Scott's. The first Archdeacon had insisted that in higher education, as well as in primary, the National System was to be followed, which meant using the Book of Common Prayer and its Catechism as texts for general study. Broughton avoided this without capitulating to the opposite point of view which simply used the Bible as a general text. Instead,

12. 'Plan for the Formation and Regulating of the King's Schools...', Encl. No. 1, ibid., p. 358.
13. 'Plan prepared by the Venerable Archdeacon Broughton...', Sub-encl. No. 1, ibid., p. 358.
14. 'Third Report on Receipt and Expenditure in the Colonies and Foreign Possessions', P.P., 1830-31, iv, (64), 85.
15. 'Plan for the Formation and Regulating of the King's Schools...', Encl. No. 1 in Darling to Murray, 10 February 1830, H.R.A., I.xv, p. 358.
he carefully chose a number of books 'expository of the Holy Scriptures', like Gastrell's *Christian Institutes* which arranged passages from scripture under selective headings or Tomline's *Introduction to the Bible*. There was only one catechetical work, Archbishop Leighton's *Short Catechism*, drawn up late in the 1660's to win Scottish approval for an episcopal system. It was quite inoffensive:

Q. What doth the Lord's Supper signify and seal?
A. Our spiritual nourishment and growth in Him, and transforming us more and more into His likeness, by commemorating His death, and feeding on His body and blood under the figures of bread and wine.

Q. What is required to make fit and worthy communicants of the Lord's Supper?
A. Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and repentance towards God, and charity towards all men.

These works were to be read in class, not simply at special times set apart for religious instruction, but 'sedulously and systematically combined with the course of study'.

In the upper years Broughton shifted the boys' attention away from Scripture to Christian apologetics, and in particular to the works of William Paley, an eighteenth century Divine whose

17. 'Plan for the Regulation of the "King's Schools" in Sydney and Parramatta, and for settling the Course of Study to be pursued therein', Sub-encl. No.2 in Darling to Murray, 10 February 1830, *H.R.A.*, I. xv.360; 'Proposed Course of Study and Instruction, Sub-encl. No.3, *ibid.*, p. 361.
writings/sufficiently acceptable to be seriously put forward as a foundation for an agreed religious syllabus at the new University of London.\textsuperscript{20} In Paley's \textit{Natural Theology}, Broughton wanted the boy's mind opened to an inspection of the many 'subtle and appropriate mechanisms' that kept all things, whether in heaven, on earth, or under the earth, in a wonderful and harmonious order; and to answer Paley's questions, Is there evidence of design? Can there be a design without a designer? Contrivance without a contriver?\textsuperscript{21} Should the boy agree with Paley that there was good evidence for a God of Creation, Broughton then sent him, again in Paley's company, to the \textit{Horae Paulinae} and its intricate arguments designed to demonstrate that the historical records of Christ in the Epistles of St. Paul were not fabricated tales but accounts that bore every mark of the genuine historical document. If genuine, then worthy of the boy's consideration.\textsuperscript{22} This scheme, far from seeking to indoctrinate the boy sought, in Paley's words, to 'add one thread to that complication of probabilities by which the Christian history is attested.'\textsuperscript{23} Broughton hoped that the end product of all this would be a boy with a lively faith. Should this fail he could nevertheless guarantee that the lad's reasoning powers had been well exercised, and that his knowledge of things biological, astronomical, geological and botanical matched that of a boy trained in a more deliberately scientific syllabus.

\textsuperscript{23.} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 243.
Yet in Broughton's scheme all this would be gained in the pursuit of things supernatural. By this means he hoped to fulfil his promise, that education in the Corporation's schools would be at once liberal and Christian.

Broughton, perhaps unwisely, chose texts exclusively by Divines of the Established Church. He nevertheless scrupulously avoided all temptation to seek an advantage for the views of his own party. William Paley was an extreme liberal, a latitudinarian who advocated the abolition of Subscription and left little doubt in his strictly theological writings that he tacitly regarded many points of orthodoxy as superfluous. A most charitable commentator assessed him as 'nothing like a modern Socinian...something more than an ancient Arian; but... the precise shade of his creed cannot be determined by us and, perhaps had not been determined by himself.'

In Broughton's reckoning he belonged in the company of Bishop Hoadley and William Hey, both of whom he had marked down in his Diary on board the ship 'John' as sceptics of varying degrees. But like many others who hesitated at his theology Broughton found Paley's strictly apologetic works useful as a defence of the faith against the rationalists.

was a Scottish prelate of the Restoration who had advocated 'lengthening the cords and stretching out the curtains of the episcopal frame, as to take in all the covenanters who were not implacable recusants'. 27 He could not be classed as rigid or exclusive. Yet another, Bishop Porteus, was a strict evangelical. 28 Only with Bishop Tomline, his former patron at Winchester, did Broughton have any real affinity. Yet Tomline's book stood squarely on its merits. It had established itself as a classroom classic and run into sixteen editions by the time Broughton put it in his syllabus. And even here Broughton moved circumspectly. Tomline's work appeared in two volumes, one on Scripture and the other on Church doctrine. 29 Broughton selected only the first for the King's Schools. Lang, for one, may not have liked the predominance of episcopal authors, but as an attempt to provide 'instruction in doctrine and evidences to the extent in which they are admitted by nearly all denominations' Broughton's selection succeeded fairly well. 30

The Archdeacon showed that in the two hours of instruction

for children of the Established Church things would be very different. He set for them texts by Lancelot Andrews, a former master of Pembroke College and champion of the religious policies of James I, and the non-juror Bishop Ken. This instruction was to take place at a separate hour, and parents could protest (provided they did so at the time of enrolment) that learning about the history of the Reformation, the doctrines, ordinances and discipline of the Established Church, would interfere with the religious principles they desired their sons brought up on, and have them exempted.\footnote{Plan for the Regulation of the "King's Schools" in Sydney and Parramatta..., Sub-encl. No.2 in Darling to Murray, 10 February 1830, \textit{ibid.}, p. 361.}

\begin{quote}
Broughton anticipated some annoyance with his proposal to restrict the mastership of each school to a clergyman of the Established Church.\footnote{Broughton to Darling, 26 January 1830, Encl. No.2 in Darling to Murray, 10 February 1830, \textit{ibid.}, p. 364.} The provision, however, followed a practice in English Public Schools; and, as the \textit{Edinburgh Review} noted, it had not proved too offensive to Dissenting families judging from their willingness to send generation after generation of their sons to them.\footnote{\textit{Edinburgh Review}, vol. 34, 1820, p. 250.} Moreover, the voice of radical reform which had questioned so much, rarely queried the propriety of retaining the clergy as the nation's teachers. Jeremy Bentham actually recommended it. He regarded firmly that an introduction to moral sanctions was as essential a part of education as reading and writing, he thought the clergy would in the end be the most apt teachers.\footnote{M.P. Mack, \textit{Jeremy Bentham. An Odyssey in Ideas 1748-1792} (London, 1962), pp. 303 and 314.} Henry
Brougham also decided that the clergy should stand at the helm of his new system of schools, partly because they were the only body of teachers available and partly because no other group had demonstrated such proven ability to the satisfaction of the state. Moreover, the clergy were conveniently part of an established system whose disciplinary heads sat in the House of Lords and were therefore open to a measure of parliamentary control. Broughton did not try to argue his case any differently:

I am at a loss to discover any other class of man, concerning whose character and attainments we can have more satisfactory assurance than we possess respecting the clergy of the Church of England, or any who are more entitled to expect general confidence, than they, who, in the office of established Instructors, already enjoy the confidence of the State.

The Established Church could hope to reap an advantage from this arrangement and Broughton doubtlessly leaned on it as one indirect means for extending the influence of the Established Church. But he was painfully aware that the argument could cut the other way should a bad choice of Masters be made, a phenomenon not without frightening precedent in the colony. The Master of each school, he insisted, must be learned and pious, but prudent, temperate and forbearing as well, and warned Darling that 'any deviation from these proprieties, ... would quickly forfeit the confidence and good opinion of the jealous community... and the entire scheme will be rendered abortive.'

However acceptable the schools were made in every other respect Broughton knew from his own returns, and the legacy of information left behind by Scott, that they would only be patronised provided they were 'of easy attainment both as to locality and expense'. Scott never intended that education in the colony should be provided free except to the extremely poor, in which case he was prepared to use the Corporation's funds to subsidise talent to its limit. In the end the general resistance to education forced Scott to change this at the primary level; but up to the day of his departure he resisted all moves to maintain a free Grammar School from the resources of the Corporation. As a result, higher education in the Corporation's Grammar Schools was to cost from £30 to £100 a year for boarders, and £14 to £30 for day scholars, depending on the level of education reached. When Broughton announced boarders' fees of £28 a year and only £8 for day scholars, the Sydney Gazette hailed this as 'contributing more than any other

39. 'A Plan for the permanent provision of the Church Establishment' in *Despatches of the Governor of New South Wales 1823-1824*, vol.5, p. 742 (A1194, M.L.); Scott to Clergy of Van Diemen's Land, 18 February 1825 (*Scott Letter Book*, vol. 1, M.L.). Scott was forced to provide free primary education for children of 8 years and later 10 years, see Scott to Clergy, 5 February 1827 (*ibid.*), and Scott to Hamilton, 27 August 1828 (*Scott Letter Book*, vol. 2, M.L.). Scott was in line with English thought and practice as shown in evidence of Edward Wakefield, 'Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee appointed to enquire into the Education of the Lower Orders of the Metropolis', *P.P. 1816, iv*, (427), 40-4; *Edinburgh Review*, vol. 34, 1820, pp. 240-3.
cause to the advancement of Australia'. 41 In a colony where a man's labour returned him three shillings and ten pence a day, as much as he could earn in a whole week in Lancashire where, too, meat and bread cost twice as much, he could afford three shillings a week to send his son to a good school. 42 'Education bids fair to be easy of attainment', the newspaper continued; at least for those who did not squander their gold on liquor and dice. Broughton's fees were about half the £50 to £60 normally being asked by private educationalists to prepare a boy for college. 43

To achieve this low figure Broughton relied on the Colonial Office agreeing to pay the Master a basic salary of £150, a provision Scott had come to recognise as essential but never seems formally to have recommended. To make the proposition palatable at the economically minded Colonial Office, Broughton suggested making the Masters official assistant chaplains to help with Sunday work in the larger parishes where some of the older chaplains were growing somewhat feeble with age. For the remainder of their income the Masters had to rely on incentive payments in the form of a set proportion of each pupil's fees. Should the Sydney school happily attract a pupil to each of its 100 desks, the Master there

42. The comparison was made in *Sydney Gazette*, 22 May 1830.
could anticipate a healthy income of £950 a year; a sufficient sum, the Archdeacon felt, to entice good talent from schools in England.  

Broughton asked Darling to press hard the Corporation's request for royal patronage of the schools. If successful New South Wales could one day be studded with Grammar Schools honouring the House of Hanover much as venerable foundations were to be found all over England honouring the name of the founders of England's modern Grammar Schools, Edward VI and others of the House of Tudor; 'a design', in Broughton's imagination, 'calculated... to have a powerful effect in preserving this colony for a long period of years in cheerful dependence upon the crown of Great Britain'. The King's name would also enhance the status of the schools and help attract the class of boy Broughton wanted, a not inconsiderable point in view of the competition of the Sydney College. Moreover, it would permit Broughton to use the name 'The King's Schools', a title attractive for sentimental reasons; it was reminiscent of his own school at Canterbury, his happy days there, and of the ideal symbolised in its presence by the great cathedral turning out men for service in Church and State.

There was more in the idea than mere sentiment. The name, the 'King's Schools', had a timely ring about it which Broughton

44. Broughton to Darling, 4 February 1830, Encl. No.3 in Darling to Murray, 10 February 1830, H.R.A., I.xv. 366-7.
45. Broughton to Darling, 26 January 1830, Encl. No.2 in Darling to Murray, 10 February 1830, ibid., p. 365. The tradition that the Tudors were benefactors of education was not challenged till the end of the nineteenth century, see Joan Simon, 'A.F. Leach and the Reformation', British Journal of Educational Studies, vol. 3, 1955, pp. 128-43.
told Darling was 'essential to express their true design'. This could have puzzled Darling. In 1830 there were few virtues adorning the royal name of George IV that seemed of any obvious use to Broughton. But the King's friends insisted that whatever the monarch's other failings 'his character was never tainted with any unprincely vices'. Certainly self-indulgent and very extravagant, but never once had he tried to make the companions of his youth the ministers of his empire, as other kings had, and on succeeding to the throne he had followed the policies of his father. This meant firmly maintaining, in the face of all opposition, the strong ties between Church and State. In Broughton's eyes this was part of the ideal duty of a Christian monarch; 'principles and probity', he had once written, '...when banished from the world, should find their resting place in the hearts of Kings', and he believed that English Kings, despite their grave personal weaknesses, had not been found wanting in England's hours of need. The nineteenth century seemed no exception. In the 1820's when the materialist spirit of the age had succeeded in raising up a temple of erudition about as much dedicated to Christian learning as the universities of modern Constantinople, the King had headed a drive to put up another in direct opposition to it. The infidels called

46. Broughton to Darling, 26 January 1830, Encl. No.2 in Darling to Murray, 10 February 1830, op. cit., p. 365.
47. Annual Register, 1830, p. 132.
48. Ibid., pp. 133-5.
theirs, the University of London: the other took the name of King's College. Broughton wanted the King's name attached to the Corporation's schools to signify that the King had extended to the Dominions his patronage of the cause which sustained in unity Christian and secular learning.

When Darling read and thought about the material submitted to him by Broughton and the Trustees he agreed that it was good and sensible. Broughton had every reason to expect that the Colonial Office would also find his plans fully acceptable. They were no more exclusive than the provisions of Brougham's Bill of the 1820's which was the product, not of a Tory, but of a liberal Whiggish mind. Though Brougham dealt with primary education and Broughton with higher education, the underlying problems facing the two men were strikingly similar. Each wanted to bridge a dangerous gap in an incomplete system of education: both believed that only government funds could do it, and that this meant being satisfied with one system for the whole country: neither was prepared to abandon the religious content of education to avoid sectarian conflict; 'If the legislation did not secure for them a religious education', Brougham told the House of Commons in defence of his bill, 'they (the legislators) did not, in his opinion, half execute their duty'. The problem was to discover a means of

achieving this which neither undermined the security of the Establishment on the one hand, nor afflicted an injustice on the Dissenters on the other. Brougham's solution was to allow the Established Church to supervise the schools but by law to remove all religious sectarian material from the syllabus. This, too, was Broughton's solution.

Mansfield thanked the Archdeacon in the *Sydney Gazette* for providing an academic institution which Presbyterians and Dissenters could use without sacrificing their consciences, and which was solidly Christian but without signs of bigotry or exclusiveness. 'Further than this', he concluded, 'they could not expect an Episcopalian body to go'. There were some, however, who expressed a fear that things would go further; 'It is not said indeed that the whole education will necessarily be Episcopalian; but it is too evidently implied and understood to be doubted for a moment'. The Shareholder of the Sydney College who uttered this fear, though he had not seen the details of the syllabus of the school, could not understand how an institution under the management of an Archdeacon, with ordained priests as masters, could escape being dominated by the principles of the Church of England.

Over all the plans for the King's School received little adverse criticism when first revealed. Their publication coincided

55. *Sydney Gazette*, 21 January 1830.
56. *Sydney Gazette*, 23 January 1830 ('Shareholder' to Editor).
with the passage of an Act restricting the rights of newspapers and found the press too busy, decking itself in black and bewailing yet another attempt to rifle it of the liberty which was its life, to turn much thought to education. Hall recovered before his competitors, and found sufficient space between black borders to assure the public that, despite the Archdeacon's plans, Sydney College would still remain the choice of the truly pious, though not of the intolerant, the bigoted, the narrow or the unapostolical. 'Worthy Mr. Broughton's High Church college', he observed, 'is better for such old fashioned folk who are a century behind the rest of the world in religious and political light.' Hall was not simply being rude. He genuinely liked Broughton and was deeply disappointed with the Archdeacon's proposal for a second school in Sydney. For some reason, and being a Shareholder in the Sydney College he ought to have known better, Hall believed Broughton had intended supporting the Sydney College until dissuaded from doing so by the resident 'colonial priestcraft' who had been taken in by the Bishop of London's cry of 'the Church in danger'. Broughton's behaviour was a clear case of meekness dissolving into timidity. Hall could not censure so human a failure. The best of men had their weaknesses; and Broughton, to his amazement, found Hall, in his hour of disappointment, hanging

59. In later years when Hall turned a bitter pen against the Church Establishment he constantly professed respect for Broughton's character, see *ibid.*, 7 April 1832 and 24 July 1833.
the Archdeacon's portrait in a gallery of colonial heroes. For the onlookers he had prepared a touching speech. 'This gentleman's character', he said in praise of the Archdeacon, 'for true and undefiled religion stands so high, that, as charity covers a multitude of sins, so his sterling worth as a real man of God, converts his very weakness into amiabilities. Thus it was with Macquarie - thus it was with Brisbane - thus it is with Mr. Broughton.'

Broughton had never entertained the liberal views towards Sydney College which Hall imagined, though it is possible that the Trustees of the old Grammar School may have had a hope that Broughton would supply the interest and the backing they had wanted from Scott, but which Scott had denied them. When Broughton showed no interest in their scheme the Trustees forged ahead taking heart from the fact that rains had changed the times and might loosen men's pockets. Yet if Broughton had disappointed the Trustees of the Sydney College, and Hall in particular, he had himself received a severe blow to his own hopes, when, in the early weeks of January 1830, Lang switched his support from the King's Schools to the Sydney College.

Broughton and Lang enjoyed a relationship sufficiently cordial and sympathetic for the Archdeacon to have wanted him on the board of management of the King's Schools. At one stage the two men had exchanged opinion about Christian education and found

60. Ibid., 13 March 1830.
themselves in total agreement. There was something kindred in their spirits too. Lang shared Broughton's vision of the colony's destiny under divine Providence to give laws, language, civilisation and the Christian religion to the Eastern world; and that great bulk of Calvin's thought, which Broughton found essential to the Christian faith, drew both men into an overwhelming awareness that their God was one who would destroy what remained unconverted by the day of visitation. It came, then as a profound shock to Broughton to discover, on opening the pages of the *Sydney Gazette*, that Lang had joined in the proceedings on 14 January at the Pultney Hotel.

Broughton had treated Lang rather poorly. Though the two men had discussed the schools' venture in general, Broughton never divulged any of its particulars to Lang, and while he spoke in broad terms of members of other denominations sharing in the management of the schools he did not confide to Lang that his name was in fact on the list of the prospective board of management. Lang, possessed of goodwill towards the venture but without first-hand knowledge of its workings or of any guaranteed place in its government, found himself, so he alleged, easily persuaded by other


62. Broughton read the Calvinist theologian, Elisha Cole, and commented: 'I find in him indeed so much in which we all agree as to impress upon me very forcibly the justice and propriety of Bishop Horsley's caution, that in attacking Calvinism take care not to wound our common Christianity'; see Broughton, *'John' Diary*, 3 July 1829.

63. Broughton to Lang, 16 January 1830, *op.cit.*
Presbyterians that there were no sound liberal principles in the scheme at all. Broughton might himself be of a liberal frame of mind but what would guarantee that his successor would be? Presbyterians might share in the management, but from the secrecy enveloping the preparation of the schools could they confidently expect this to amount to a genuine influence over their affairs? Despite Broughton's professed goodwill, Presbyterians feared they were to remain unequal partners of the Established Church and be once again required 'to reduce themselves to the character of mere puppets in her train'.

In the first weeks of January 1830, whilst Broughton was away in the country, Lang said eyes were opened to all this and he resolved to resist it. He had come to New South Wales to secure an honourable place for Scottish Presbyterianism and had taken one governor to task publicly for grossly neglecting it in favour of the other established church in Great Britain. He now determined in the same vein to vigorously oppose Broughton's attempt to exert Episcopal control over higher education, for that was what he saw the scheme amounting to.

In Marsden's view Lang was a young Presbyterian minister without patience, perseverance, or experience, all too hastily set on a public career. He was just thirty-one years of age, eleven years Broughton's junior, and certainly not one to accept

64. Lang, *New South Wales*, vol.2, p.344.
a subordinate role where a more eminent one beckoned. When he first departed from Broughton he thought of launching a Presbyterian school himself, but Darling scotched the plans by refusing a grant of land, as he was bound to under new instructions received from the Colonial Office. Lang next courted the Trustees of the Sydney College, found them surprisingly receptive to a number of suggested changes, mainly to do with an adequate provision for prayer and Bible reading, and decided to throw his lot in with them. Before long he prided himself on having plucked higher education from the grip of 'the exclusives and the incapables', the Established Church, and the bunch of indolent Trustees who had ruined the first Grammar School. Moreover he found riding between the Chief Justice and Sir James Jamison at the head of the procession on 26 January a more dignified pastime than waiting around in the ante-chamber to Broughton's study. The loss of Lang's co-operation robbed Broughton of a good

67. The Sydney Free Public Grammar School (the unsuccessful antecedent to the Sydney College) made no provision for religious teaching and the Australian urged that policy on the Trustees of the Sydney College. 'In lieu of Bible and Testament, we are of opinion that good sound moral and philosophical lectures...would in their consequence to society be far more advantageous than the task of gabbling over occult scraps of Scripture'; Australian 21 January 1830. See also ibid., 2 January 1830. The Sydney College provided for a daily prayer and weekly Bible reading.


educational adviser and the best opportunity he had of putting a tolerant religious aspect on the schools. But he lost a good deal more than this. The Presbyterian predeliction for finding a Laud in every set of gaiters had convinced Lang that Broughton, if personally liberal, was not part of a liberal system, and was therefore a foe to be closely watched. Lang's co-operation was exchanged only for his enmity.

Lang later expressed misgivings over Broughton's concentration on the classics. One of the highlights in his own education had been the discovery of science at Glasgow College, and part of the attraction of the South African College was its attempt at weaving science into general education. This was a modern trend, as Broughton readily admitted. Yet Broughton's own syllabus was misrepresented if merely considered as standing firm on the past. He advocated change, but of a different kind. The changes he sought were being developed in England and increasingly associated with the name of Thomas Arnold.

Thomas Arnold went to Rugby to change the face of English education about the time Broughton came to New South Wales. In the estimate of his contemporaries Arnold died with a more modest, but not insignificant, achievement to his credit. He revitalised the traditional curriculum of the English Public Schools by teaching

71. J.D. Lang, 'Ode to Glasgow College' in *Aurora Australis or Specimens of Sacred Poetry for the Colonists of Australia* (Sydney, 1826), pp.115-9.
classics and Christianity as complementary classroom studies. He taught his pupils to believe that in the philosophers of Greece and Rome they would find a perfect discussion of the great principles of all political questions, and in the Christian revelation their perfect solution.\(^73\) The Public Schools of England had always taught classics and religion, but in separate compartments, and in the opinion of Arnold the first was the only serious study.\(^74\) Arnold's genius was to mix them in a way that was fresh and attractive to his pupils and to his age. He did this out of a deep concern for the disturbed state of England, beset as he saw it by the problem of the age, a corrupt aristocracy, a restless mob and the fear of revolution, and each of them the bequest of a ruling class that had lost its way.\(^75\) Arnold wanted to take the sons of England's self-conscious ruling classes and make them better than their fathers, as men, and as rulers.\(^76\) The idea had once occurred to him of putting it all in a book, 'a work on POLITIKA, in the old Greek sense of the word, in which I would try to apply the principles of the Gospel to the legislation and administration of a state'.\(^77\) He did not write the book, but made Rugby a model of what he wanted to say.

Broughton wanted for New South Wales what Arnold wanted for


\(^74\) Stanley, *Arnold*, p.56.

\(^75\) Arnold, *Church Reform*, pp.23-5.


\(^77\) Stanley, *Arnold*, p.28.
England, and like Arnold believed the foundations of a secure and
godly future had to be laid in the proper education of a ruling
class. Unlike Arnold, Broughton did not have a self-conscious
ruling class at hand to begin with. He had first to create it.
In all other matters the two educationalists proposed remarkably
similar courses for strikingly similar ends. In New South Wales
commentators like E.S. Hall looked at Broughton's proposals,
branded them old fashioned and raised the fear that their end
product would be a new reactionary class. In England Arnold's Rugby
was thought to be tarnished with radicalism.

On 10 February Darling despatched the plans for the King's
Schools to the Colonial Office and Broughton prepared to leave on
the H.M.S. 'Crocodile' for Van Diemen's Land. He had not been
well in the January of 1830, and an accident after his horse bolted
and smashed his phaeton to pieces on the gates of the Military
Barracks had left him badly shaken. His welcome in Hobart on
19 February was quiet and sober. In Sydney the Australian,
continuing its favourable press for the Archdeacon, noted that he
had 'declined those noisy demonstrations, which would have so
delighted his predecessor.' But in Hobart the feeling was one

78. Bishop Polding had similar anxieties and objectives, see 'The
Memorial of John Polding D.D. Catholic Bishop and Vicar
Apostolic in New Holland and Van Diemen's Land', 6 August
1834, C.O. 201/244, p.578; P. O'Farrell, The Catholic Church
79. K. Chorley, Arthur Hugh Clough. The Uncommitted Mind (London,
1962), p.16.
80. Sydney Gazette, 5 and 19 January 1830.
81. Hobart Town Courier, 27 February 1830.
82. 2 April 1830.
of relief that the vacancy created by the deeply regretted departure of Archdeacon Scott had been 'so ably and in so superior a manner supplied'. 83

The Archdeacon's clear, practical sermons delighted his congregations, 84 but, with a highly qualified resident clergy of their own, superior intellectually to their brethren in the other colony, they hoped the Archdeacon's visit would bring them more than a few good sermons. They wanted sound practical advice on two pressing problems, the advancement of higher education and the amelioration of the blacks. 85 On the 15 April, after two months of inspection, Broughton called his clergy to a Visitation in the small stucco church of St. David, Macquarie Street, Hobart. 86 He charged them much as he had charged their brethren in New South Wales, 87 and drew universal praise for what he said, as well as a mild admonition for diplomatically omitting to repeat his criticism of the conditions of the aborigines. 88 The Hobart Town Courier supplied the deficiency and published extracts from a copy of the Sydney Charge. 89 Back in Sydney itself, the Archdeacon's omission received a somewhat harsher censure; 'With all the venerable gentleman's good sense and benevolence', the Australian pointed out,

---

83. Hobart Town Courier, 6 March 1830.
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85. Hobart Town Courier, 6 March 1830.
86. Hobart Town Almanack 1830 (Hobart Town, 1830), p.19.
87. W.G. Broughton, A Charge delivered to the Clergy of Van Diemen's Land at the Primary Visitation held in the Church of St. David, in Hobart Town, on Thursday, the 15th. of April, 1830 (Hobart Town, 1830).
88. Colonial Times, 16 April 1830.
89. 24 April 1830.
'we are rather surprised and mortified that no allusion, in his charge, appears to have been made to the state of the aborigines.'  

A few days later when Broughton announced his intention of departing on 24 April the following week there was a general sense of dismay that so little had apparently come of his visit. As far as could be ascertained only one decision had been definitely reached, and that was to build five more churches. No voice was raised against this, but it was clearly less than had been hoped for.  

Broughton had not forgotten the problem of the white settler and the hostile native. He left Hobart with him a novel plan for exporting to Van Diemen's Land a group of the more benign tribesmen of the mainland who, it was hoped, might show how black and white could live peaceably together. The Executive Council in New South Wales rejected the proposal. It feared that 'in opening a communication between the natives of the two colonies, the hostile spirit of the one could scarcely fail of being communicated to the other'. After this setback Broughton abandoned all hope for relief, except for what would come in time from missions set up to Christianise and civilize the native. When Arthur suggested that the Archdeacon might compose a special prayer to shield the settler in the meantime he received a quick admonition: 'Are we entitled

90. *Australian*, 1 May 1830.
91. *Hobart Town Courier*, 1 May 1830.
to think that God will vouchsafe to us extraordinary means when those which he placed within our reach have not been diligently employed?'.

Broughton believed that the black plague on the white settler was retribution for forty years of neglect by a colonial administration which had gone about its business without so much as giving a thought to the possibility that the native had a soul to be saved. He wondered how much longer this lassitude might continue if the settler was miraculously shielded from the effects of this neglect. If the natives' hostility was a measure of divine justice, it also served to goad the colonists into action. Broughton would have rested content to leave the problem there except that he feared the white settler might be prompted to exterminate the natives rather than patiently civilize them. 'May God', he once cried on hearing that Anstey was preparing another drive, 'subdue their rancour', and he gave Arthur the prayer he wanted.

One event marred the last days of the Archdeacon's visit to Van Diemen's Land. On Monday 19 April Mary McLauchlan, the mother of two children, was hanged for the infant murder of her third child while in detention at the Female Factory. She was the first woman executed in Van Diemen's Land. The Executive Council had hesitated at first to confirm the sentence against

94. Broughton to Arthur, 6 August 1830 (ibid.).
95. Tasmanian, 23 April 1830.
her. Jocelyn Thomas, its non-official member and a staunch Wesleyan, pleaded for mercy and the Colonial Secretary, John Burnett, supported him. Arthur, influenced by a letter from the jury recommending mercy, seemed disposed towards leniency. Only the Chief Justice, the thirty-seven year old John Pedder, had set his face sternly from the beginning in favour of the full rigour of the law. That was Friday 16 April. Overnight everything changed. When the Executive Council reassembled at 2 p.m. on Saturday Mary McLauchlan had only Jocelyn Thomas to plead for her.

Since the whole colony was agitated by the affair over the weekend of 16 to 18 April, Broughton would have been well aware of the circumstances surrounding the case and, being the guest of the Governor for the duration of his stay in Van Diemen's Land, he almost certainly would have been aware of Arthur's undecided attitude. In all probability Arthur consulted him, if not as a churchman, as a member of the Executive Council of New South Wales, for in his own Council he had shown himself anxious for the guidance of precedents established elsewhere for dealing with female prisoners capitally convicted. Broughton quite possibly

98. Hobart Town Courier, 24 April 1830.
99. He must also have grown to know Burnett as well having officiated at his eldest daughter's wedding in March, see Colonial Times, 26 March 1830.
refused to be involved in the case at all, for, by April 1830, he had established the principle in New South Wales of not attending Executive Council meetings where capital cases were reviewed. On the other hand he was aware, as was no one else in Van Diemen's Land, that Jocelyn Thomas' plea of mercy for Mary McLauchlan on the ground that her crime was not a common one, was probably wide off the mark. Late in the previous December the Executive Council of New South Wales had been disturbed by a report from the Female Factory at Parramatta that twenty of the twenty-two babies born there to inmates in the last twelve months had died, most of them, it was feared after exposure and neglect deliberately designed to ensure death. Whatever events turned mercy away from Mary McLaughlan on the night of 16 April, she went to the gallows while Broughton still resided in the town, and under circumstances which suggest that a firm plea for mercy could have saved her.

The contact Broughton made with Arthur on this visitation had every appearance of growing into as happy a friendship as had existed between Scott and Arthur; and when Broughton returned to Sydney he despatched to his host, as Scott had regularly done, a supply of plants and grafts. Very soon Arthur found himself conferring with Broughton on both personal and official matters. There was, however, one significant difference in the relationship Arthur had with each of the two Archdeacons. Scott made Arthur

his confidant to compensate for the loss of sympathy between himself and Darling, whereas Arthur, stricken from time to time by almost overwhelming criticism of his administration, turned to Broughton for encouragement. Broughton, who had a firm and satisfactory relationship with Darling, did not feel the need of a confidant.

Broughton was willing to listen to Arthur but found him somewhat humourless, a little self-righteous, and far too puritanical. As a result he mingled his sympathy with firm counsel that Arthur may have found distasteful at times. Once Arthur indulged in a great groan over convict behaviour and found himself abruptly checked. 'The convict population is unworthy and vile enough I admit', Broughton responded, 'but are we so pure under an all seeing eye as to venture to pretend that in a moral and religious estimate we form a separate class from them?' On another occasion Arthur spoke of a sense of inner uneasiness at having farewelled the Archdeacon with a party where the young became a little gay and the merriment a little loud. The truth, Arthur confirmed, was that his official position forced him to preside at festivities which warred against the growth of that fruit of the spirit he knew he should strive after. Broughton prodded him with a gentle reminder that his relish for gaiety had possibly vanished along with his youth, and that he should not allow the disappearance of that vital commodity to prevent his deriving gratification from seeing others innocently pleased.

A weighty office such as they both exercised, Broughton agreed, might lead them to attach little value to worldly enjoyments, but the main thing, he advised Arthur, was to avoid being over scrupulous:

Many persons I have known to exercise themselves with scruples which to the best of my judgement were unnecessary; nor indeed have I found the aesthetic disposition favourable to the growth of any of the virtues... except... temperance.\

It was this temperate man of mild character and modest appearance whom the colonies welcomed in 1829 and 1830. His origins were obscure and he seemed only a little above the ordinary, and that pleased them. His accomplishments, as far as could be learned in so short a time, lay in things purely ecclesiastical. He preached well, and they liked that. He had an enthusiasm but it seemed to be for the things above, and they liked that too. They could look after the things below. Some thought him a little dated in his ideas but he was such a welcome relief after Scott that men wanted to get along with him. However he must understand, they said, that where his ways were not their ways there would be ample room for both. This was a new land. Broughton noted this and kept his peace, except in one unguarded moment he let it slip that he could find no fault in Scott.

5. Broughton to Arthur, 3 June 1830 (ibid.).
A clergyman has an opportunity here of rendering himself the instrument of great good to a great number of souls.

W.G. Broughton, September 1831.
Broughton's return from Van Diemen's Land ended a round of tours designed to acquaint him with the general conditions of his immense archdeaconry. At the beginning of June 1830, he settled down, amidst general goodwill in the colony, to deal with the problems of the church and to fulfil the broader obligations of his office.

His official role as an Executive Councillor had already given him some trouble. After observing the Council's procedure for some weeks in 1829 he concluded that, in order to share in the direction of general colonial affairs, he had to be prepared to help tighten the rope around the necks of the more wretched victims of colonial life. At more meetings than not, capital cases were put under review along with the other business. He did not like this. He had already, before arriving in the colony, made the comment that a man would need to have a bad heart to covet a share in the administration of rigorous justice if his office did not strictly require it of him, and an even worse one to do so without visible evidence of reluctance or regret. On these grounds he had taken exception to the conduct of Archbishop Laud for one; though at the same time he admitted that severe punishments may be necessary for the support of law and government. In New South Wales, where the Executive Council had four members, Broughton decided that it was not necessary for him to share in this business and, after 7 October

1. Broughton, 'John' Diary, 5 June 1829.
1829, declined attending Executive Council meetings where capital cases were put under review.\footnote{Broughton attended the Executive Council for the review of sentences of capital punishment on 6 and 7 October 1829. The subsequent history of his absence on all occasions associated with capital punishment can be followed in, Minutes of Proc. Ex. C. (N.S.W.) from September 1829 onwards, C.O. 204/3. One curious exception occurs in the interregnum between Darling's departure and Bourke's arrival. Broughton sat with the Council on three occasions reviewing capital sentences and all were commuted, see Minutes 59, 11 November 1831, and Minute No. 62, 22 November 1831, Proc. Ex.C. (N.S.W.), C.O. 204/4. For Broughton's reason for not sitting on the review of capital punishments, see Bourke to Glenelg, 28 November 1836, 'Copies or Extracts of Despatches relative to the Establishment of Episcopal Sees in Australia Etc.', PP., 1850, xxxvii, (174), 571.}

This cut Broughton's attendance by half. It meant for him a considerable sacrifice of power and influence over the progress of colonial affairs, for the Executive Council, by virtue of the secrecy imposed on its meetings and its right of prior consultation with the governor, exercised significant sway over local administrative decisions and legislative proposals. Nor was it without its inconveniences, particularly when Broughton found himself compelled to submit his own urgent ecclesiastical business before the Council in writing, as happened on 1 February when a chaplain undertaking relief work in Sydney fell into desperate need of assistance with house rent.\footnote{Minute No. 6, 1 February 1830, Proc. Ex.C. (N.S.W.), C.O. 204/3.}

By January 1830 Darling, once opposed to admitting Scott's successor to a seat on either the Executive or Legislative Councils,\footnote{Darling to Hay, 10 October 1826, H.R.A., I.xii. 645.} had come to welcome and rely on the style of advice and assistance he found forthcoming.
from Broughton. For this reason perhaps more than any other, he was unwilling to see the Archdeacon separate himself so frequently from its deliberations. In June, therefore, Darling re-adjusted Council procedure to accommodate Broughton's susceptibilities. In future, capital cases were to be reviewed at special sittings. Whenever this was not practicable they were to be placed first on the agenda and Broughton admitted to the Council chamber after they had been dealt with. From mid 1830 onwards Broughton shared fully in the general business of the Executive Council which, so long as Darling was governor, met more frequently and conducted more business than the Legislative Council.

The business of the Legislative Council was more routine than that of the Executive Council, but Broughton diligently attended its meetings and accepted his share of responsibilities in what, at times, must have seemed interminable debates on matters remote from his concern however widely he interpreted the unity of church and state. There were debates on what to do with insolvent debtors, what to do with stray dogs, how better to collect custom dues, how best to slaughter cattle, and only occasionally a matter, such as the control of liquor sales, for which he felt some deep concern. The sub-committees he served were equally varied. He enjoyed opportunities for investigating immigration policy, but the obligation to accept a fair share of the mundane matters forced

him more often to spend days on end sorting out the problems of financing new roads in Woolloomooloo, or taking sheaves of evidence on the need for a breakwater at Newcastle or a new quay in Sydney Cove. Occasionally, however, amid its routine business the Legislative Council became the setting for more lively issues. Two of these came up in Broughton's first year of residence.

A Newspaper Restriction Bill was passed in January 1830 to ensure that the judges banished from the colony persons twice convicted of publishing material bringing into contempt the governor or his government, or exciting colonists to alter by unlawful means the established order in church and state. Broughton voted for the measure; so did Forbes, the guardian of press liberties. The measure, which exceeded the severity of its counterpart in Castlereigh's infamous Six Acts, originated in

7. Based on, V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 20 February and 16 March 1832; 2 August and 9 October 1832, and 28 August 1833. It was such activities as these which lay behind Lang's jibe at Broughton as 'a mere Botany Bay Macadam', see Lang, New South Wales, vol. 2, p.367.
10. The Six Acts followed in the wake of Peterloo and were designed to suppress unrest. Three of the Acts dealt with the press. One, 60 Geo. III, cap.8, was the model for 8 Geo. IV. No.2 passed in N.S.W. in 1827 to regulate the local press, see. C.H. Currey, Sir Francis Forbes (Sydney, 1968), pp.201-2. The local Act of 1830 exceeded the severity of Castlereigh's Acts by removing the judges discretionary power on banishment for an unspecified period upon a second conviction, and enforcing the banishment for a minimum of 2 years, see 11 Geo. IV, No.1, Op. cit., and Elie Halevy. The Liberal Awakening, (first paperback ed., London, 1961), pp.70-1.
outraged tempers whipped up late in December 1829 by an attempt on Darling's life. It was alleged that the would-be-assassin, J.D. Shelly, had been keeping company with Hall the editor and had fallen a victim to the unrestrained passion of that publisher's attacks on the Governor. Broughton saw every reason for removing such a menace from the colony should he persist in his activities. If one man could be stirred to murder might not many be excited to lawlessness and even to riot?

When tempers subsided Broughton had second thoughts. The Act required proprietors of newspapers to lodge bonds with the government to be forfeited upon conviction of a libel. Broughton had objected to that provision. And he objected to it more when he learned how Darling purposed using it. Hall could not meet the required sum and no creditor in Sydney was foolhardy enough to loan it to him. Hall had either to retire from business or flout the law. He flouted the law. Darling, who had waited for years to get Hall, seized this opportunity and moved in the Executive Council to have Hall prosecuted to the utmost extent of the Act. He could not put Hall out of business, he would have him out of the way. To Broughton the Act, designed to punish libels, was being misused if applied to drive the unconvicted from business. But Darling won his way, and Broughton was left to record in the Minutes of the Council that he objected to the provision in general

and to the enforcement of the penalty against Hall. 14

The other matter, trial by jury, aroused more interest. When Broughton first met the Legislative Council on 16 September 1829 he found it engrossed in a debate over the qualifications to be required of the jurors to be empanelled under section 8 of 9 Geo. IV, c.83, the Act passed at Westminster in July 1828 to provide for the administration of justice in New South Wales. This Act arranged for the recruitment of civil juries in civil actions brought before the Supreme Court where a plaintiff or a defendant requested it, and the presiding judge could discern nothing in it likely to prejudice an impartial decision. 15 It was a small concession written into the Bill as an afterthought when the then Secretary of State for Colonies, William Huskisson, coming under attack from Sir James Mackintosh and others in the Commons, decided it was more circumspect to surrender a little on the issue than to continue his support for the party of total resistance in the colony.16 The Colonial Office meant it as a pledge that more would follow as soon as the colonists showed their fitness to receive it.17 Colonial radicals received it as a disappointing moiety: the conservatives looked upon it as an unsettling concession. It was unsettling locally, because it left the colonists with the prickly question of deciding who should sit on juries; a question which divided them as deeply as the wisdom of the civil juries themselves.

15. Statutes At Large, vol.xi, p. 611.
When the matter came before the Legislative Council on 2 September 1829 the opposing parties divided behind Forbes and Scott. Forbes believed the colony should adhere strictly to British practice and, dissenting from an earlier opinion, he explained that, to the best of his understanding, this meant opening the jury lists to all who had the stipulated property qualification unless they were serving a sentence or had been convicted of an infamous crime. The Colonial Office did not require this conformity. Scott invoked this privilege and proposed to have disqualified for life all persons brought to the colony under sentence of transportation. He put his motion to the Council on 15 September 1829 and Forbes moved to have it debated the following day. It was Scott's swan song. The following day Broughton sat in the Council Chamber in Scott's place.

Behind Scott stood John Macarthur. He prepared to carry the fight forward while Scott, describing himself simply as a member of the Light Company, sustained his opposition from outside risking, in his opinion, assassination. On 16 September, immediately after

18. V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 2 September 1829.
20. V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 15 September 1829.
21. Ibid., 16 September 1829. In his recent biography of Forbes, Dr. Curry misinterprets the events of these days and attributes the hardline proposals of 15 September to Broughton, and states further that Broughton and Forbes were at loggerheads on the issue from the beginning; see, Curry, Forbes, p. 363.
Broughton was sworn in, Macarthur moved to have discussion of the Jury Bill adjourned for a month, possibly hoping in that time, with Scott's aid (for Broughton was a guest in Scott's household) to win the new Archdeacon's co-operation. If so, he failed. Broughton, Scott wrote, was fresh to the colony and did not understand it. When discussion re-opened Forbes submitted a modified motion affirming the right of emancipists to be jurymen but agreeing to the exclusion of those who had been convicted of a felony in the colony after transportation. He spoke for two hours, and then gave the floor to Broughton who seconded and 'decidedly supported' the motion. The Sydney Gazette burst into fulsome praise. Mr. Broughton, it said, had 'espoused the liberal side'.

Forbes agreed to a second compromise, and deferred to those who wanted a higher property qualification for jurors. He had proposed £200: he settled for £300. The need for compromise indicated that neither the Chief Justice nor Macarthur commanded a clear majority in support of their original propositions. Broughton probably worked to reconcile their opposition as the details of the Bill were thrashed out between 16 and 24 September outside the Council. That he should have been nominated to second Forbes's motion and, after only two weeks in the colony elected to a seat on the sub-committee to draw up the final draft of the Bill suggests his role was more than a nominal one. Moreover, he brought McLeay over

23. V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 16 September 1829.
25. Sydney Gazette, 26 September 1829.
26. V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 24 September 1829; for Forbes's original proposal, ibid., 15 September 1829.
with him and for one bright moment gave the colonists a glimpse of the Colonial Secretary posing as the friend of the emancipists.\textsuperscript{27}

Happily for Broughton the Bill involved no compromise in his own thinking. One criminal conviction need be no more than the sign of a temporary weakness or ignorance and ought to be forgotten in time, he had written in his diary after giving some thought to a convict's predicament while onboard the 'John'. A second conviction, he had added, pointed to the presence of a deeper perversity that could not easily be overlooked.\textsuperscript{28} He proved his trust by taking an offender into his own home as his personal man servant.\textsuperscript{29}

The compromise which united the Council stirred 'the people outside', as Darling called them, to renewed efforts in pursuit of further constitutional concessions. This forced Darling to reveal the secret he had kept for some time, and on 27 January 1830 he announced that the Colonial Office had agreed to pare away the remaining use of military juries and commit all criminal cases to trial before civil juries as soon as the Legislative Council recommended it. The Governor warned the Council that one day soon, after the lapse of a decent interval for testing the new civil juries he would invite each Councillor to submit a written opinion on the matter for transmission to the Colonial Office.\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{27} Sydney Gazette, 26 September 1829.

\textsuperscript{28} Broughton, 'John' Diary, 5 July 1829; see also his comments on the Schoolmaster, Mr. Finn, \textit{ibid.}, 6 June 1829.

\textsuperscript{29} John Bridges, origin Derby, born 1800, a baker transported on 'John' for seven years for stealing; see, Broughton to Bourke 14 January 1833, \textit{C.S.I.L.} 33/519, Box 4/2169 (N.S.W. S.A.).

\textsuperscript{30} \textit{V. \& P. (L.C. N.S.W.)}, 29 January 1830.
When this day came in August 1830 Broughton submitted one of the ten opinions opposed to any concessions for the time being. Most of these queried the propriety of trying an alleged criminal before an ex-criminal and possibly, as the demand for juries increased, before a panel dominated by ex-criminals. McLeay felt strongly that where civil juries had been used at Quarter Sessions in the past they had proved unreliable, and that their performance under the recent legislation had left much to be desired. He repented of his leniency in supporting the Jury Bill the previous September and opposed the extension of its errors. Others felt that no reasonable check could be maintained on the type of emancipists called for service. The attempt to demand a qualification of good conduct, in addition to property, of the jurors seated at Quarter Sessions had failed, and it was feared that it could not be applied to safeguard criminal juries from undesirable members. 31

Broughton rejected such forebodings. He raised no objection to the use of civil juries, even when dominated by emancipists, for the trial of the general run of criminal charges involving violence to life and property, perjury, or even libel. He frankly admitted that emancipists had shown an habitual leaning towards the convict class. But their self interest would check that and keep them on the side of justice, he said:

...knowing how necessary it is for the security of their own persons and properties that the guilty should not escape punishment, I do not think that the emancipists would suffer their verdict to be influenced by consideration of the class

to which the accused belonged, nor that they would feel any reluctance to condemn, when the evidence plainly required it.32

There remained to trouble Broughton one category of criminal activity peculiar to the age - public disturbance and riot. Here the self interest of the emancipists, and other groups in society might put them on side against the government and its unpopular restrictions. Broughton invited Darling to consider the predicament which could overtake the government should a crisis occur in New South Wales resembling that of Manchester in 1819, where, in an effort to maintain its own authority, the government was forced to prosecute those who disturbed the peace. Could the population at large in the colony be expected to furnish civil juries who would bring an impartial mind to the trial of such cases? Broughton doubted it:

I am persuaded that the sentiment of obedience is so imperfect here that all restraint, beyond what is necessary for the repression of personal violence, finds little support in public opinion. There is a predisposition to believe that every man, who sets himself in opposition to such restraints, is morally innocent, though he may be legally guilty. Such persons are sure to have a perverted popular feeling upon their side; and, if, under the influence of general excitement, juries should be found resolutely predetermined not to convict, the government may be braved with impunity, and must be exposed to embarrassments.33

Reluctant though he was to do it, Broughton advised Darling that, being wise to the antinomian spirit evident to some extent in all classes in the colony and having regard to the jeopardy in which

32. Broughton to Darling, 14 September 1830, Encl. No. 2 in Darling to Murray 7 October 1830, *ibid.*, p. 775.

33. *Ibid.*, p. 776. Whether juries could be relied on to bring in convictions against disturbers of the peace after Peterloo was an issue causing concern, see *Annual Register*, 1819, pp.103-15; *ibid.*, 1820, pp.29-39, and 'Appendix to Chronicle', pp.849-98.
that could place the general security of the land, he could only conclude that the colony would benefit from the retention of military juries for a while longer. He agreed with the Chief Justice that these juries had served the ends of justice well; but disagreed when the same judge added that their verdicts, however correct, were often held suspect by the people; 'I cannot but think that upon the questions accompanied with party feeling, the verdicts of the military are most likely to recommend themselves to the approbation of impartial men' he wrote reassuringly to Darling. Broughton's opinion had the support of people's feet if not their words. In 1830 420 civil actions were brought into the courts and only 19 went before the new civil juries.

Broughton promised to abjure his recommendation should it appear, as Sir James Mackintosh in the House of Commons had proclaimed with deep foreboding it most surely would, that as the colonial born increased in numbers over the English born, a new race, unappreciative of the blessing of trial by jury, would take over the colony and British institutions be lost to it for ever. Brought had dedicated his administration to the attainment of the very opposite end; he had established the King's School to cultivate an affection for British

34. Broughton to Darling, 14 September 1830, op. cit., p.776; for Forbes' opinion, see Forbes to Darling 5 October 1830, Encl. No.1 in Darling to Murray, 7 October 1830, H.R.A., I.xv. 773-5.
35. Appendix No.16, 'Return of the number of Issues Tried on the Civil side of the Supreme Court, during the years 1830 to 1834, distinguishing those Fixed by Assessors, and by Special and Common Juries', in (Macarthur), New South Wales, Prospects, p.103.
institutions and recommended the retention of military juries as a 'temporary expedient' only to maintain the stability necessary for those institutions to take root. To cling to the latter at the expense of the former would be to drive out one devil and have seven enter in its place. 'I should without hesitation advise the immediate discontinuance of military juries', Broughton added by way of a rider to his opinion, 'if I could be persuaded that through their partial adoption there was any danger in the colony being ultimately deprived of Trial by Jury according to the regular constitutional form.'

The need for this temporary expedient would vanish as education was more widely diffused, McLeay said. It would disappear as immigration closed the gap between free and freed, John Macarthur and Richard Jones added. To Broughton it was neither a question of free against freed nor simply of education, important though that was, but one of an overall moral improvement in the colony. To hasten the advent of that happy situation Broughton had much to be busy about in the colony at large, and around Sydney in particular. There it had become obvious to him that the free and the freed were drawn into degradations which rendered them unfit to exercise the general responsibilities of free citizens under English institutions.

The seamy side of Sydney's life greeted most newcomers on arrival. More likely than not they took their first lodgings in one

37. Broughton to Darling, 14 September 1830, op. cit., p. 777.
38. McLeay to Darling, 11 October 1830, Encl. No.3 in Darling to Murray, 7 October 1830, H.R.A., I.xv. 777-9; John Macarthur to Darling, 18 September 1830, Encl. No.7 in ibid., p.782; Jones to Darling, 29 September 1830, Encl. No.10 in ibid., pp.786-7; Broughton to Darling, 19 June 1830, Encl. in Darling to Murray, 20 September 1830, H.R.A., I.xv.725.
of the large boarding houses close by the wharves in the older parts of the town. If they could afford it they might go to one of the better inns, but even there the effects of hot, fiery, East India rum on the colonial thirst soon became evident. What they did not hear or see for themselves idle gossip, the bane of a colony deprived of a theatre according to the diagnosis of one surgeon formerly resident in the colony, added and inflated. The press made its own sorry contribution. The filth and abominations the English got rid of in underground sewers was spread on Sydney dinner tables, Lang once said, in the guise of police reports. 39

By June 1830 Broughton had confirmed for himself the truth of the very worst rumours and reports about an area he had come to know on journeys to and from his residence, the district called the Rocks. Travellers knew it as the St. Giles of Sydney Town, a place for the poorest and the lowest. Broughton knew it as a retreat for the perpetrators of almost every violation of the law: prostitution and theft were rife among its inhabitants, adultery and drunkenness, its habitual occupation. The people there, if not ignorant of all religion, lived in total disregard of it. 'The only difference which I have found to exist between the Sabbath and other days', Broughton told Darling, 'is that, the people being then all at home and unemployed,

there is a greater prevalence than ordinary of all sorts of disorder and wickedness.  

Though he had never before had contact with this class of people, Broughton decided to take the lead himself in evangelising its worst areas and set to work on the problem immediately he returned from Van Diemen's Land. He searched and found an unoccupied stone building to turn into a chapel at the northern end of Prince Street, where life was roughest. There he planned to go and preach morning and afternoon every Sunday he was in Sydney. He hoped that the most useful of these sermons would then be published and distributed to the clergy to aid them in their own work among the more reprobate classes whom he gathered, on his travels, were the source of much anxiety. Along with the chapel he wanted a school and asked Darling for a block of land in Cumberland Street, in the heart of the Rocks area. He hoped by the end of the year that this area, depressed and hitherto neglected, would have received the first material benefits of his administrative control over the affairs of religion and education.

Darling supported the plan with enthusiasm, promised to hire the building in Prince Street for three years, outfit it for worship, and provide a chaplain to assist Broughton in the work. That was June

40. Broughton to Darling, 19 June 1830, op. cit., p.726.
41. Ibid., pp.725 and 728.
42. Broughton to Arthur, 3 June 1830 (Arthur Papers, vol.12, M.L.).
43. 'The Report of the Proceedings of the Trustees of the Clergy and School Lands in New South Wales, from 1 March to 31st. of December 1830, inclusive', in Despatches from Governor of New South Wales. Enclosure etc. 1830-31, p.812, (A 1267/12, M.L.).
Within two months the plans lay in ruins. Darling received a chilling reminder that the Colonial Office would sanction no deviation from the rules governing ecclesiastical expenditure as set down by Sir George Murray on 25 May 1829. This meant Broughton had first to raise by public subscription half the cost of the venture before any grant could be made from the colonial treasury. This was beyond the resources at Broughton's disposal and Darling could do nothing more than refer the matter to the Colonial Office for special consideration. In less than a year from his arrival Broughton tasted the bitter colonial reality which had soured the will and sapped the enterprise of his predecessor; London's doctrinaire approach to the problems of the colonial church, and the frustration of trying to resolve urgent problems by the long sea route that separated them.44

In theory the British government had arranged for the ecclesiastical establishment to reign self-sufficient on the funds of the Church and Schools Corporation45 and, as Scott soon learned, the inability of the Corporation to make good its position was pitilessly disregarded at the Colonial Office.46 During the declining months of

44. Darling to Murray, 20 September 1830, H.R.A., I.xv.725; Broughton to Darling, 12 August 1830, C.S.I.L. 30/6217, Box 4/2080 (N.S.W. S.A.); Colonial Secretary to Broughton, 19 August 1830, C.S.O.L. 'Letters to Clergy', 30/95 (N.S.W. S.A.); Colonial Secretary to Broughton, 23 August 1830, ibid., 30/96; Colonial Secretary to Broughton, 1 September 1830, ibid., 30/101.


his administration Scott had concentrated on securing land for the Corporation so that he might retire consoled by the knowledge that his successor had inherited a situation materially better than he had ever enjoyed. He succeeded. Between 3 February and 1 September 1829 the Corporation received Deeds for 419,199 acres of land. So when Broughton attended his first meeting with the full bench of the Trustees of the Corporation on 1 December 1829, he witnessed the adoption of grandiose plans for the development of a whole village, to be named Hebersham, in memory of Bishop Heber, on the Corporation's property at Rooty Hill. The Corporation seemed on the verge of prosperity.

Not for the first time, however, did the right hand of the colony not know what the left hand of the Colonial Office was doing. While Scott badgered Darling to speed up the survey and transfer of land, servants of the Colonial Office studied the history of a somewhat similar, though not identical, venture in Canada. There, under a scheme established in 1791, the protestant clergy were entitled to one seventh of all land grants for the support of their work. By 1828 they were receiving an income of £930 yearly from 488,594 acres, most of which was spent in the process of being collected. The experiment was considered a failure and in July 1828 a Committee of the House of

47. Darling to Murray, 12 December 1828, H.R.A., I.xiv.518; Darling to Murray 11 February 1829, ibid., pp.638-40; Darling to Murray 19 February 1829, ibid., pp.659-60; Note 37, H.R.A., I.xii.814.
48. Proceedings of the General Court No.1, of the Trustees of the Clergy and Schools Lands, p.293 (Ms. No.4/291, N.S.W. S.A.).
Commons recommended 'in the strongest manner the propriety of securing for the future any provision which may be deemed necessary for the religious community ... by other means than a reservation of one seventh of the land'. This recommendation bore fruit a year later in New South Wales. In his despatch of 25 May 1829 Murray advised Darling that he had abandoned plans for a Corporation in Van Diemen's Land and counselled the King to revoke the Letters Patent that had erected the Corporation in New South Wales. Broughton received this news on 3 December 1829. Scott by this time was shipwrecked at the Swan River and blissfully unaware that he had left behind a successor in a financial plight as uncertain and as restricted as his had been.

Only a modest sum of money was required to launch the Rocks chapel. Broughton unfortunately had less than a modest sum at his disposal. Rents on land already leased by the Corporation amounted to £834.11.5 annually. But that was a nominal figure. Poor seasonal conditions had halved the Corporation's actual receipts. In 1829 the Corporation had managed to raise a further £2,401.17.3 for urgent works

53. 'Schedule of Lands granted to the Trustees of Clergy and School Lands showing whether sold or leased - if sold, the amount of purchase money and annual interest - and if leased, the yearly rental arising therefrom', in Encl. No.1 in Darling to Murray, 17 August 1830, C.O. 201/213.
by the sale of small blocks of glebe land and pastures attached to the orphanages. The opportunity of raising similar sums by the sale of remaining glebes, which in Sydney brought a good price, was frustrated by Darling's rigid interpretation of Murray's despatch as an order to suspend all the Corporation's transactions pending the early arrival of fresh instructions.

In mid-1830 Broughton's one hope for funds arose from the recent rains and the opportunity this would give the Corporation to press for the payment of arrears amounting by that time to £3911.17.3 He did not want to fritter away this money on a temporary chapel but have it put directly into the construction of a new church in Sydney.

While the Corporation, which was the key to expansion, was suspended in inactivity Broughton found other causes to occupy his attention. Not the least important of these was the challenge he had already verbally adopted, to improve the impoverished lot of the aboriginals. 'As the Church of England is endowed with pre-eminent advantages here', ran one of his earliest exhortations to his clergy, 'she should justify the distinction by ... becoming the mother of missionaries who shall attempt the recovery of this unhappy generation'.

54. 'Receipts and Disbursements for the Years 1828 and 1829', in *ibid*.
55. 'Report of the Proceedings of the Church and School Lands in New South Wales from 1st March 1828 to the 28th February 1830, inclusive', in *Despatches from Governor of New South Wales, Enclosures etc. 1830-31*, p.737 (A1267/12, M.L.).
The picture of the natives' wanton existence around Sydney upset him from the beginning. They seemed either to wander aimlessly around the town's streets or to drink with undivided purpose until, overcome by an alcoholic stupor, they lay insensibly where their powers deserted them. Such was the white settlers' malevolent influence. His fitful attempts at benevolence were hardly less degrading. The 'annual conference' between the governor and the natives at Parramatta was the principal occasion for the distribution of the white man's bounty to the older black inhabitants. In 1830 this fell on 6 January and Broughton joined the Governor's party as a spectator. From midday onwards he watched as 269 natives feasted on roast beef, pudding, and 'a reasonable quantum of grog', performed a corroboree by way of thanksgiving, and were then dismissed with a benediction of blankets and odd clothes to go back for another year to bark huts, a diet of wombat and Bungong moths, and ancient superstitions.

This was a terrible day for a churchman. It was the Feast of the Epiphany; a day when Christians around the world celebrated the joyful surrender of old world superstitions to the light that shone in Jesus Christ. In New South Wales, the white settler, heir to centuries of that light, had abandoned the native to eating and drinking because he believed that in him he had found the darkness

59. Ibid., pp.27-8.
60. Sydney Gazette, 9 January 1830. For a picture of native life around Sydney as Broughton would have encountered it, see Bennett, Wanderings in New South Wales, vol.1, p.338.
that had overcome the light.

Churchmen had a hand in this. 'Mr. Marsden, whose long experience and close observation entitles his opinion to much deference, considers them uncivilizable', one Christian gentleman, resident in the colony, bluntly told the Church Missionary Society in a desperate attempt to prevent that Society adopting the conversion of the aboriginals as a principal object of its concern. 61 Marsden averred that he never had, nor ever would, oppose the spending of Society funds on beneficial projects for these people. 62 It just so happened that after 1820 he never found an occasion to justify recommending it. 63

Scott was determined to do better. His Majesty and master, the King, had commanded him to do something for these unfortunate people, and it pleased Scott to obey. 64 In characteristic fashion he commissioned a searching five month survey of country areas only to conclude that the colonists were clearly united against any attempt to civilize the natives as too difficult, too expensive, too slow and,

61. Captain Irvine to Secretary C.M.S., 8 August 1820 ('Correspondence re. C.M.S. Auxilary 1821-1837', C.N./012, C.M.S. Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
63. Marsden to Coates, 4 January 1833 (Bonwick Transcripts, Missionary, Box 54, vol.6, pp.1858-62, M.L.).
64. Scott to Hill, 18 December 1826 ('Correspondence between Sydney Corresponding Committee and Missionaries and Others in New Holland Mission 1821-37', C.N./05a, C.M.S. Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
after all that, of trivial benefit only. The Reverend Richard Hill was one of a handful in the colony who had not succumbed to the pessimism of the many. As secretary of the local committee of the Church Missionary Society he had suffered inwardly in 1821 when Marsden and others defeated his attempt to have the Society take up the cause of the aboriginals. But his faith in their eventual conversion never wavered, he told Scott, because he knew from Christ's own teachings that in Heaven there would be representatives of every kindreds, tongues, peoples and nations. He encouraged Scott's fresh attempts and warned him against repeating the errors of those who had been at work before him. Choose higher ground and employ men competent to lay down the rudiments of their language and to cultivate a useful knowledge of it, he advised the Archdeacon. 'Till this is done', he said, 'nothing I believe effectual can be done.'

Judged by such criterion the Reverend Lancelot Threlkeld was the one person in New South Wales whose work was destined to be of decisive and permanent value. Threlkeld, a minister of the Independent persuasion, had turned to working among the aboriginals after failing to find any contentment on the Protestant missions in the Pacific region. By 1827 he had published his initial attempt at reducing an aboriginal dialect to written form. He attributed this success to

65. Scott to Darling, 9 December 1826, Encl. in Darling to Bathurst, 12 December 1826, H.R.A., I.xii.796; Scott to Darling, 1 August 1827, Encl. No.1 in Darling to Huskisson, 27 March 1828, H.R.A., I.xiv.57.

66. Hill to Scott, 18 September 1827 (C.N./05a, C.M.S. Papers).

67. L.E. Threlkeld, Specimens of a Dialect of the Aborigines of New South Wales, being the first attempt to form their Speech in a Written Language (Sydney, 1827).
the unique arrangement of his mission farm by Lake Macquarie where, with steady gratuitous handouts of grain, he had settled wandering natives for periods sufficiently long to be useful for linguistic investigations. By this same means he had spent £1,800 in two years and greatly displeased his English sponsors, the London Missionary Society. It ordered him to cut expenses. But Threlkeld, full of the imperious certainty of one on a divine mission, defiantly drew bills as lavish as ever. The Society finally dishonoured these, threw Threlkeld into the Supreme Court as a debtor, and forced him, around August 1827, to temporarily abandon his mission.

The Reverend C.P. Wilton, the chaplain at the Field of Mars and a Fellow of the Cambridge Philosophical Society, a scholar of talent with a weakness for repaying debts, understood the value of Threlkeld's work and the harrowing annoyance of impatient creditors. He stood by Threlkeld, and called on Scott to exercise a magnanimous spirit and provide the missionary with sufficient means to continue his linguistic investigations, if not his mission, and produce that badly needed text on aboriginal grammar. Scott sympathised; but with only a destitute Corporation at his disposal he had no means for helping Threlkeld. Moreover, he had put forward a grandiose plan of his own for a string of seven mission stations on the frontier of the


For Wilton's financial plight see further on this chapter.
settlement, from the Murrumbidgee River in the south to the Peel River in the north. He estimated this scheme to cost £2000 a year and dared not ask for more. It disappeared with Scott's departure in 1829.

At much the same time the London Missionary Society took final umbrage at a pamphlet Threlkeld had published calling on the subscribers of the Society to purge its management of the autocrats who were driving missionaries from their engagements. It withdrew all support from Threlkeld and collapsed the mission at Lake Macquarie. So when Broughton arrived in Sydney in 1829 he found all organised missionary effort at a standstill. Instead the discomforting challenge to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ had been supplanted by good-will votes in the colonial Estimates of about £400 annually for blankets, provisions and clothing.

It soon became evident to Marsden that the new Archdeacon contemplated the re-establishment of a mission and he tried hard, with a long, sorry tale of the ill-success of past ventures, to dissuade him from it. Broughton took this as the counsel of despair; 'I am

72. 'Abstract of the Revenue of the Colony of New South Wales and its Appropriation for the year 1832', *V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.)*, 1833.
73. Marsden to L.M.S., 5 December 1829, in N. Gunson (ed.), *Reminiscences and Australian Papers of the Rev. Lancelot Threlkeld, Missionary to the Aborigines of New South Wales* (with biographical introduction by editor, 5 vols.), vol.1, p.86. (Ms. copy in possession of N. Gunson, Department of Pacific History, Research School of Pacific Studies, A.N.U.).
aware of attempts having been undertaken ... and of their abandonment from a sense of existing difficulties and despair of final success'.

But before the faintest glimmer of a new mission appeared Darling called in Broughton to help sort out Threlkeld's future. Though the London Missionary Society had decided to quit Australian soil and abandon Threlkeld to the mercy of his sharp tongue, it graciously consented to hand over its assets at Lake Macquarie to the support of anybody willing to carry on Threlkeld's work. In January 1830 Darling asked Broughton to decide if Threlkeld's work was sound, and whether the government could support him without incurring the heavy charges that had broken the spirit of the London Missionary Society.

Threlkeld had in the meantime approached the Archdeacon independently and shown him his linguistic achievements. Broughton took an immediate interest in these, carefully examined the missionary's system of orthography, and pronounced it sound. The progress made in translating the Gospels quite delighted him, and he suggested that Threlkeld might take time off to try his hand at fixing a few pages of the Book of Common Prayer in a native dialect. 'Our church and nation are under an obligation to make an effort for the moral and religious improvement of the people whose country we have occupied',

74. Broughton, Charge 1829, p.29.
76. Colonial Secretary to Broughton, 13 January 1830, C.S.O.L. 'Letters to Clergy' 30/7 (N.S.W. S.A.).
77. Threlkeld to Broughton, 17 November 1829, in Gunson (ed.), Threlkeld Papers, vol.2, pp.334-7; Threlkeld to Broughton, 9 January 1832, ibid., p.358; T.C. Harrington to Threlkeld, 13 May 1830, ibid., vol.3, pp.685-6.
Broughton wrote to Darling. And the finest beginning he could suggest would be for the government to grant Threlkeld an annual stipend of £150 for five years and give him time to put the Word of God into the native tongue. He recommended, too, that Threlkeld's salary should be back-dated to the time the L.M.S. cut it off, and that the contentious farm, which Threlkeld insisted was an essential part of his scheme, should be continued and tilled by four convict labourers.\footnote{78}

Marsden grit his teeth to see Threlkeld so gloriously raised up. 'Archdeacon Broughton is an excellent man, and is anxious to do good to the Aborigines,' the ageing chaplain wrote home to his friends. 'And from his wish to benefit them, he will countenance Mr. Threlkeld or any other person who may be likely in his opinion to promote this object.' Broughton more than countenanced Threlkeld. In the missionary's hour of need, after the London Missionary Society had abandoned him and before the government had adopted him, the Archdeacon, though burdened with a £500 personal debt to the colonial treasury, dipped into his pocket and gave generously to the relief of the beleaguered pastor and his family.\footnote{80} Threlkeld never forgot the gesture.\footnote{81}

\footnote{78}{Broughton to Darling 3 June 1830 in Encl. No.2 in Darling to Murray, 9 August 1830, \textit{H.R.A.}, I.xv.675-6; Colonial Secretary to Broughton, 1 October 1831, \textit{C.S.O.L.} 'Letters to Clergy', 31/108 (N.S.W. S.A.).}

\footnote{79}{Marsden to L.M.S., 22 January 1830, in Gunson (ed.), \textit{Threlkeld Papers}, vol. p.86.}

\footnote{80}{See an extract from Threlkeld's Journal, 9 July 1831, in Gunson (ed.), \textit{Threlkeld Papers}, vol.2, p.356. For Broughton's debt to the colonial treasury, see Colonial Secretary to Broughton 8 January 1830, \textit{C.S.O.L.} 'Letters to Clergy', 30/4 (N.S.W. S.A.).}

\footnote{81}{'Extracts from Journal of James Backhouse and G.W. Walker', in Gunson (ed.), \textit{Threlkeld Papers}, vol.2, p.398. Backhouse was one of Threlkeld's original sponsors and his information on Broughton would have come from Threlkeld. This extract attributes the reprieve of the mission to Broughton's interest and activity on behalf of Threlkeld.
While Broughton strove to excite a new compassion in the colonial government and solicit patronage for the support of this good work, the Colonial Office underwent a change of heart. The mean mood of 1827, which had bluntly shelved all aboriginal work until after the colonists' needs had been fully satisfied, gave way before a new vision. No undertaking to convert or civilize the aboriginals which held out 'a fair prospect of success' would be permitted in the future to languish for want of pecuniary aid. The man behind the change was no idle babbler, James Stephen told a friend, but one whose word would be found to be his bond. The man behind the change was Sir George Murray, and he inaugurated the new era in November 1829 with an offer of £500 from the colonial treasury to any missionary organisation willing to place two or more teachers on a mission station somewhere along the primitive fringe of the colony's settlement. Because James Stephen was on the spot in London, and a zealous advocate of the interests of the Church Missionary Society, he secured first option for that organisation and a guarantee that it would be free to write its own terms for the control and conduct of the mission.

---

83. Twiss to Coates, 18 February 1830, ('Home Letters, November 1829 - March 1830, C.H./050, C.M.S. Papers, m/f, A.N.L.').
84. Stephen to Coates, 1 December 1829 (ibid.).
85. Minute, 24 November 1829 ('M.C. Committee Minutes', vol.x, C.M.S. Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
86. Stephen to Coates, 1 December 1829 (op. cit.); Coates to Twiss, 1 January 1830 ('London Letter Books re New Zealand Mission', C.H./L.1, C.M.S. Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
The Church Missionary Society did accept, and soon found itself treading the rough and shoddy path to Australia. The Secretary of State fell into a dispute with the Bishop of London over the type of missionaries to be sent out. Murray favoured the despatch of laymen in humble circumstances because they, without a regular profession to fall back on, would be less inclined to abandon their task in the face of difficulties. The Bishop of London insisted that without a priest in Holy Orders the mission could not offer full apostolic rites to the aboriginals. In the end they compromised and selected one priest and one layman. Before either departed the Whigs came into office and had second thoughts about the whole project. For a while they stalled on it, then abandoned it, and in the end agreed to restore it provided it became a Church Missionary Society venture with an annual government subsidy limited to £500, rather than an official undertaking in which the Society acted as the government's agents and the work was capable, in Murray's terms, of indefinite expansion.

While these conflicts played themselves out in London Broughton went his own way preparing the colony for its renewed missionary endeavour. He became a subscriber to the Church Missionary Society to assist in the work of converting the native in New Zealand, but

87. Minutes, 30 March, 6 April, 18 May and 8 June 1830 ('M.C. Committee Minutes', vol.xi. C.M.S. Papers, m/f, A.N.L.); Murray to Bishop of London, 8 June 1830, C.O. 202/24.
88. Howick to Coates, 11 December 1830, C.O. 202/26; Coates to Howick, 9 February 1831, C.O. 201/222; Coates to Howick, 17 February 1831 and Minute attached, C.O. 201/222; Howick to Coates, 18 February 1831 ('Home Letters, February 1831 to July 1831', C.H./053, C.M.S. Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
declined at first to join the Society's local corresponding committee. In February 1830, however, he relented under pressure from McLeay; and the gratifying news sped on its way to New Zealand and London.89 In his own mind Broughton saw that there was room in New South Wales for a united effort between high churchmen and evangelicals, and he foresaw a day when the Church Missionary Society, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and the Colonial Government itself would all unite under his direction in recruiting men and money for the advancement of the religious and material condition of the aboriginal people.90

Broughton undertook two journeys inland to assay the countryside, and in mid-1831 asked the Governor's permission to turn a disbanded convict settlement at Wellington Valley, 100 miles from Sydney, into the first missionary station.91 Darling consented, and by a happy coincidence the first of the new missionaries, Johann Handt, landed in Sydney.92 Handt, a layman and Lutheran by confession, found Broughton attentive and in good spirits, but anxious to detain him in Sydney until a second missionary arrived. Then, as Handt recalled, the Archdeacon said, 'he himself would, if circumstances permit, proceed with us to the place (Wellington Valley) and arrange

89. Minutes of 16 October 1829, 26-27 January and 2 February 1830 ('Minutes of Corresponding Committee, Sydney, 1821-41, C.N./01, C.M.S. Papers, m/f, A.N.L.); Marsden to Coates, 14 October 1829 (Bonwick Transcripts, Missionary, Box 53, vol.5, pp.1805-6, M.L.).
90. Hill to Coates, 31 May 1830 ('Letter of Corresponding Committee Secretary to Home Secretary', C.N./02, C.M.S. Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
91. Hill to Coates, 9 February and 21 July 1831 (ibid.).
things properly'.

Before long a shadow fell across the joy of Handt's arrival. In August Broughton learned from Hill that Handt carried letters from the Society in London instructing the local corresponding committee to take full control of Handt and his work, and to refer all difficulties directly to the Society's London headquarters. Broughton viewed these arrangements with disgust. They conflicted with the Governor's official instructions to consult the Archdeacon in all matters affecting the aboriginals, and stood at variance with ancient apostolic order where, from the church's beginning, it had been the custom to have all missionary effort in a single area radiate from a bishop at its centre. Broughton had anticipated an arrangement whereby the Church Missionary Society would choose men for a work on which the government would spend £500, but that the missionaries would be placed under the Archdeacon as chaplains on their arrival.

Broughton hoped Handt's letters would turn out to be nothing more than the zealous scribblings of a badly informed officer of the Society. Some of the long standing members of the Society's local corresponding committee believed they would remain as they were. 'The Church Missionary Society', they said '... is a pure and holy


94. Hill to Coates (private), 3 October and 9 November 1831 (C.N./0.2, ibid.). Handt's Instructions are not available but those issued to his companion about the same time are to be found in 'Instructions for the Committee of the C.M.S. to the Reverend William Watson and Mrs. Watson, on their proceeding to New South Wales, on a mission to the aborigines of New Holland', 7 October 1831, C.O. 201/222.
institution, administered only by those who know and practise truth. It had never automatically submitted to the governing authority of bishops, archdeacons, or of any church dignitary. They quarrelled with the bishop but remained firm. 'It does not appear to me the duty of the corresponding committee to give up the missionaries to the Archdeacon', Hill wrote home to London after cross words with Broughton, and called a meeting of that committee for 8 November 1831 to plan Handt's future.

Broughton's wrath broke. As a member of the committee he was astounded to find himself invited to join with his ecclesiastical subordinates and begin deliberations on matters he had already settled. 'Entertaining a persuasion that the superintendence and direction of a mission for the conversion of heathens cannot without a breach of the order of the church, be committed to any other than the Bishop of the Diocese within which it is undertaken,' he wrote back to the committee on receipt of his invitation, '... I beg to decline attending the meeting of the Committee of the Church Missionary Society at which you propose to take this subject into consideration.' The corresponding committee was disappointed; and Broughton's letter marked the termination of his association with the Church Missionary Society in

95. Captain Irvine to C.M.S. Secretary, 8 August 1821 (C.N./0.12, C.M.S. Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
96. Minute, 11 August 1831 (C.N./0.1, ibid.).
97. Hill to Coates (private), 9 November 1831 (C.N./0.2, ibid.).
98. Broughton to Hill, 7 November 1831 (C.N./0.5a, ibid.); see also Broughton to Hill, 22 May 1831 (ibid.).
the colony for the time being.\footnote{Lang, \textit{New South Wales}, vol.2, p.344.}

Broughton faced a bitter moment. Whether Handt's letter reflected an error, or conveyed in accurate terms the arrangements of the Church Missionary Society had agreed to in London, the same result followed. Another of Broughton's ventures ground to a halt. Primary education had ceased to expand with the suspension of the Church and Schools Corporation. Religious growth had withered under the same curse, and the Rocks chapel had been swept into oblivion the moment it was set to be opened. Now, after eighteen months of planning and investigation, Broughton had to put aside his scheme for aboriginal advancement and await the outcome of a tedious exchange of letters with London.

About the same time another blow fell which looked to have within it the seeds of destruction of his plans for higher education. In January 1830 when Lang withdrew his support from the King's Schools and gave it to the Sydney College he did so, he said, to ensure that colonial youth had open to them an alternative to an exclusively episcopal education.\footnote{Broughton to Hill, 4 June 1832 (C.N./0.5a, \textit{ibid.}); Hill to Broughton 23 August and 7 November 1832 (\textit{ibid.}); Hill to Coates, 2 June and 8 September 1832 (C.N./0.2, \textit{ibid.}); Watson to Coates, 4 June 1832 ('N.Z. Mission. Rev. Wm. Watson, Letters, Journals, Reports, 1832-42', C.N./0.93, \textit{ibid.}); Minute 7 November 1832 (C.N./0.1, \textit{ibid.}); Minute 4 December 1832 ('M.C. Committee Minutes', vol.xii, \textit{ibid.}).} The laxity of the Sydney College trustees soon dismayed him. 'It is no part of the colonial system to act merely after having resolved to do so', he lamented. Month after month the foundation stone of the College sat like a solitary egg in a deserted
nest, and Lang feared that, for all his deft footwork, episcopacy still 'seemed likely to realise her fond prediction, uttered in the dark days of Archdeacon Scott and the Corporation, "I shall sit as a Queen, and see no sorrow"'.

Then a domestic calamity recalled Lang to Scotland. And in August 1830, as he prepared for departure, the Presbyterian divine's imagination caught fire and he determined to turn his misfortune into an opportunity for achieving one long desired aim, a school under his own direction. He could then be rid of cumbersome Trustees; men competent in their own fields, he often said, but as unfit to direct education as to legislate for the inhabitants of the moon. His school would be given over to practical instruction of the type the colony needed most. 'Latin and Greek may serve well for dead weight, but never for a whole cargo', he mused. 'The object of importance therefore, in the education of youth in the colony, is to impart the largest quantity of useful knowledge in the shortest possible time ... (and) to teach youth what they are to practise when they are men.' Lang believed the common sense of the colonists would assure the success of the venture; and in one swoop he could destroy the monopoly of the proud 'Queen', the Corporation, and honour the good name of Presbyterianism.

Lang drafted the prospectus for such a college on the voyage

---

2. Ibid., pp.328 and 345-6.
4. Lang, New South Wales, p.347; Sydney Gazette, 2 October 1832.
over in 1830, and forwarded a manuscript copy of it to the Colonial Office on 28 December the same year. He pointed out with particular care that this college would fill the gap left by the failure of all schemes hitherto proposed in the colony. He intended, he submitted, following the well tried pattern of the Belfast College, and needed only £10,000! 

That Christmas the light from the heavens shone down brilliantly on the spot where Lang rested at his journey's end. Within a fortnight the Colonial Office promised him loans totalling £3,500, and an assurance that more would follow should the project prosper. Lang thanked the Lord, but the essence of his success was largely in his timing. Goderich had just assumed the seals of the Colonial Office and, as he had soon to confess, was imperfectly acquainted with the back-log of business. He knew nothing of the plans for the King's Schools, or of the copy of a prospectus for the Sydney College which Murray had received, and acknowledged with the intimation that he would consider recommending a government grant in aid of its construction. To Lord Howick, the Parliamentary Under-Secretary with whom Lang had most to do, the scheme embodied every 

6. 'Outline of a Prospectus of an Academical Institution which it is proposed to establish in Sydney, New South Wales', Encl. in Lang to Goderich, 28 December 1830, C.O. 201/215.
7. J.D. Lang, Account of Steps Taken in England, with a View to the Establishment of an Academical Institution or College, in New South Wales; And to Demonstrate the Practicability of Effecting an Extensive Emigration of the Industrious Classes, From the Mother Country to that Colony (Sydney, 1831), pp.5, 17-8 and 25.
It combined progress in the colony with the emigration of redundant English artisans; and that without cost to Britain, or finally to the colonial treasury. The plan Lang presented on 28 December 1830 was approved early in January 1831, without enquiry or investigation, and on 12 January a letter left the Colonial Office instructing Darling to make arrangements for the advance of the sums agreed upon.

Lang's success became Broughton's despair. News of the coup preceded Lang's return to the colony, and Broughton learned of it before hearing of the fate of his own schools. This ruffled him. But two despatches landed in the colony a few months later upset him more. In one the Secretary of State declined, in a final ruling, to allocate one penny to the Rocks chapel prior to a public subscription being raised. In the other he waived all similar restrictions on Lang's loans, and instructed Darling to place £1,500 at the divine's disposal immediately he put foot again on colonial soil so that Lang could begin building his college while a public appeal in support of it was still being organised. 'Experience has proved that men are prone to undervalue that which is too easily obtained', Goderich wrote to console Broughton in his disappointment; and left the Archdeacon to ponder what, in recent years, had been more easily obtained than

14. Goderich to Darling, 29 March 1831, H.R.A., I.xvi.223-4. This and the preceding despatch came on the ship Georgina.
But it was on 13 October 1831 when Lang sailed into the harbour on board the ship 'Stirling Castle', with its store of Scottish immigrants, that Broughton realised how radically the position had changed. Lang not only unloaded the artisans who would put up the walls of the college, but produced its masters, and sent them out to deliver public lectures, to advertise their talent, and to recruit the cream of the pupils awaiting higher instruction. Being first in the colony was important, Broughton said. He had investigated the demand for education and knew the situation better than most. 'There is no room for two such undertakings at once', he reported to London, and predicted the failure of one venture. 'By the time the Masters of the King's Schools can arrive Dr. Lang will have been able to obtain assurances of support from all or nearly all who have children to be educated.'

The Sydney Gazette sympathised with Broughton's disappointment, and called on churchmen to 'rally around the Archdeacon' and await the arrival of other masters. But Broughton was the first to see that

15. Goderich to Darling, 24 March 1831, op.cit., p.117. The facility with which the grant was obtained also puzzled later officials, see Minute attached to Lang to Secretary of State, 6 November 1833, C.O. 201/235.
16. Sydney Gazette, 15 October 1831. Construction began eight days after the Stirling Castle arrived, see Lang, New South Wales, vol.2, p.353. Publicity lectures began immediately, see First Report of the Council of the Australian College (Sydney, 1832), pp.6-7.
17. Broughton to Darling, 19 October 1831, Encl. in Darling to Goderich, 13 November 1831, C.O. 202/221. (This despatch is not in H.R.A. and Darling's covering letter is marked 'At Sea'. Broughton apparently gave it to Darling on the eve of his departure for delivery when he reached England.)
18. 10 December 1831.
this asked too much of parents. No one could reasonably be expected to await the arrival of unknown instructors at some undetermined date, when a school amply endowed and patronised by the government was open and ready to receive them. At the same time he washed his hands of all responsibility for the prosperity of the King's schools, and refused to accept any liability for the great loss in income which the masters would suffer from depleted enrolments. He could exact no reparation from the Colonial Office. Instead he satisfied his anger by bluntly accusing its officials of gross discourtesy, and indulging in a choicely worded jeremiad against Lang.

The plans for the King's schools would have been at the Colonial Office two months before Lang's ship cleared Sydney Heads, he said, and yet priority had been given to a man whose 'tortuous course' in the whole matter of higher education could bring him no credit and even less respect. There had been a moment, Broughton recalled, when Lang sat in his house expressing satisfaction with the King's schools, and pouring out most unfavourable impressions of the designs and principles of certain individuals whose names had appeared in connection with the Sydney College. The next moment Lang stood up in public and poured a divine benediction on the very project he had so roundly condemned, and designed for its foundation stone a testimony that all was done, 'Deo Optimo Maximo annuente'. Lang excused this seeming inconsistency on the ground that he had come to view the exclusive use of episcopalian clergymen as masters at the King's schools as harmful to the future of the colony. Broughton found this excuse

understandable in itself, but he failed to reconcile it with the Reverend gentleman's present intention of introducing a school whose masters were exclusively ministers of the Presbyterian church. 'In fact the determination of Dr. Lang was evidently that his church should play the first part or none at all', Broughton summed up his impression of the affair, '(and)... the neglect displayed towards me cannot but operate, and I know has operated, to lower it (the Established Church) in the public estimation.'

Broughton might complain about Lang's conduct and the discourtesy of the Colonial Office, but he had no grounds on which to oppose the grant. On 8 November 1831 when the matter came before the Legislative Council, he attended and cast his vote for it. It was his gloomiest moment. Shortly afterwards the Reverend George Innes, an Oxford graduate, stepped quietly ashore at Sydney. He had been chosen master of one of the King's schools. Once the Colonial Office had realised its blunder in overlooking the King's Schools it went doubly quickly about the business of appointing masters, and so had Innes in Sydney before Lang had dug the foundations of his college.

Broughton rejoiced; and realised in a twinkle that he might yet beat Lang to the start. He had already drawn up plans for renovating the

20. *Ibid*. For Lang's insistence that the masters of his college 'should, in the first instance, be Licentiates of the Church of Scotland', see Lang, *Account of Steps Taken*, p.20.
22. Innes arrived unheralded on 2 December 1831 on the same ship as Governor Bourke. The official notification of his appointment came a week later! See, Colonial Secretary to Broughton, 19 December 1831, *C.S.O.L. 'Letters to Clergy*', 31/146 (N.S.W. S.A.).
crypt at St. James' Church and putting the first King's School there, but abandoned these as too slow. Instead he hired rooms in the old subscription library in Pitt Street, and announced that pupils would be enrolled from 2 January 1832. Lang fought back. He assembled his friends in a Council on 23 December, proclaimed the existence of the Australian College, and announced that it would open on 2 January 1832 in temporary premises at Mr. Underhill's building, Church Hill.

To the colonists at large this holy competition between Broughton and Lang could only do good. Three colleges were better than two; it afforded parents a wider choice, bestowed a more civilized image on the colony, and alerted the muse:

Where'er I turn my gladdened eye,  
Prosperity extends her sway;  
Her academic domes arise,  
To spread the intellectual ray.

The opposition press was disappointed that its protege the Sydney College, first in the field and the only institution with its permanent buildings under construction, should be the last to open. It could not praise the King's School, but neither would it condemn it. For the moment it resented Lang's desertion to the Australian College more strongly than the presence of the Established Church. 'We like the King's School', wrote the Australian's editor with a solecism barely

24. V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 8 November 1831; Australian, 25 November 1831.
25. Sydney Gazette, 10 December 1831 (advertisement), and 17 December 1831.
26. Ibid., 22, 27 and 31 December 1831.
27. Sydney Almanack, 1832 (Sydney, 1832), p.xvi.
28. Second Annual Report of the Sydney College (Sydney, 1832), pp. 6-7. See also Australian, 28 September 1832, where its tardy progress suggested to that newspaper's editor that it had become 'a monument of faded patriotism'. 
disguising his true feelings, 'because, though exclusive - they will contribute to enlarge the sphere of useful knowledge; but we anticipate little general good from the establishment.' At the Sydney Monitor, Hall contented himself with a jibe. He invited the critics who had condemned the Sydney College as an ungodly affair to run an eye over the curriculum of the King's School, Sydney. Paley and Ovid side by side, he noted; 'We cannot understand how a college can teach religion and lewdness at one and the same time'. The burning question for the supporters of the Sydney College was, had or had not Lang misled the Colonial Office into believing that his Presbyterian college was the same as the Sydney College. If so, had he scooped up for himself the bounty due to the other. As for the title 'Australian College', the Sydney Monitor would not have a bar of it; 'We can allow such a title only to the people's College. The true Australian catholic-like undeceptive college is the Sydney College.'

In the midst of this banter Broughton announced the opening of the second King's School, Parramatta, and not a murmur was raised against it. Instead, there was a general feeling of relief that the Windsor, Richmond, Penrith, and Liverpool area should have a school of its own. Those principles of education from which so little good
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could be derived in Sydney were, apparently, expected to abound to the advantage of those who lived a little further inland.

The unexpected opening of the King's school marked the high point in Broughton's achievement for 1831. The key to wider progress lay with the Church and Schools Corporation, and by December 1831 the fate of that body was locked in a tighter stalemate than ever. For a brief moment earlier in the year it had seemed different. The Tory government which originally suspended the Corporation's activity in 1829 understood the defects of clergy reserves; but it was barren of invention when it came to replacing them. It promised a substitute scheme in 1830.34 None arrived. Instead the Colonial Office found itself driven back to a system of land grants for underwriting religious and educational expansion, and it attempted to overcome the difficulties revealed in the Canadian enquiry by bringing the scheme directly under government control.35 A board of Commissioners replaced the older body of trustees. The Archdeacon sat as its president, but had only senior officers of government as assistant commissioners. Together they were responsible for raising handsome dividends on the land given to them but had no power to spend it. They were reduced to recommending to the governor how best he might spend it.36 This arrangement banished the Corporation's original autonomy and opened the way for official interference.

36. 'Instructions to the Commission for Managing the Affairs of the Church and School Estate in the Colony of New South Wales', Encl. No.2 in Darling to Goderich, 27 April 1831, C.O. 201/219.
Broughton accepted the change without a murmur. By March 1831 he was eager to accommodate any reasonable arrangement which would dispel the general inactivity in ecclesiastical development. Darling co-operated better than ever; he promised the commissioners the remaining acres in Cumberland County and agreed to put surveyors to work carving out some good land in Bathurst, Durham and Northumberland counties. By June 1831 the Corporation seemed at last within grasp of reasonable prosperity. This expectancy reigned a few weeks. Then in a move as abrupt as it was unexpected every fair prospect collapsed. Early in July before any title deeds for this land had been handed over Darling received instructions to suspend all land grants, dismiss the Commissioners for the Clergy and School Estates, dissolve the Corporation, and return its lands to the Crown in as full and ample a manner as if they had never been granted. Churches and schools would henceforth live off annual grants from the treasury.

In this manner Whig succession to power made its impact on the colony and, in predictable fashion, carried off the property of the church as its first victim. For many years Whigs had displayed an open hostility to ecclesiastical wealth, and delighted in counselling bishops that a church which pursued purity in preference to property could afford to trust to the affections of the people for its

37. Broughton, Lithgow and McQuoid to Darling 17 March 1831, Encl. No.6 in ibid.; Darling to Goderich, 27 April 1831, H.R.A., I.xvi.255.
40. Minute No.35, 8 July 1831, ibid.; Goderich to Darling, 9 January 1831, H.R.A., I.xvi.19-22; Goderich to Darling, 14 February 1831, ibid., pp.80-4.
support. 41 Goderich recommended Broughton to trust to the treasury and pushed the colonial church half way to the Whig ideal. In England Robert Southey, the radical turned Tory, carried the banner of hard-headed opposition to this type of sentimentality. 'Good principles enable men to suffer rather than to act', he wrote. 42 Broughton stood with him. The spirit of the age was not with the church; and any arrangement, he said, which saddled on the public purse an annually increasing expenditure for religion and education was destined to create a 'permanent dissatisfaction'. The church which accepted this may do well in the beginning, Broughton told Darling, but eventually it would find itself abandoned by a government forced to make peace with its people. 43

Broughton resolved to fight the change. When Darling put Letters Patent for dissolving the Corporation before the Executive Council, Broughton raised a technical objection to stall their execution. 44 Letters Patent could alter the constitution of the Corporation but it required an Instrument of the King's Privy Council to abolish it. Furthermore the lands of the Corporation could never be resumed as if they had never been granted. Sections 36 and 37 of the Corporation's charter provided that, upon the termination of the trust, lands resumed by the Crown must be disposed of as 'shall appear most conducive to the

41. See Earl Grey's speech on Catholic Emancipation, P.D., new series, vol.21, 4 April 1829, col.431.
43. 'The Report of Archdeacon Broughton on the State of the Church and Schools Establishment in N.S.W., 29 September 1831', Despatches from Governor of New South Wales. Enclosure etc. 1832-5, p.1136 (A.1267/13, M.L.).
44. Minute No.41, 1 August 1831, Proc. Ex.C. (N.S.W.), C.O. 204/4.
maintenance and promotion of religion and education of youth in the colony'. The judges of the Supreme Court upheld Broughton's objection against the validity of the Letters Patent and their power to resume the land outright, and that sufficed to send the matter back to London for further consideration.

This turn in events bewildered the chaplains. 'Everything is unsettled', Cowper wrote to his son at Oxford. 'The chaplains, I understand, are to be considered as the civil officers of Government.' Darling put the remaining acres in Cumberland County up for sale, and Broughton sat down to compose the arguments which he hoped might bring a last minute reprieve to the Corporation. He argued that in an age of growing scepticism it would be impolitic to throw the church on a government whose policies changed with the sentiments of the people; he drew attention to the extraordinary situation of a colony where the greater number of settlers came from the classes notorious for their irreligion in England; and he questioned whether a secure, alternative arrangement could be fashioned. He dared not suggest, as those to whom he wrote dared not admit, that the government no longer intended

45. 'Observation of the Venerable the Archdeacon', 1 August 1831, in Encl. in Darling to Goderich, 28 September 1831, Despatches from Governor of New South Wales. Enclosures etc. 1830-31, pp.1014-6 (A.1267/12, M.L.).
46. 'Copy of a Letter from Their Honors The Judges of the Supreme Court to His Excellency the Governor', 8 August 1831, ibid., pp.1017-9; Darling to Goderich, 28 September 1831, H.R.A., I.xvi.381.
47. William Cowper to Macquarie Cowper, 3 July 1831 (Letters of Archdeacon Cowper to his son, 1828-1832, Ms.No. A3315, M.L.).
to secure the church its finance.

But such arguments availed little.\textsuperscript{50} Goderich made it clear that the sacred text for current colonial policy was a report from the House of Commons in 1831 on colonial finances.\textsuperscript{51} Broughton studied its findings with dismay. The Corporation had sinned greatly, in the eyes of its English masters, because in all five years of its existence it had brought no relief to the colonial treasury. How could it? Broughton asked. The first two years of its life went waiting for land, the last two had been spent under official suspension. In the one intervening year, with less than one-fiftieth of the colonial lands and not the fabled one-seventh, it could hardly be expected to produce instantly the large sums required to release the treasury of the cost of religion and education. If circumstances in the colony had prevented the King's instructions from being punctually complied with, then, Broughton went on to charge the makers of the report, 'it must be unjust to make it a charge against the Trustees that they did not realise such an income as might enable them to dispense with pecuniary advances from the Government'.\textsuperscript{52}

In a second complaint the Corporation reserves were held to account for driving settlers into remote districts. That, Broughton replied, 'never had much foundation in fact or in justice'. He did

\textsuperscript{50} See Goderich to Bourke, 25 December, 1832, \textit{H.R.A.}, I.xvi.830.
\textsuperscript{51} Goderich to Darling, 14 February 1831, \textit{H.R.A.}, I.xvi.80.
\textsuperscript{52} 'The Report of Archdeacon Broughton on the State of the Church and Schools Establishment in N.S.W., 29 September 1831', \textit{op.cit.}, pp.1133-5.
not bother to refute it; though he might have pointed out with advantage that in the year 1828, which the report relied on for its facts and figures, the Corporation had been virtually landless. Instead Broughton attacked the use to which Goderich put the assumption. The Corporation reserves by dispersing settlement had increased the costs of government the argument ran. Reverse the process, remove the reserves, force intensive settlement on the colony, and a considerable economy in administration will be achieved, Goderich reasoned. If the assumption was true then the conclusion would indeed be true, Broughton agreed. Yet the same result could be achieved with less drastic consequences for the Corporation, he said. The decision to abolish land grants to individuals had already been made, leaving settlers to buy or lease their acres from the Crown or the Corporation. By simply regulating the extent of the lands made over to the Corporation and requiring it to release them on the same terms as the Crown, the desired control over the spread of settlement could be achieved.53

Broughton fought prejudice not reason. Prejudice had been the Corporation's foe from the beginning, and he confessed bitterly that it had triumphed. The press had repeated at trumpet pitch the myth of the Corporation's land wealth till men everywhere believed it. 'All the reflections to which the Trustees have been subjected have

proceeded on the assumption that while they were applying for those advances (i.e. from the treasury), they had actually in possession a seventh of the territory', Broughton observed. 'The continual repetition of which assertion', he went on to add, 'occasioned it to be very generally credited here, and it also may very probably have been by the Parliamentary Commissioners.'

The Archdeacon had scarcely laid down his pen when a brazen example of that prejudice appeared above Lang's name in a pamphlet just published in Sydney. Whilst in London in 1831, Lang had advised the Secretary of State for Colonies that vast tracts of prime quality land, much of it belonging to the Corporation, lay unoccupied in the most accessible and eligible sections in and around Sydney. If sold it could finance many ventures similar to that undertaken on the 'Stirling Castle'. Lang knew what tempting bait to serve up to the Whigs; and to help overcome any reluctance they might feel in interfering with the Corporation he had collected for them, he said, some information about that organisation not likely to have reached their ears by other channels. Had they heard, for instance, that the Corporation lands had impeded efficient settlement in the colony? Had they heard that the episcopal clergy were a mob of business men, who passed their time trading in land while their spiritual flocks languished for want to attention? Colonial morals had reached an all

54. 'The Report of Archdeacon Broughton on the State of the Church and School Establishment in N.S.W., 29 September 1831', op. cit., p. 1134. Examples of the prejudice Broughton condemned are found in: Sydney Monitor, 5 December 1829; Australian, 12 December 1829, 22 October 1830, 29 April and 27 May 1831.
time low and religious observance was fast fading away. Worse still, had they heard that the colonial youth were murmuring against the king, complaining that he had taken away their inheritance in the land their fathers had settled?  

Broughton read all this and more, turning a paler shade of white as he thumbed page by page through Lang's proud account of his days abroad. Finally he exploded. 'He has laid charges against the Corporation...with the blind animosity of a political partisan', he wrote off to Goderich. The *Sydney Gazette* concurred. He has injured the character of our youth, distorted the truth about the Corporation's running expenses, and in a most unseemly manner, the editor added, attacked his brother clergy behind their back before persons of high office 'whose displeasure might be the ruin of them and their families'. Indeed he had done worse and accused the clergy of unfounded misdemeanours:

> It would be inferred from Dr. Lang's putting, that they were perpetually immersed in business, like the managers of some large joint-stock company; that their pastoral duties were constantly interrupted by the drudgery of buying and selling; that they were more in the counting house than in the pulpit... the secularising duties of the clerical trustees consisted in attending a meeting once a quarter! One day in every three months...for some two, three, perhaps four hours, at the official board - to hear reports, pass votes, and then quietly return.

56. 'Commissioners for Managing Affairs of Church Corporation to the Acting Governor', 18 November 1831, Encl. in Lindesay to Goderich, 18 November 1831 (Separate), *H.R.A., I.xvi.459.*
57. 17 December 1831 and 26 January 1832.
Broughton was not content to see his clergy vindicated locally. He wanted the whole matter set right where it had begun at the Colonial Office. Though deeply upset he handled his indignation coolly. He neither attacked Lang nor attempted himself to exonerate his clerical brethren, but took his stand by the principle that 'if there be any foundation for the charge it must admit proof'. Since the Colonial Office had positively encouraged Lang in his projects subsequent to his laying these accusations against the Episcopal clergy, he feared that they had been accepted as fair and just comment. Broughton named the three clergymen who assisted him in the 'secular' affairs of the Corporation; that is, he said, 'if the superintendence of schools for the religious education of youth, if providing for the maintenance and instruction of orphans and for settling them advantageously and honestly in life, if the care of public charities and of devising facilities for public worship be secular concerns'. The men were Marsden, Cowper, and Hill. 'I trust in justice to these men', Broughton concluded his letter, 'your Lordship will have the goodness to call on Dr. Lang to state to you, whether he believes them to be, in the estimation of the whole colony, identified with secular pursuits.'\(^{59}\)

Broughton had every reason to be angry at Lang's imputation. Only one year before, in a bid to forestall any deterioration in public respect for the clergy, he had intervened to prevent the clergy taking personal possession of land grants due to them as a reward for long service. He insisted that the lands be put into the hands of lay

\(^{59}\). Broughton to Goderich, 19 November 1831, Encl. in Lindesay to Goderich, 18 November 1831, \textit{H.R.A.}, I.xvi.452.
trustees appointed by the Governor and developed to provide an income payable to clergy in sickness or old age, or, more finally to their widows. By this means he took away not only the concern for managing them but the enticement to exploit them for additional benefit during the period of their healthy ministry.\textsuperscript{60}

When he turned to defend the Corporation his anger waxed stronger because he felt his task was more desperate. So long as the Corporation languished in an uneasy reprieve and there remained a hope, however faint, of saving it, Broughton threw every talent into 'unmasking the artifice by which representations, true in appearance...are palmed upon the world for the purpose of conveying an impression altogether erroneous'. Lang was correct in pointing out, the Archdeacon said, that the Corporation had drawn large sums of money from the treasury every year. But had it an alternative so long as it was landless, or its land valueless? It possessed not so much as a block in Sydney or within seven miles of the main settlement, save one 'on the barren sands and inaccessible shores of Botany Bay'. Would Lang have the Archdeacon suspend religious ministrations and abandon education until lands had become available and profitable? Again it was true, as Lang had said, that the Corporation's administrative costs had soared as high as £1,500 to £2,000. But that had occurred in one extraordinary year only and not annually as Lang had implied. In 1828 in anticipation of

\textsuperscript{60} 'Report of Archdeacon Broughton on his first visitation to Van Diemen's Land', pp. 33-8, Encl. (dated 23 April 1830) in Arthur to Murray, 19 August 1830, C.O. 325/28.
receiving large land grants extra surveyors and clerks had been
engaged. Broughton reminded the Secretary of State that Lang had
not added, as it was well within his knowledge to add, that
administrative costs had dropped to around £900 a year. It was
also true that the Corporation had not managed to reduce its
annual draft on the treasury, an amount ranging up to £18,000 a
year and not Lang's alleged £20,000 to £22,000. It was equally
true, however, that in 1831 this money had been made to support
more chaplains, many more orphans, and more than double the number
of schools than it had in 1825. Lang's accusation of extravagance,
Broughton counter charged, would not be supported by an unprejudiced
examination, rather the very opposite was revealed. The Corporation
under its present form of management had managed to relieve rather
than burden the treasury. 'Dr. Lang asserts that the whole scheme
has utterly failed of its intended object,' Broughton noted. 'We
venture to assure His Lordship that the capacity of the Institution
to accomplish its object has never been fairly tried.'

There was a pause in the affairs of the colony at the end of
1831. Darling's term of office expired, and he departed the colony
fearful of there being something in the times out of joint which
would not easily be set right. Before he left Broughton read him

61. 'Commissioners for Managing Affairs of Church Corporation to
Acting Governor', 18 November 1831, Encl. in Lindesay to
Goderich, 18 November 1831 (Separate), H.R.A., I.xvi.455-8.
Many of the details of this statement were published in
Sydney Gazette, 13 December 1831, and supplied further evidence
of Broughton's willingness to use the Sydney Gazette for his
purposes.
a tribute from the Executive Council extolling his labours. 'We have seen you devote yourself to the duties of your station with an indefatigable perseverance which left you scarcely those intervals for rest and opportunities of relaxation which are essential for health', he said. Yet as Broughton uttered each word he may have wondered to what lasting end Darling had applied all this energy.

For all the goodwill that passed between them, Darling had given Broughton little profitable or energetic assistance. Though he rarely failed to approve the Archdeacon's plans, he never sent them off with the compelling or enthusiastic recommendation needed to soften the almost predictable official opposition to ecclesiastical expansion. Darling could be secretive, inefficient, and indecisive, especially where money was involved. Decisions affecting the orphanages which Murray settled in his crucial despatch of 25 May 1829, were withheld from the Trustees for over nine months. Darling approved the Rocks chapel after a month of discussion, and

64. Darling to Broughton, 25 August 1830, Correspondence between Governor and Officials, p. 59 (Ms. No. 4/1664, N.S.W. S.A.). Scott suffered from similar inefficiencies. On 25 July 1827 Darling received a despatch from Bathurst asking Scott to clarify a recommendation for expenditure on schools made in May 1826. Darling asked Scott for the information on 7 August 1827 and Scott supplied it on 27 September 1827. Darling did not transmit it to London till 28 March 1828. See, Darling to Huskisson, 28 March 1828, and Enclosures, H.R.A., I.xiv. 49-54.
then reversed his decision overnight. 65 He was solely responsible, as the unclouded eyes of the Chief Justice saw, for the depressed financial state of the Corporation. 66 Darling alone made the decision not to transfer lands to it in 1826, 1827, and 1828. 67 In 1829 and 1830 he alone made the decision not to include valuable Cumberland County lands in the then belated transfers. So when Broughton claimed that the Corporation had been condemned without fair trial, he might well have reflected that Darling had done more than any other to deny it that trial. No governor had been so advantageously placed for building up a materially strong church; and, for a self-confessed churchman, he must have looked, in the eyes of Him who reapeth where He soweth not, like the unprofitable servant who had buried his talent. Yet Broughton and Scott shielded him from blame. 68

Darling's officer mentality was both a strength and a weakness. He commanded others, and expected obedience: others commanded him, and he obeyed; and he obeyed no command more than that to guard the treasury. Once he had been generous to Scott and

65. Darling approved the project 19 August 1830, cancelled it 23 August 1830 and sent the explanation on 1 September 1830; see Colonial Secretary to Broughton 19 and 23 August and 1 September 1830, being 30/95, 30/96, and 30/101 respectively, C.S.O.L., 'Letters to Clergy' (N.S.W. S.A.).

66. 'Motion prepared for discussion at the next Meeting (i.e. of Corporation)', signed Francis Forbes, Encl. No.3 in Darling to Hay, 4 September 1828, H.R.A. I.xiv.390-1.

67. Darling to Hay, 4 September 1828, ibid., p. 387.

68. In later years Broughton was capable of passing a sharp comment on Darling, see Broughton to Coleridge, 19 October 1837 (Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
earned a sharp reminder from his masters that governors could be compelled to repay unauthorised expenditure out of their own pockets.\textsuperscript{69} From that time on he became inflexible, and so his reluctance to authorise money for new schools and churches, for Threlkeld and the Lake Macquaries mission, or for the Rocks area and the extension of the orphanages, was understandable. Some of his other economies were not. He not only refused to allow the female orphanage to expand, but fought to have its income reduced.\textsuperscript{70}

When Broughton acted on medical advice and refused to admit more children into the already overcrowded dormitories of the female orphanage, Darling over-ruled his decision. Broughton attempted to shake the governor of his decision by threatening to turn the master's residence into a dormitory. Darling, content with any short term move that did not involve expense, approved; and to Broughton's great disgust left him the future problem of securing supervisors who did not require separate accommodation.\textsuperscript{71} During the same years, parsonages fell apart for want of timely repairs. 'A person standing in the lower rooms, can in many places see the sky through the chasms in the shingles', he reported after a visit to the Bathurst parsonage,

\textsuperscript{69} Bathurst to Darling, 6 October 1826, \textit{H.R.A.}, I.xii.608.
\textsuperscript{70} Based on Darling to Huskisson, 30 March 1828, I.xiv.76-8; Darling to Huskisson, 31 March 1828, and Enclosures, \textit{ibid.}, pp.95-101; Broughton, Cotton and Macquoid to Colonial Secretary, 10 May 1831 (and Minute of James Stephen), \textit{Despatches from Governor of New South Wales, Enclosures etc.} 1830-31, pp.984-91 (A.1267/12, M.L.).
\textsuperscript{71} Broughton to Colonial Secretary, 18 December 1829, \textit{C.S.I.L.}, 29/9981, Box 4/9981 (N.S.W. S.A.); Broughton to Colonial Secretary, 14 January 1830, \textit{ibid.}, 30/327, Box 4/9981; Colonial Secretary to Broughton, 28 January 1830, \textit{C.S.O.L.} 'Letters to Clergy', 30/19 (N.S.W. S.A.).
and begged to have repairs effected immediately. The rains poured in again the next winter.\textsuperscript{72} A few shillings worth of forage for a catechist's horse, Broughton found, could involve more letters than provisioning the orphanages for a year. So the Darling years, which could have seen the church launched into financial independence and put on the road towards meeting the colony's demands for chaplains, churches, and school masters, left the Archdeacon a suppliant at the treasury door whether his need was to build a church or repair a window.\textsuperscript{73}

Few other things went smoothly. He failed in all his attempts at manipulating clerical duties as to add small extra fees to the stipends of chaplains with large families.\textsuperscript{74} He succeeded better in launching a scheme where, in exchange for duties performed at jails and hospitals, the chaplains received the services of two convicts to till their glebes. Yet his solicitude only added to his work. Chaplains complained that they were sent the 'refuse of the prison people'. The Reverend Mr. Reddall got one man so ill he had immediately to put him into hospital: the other absconded within a

\textsuperscript{72} Broughton to Colonial Secretary 23 December 1830, \textit{C.S.I.L.} 30/9776 in Broughton to Colonial Secretary, 23 March 1831, \textit{C.S.I.L.} 31/2151, Box 4/2101 (N.S.W. S.A.).

\textsuperscript{73} The instances are too numerous to detail but the following are typical examples of what consumed Broughton's time: Colonial Secretary to Broughton, 26 May 1831, \textit{C.S.O.L.} 'Letters to Clergy', 31/48 (N.S.W. S.A.), permission to repair a fence; Colonial Secretary to Broughton 28 June 1831, \textit{ibid.}, 31/66, forage allowance for Rev. R. Hill's horse; Colonial Secretary to Broughton, 12 August 1831, \textit{ibid.}, 30/85, permission to repair leaking roof at Newcastle.

\textsuperscript{74} Broughton to Darling, 17 February 1831, Encl. in Darling to Murray, \textit{H.R.A.}, I.xvi.90; Goderich to Bourke, 18 September 1831, \textit{ibid.}, p. 356.
week; and Broughton was left with the task of persuading Darling that he could not guarantee the proper performance of duties in hospitals and jails unless the governor intervened to ensure that the convicts assigned to the clergy were of 'a somewhat better class than at present'.

Among the clergy there was a persistently troublesome element. The Reverend Mr. Vincent quarrelled with Captain Logan at Moreton Bay, and Broughton was forced to remove him to restore unity in the settlement. Thereafter Vincent complained of the inadequacy of his parsonage till Broughton admonished him that 'the chief thing wanting to make it commodious is a willing and content disposition.'

The Reverend Mr. Wilkinson, irritated by an unconfirmed suspension imposed during the Scott era for political behaviour ill-fitting to his calling, wrote Broughton insulting letters and threatened to publish remarks 'derogatory' to his station. The Reverend Mr. Wilkinson's

75. Governor to Broughton, 16 August 1830, Correspondence between Governor and Officials p. 54 (Ms.No. 4/1664, N.S.W. S.A.);
    Broughton to Colonial Secretary, 8 November 1831, C.S.I.L. 31/9144, Box 4/2122 (N.S.W. S.A.);
    Colonial Secretary to Broughton, 26 November 1831, C.S.O.L. 'Letters to Clergy', 31/134 (N.S.W. S.A.);
    Broughton to Colonial Secretary, 6 December 1831, C.S.I.L. 31/9856, Box 4/2122 (N.S.W. S.A.).

76. Broughton to Darling, 6 October 1829, C.S.I.L. 29/7896, Box 4/2047, and Broughton to Vincent, 23 November 1829,
    C.S.I.L. 29/9256, Box 4/2058 (N.S.W. S.A.).
    Broughton to Bourke, 4 November 1833, C.S.I.L., 33/7334, Box 4/2169 (N.S.W. S.A.). See also, Broughton to Darling, 13 November 1830, Encl. in Darling to Hay, 18 January 1831, H.R.A., I.xvi.30.

77. Wilkinson to Colonial Secretary, 27 November 1830, in Broughton to Colonial Secretary, 6 December 1830, C.S.I.L., 30/9178, Box 4/2090 (N.S.W. S.A.).
English creditors finally caught up with him and Broughton had the unenviable duty of prying open the chaplain's purse.\textsuperscript{79} Scott had fared much worse; but to Broughton these were worries he could well have done without. Caution, he said, must be exercised in the selection of chaplains. In future he wanted men from the universities, and assured his English superiors that the people of the colony would be satisfied with nothing less.\textsuperscript{80} It was a curious preference on Broughton's part, for the two most regularly trained clergy in the colony were Wilkinson and Wilton, while Cowper, the only chaplain for whom Broughton expressed unqualified respect, had had no university training.\textsuperscript{81}

Under these and other pressures Broughton became irascible and at times vindictive, as his dealings with Lang showed. At times, too, he became absurd. When the steamer 'Sophia Jane' put on a public demonstration and towed the ship 'Lady Harewood' out of the harbour on the sabbath to an accompanyment of booming cannon, Broughton urged Darling to avenge this 'insult to Government and Religion' by a public prosecution. If that failed, he said, the government should threaten

\textsuperscript{79} Colonial Secretary to Broughton, 6 October 1831, \textit{C.S.O.L. 'Letters to Clergy'}, 31/84 (N.S.W. S.A.); Broughton to Wilton, 10 August 1831 in Broughton to Colonial Secretary, 3 October 1831, \textit{C.S.I.L. 31/7946}, Box 4/2118 (N.S.W. S.A.); Broughton to Colonial Secretary, 17 August 1832, \textit{C.S.I.L. 32/6162}, Box 4/2153 (N.S.W. S.A.); \textit{Australian}, 26 November 1830.

\textsuperscript{80} 'The Report of Archdeacon Broughton on the State of the Church and Schools Establishment in N.S.W.', \textit{Despatches from Governor of New South Wales. Enclosures etc. 1832-5}, p.1129 (A.1267/13, M.L.). See also \textit{Australian}, 24 April 1829.

\textsuperscript{81} Broughton to Arthur, 25 February and 19 March 1832 (\textit{Arthur Papers}, vol. 12, M.L.).
to withhold all contracts from the ship's owners until they made a public apology for disturbing the sabbath. But for all his problems, disappointments, and frustrations Broughton resisted the despair that overtook Scott in his first two years. Progress had been slow, but his vision of the future was encased in hope. The Corporation might be saved, the aboriginal mission made fully his, the King's schools expanded, and the government brought to realise that the outward exercise of religion was its best hope for peace and security. To foster that observance, he said, the people must have religious establishment 'supported for them in the first instance'. Only then could they be taught to value the church for its own sake and happily come to support it from their own wealth. Reason was on his side, and he believed it would prevail.

If Broughton's hopes for the future were fulfilled, the colony would be moulded in the image of rural, ecclesiastical England familiar to his early ministry and to his liking. Yet for his yearning after a familiar past there were encouraging signs that he could adapt to his new environment. He admitted to colonial life having a pace of its own and abandoned all ideas of spectacular progress; he was prepared, he advised the Colonial Office, to live out the next few years without many changes in his staff. People attended church more regularly than pessimists allowed, and his

82. Broughton to Darling, 13 June 1831, C.S.I.L. 31/4721, Box 4/2019 (N.S.W. S.A.).
84. Ibid., pp. 1141-2.
journeys through the archdeaconry had convinced him of a turn for the better among all but the lowest and poorest classes. 85 Life centred on material gain; but without proper education, he said, nothing better could be expected. There was a great deal of debauchery, too, but the imbalance of the sexes had much to do with that. 'The Almighty', he observed, 'never has engaged to bestow upon the ministry of his Church such an efficacy as should enable it to prevail against the habitual violation of his own declared appointment that it is not good for man to be alone'. 86

Within himself there were signs of change. He had discarded none of the dignity and honour which surrounded his own ecclesiastical office and its civil appurtances. But an idea of what an apostolic ministry in the colony meant for others was clearly forming in his mind:

A clergyman has an opportunity here of rendering himself the instrument of great good to a great number of souls; but he ought to come prepared to carry on his ministerial labours in comparative obscurity; in thinly peopled districts; at a distance from cultivated society; and with abridged opportunities of study and improvement. 87

Should his hopes be dispersed in disappointment and should he determine to live by the counsel he delivered to others, there seemed to be nothing in the past or future that could prevent the tory minded curate of Hartley Wespall staying, for good or for ill, in the colony, till higher office or death called him away. His prospects were brighter than his accomplishments, but he had weathered the storm of disappointment better than his predecessor.

85. Ibid., p. 1146.
86. Ibid., p. 1147.
87. Ibid., p. 1131.
I would request permission to remark upon the very anomalous, and personally irksome, situation in which I have been placed.

Broughton to Bourke, September 1832.
'My life has been one of incessant labour and anxiety',
Darling had confided to Arthur in June 1831, and he said then that
he saw no prospect of relief. 1 Already by that date in London his
relief had been decided on. 2 A new Secretary of State for Colonies
had selected Richard Bourke from among the Irish gentry to take
his place and, when this news reached Sydney, no one resented it
more bitterly than the fatigued Governor himself. 3 Coming as
it did close upon the attacks made on him in the House of
Commons, a calumnious episode which Broughton assured him could
not prevail against his integrity, it seemed to Darling, as Darling
also feared it would seem to the colony, that he had been dismissed. 4
Men of unwarped judgment will receive the news with sincere regret,
Mansfield wrote in an editorial in the Sydney Gazette; but there
remained, he reminded them, a 'shrivelled remnant of a once noisy
cabal' to whom it would afford much gratification and they could be
expected to rejoice. 5

Rejoice they did. The tale was told around the colony that
as the General departed so too would 'tyranny's dire scourge'; and
only then would the way be made straight for settlers to rediscover
the peace and beauty of their adopted land. Hall, to celebrate the

2. Goderich to Darling, 15 March 1831, C.O. 202/25; Howick to
3. Darling to Goderich, 21 June 1832, C.O. 201/229; Darling to Arthur,
4. Broughton to Arthur, 16 November 1830 (Arthur Papers, vol. 12,
M.L.); Darling to Goderich, 3 October 1831, H.R.A., I. xvi.400-2;
Sydney Monitor, 1 October 1831.
occasion, sat by his flag-pole at Cockle Bay and ladled out punch to the subscribers of the *Sydney Monitor* who had supported him in the darkest days of his incarceration under the tyrant's rule. Wentworth indulged in a greater extravagance. He had scored handsome fees defending the tyrant's victims. Some of these he ploughed back into a great festive event at Vaucluse, and he invited as many as wished to drop by. He put an ox on the spit and passed colonial gin and beer around by the tub full. There was a band and entertainment to taste; dancing and blindman's bluff for the tender spirited, hurling, wrestling, and boxing for the young and lusty.  

When the day passed into evening, without any interruption to the gaiety, McLeay failed to discern any difference between Wentworth's house and a common grog shop; except that the one was regularly licensed. He recommended to the Attorney-General that the owner of Vaucluse be prosecuted for distributing liquor to the public without licence. But a search of the statutes proved that every Englishmen could behave as Wentworth, and dispense unlimited hospitality on the lawns of his own home. McLeay's suggestion was a token of the deep resentment aroused among the Governor's friends by the event. They were offended, not so much at the sight of Hall or Wentworth or of any of the Governor's declared opponents rejoicing at the Governor's departure, as by

the knowledge that so many of the ordinary, well dressed citizens
had joined with them. The 'shrivelled remnant' on parade had
turned out to be a multitude 4,000 strong; willing and ready
to sport a tri-colour, or toss high a hat before the harangue
of the 'patriot of Australia', Wentworth, the antipodean Burdett. 8

Broughton had seen it all, in London, in 1812. The *Sydney
Gazette*, dipping its pen in ridicule, dismissed the event as a
people turned rabble on the 'generous' hospitality of a rogue. 9
Broughton could not dismiss the rabble. He feared it. He believed
it had a dangerous tendency to persist and find its fulfilment in
destruction. The boisterous revels at Vaucluse confirmed
Broughton in his opinion, and exonerated his view, that a wide­
spread anti-nomian spirit had taken its grip on all classes in the
land. Darling's firm hand had held it in check. Now that it had
reared its head more daringly than ever before it was all the
more necessary for his successor to reassert that firm hand.

At mid-day on Saturday 3 December 1831 Broughton stood in
the dockyard waiting to greet that successor, the colony's eighth
governor. With him were the usual people. When the Governor
landed the usual ceremony took place, interrupted once by an
unceremonious but hearty cheer from a crowd gathered around
the dockyards. A procession followed. Bourke, like a conquering
hero, mounted a charger and took the lead. 10 His 'lively, affable

8. *Sydney Monitor*, 15, 19 and 26 October 1831; *Australian*,
14 October and 9 December 1831.
and intelligent countenance', passing along through the ranks of citizens lining George Street, seemed to promise that benevolent change the colony needed. To some observers it was therefore a strange thing that the people should have cheered so timidly. But six years' tyranny, they reflected, was not to be overcome or forgotten in a day. For most people, however, the procession was not so very different after all. Immediately behind the governor came the Chief Justice and the Archdeacon in their sedate carriages. The lean and gaunt face of the one a grim reminder that with or without the dashing Bourke theirs was a convict colony and crime was its chief business. The short rigid figure of the other, with its fixed, aloof stare, proclaimed that, whether Bourke arrived or Darling went, the unalterable law of God remained ruling kings and governing princes.

There was little joy or reassurance in the procession for Broughton. The band of the 39th Regiment might rap out its familiar airs, and the militia that lined the streets snap smartly to attention in its finest military tradition; but this was so much dressing in an age when fundamentals were being shaken. Recent news from England had not been good. The malicious mumblings against the Church, her bishops, her rituals and her revenue, once confined to the gutter press and a few hardy agitators, were now reported as issuing with rhetorical splendour from within the chambers of the mother of parliaments herself. Men stooped to

invoke the privilege of one ancient Institution as a means for hurling degrading and insulting remarks at another, more ancient and more venerable. Such was the odour of the new Whig rule. Riding before him, erect and dignified, was a man chosen for office by those very same Whig rulers. Broughton must have wondered for what purpose he had been sent.

Goderich, he could recall, had given little satisfaction in the matter of Darling's removal. He had passed it off as a routine application of the new six year rule. Why then, the thought remained, should Arthur be allowed to enter his eighth year without any hint of his recall? Moreover, if it was merely routine, why had Arthur been passed over as a successor? His record was impeccable and his reputation at a peak at the Colonial Office. He had himself been led to expect some such promotion. Instead, a stranger had been sent. Had he been hand picked? If so, for what? Clearly, for what the Colonial Office wanted most of all in New South Wales. Broughton shuddered. The innuendo in Goderich's communication to Darling suddenly took on a menacing shape. 'I consider you to be free from the blame imputed to you', the Secretary of State had written. 'I cannot but feel at the same time that the misunderstandings and dissentions, which have occurred in New South Wales, render it advisable...(that) a new Governor should take charge

of the colony. If a governor's first duty was to keep the peace, how could he succeed against men who preached that 'the best form of government, is that which the people approve'? He must either trade concessions from the government for co-operation from the people, or go the way of his predecessor. Confronted by men like Hall, who had shown themselves willing to suffer imprisonment for their beliefs, the end result of such a policy was frightening. For a moment, it could have seemed to Broughton that Bourke had come to open the doors of the colony to the gales of change blowing through England.

When the procession finally halted by Government House, Broughton went inside for the official ceremonies. His specific duty, was to swear in the Governor as a member of the Executive Council. That done, the Governor read the Instructions delivered him by the King. Broughton cocked a keen ear to these. He was anxious to detect what changes, if any, had been written into them concerning his responsibilities for addressing the Governor on matters concerning the aboriginals. He was soon stunned. In the presence of his fellow officials and before a great number of invited civil and military guests, he heard his office reduced in status from that of third to that of fourth official in the land. The change was small but significant. As the colony's third citizen he had enjoyed the high honour of being the senior member of the Executive Council and,

16. Goderich to Darling, 15 March 1831, op. cit.
because the Chief Justice was regularly absent on court business, of being the most senior member present at the Legislative Council. By the new Instructions the Chief Justice remained undisturbed in his place as the colony's second citizen, while the Archdeacon was made to vacate his in favour of the military officer immediately inferior to the Governor. Henceforth, Broughton would sit in both Councils indistinguishable in status from other government officials such as the Colonial Secretary and the Colonial Treasurer. The original order of Governor, Chief Justice, and Archdeacon, had mirrored the traditional order of precedence in England, of King, Chancellor and Archbishop. The change, Broughton felt, was capricious, unholy and mischievous.  

The matter simmered in Broughton's mind until the day for meeting the Governor-in-Council. He decided then to take his seat under protest. His own personal ambitions, he assured Bourke, were not involved in the issue. His anxiety was for the Established Church alone and for what adverse effect his reduction in office might eventually have on its place and authority in the colony. Broughton, conscious that he was treading on delicate ground, avoided a direct request to have the matter reversed as though it was simply a question of policy. Instead, he made a legal issue of it. The

18. Based on, Hill to Coates, 21 July 1831 (C.N./0.2, C.M.S. Papers.); Minute No.65, 3 December 1831, Proc. Ex. C. (N.S.W.), C.O.204/4; 'To the Right Honourable Thomas Spring Rice, M.P., H.M. Principal Secretary of State for Colonies. The Memorial of the Reverend Grant Broughton M.A. Archdeacon of New South Wales and its Dependencies', 1 September 1834, C.O. 201/244; Royal Instructions to Sir Richard Bourke as Governor of New South Wales, p. 3 (Ms.No. 394, A.N.L.).
status originally granted the Archdeacon had been bestowed by a Writ of Privy Seal, a legal document of the highest rank issued by the King's Privy Council itself. This, Broughton pointed out, had been set aside by a Commission under the Sign Manual, a document of inferior status. Was such a move possible? Unfortunately the innuendo in his letter carried a slightly offensive tone. The Archdeacon came close to implying that his reduction in status had not originated in the highest Councils of the realm, but had been carried through, as a coup, by some lesser body of officials set upon eclipsing the King in his Ecclesiastical capacity.  

Bourke despatched the complaint to London without comment. He had ready for despatch, too, a copy of the Archdeacon's recent report on the Ecclesiastical establishment. This contained a full account of an earlier move by the Archdeacon to frustrate Colonial Office instructions by raising legal technicalities, technical legal objections to the dissolution of the Church and School Corporation. Bourke at this moment seemed to sense that Broughton, more than the Chief Justice about whom he had been warned, would be his most prickly fellow official. He decided to act. He allowed Christmas and the New Year to pass in peace then, at the earliest possible moment in January, he assembled the Executive Council. He read to

20. Bourke to Goderich, 28 February 1832, ibid., p. 542.
it a hastily prepared minute announcing his intention to proceed immediately with a Bill to extend trial by jury to criminal cases. He was aware, he explained, that some people present were hostile to the idea. He had read their opinions and the objections they had submitted to Governor Darling. These he had decided to reject in favour of more 'correct information' from 'persons most likely from their official situation and professional employments to be competent advisers in such a matter'. It was an ungracious thrust. Broughton, commended by Wellington and praised by Darling for his sound counsel, was bluntly informed by Bourke that he was regarded, by him, as incompetent. Bourke had lived in the colony exactly one month.

Broughton overlooked Bourke's incivility. He could afford to. On this occasion the roar of the lion echoed faintly with the neigh of an ass. When Bourke revealed the submissions of his competent advisers they turned out to be embarrassingly thin; an opinion Forbes had written for Darling sixteen months earlier, and one new one from Roger Therry, Commissioner of the Court of Requests. Bourke had clearly consulted one person: it was not clear that he had consulted more. As for his talk about the people generally desiring common juries, that sounded decidedly second-hand from a man who had resided

22. Minute prepared by Governor Bourke, 29 December 1831, in Minute No. 1, 3 January 1832, Proc. Ex. C. (N.S.W.), C.O. 204/5.
24. Enclosures A and B to Minute No. 1, 1832, Appendix (for half year ending 30 June 1832), Proc. Ex. C. (N.S.W.), C.O. 204/5.
only one month in the colony. Campbell Riddell, the Colonial Treasurer, in a blunt retort in the Council Chamber, accused Bourke of not having even consulted the records available to him close at hand, let alone the people. These showed, he said, that the people, rather than desiring an extension of common juries, had cast aside those already in existence; and they had done so because they felt that those who sat in them were not to be trusted on their oaths. Bourke nevertheless insisted that he heard, from the small scale immigrant settlers and the colonial born alike, a loud cry for the abolition of military juries. That noise was the one he would attend to. Then, a week after this uncompromising declaration to proceed immediately with a bill extending the common juries, Bourke announced an amended programme. Action was to be deferred for twelve months. Somewhere, another voice had spoken above the clamour of the people.

In January 1832, when Bourke had spread the garments of his authority before his chief councillors, he had sought to dazzle them with the scarlet and the gold. The Secretary of State for Colonies, he gave them to understand, had favoured him above his councillors. One thing, and only one thing, was required for the implementation of the proposal he had in mind, he said, and that was 'that I should deem it advantageous to the colony'. Bourke showed his aggressive front.

25. Bourke to Howick, 10 February 1832 (private), C.O. 201/225.
26. Riddell to Bourke, 24 February 1832, in Minute No.8, 5 March 1832, Proc. Ex.C.(N.S.W.), C.O. 204/5.
27. Bourke to Howick, 28 February 1832 (private), C.O. 201/225.
29. Probably that of the Judges, see Forbes, Stephen, Dowling to Bourke, 17 February 1832, Encl. in Bourke to Goderich 22 February 1832, C.O. 201/225.
30. Bourke to Riddell, 2 March 1832, in Minute No. 8, 5 March 1832, Proc.Ex.C. (N.S.W.), C.O.204/5.
Unfortunately, he showed too where that front was most vulnerable. He was impetuous. His strong sympathy for popular change beguiled his good judgment and precipitated him into ill-considered actions. He showed that he would as likely rush and stumble over an issue as pursue it with calculated caution. Against such a man there was hope. Broughton had said of Darling's administration, 'its measures... having been adopted with our concurrence and advice, must to a certain extent be regarded as our own'. Broughton would scarcely be able to repeat the sentiment at Bourke's departure. At the same time, he could confidently expect the business of the colony to bear a greater impress of the Council's advice than the Governor, in January 1832, wished to allow for.

Broughton and Bourke were alike in temperament, proud and inflexible. In doctrines they were to one another as Pharisee and Saducee. The headstrong devotion to beliefs that each demanded of his integrity fixed a gulf between them. Broughton proudly submitted to the Church of England and became its inflexible servant. Bourke adopted the Christian religion but was too proud to submit to any Church. Spiritually, he dwelt with the liberal divines of the eighteenth century. Like them he found the doctrines of the Holy

31. When pressed for evidence of his sweeping powers Bourke could produce none and had hastily to forward to England a copy of notes made after a conversation with Goderich in which he maintained these powers were given him; Bourke to Goderich, 11 January 1832, H.R.A., I.xvi.530, and 'Copy of Minutes of Instruction to Governor Bourke', June 1831', Encl. in Bourke to Goderich, 11 January 1832, C.O. 201/225.
33. See fragment of a letter Mrs. Percival to Bourke, n.d. (letter No. 47, Bourke Papers, vol. 10, M.L.). Mrs. Percival was a daughter of the Governor.
Trinity and the divinity of Christ a stumbling block, and dealt with it after the manner of the tacit reformers. He would subscribe to it with his lips to secure a commission, but denied it in his heart as the remnant of an obscurantist past that Parliament had no business enshrining in its law. Like them too, he regarded bishops more as ecclesiastical officials, appointed by the crown for the superintendence and restraint of the clergy rather than as modern day apostles. Once, earlier in his career, he had threatened to disband a school on his estate at Limerick should the bishop of the diocese, Dr. Mant, insist on his right to nominate its master. It counted for nothing that the gentry elsewhere accepted the practice. For Bourke it was a sufficient argument against it that he found it inconvenient; 'it would be exceedingly unpleasant to Mrs. Bourke and me to have a master or mistress put in of whom perhaps we might not approve'.

Bourke was captain of his own soul and master of his own vessel. One of that breed who accepted private judgment as the fundamental source of authority in matters of religion, and utility and expediency in policies. In Broughton's opinion, a man of 'Galileo's temper'; so indulgent towards the spirit of independence as to be careless of the authority of the church. Broughton abhorred the eighteenth century apologists who, with support from the Hanoverian Kings had established a precedent which permitted men of such unorthodox

34. Bourke to Secretary of Commission of Enquiry, 12 December 1824, in Appendix to 'First Report of Commissioners of Irish Education Enquiry', P.P., 1825, xii, (400), 640.
opinions to remain within the ruling caste of the Establishment. In
the day of their former ascendency these men had put the Church of
England on trial. Their ascendency had passed, but their disciples
had remained. Fate, in 1832, deposited one of them in office, above
Broughton, in New South Wales.

Life had taught Broughton and Bourke different lessons. Like
all men born in the latter half of the eighteenth century, they shared
the experience of having seen the mob grow wild and dangerous. The
mob best known to Broughton was the London rabble. He attributed its
madness to ignorance and irreligion and to the persistence in man of
his original possession, a 'nature inclined to evil'. Bourke,
after living among the Irish peasants, understood this madness as
springing from a thwarted dignity; from men cast low by poverty and
lower still by the rights other men had rifled from them. From
religion they drew a different inspiration. Broughton lived in
anticipation of that great day God's glory filled the earth as the
waters covered the sea. Bourke looked forward to a better world,
made in the image of a profound change anticipated in Christ, a world
rid of Jew and Greek, bond and free, and peopled simply by men, equal
and free.

Broughton disapproved of Bourke's fresh plan for trial by jury
because it threatened the internal security of the colony. Another

37. Evidence of Major-General Bourke, 'Minutes of Evidence before the
Select Committee of the House of Lords Appointed to Enquire into
the State of Ireland', P.P., 1825, ix,(181), 172 and 180.
plan brought to light at much the same time, from what seemed to be Bourke's bottomless bag of private instructions from London, caused him even deeper concern. Outwardly it wore the harmless aspect of a simple money Bill; inwardly it harboured a threat to the stability of the church establishment. This was a Bill to provide for the payment of the Governor's salary and the salaries of the Supreme Court Judges out of custom revenues, and on the authority of warrants issued directly by the Governor. It was expedient, Bourke said in introducing the matter, 'to make some certain provision' for these salaries. 38 It was indeed expedient. Bourke had just announced that in future the estimates for colonial expenditure would be printed and turned over to the Legislative Council for debate. 'I assure you', he added, 'I shall feel great satisfaction in diminishing any expenditure that may be shown to be unnecessary.' 39 He intended, nevertheless, to deny the Council the opportunity of debating the high cost of governors and judges. With cries of 'no bishoprick above £1,000 - no rectory, above £400 - no working curacy under £150 per annum' already in the colonial air, 40 Broughton thought it expedient that the Archdeacon's salary be granted a similar safe passage through possibly troublesome times.

39. V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 19 January 1832.
40. Australian, 17 February 1832.
Broughton considered such a concession not only expedient but just. In the terms of his appointment it was clearly set out that 'in whatever manner the payment of the Governor's salary might be fixed, the payment of the Archdeacon's should be secured in the same manner'. Broughton tried in private to persuade Bourke to accept this. The Governor refused; he said his Instructions did not allow it. Broughton considered for a moment making an open issue of it in the Council, but in the end decided against it. 'I...(am) unwilling to urge any measure, which could embarass Your Excellency's proceedings by giving rise to debate', he told Bourke. So the Bill passed the Legislative Council on 3 February 1832. But the day following the Governor received a sharp note from the Archdeacon. It may have been improper for the Governor to exceed his Instructions and provide for the Archdeacon's salary in the right manner, the note ran, but it would be more than proper for the Governor to write to London and have them amended and corrected. 'I have now most respectfully to request your recommendation to the Secretary of State', the Archdeacon said by way of winding up his letter, 'that the payment of my salary may be provided for out of some permanent fund at the disposal of His Majesty.'

Bourke might have marvelled at all the fuss. But the matter did not just touch Broughton personally. He saw it as another attempt to downgrade his office and he felt obliged to resist that. Yet he feared even more its effect should the Church and Schools Corporation

41. Broughton to Bourke, 4 February 1832, Encl. in Bourke to Goderich, 5 February 1832, *H.R.A.*, I.xvi. 514-5.
be finally disbanded. Every officer of the church, himself included, would then become a stipendary officer of the state forced to live off the annual vote of a parliament. The consequence of such a move had often engaged Broughton in thought. 'It is a question of great extent upon which past experience throws very little light', he frankly confessed. But what little he saw by that dim light was not reassuring 'I cannot but entertain most serious doubts how far the functions which appertain to an Established Church can be discharged by one which is merely stipendary.'

Broughton regarded the Established Church as part of a nation's insurance against impiety and insurrection. To succeed in this the Church needed a sufficient staff in its ministry and a pure doctrine. One danger inherent in a stipendary church was that both of these could easily disappear. By a sufficient staff Broughton had in mind one which adequately covered the entire population of believers and non-believers; it would confirm the believers in their faith and convert the others from their error. Should the maintenance of such a ministry be made to depend on the vote of a people, or their representatives, could it be expected, Broughton asked, that non-believers would vote a slice of the public purse for the maintenance of a ministry they did not desire? This would leave a colony like New South Wales, where 'the greater number arrive in total ignorance and disregard of religion', with a grim and uncertain future. Unless it proved possible to send into these new settlements 'in the first

42. 'The Report of Archdeacon Broughton on the State of the Church and Schools Establishment in New South Wales, 29 September 1831', Despatches from Governor of New South Wales. Enclosures etc. 1832-5, p. 1136 (A1267/13, M.L.).
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instance at the public expense zealous and efficient ministers, by
whom they may be gradually won over', Broughton told Arthur with whom
he discussed the problem, 'I cannot but fear that the next and more
numerous generations will grow up in infidel habits of thought, and in
consequent addiction to immoral practices'. No government worthy of
the name would deliberately open the door to such a prospect. Yet he
feared that Bourke's Bill, by turning the entire Church establishment
over/the vote of the Legislative Council had taken the first step in
thrusting such a prospect on the colony.

So much for the havoc the vote of the non-believer might bring
in its train. Yet the vote of the believer could be every bit as
dangerous in Broughton's estimate. Religion pure and undefiled was
a stiff dose for frail humanity. Once the laity voted the stipends
of its clerical teachers the Archdeacon feared they could be emboldened
to demand that the rites and doctrines of the Church be adjusted to
their taste. Hall the editor was on hand to fortify the worst of
Broughton's fears. He had once considered entering the ministry: he
still considered himself something of a theologian. He was also a
conscientious pew holder at St. James' Church. The very model, in
word and deed, of the sort of Christian gentleman Broughton feared
might circumscribe his support with unwholesome conditions. In
January 1832 Hall wrote to Goderich and showed just what he would do

45. 'The Report of Archdeacon Broughton on the State of the Church
and Schools Establishment in N.S.W., 29 September 1831', op. cit.,
p.1137.
with his vote:

Provided a National religion can be established among us on a cheap foundation, divested of all civil authority, a great majority of the colonists would concur in such a state of religion being maintained out of the revenue of the colony... but they would require its maintenance to be on the same independent footing, as the army of the United Kingdom is, whose substance is voted annually by the people through their representatives in Parliament. And as the services of the Church of England and her Communion, are Catholic and Scriptural, very broad and liberal in their nature, I think the colonists generally would have no objection to her ceremonies and rites.47

As far as Goderich was concerned men like Hall would never have a say in the matter. The Church of England was firmly established in the colony and in Goderich's opinion would ever remain so.48 He told Broughton his fears were groundless and the changes he sought pointless.49 This only heightened Broughton's anxiety and McLeay, who for some years had handled the correspondence between the Archdeacon and the Governor would have noted a new and peremptory tone in Broughton's letters on the subject, marking a sharp departure from the customary politeness that had graced former exchanges between Corporation House and Government House. He may have reflected, too, that the new Governor had drawn out another side of a man hitherto distinguished in the colony for the mildness of his manner. In adversity Broughton seemed to develop a resilience which, if it did not permit him to enjoy a contest, afforded him the determination to conduct one. The Duke of Wellington's boast, that he knew how to pick his men, showed signs of vindication.

47. Sydney Monitor, 6 January 1832.
48. Goderich to Colborne, 5 April 1832, in 'Copies or Extracts of Correspondence Respecting the Clergy Reserves in Canada: 1819-1840. Part I, Correspondence', P.P., 1840, xxxii, (205), 95-6.
While Goderich believed local good sense would preserve the Church of England inviolate, Mansfield praised the spirit of goodwill which that privileged Christian body showed to other denominations. 'It cannot be doubted', he wrote after hearing of McLeay's gift of £25 to a new Independent chapel in Sydney, 'that in no part of the globe is the odium theologicum less visible than in New South Wales.' The disposition to go beyond a mere toleration of another man's conscience into helping him maintain his beliefs in outward dignity was viewed by many as a pleasing feature of colonial life. Protestants gave aid to Protestants; but what was more significant they gave aid to Roman Catholics as well. The help was meagre, but for the large and impoverished Roman Catholic community any assistance was a boon to its struggles. It struggled for most things, for clergy, for churches, for teachers and for schools. But what most excited public sympathy was its struggle to complete the still floorless and roofless chapel in Hyde Park. The colony's stature was measured by its buildings, and this 'immense gothic edifice', as Scott once described it, had caught the imagination of many who were not Roman Catholics. 'That great and laudable undertaking - the Roman Catholic chapel', Mansfield told the Reverend J.J. Therry whose dream it was, 'I shall always feel pleasure in promoting whether by my pen, or by any other means at my command.'

50. Sydney Gazette, 10 August 1830.
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Roger Therry decided to capitalise on this goodwill. Early in 1830, not long after his arrival in the colony as Commissioner of the Court of Requests, he organised the Roman Catholic community into making an appeal to the Governor and to the protestant colonists at large, to help them save from ruin the partly completed but still partly exposed chapel at Hyde Park. John McArthur agreed to preside over a Protestant Committee to Aid Catholic Brethren, and enlisted fifteen others. Sir John Jamieson rallied to the occasion, and Mansfield came good with his pen. 'The object is most meritorious', he instructed the colony. 'Firmly protestant as we are we should rejoice to see that feeling once more displayed in this particular instance, as to enable the managers to put a finishing hand to their splendid temple.' The public appeal enjoyed some success; but all overtures to the Governor fell on deaf ears, and Broughton probably helped to close them.

Broughton had derived no comfort from Roger Therry's arrival in the colony a few weeks after his own. He was a literary gentleman, as some remarked, but he was also an unabashed disciple of George Canning, the leader of a factious Tory group Broughton had some years back dismissed as 'contemptible for their duplicity'. He was, too,

---
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58. On Therry's background see *Sydney Gazette*, 7 November 1829, and 16 February 1832. For Broughton's opinion of Canning, see Broughton to Duchess of Wellington, 20 June 1827 (*Letters of William Grant Broughton, 1826-1829*, Duke of Wellington Collection, m/f, M.L.).
the first fruit in New South Wales of Wellington's one folly, Catholic Emancipation; and his activity in 1830 on behalf of the Roman Catholic community stamped him as a protagonist for the gradual extension of the spirit of concession embodied in that measure. While Protestants commended the appeal for Hyde Park chapel to one another with sentimental thoughts about cheering the depression of exiled Irishmen, Therry unabashedly addressed the Governor-in-Council suggesting, that it might consider completing the chapel as a memorial to the great measure of political equalisation recently accomplished in England. If Broughton had properly understood the passage of that measure, it had been coupled with a declaration against further indulgences. He had adopted the measure, Peel told the House of Commons in 1829, to strengthen Protestantism. In 1830 in the colony, Therry's appeal was turned away by a Council determined to do just that.

But the new Governor was not one of Peel's men. 'A government is bound in my opinion', he told a Roman Catholic priest in Sydney, 'to extend equal freedom of conscience, equal protection, and equal proportionate assistance to all classes of its subjects, provided they teach nothing inconsistent with plain morality and the public peace.' Years before in Ireland the Catholic clergy had earned Bourke's respect as a 'well-conducted moral class of people', and he

59. *Sydney Gazette*, 9 March 1830. Darling's one concession was an acknowledgment that Roman Catholics could benefit from one additional chaplain, see Darling to Murray, 16 March 1830, H.R.A. I.xv. 382-3.
61. Minute by Bourke attached to Ullathorne to Bourke, 29 April 1833, C.S.I.L. 33/3059, Box 4/2175.2 (N.S.W. S.A.).
had on frequent occasions observed that the most peaceful areas of his homeland were those well staffed by them. He believed, in opposition to many of his countrymen, that the Irish priests were the best hope for bringing peace to that torn country. The journals Broughton read took the opposite view. Where the priests blessed insurrection it flourished, they said, and where they condemned it they were often hounded from their altars. So the more Broughton poured out his fears of a possible future insurrection in the colony, the more Bourke would have felt driven to adopt policies of conciliation to oppressed sections of the community. Bourke had a straightforward view of good government. 'Peace and tranquility depend on a good gentry, good clergy, and good magistrates', he said. For the Irish catholics in New South Wales 'good clergy' were Roman Catholic clergy. This simple formula, uncovered in Limerick, travelled with Bourke to the colony.

Bourke's conviction fitted well with Therry's desire to do more for Roman Catholics than squeeze an occasional pittance from the pockets of patronising Protestants. The treasury, Bourke announced, had ample funds in reserve to provide for more schools and places of worship. Broughton, Bourke could confidently expect, would not lay
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claim to any great portion of this, for in a recent report he had expressed satisfaction with existing level of grants for churches and schools. If he could replace two catechists with priests and put chaplains on the penal stations 'the Establishment without increase of numbers and expense, would be competent to the charge of a much more numerous population', the Archdeacon had reported. 'The only points indeed at which I should apprehend that additional aid could for many years be required would be towards the upper branches of Hunter's River.' Bourke supported the Archdeacon's request for extra chaplains, and he could reasonably hope that the new land regulations might slow down expansion in the upper Hunter region. Aid could then be made freely available where it was most needed among the neglected Irish catholics settled in the established counties. It appeared early in 1832 that the only likely impediment to the diversion of expenditure in this direction would be the Colonial Office itself.

Bourke plotted to forestall this; at least, it must have seemed that way to Broughton. Since the policy of the Colonial Office was to consider for review only those grants which the Legislative Council had already agreed to meet from its own treasury, Bourke's first move was to test the Council's mood. He found it warm, and willing

To sway the Colonial Office into approving the grant Roger Therry took over and approached Protestants for a goodwill signature on a Memorial, to be forwarded with the Council's recommendation, expressing protestant approval of the grant and further government aid towards Roman Catholic churches, schools, priests and teachers.

Therry wanted the best of signatures and pursued them into the countryside. So it happened that around the end of April 1832 Sir Edward Parry, Commissioner in charge of the Australian Agricultural Company, received one of Therry's letters and a request for his signature on the Memorial. Parry was a devout churchman and as likely as not would attend worship three times on Sunday. He had, too, a zealous concern for the souls of others. In a matter of two years he had turned the congregation at Carrington, on the Company's estates, from a mere handful of about thirty (mostly convicts bound to attend) into a regular congregation of two hundred. When he landed in New South Wales late in 1829 he had found the colony 'an absolute moral wilderness' and was easily induced to give a donation to the Roman Catholic community. 'I did it', he recalled, 'in the

69. V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 9 and 15 March 1832.
70. Sydney Gazette, 31 March 1832.
72. Edward Parry, Journal 1829-1832, 3 June 1832; 17 January, 2 and 25 April, and 25 July 1830; and for increase in congregation, 10 January 1830 and 3 October 1832 (Parry Papers m/f, A.N.L.).
73. Ibid., 10 January 1830.
sincere belief that to build a Roman Catholic Chapel where there was none...was the least of two serious evils. The same spirit moved him to distribute Bibles and Prayer Books to destitute Roman Catholics at Port Stephen. From such a man Therry anticipated automatic support.

It so happened that over the week-end of 28 April to 1 May 1832, the week-end Therry's letter arrived, Wilton, the high church chaplain from Newcastle, came to Table House, the Parry residence, with news that Sir Edward's mother had died in London. From that devout woman Parry had learned all the great truths of Evangelical religion. He had been her youngest and her most favoured son; a child, he admitted, 'of never ceasing prayer'. Therry's letter, arriving at so inopportune a moment, received unexpected treatment. 'I do from my heart most solemnly protest against the Church of Rome, as being, in my opinion, a system of idolatry and superstition', Parry wrote back to Therry. It was his mother's opinion; and Parry was paying his last respects to her Evangelical fervour.

The next day on the way to church Parry's horse stumbled and fell, tossing Parry on to the hard earth.

Therry got nothing from Parry but 2,000 other Protestants put their signatures where he asked them. Then at a meeting of Roman
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Catholics on 29 July, Therry announced that the time had come to deliver the Memorial to the Governor and despatch other copies to good statesmen abroad, like Lord Howich and Daniel O'Connell, who might be induced to further their cause. Therry was profoundly thankful for Protestant support, but not content with it. Though Irish and catholic to the core, he was anxious to appear as English as St. George and slay the dragon of prejudice which remained in the colony. He took up Parry's letter and read it to the assembly of Roman Catholics as a typical example of the mischief circulating in their midst. 'Whence...did the worthy Knight derive his mission to be a denouncing and destroy-angel?' he asked. It came from a blindness prevalent among Protestants, he answered, which refused to acknowledge that the foundation of England's constitutional liberties had been laid in Catholic England of the thirteenth century, by catholic bishops and barons centuries before Protestantism was dreamed up.

A presbyterian penman who called himself 'Philadelphus' leaped to Parry's defence. He wanted it put right that English liberties arrived with Hampden, and that the rest of Therry's argument was 'as lame on the one hand, as it was uncharitable on the other'. The Reverend Henry Fulton, a chaplain as Irish as Therry but protestant, drew up a pamphlet supporting Parry's charge that Roman Catholicism was imbued with idolatry. Fulton had trouble discipling his pen, and ended up publishing a discursive survey of papal aberrations from
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the Arianism of Pope Liberius to the unscriptural use of oil, salt, and tapers at baptism. The controversy expanded; the debate became ham; and as Therry observed invective soon replaced argument. But before that dreary stage had fully arrived Broughton contributed a pamphlet on a somewhat different plane.

For over two years Broughton had witnessed with growing alarm, he recalled, the consolidation of the colony's peculiar system of protestant aid to Roman Catholics. But he had kept silent. Then seeing Therry attack Parry in public and assail the Reformation for good measure, he felt duty bound to speak out and warn the colony's Protestants against any further 'submission to the insidious paralysing influence which has been lately exerted to persuade them that they are justified in encouraging the Roman Catholic religion, as being another equally acceptable mode of worshipping God'. Protestantism and Roman Catholicism 'must ever remain distinct and adverse', he maintained, and went on to spell out in detail what he had hoped every Protestant would already have known. Protestants derived their faith from Scripture alone whereas Roman Catholics concocted their beliefs from an amalgam of Scripture and an unwritten tradition. That unwritten tradition, he reminded them, had opened the door to many unholy doctrines including those which had sent the English Martyrs to their death. Protestants could not justify supporting the extension of such a system. In the past they may have
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been misguided by false notions of charity into doing this. The chief characteristic of charity was that it 'rejoiceth in truth', Broughton pointed out. Protestant 'charity' to Roman Catholics amounted to a subsidy on error. So in the future Broughton ruled, no Protestant may contribute to the establishment of colonial Catholicism 'without guilt'.

Some Protestants responded by donating immediately to the Hyde Park chapel. Others accepted Broughton's reasoning and declined, like Parry, to repeat their earlier liberality. Therry read Broughton's pamphlet and shuddered. 'It breathes the spirit of retracting former relaxations and re-enacting former disabilities', he warned. Yet Hall the editor, a fierce apostle of liberty, read it and liked it. 'Forcible, logical and to us convincing', he wrote in the Sydney Monitor. 'We believe him (Broughton) to be an enemy to persecutions and intolerance of all kinds, whenever he can distinctly detect their probable presence.' So men seemed free to make what they liked of the pamphlet; and the many copies sold (a second edition being printed in just over a month) showed that it touched upon a subject which meant a good deal to them.

88. Busby to J.J. Therry, 11 November 1833, and James McArthur to J.J. Therry, 10 November 1834 (Therry Papers, Canisus College, Sydney).
89. Therry, Appeal on Behalf of Roman Catholics, pp. 34-5.
90. Sydney Monitor, 29 September and 3 October 1832.
91. William Cowper to Macquarie Cowper, 28 October 1832 (Letters of Archdeacon Cowper to his son, 1828-1832, Ms.No.A3315, M.L.).
When the mist of passion cleared there were no scars except on Broughton. He seemed henceforth to walk before men disfigured by a lack of charity.92 I would, Therry wrote looking back over the affair, 'that he had availed himself of the dispassionate tone of the public mind - of the prevailing disposition to merge sectarian feeling and invidious distinction in the comprehensive pursuit of the general happiness of all, and the real welfare of the state.' It was precisely against such a notion that Broughton had pitted his wits and to the discerning reader of his pamphlet it was plain that beneath the dust of controversy the Archdeacon's principal foe was religious liberalism not Roman Catholicism.

Broughton had no objection to the presence of Roman Catholics in the colony or to the open practice of their religion. 'So long as men are earnest and sincere, even in erroneous views with respect to Christ, there may be in them a feeling of real piety',94 and he provided local Roman Catholics with a room in St. James' schoolhouse to practise their own, if mistaken piety.95 He even defended their right to jingle bells during worship when the Presbyterians in an adjoining room complained of excessive noise on the Sabbath.96 The spirit of usurpation, which he believed, like so many of his countrymen, to belong to that religion worried him in theory but caused him no real

93. Therry, Appeal on Behalf of Roman Catholics, p. 30.
95. Broughton to J.J. Therry, 11 October 1830 (Therry Papers, op. cit.).
96. J.J. Therry to McGarvie, 17 November 1832 (ibid.); Broughton to Bourke, 21 November 1832 (Bourke Papers, vol.11 M.L.).
concern in the colony. So long as Roman Catholics were restricted to expanding by their own means they could pose no threat. The little money Protestants gave, as well as the £500 from the Council, made little difference materially and, for that reason, he had suffered it in silence. If the English government should decide to grant them extensive aid then the threat could indeed be revived, but for the moment Broughton was prepared to trust to the good sense of men at home to prevent such folly. What angered Broughton in 1832 was not the presence or practice of Roman Catholicism but its manipulation of liberal jargon to win an advantage from Protestants, and in so doing plant notions which could bring about its eventual decay.

The Gospel, Broughton maintained, 'requires us to have in all our doings, a single eye to the advancement of truth'. The world at large eschewed such earnestness. It preferred instead a so-called spirit of toleration, which Broughton was wont to describe as a 'phlegmatic and listless unconcern for respecting matters of faith and principle'. When Roman Catholics appealed for protestant support what spirit were they hoping to find in them? A single eye for truth, or a listless unconcern for the principles of their faith? When they praised protestant generosity, they lauded not protestant conviction but protestant indifference. And when the time came for Roman Catholics to depart with their gain, they would leave behind a

99. Ibid., p. 4.
1. Ibid., p. 27.
colonial protestantism so conceitedly tolerant that it no longer bothered or even considered it important to search out the difference between truth and falsehood. 'The system of giving countenance and support to religious opinions which are diametrically opposed ... may for a time promote the apparent interests of your Church', he warned the Roman Catholic leaders,

but I warn you of the injury which religion must sustain from the example of such an alliance. You will do no good, even according to your own understanding of the term, to those with whom you are united; and they will do you much harm. You will not bring them over to your Church: but what if they should carry into its bosom the spirit of their own indifference! In availing yourself of their assistance, you recognised a principle which carried to its full extent, would authorise all men to encourage all sorts of opinions, without consideration of their truth or falsehood. I do not perceive where the limit is to be fixed; for if any of us may in one instance support that which we do not believe, why not in all?²

Nothing went well between Broughton and Bourke in 1832.

Broughton found Bourke/sympathetic and obstructive. Bourke found Broughton heartless, an impression that first began to form in his mind after a clash with the Archdeacon in January 1832 over the new land regulations. Broughton had played a leading role in the Executive Council in 1831 when the rules were framed adapting the new land policy of the Colonial Office to local conditions. These rules required settlers who had taken up crown lands any time during the 1820's to pay off their arrears in quit rents, and to complete the outright

purchase of the lands they wanted to keep by August 1832. This would ruin the agricultural interests in the colony, the landholders protested. But Broughton was unmoved by their plight. He told Bourke that at the time the condition was imposed the Executive Council knew 'it could not be complied with', and that was its purpose. 'It would have the effect', he continued, 'of procuring the surrender of considerable portions of land which it might be convenient to have on hand to dispose of to newcomers.'

The landholders looked to Bourke for relief and got it. They met at Paramatta on 30 November 1831 and asked for five years in which to complete their purchases. Bourke offered them a further two. Broughton opposed the concession. It was impolitic, he said, to dispose into the hands of a few individuals all the lands available to attract immigrants. It was immoral, he added, to sell land to the wealthy already in the colony on easier terms than to new settlers. If new settlers were to be allowed only one month of credit, he objected to the old ones having almost three years. 'This appeared to me' Bourke reported to London, 'to savour of injustice to one's old friends.'

3. Minutes Nos. 40, 43 and 44, for 20 July, and 8 and 12 August 1831 respectively, Proc. Ex.C. (N.S.W.), C.O. 204/4. Broughton claimed on a subsequent occasion that Darling had relied exclusively on his advice in drafting the regulations, see concluding paragraphs of 'To the Right Honourable Thomas Spring Rice, M.P., H.M. Principal Secretary of State for Colonies and its Dependencies', 1 September 1834; C.O. 201/244.
5. Bourke to Howick, 28 February 1832 (private), C.O. 201/225.
8. Bourke to Howick, 28 February 1832 (private), C.O. 201/225.
But Broughton had no friends in this matter. The cry to open up land for immigration had already turned covetous eyes on the Clergy and School Estates, and a meeting of landholders at Parramatta late in 1831 had clapped madly when Lang reminded them that Goderich knew and would do something about the thousands of Corporation acres lying vacant around Sydney.\(^9\) To save the Corporation lands Broughton wanted to unlock the massive holdings of the McLeays, the Dumaresq brothers, the Riddells, the Joneses and their like, men with an acquisitiveness bordering on unprincipled greed, who took up fresh acres without paying rents and instalments on their old ones. They had done this with crown lands and they had done it with the Corporation lands.\(^10\) In many matters Broughton counted these men his friends, but he could never ignore the harm they had done to the church he loved above them all. Their defaults in rents and instalments to the Corporation had helped increase its dependence on the local treasury, and cultivated that hostility Lang so cunningly exploited on his recent trip to England, and which might finally bring down the Corporation. There was a point at which such men need be told they could go no further, and Broughton believed that

10. Details of debtors to the Crown and Corporation, see Encl.PPP to Minute No.40,1831, Appendix (for half year ending 31 December 1831), *Proc. Ex. C. (N.S.W.)*, C.O. 204/4, and 'Schedule of Lands granted to the Trustees of Clergy and School Lands shewing whether sold or leased - if sold, the amount of purchase money and annual interest - and if leased, the yearly rental arising therefrom', Encl.No.2 in Darling to Murray, 17 August 1830, C.O. 201/213.
Broughton's heartlessness angered Bourke in another matter. By March 1832 the Australian College was in difficulties. It had exhausted its initial grant from the colonial treasury, and its shareholders had, predictably, failed. Lang foreseeing difficulties had written to the Colonial Office seeking revised and more liberal terms for the allocation of the remaining £2,000 of government subsidy. In March 1832 he could not afford to await a reply. He turned to Bourke. With a healthy treasury at the disposal of a Governor willing to spend money on education, and with the colonial treasurer, Riddell, chairman of the College Council and on the Executive Council, he could confidently expect sympathetic if exceptional consideration.  

Bourke was willing. He liked Lang's venture, and showed a predisposition to favour it above its competitors. Possibly he admired Lang's energy. He certainly approved of the way Lang poured his own funds into the project. But if Bourke was willing the Executive Council was not. When it turned to review the request for

11. The Colonial Office supported Broughton's recommendations, see Goderich to Bourke, 1 May 1832, H.R.A., I.xvi.627.
12. Minute No.6, 25 February 1832, Proc. Ex. C. (N.S.W.), C.O. 204/5; Lang, New South Wales, vol.2, pp.331-2 and 338. The financial difficulties of the Australian College became public later in the year, see Sydney Gazette, 11, 22 and 25 September 1832. Other members of the Legislative Council on the Australian College Council were Richard Jones and Alexander Berry, see Sydney Gazette, 22 December 1831.
aid Broughton reminded the members assembled that it had been specifically written into the minutes of the Council the previous 31 October, that no additional money could be paid to the Australian College until £3,000 had been spent on it. In March 1832 Broughton took care to see that the Executive Council stood firmly by its ruling.  

Bourke was furious, and retaliated. He took the matter into the Legislative Council chamber and asked there, that the remaining £2,000 in question be voted for distribution 'upon the terms set forth in the despatch of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State, dated 12 January 1831'. This did not help Lang. It simply placed the money in the Governor's hands for distribution as the Trustees of the College fulfilled the conditions. It did, however, remove the affairs of the Australian College from the Executive Council. This was the satisfaction Bourke sought and it was all he received. To achieve it he had to suppress a second despatch, of 29 March 1831, superseding the earlier one, and which forbade the Governor to approach the Executive Council for any of the remaining £2,000 until after Lang had demonstrated that he had raised, and spent, £1,500 of public subscriptions on the buildings. But in the war which was brewing between Governor and Archdeacon, a dash of deceit was within the rules. As indeed was a dash of cunning. To win approval in the Legislative Council for that £2,000 Bourke had sandwiched it between

a vote of £600 to St. James' Church and £500 to the Hyde Park chapel, challenging Broughton to object at the risk of losing his own grant. If Bourke could retaliate so could Broughton, and if Bourke could spice his moves with political cunning Broughton showed that he could match him. Broughton was indeed exceedingly angry with Lang, early in 1832, for the way he had carried on about the Corporation lands at the landholders meeting the previous December. His remarks about there being sufficient Clergy and School estates to satisfy all immigration needs had touched off another witchhunt against the Corporation in the opposition press. This could only worsen Broughton's chances of saving the body from final and utter dissolution. Broughton knew others were angry with Lang at the same time but for other reasons. Some of the Trustees of the Sydney College had openly accused him in January 1832 of deliberately misleading Goderich into believing the Australian College was the Sydney College, and Lang replied mauling the Trustees with an invective that assured him of their enmity for some time. Some of those Trustees sat on the Legislative Council, and Broughton believed he could exploit their indignation to win approval for a censure motion against Lang, and a resolution instructing Bourke to

15. V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 13 and 15 March 1832. The two despatches involved were Goderich to Darling, 12 January 1831, R.R.A., I.xvi.22-6, and Goderich to Darling, 29 March 1831, ibid., pp.223-4.
17. Australian, 6 January 1832; Sydney Monitor, 7 January 1832.
18. Sydney Gazette, 26 and 28 January 1832; Sydney Monitor, 28 March 1832; Second Annual Report of the Sydney College, pp.7-8. The matter simmered on the whole year, see Sydney Gazette, 29 September and 2 October 1832.
report to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Colonies that, in the opinion of the Legislative Council, Lang's recent charges against the Protestant Episcopal clergy were unfounded and unwarrantable, and their publication a highly improper and censurable act. The resolution succeeded.

It was a largely wanton move. Lang and his pamphlet had already been condemned by the highest administrative authority in the colony, and the appropriate complaints forwarded to London. What Broughton gained was the satisfaction of forcing Bourke, who delighted in snubbing his Executive Council, into reporting unfavourably to the Colonial Office on a man whom he had shown signs of wanting to patronise. Bourke dismissed the act as vindictive. It was. But it revealed at the same time to Bourke that he faced a resourceful opponent.

The victory begat Broughton no gain. He was vulnerable in too many matters. He had tried to persuade Bourke throughout the early months of 1832 to return him control of the aboriginal mission. Bourke simply closed his ears. 'I shall have great pleasure in promoting the object', he told the Archdeacon, 'but I have no reason to desire that the direction should be placed in other hands.' He had every reason to place the direction in proper hands, Broughton

20. Bourke to Goderich, 1 May 1832, ibid., p.627.
retorted. The King's Instruction to the Governor in July 1831 had reaffirmed the earlier Instructions issued to Darling and left no room for doubting that the Governor must continue to consult the Archdeacon in all matters affecting the aboriginals. If the Governor could pick and choose between his Instructions might not the colonists be encouraged to pick and choose between laws? Moreover, it was plainly contrary to Apostolic practice to have Christians at work in one area and yet free from the bishop's jurisdiction. And it was plainly embarrassing to him to have people wondering why the Governor had seen fit to withhold certain of his powers in defiance of the King's Instructions. Would they not suspect that the Governor had uncovered something unsatisfactory in the Archdeacon's behaviour, Broughton asked.

The most unsatisfactory aspect of Broughton's behaviour was his growing preoccupation with status and authority. 'I undertook a very laborious and responsible charge', he reminded Bourke, 'upon the faith and distinct understanding that there were attached to it such privileges, as would enable me, in all except purely episcopal offices, to preside over the Established Church in these colonies.'

---

22. Royal Instructions to Sir Richard Bourke as Governor of New South Wales, pp.29-30 (Ms.No.394, A.N.L.).
23. Broughton to Bourke, 5 June 1832, Encl. in Bourke to Goderich, 17 August 1832, H.R.A., I.xvi.703-5; Broughton to Darling, 19 October 1831, C.O. 202/221. Broughton's concern for the aboriginal mission could have been heightened by a newspaper attack on it as a waste of money; Sydney Gazette, 31 December 1831, Australian, 27 July 1832, Handt to Coates, 30 July 1832 ("N.Z. Mission. Mr. John C.S. Handt, Letters, Journals, Reports 1830-1843", C.N./0.51, C.M.S. Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
But by June he found himself, month by month, presiding over less
and less. Under these circumstances he looked suspiciously on even
trivial changes affecting him, and was convinced that Bourke had
embarked on a deliberate policy of lowering the degree of estimation
his office and calling had hitherto enjoyed in the colony. Yet
Bourke might have reminded the Archdeacon that he had lost control
of the aboriginal mission through his own doctrinaire approach to
the question of his authority. The C.M.S. in Sydney had bent over
backwards to humour him early in 1832, even to the point of offering
him the permanent presidency of its local organisation.25 That
position, sensitively handled, would have given him immense influence
and virtual superintendence over the Wellington Valley mission. It
would also have placed him where he could advise the Governor on
general matters connected with the advancement of the aboriginals.
But Broughton did not want to run the mission. He simply wanted the
C.M.S., and the Governor, to acknowledge that he was the head of all
that was done in the name of the Church of England in New South Wales.

Bourke showed what he thought of the high church attitude when
Broughton decided in October 1832 to re-open the case of the Reverend
Frederich Wilkinson. For several years Wilkinson had lived under
threat of disgrace and removal from the colony for unbecoming
political activities. Scott had suspended him in 1828 and requested
his recall to England. Broughton had confirmed that decision. At

25. Hill to Coates, 22 May 1833 (‘Letters of Corresponding Committee
Secretary to Home Secretary, C.N./O.2, C.M.S. Papers, m/f,
A.N.L.’).
the last moment, however, it was decided in England that the Bishop of Calcutta should have the final say. Unfortunately at Calcutta three bishops had died within five years; and this, in Broughton's opinion had turned a once just sentence against Wilkinson into a cruel and oppressive uncertainty. 'The two years suspension which he has undergone may be regarded as sufficient punishment', Broughton wrote to Bourke early in 1832 and requested that the Governor reinstate Wilkinson. Bourke refused.26

In the Governor's opinion the matter was beyond Broughton's jurisdiction. Broughton argued in reply that in the exceptional circumstances of the Diocese of Calcutta it was not. He was not only Archdeacon of New South Wales but Commissary of the Bishop of Calcutta. That meant he had authority to administer discipline in the Diocese of Calcutta when the bishop was prevented from doing so. The Bishop of Calcutta, Broughton reminded Bourke, was dead, and in his opinion incapable of pronouncing on Wilkinson's case. If his appointment as Commissary had any meaning it was clearly the time to invoke it, Broughton added, and relieve Wilkinson. But there would be another

Bishop of Calcutta, Bourke said, and he would attend to the matter in good time. Wilkinson could wait, and Broughton could learn that in the opinion of the Governor the Archdeacon of New South Wales could not exercise a discretionary authority over his clergy even when it was to administer mercy.

Then fell the blow which hurt most. On 5 September 1832 the Reverend George Innes, Master of the King's School, Sydney, died. His school had struggled to survive its first eight months in competition with Mr. Cape's Academy and the Australian College. It had kept only eight pupils. Broughton, with an eye on the added competition implicit in the half completed building at the Sydney College, wanted Innes replaced quickly. He wrote to the Bishop of London to have the process of selection begun immediately. Bourke, for his part, wrote to the Colonial Office recommending that the King's School, Sydney, be suspended. 'The Australian College,' he testified, 'in the promotion of which Dr. Lang the Presbyterian Minister has taken so active a part, promises more favourably.'

So Bourke was able to extract a revenge for Broughton's earlier

28. The matter was settled in August 1833, see Broughton to Bourke, 30 August 1833, C.S.I.L. 33/5874, Box 4/2169 (N.S.W. S.A.). The Bishop of Calcutta confirmed Broughton's recommendations and suggested that Broughton be given absolute authority to deal with such matters in future; Bishop of Calcutta to Secretary of State, 23 April 1833, C.O. 201/235.
hard heartedness towards Lang. After the Governor had failed in March to secure relief for the Australian College, Lang had sold £3,518 of his own property to keep the project alive. Bourke wanted to reward so fine and Wiggish a gesture, and decided that, as Broughton's forecast that only one of the three Sydney Colleges would survive looked ominously accurate, he could best reward Lang by suppressing his competitors. 33 He refused to contemplate any thought of aiding the ailing Sydney College, and four times blocked Forbes's moves to have the matter discussed in the Legislative Council. 34 In the same vein he took advantage of Inne's death to put the King's School, Sydney, out of the way for the time being. 35

To justify the breach of promise such a move involved, for Goderich had promised the King's Schools three years' trial, Bourke wrote down that the prejudice against the Church and Schools Corporation was so deeply rooted in the colony that the colonists would never patronise any venture associated with it. 36 One editor called it an Upas tree in whose shade nothing can thrive. 37 It was a spurious tale. At Paramatta the King's School had suffered nothing

33. Sydney Gazette, 22 September 1832 (Lang to Editor); Bourke to Goderich, 7 August 1832, H.R.A., I.xvi.695-6. For references to there being too many colleges, see Sydney Monitor, 21 March 1832; Second Annual Report of the Sydney College, pp. 6 and 8.
34. V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 27 September, and 2, 8, 12, 13 October 1832. The matter remained unheard when the Council adjourned for the year.
36. Ibid., p.806. For the promise of three years' assistance, see Goderich to Darling, 22 March 1831, H.R.A. I.xvi. 112-3.
37. Australian, 14 September 1832; see also Sydney Gazette, 16 October 1832.
from its association with the Corporation. Fifty-three pupils, among them 'the sons of the leading and most respectable persons in the colony', packed its two temporary classrooms and a waiting list existed. Only accommodation was wanting. It was the colony's most successful college.

Broughton blamed the Sydney school's poor beginning on the Master not the Corporation. Innes had shown neither enterprise nor energy, and where he struck difficulties he took refuge in complaints. This was not the spirit for the rough and tumble of a colonial settlement. Outside the school he cut an equally unimpressive figure. Cowper dismissed him as unconverted, and condemned his preaching as puerile. 'I hope all from Oxford will not be like him', he wrote to his son Macquarie who had just taken up residence there. Hill at St. James' Church found him so odd that, desperate though he was for assistance, he turned down all Innes's offers to help. Innes's trouble probably lay in his physical condition. He died from a brain disease. His odd behaviour and lethargy fitted well with that. Another Master carefully chosen and quickly despatched could make a great difference, Broughton told Bourke. Bourke realised it

38. Broughton to Bourke, 8 August 1832, C.S.I.L. 32/6063, Box 4/2152 (N.S.W. S.A.).
40. William Cowper to Macquarie Cowper, 1 January 1832 (Letters of Archdeacon Cowper to his son 1828-1832, Ms. No.A3315, M.L.).
41. Hill to Coates, 18 September 1832 ('Letters of Corresponding Committee Secretary to Home Secretary, C.N. 0.2, C.M.S. Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
42. William Cowper to Macquarie Cowper, 17 September 1832 (Letters to Archdeacon Cowper to his son 1828-1832, op. cit.).
probably would, and was determined to interfere and prevent the possibility.

The matter brought to a close a very bad year for Broughton. The rot which had settled into the fabric of the Ecclesiastical Establishment in Darling's last year, and which he had hoped could be arrested under a new governor, simply took over, till, by November 1832, Broughton saw the Establishment and his Office on the brink of disintegration. Reduced in status; insulted and ignored as a Councillor; excluded from a Civil List that guaranteed his own salary and denied any permanent fund to provide for the keep of his clergy; bereft of means to provide more churches and robbed of schools already established; deprived of the aboriginal mission and denied authority over his own clergy. He complained to Bourke that his position had become 'anomalous and personally irksome'. The time was ripe, Broughton said, for some competent and trustworthy person to report across the table to the Secretary of State for Colonies, on the state of affairs that had overtaken the Established Church in the colonies. Broughton knew of one fit person for the task, himself. He requested leave of absence for eighteen months, from February 1833, to go abroad and consult with the Secretary of State for Colonies on a number of problems; the future of the Corporation, the need for more clergy, the need for better clergy, the need for churches, schools and teachers. He felt certain that in the Grammar Schools of England, and at Christ's Hospital in particular, there were many well educated young men, with few prospects before them in England, who might be encouraged to emigrate and teach in the colony's schools. He wanted to talk to them, and to the Secretary of
The prospect of another voyage around the world irked him and his family. He saw in it only exposure, hazzards and inconvenience; and the memory of the debility that overtook him on the latter half of his voyage out left him in no doubt that it was a drastic step. He saw at the end of it, however, a possible breakthrough in the impasse that had been reached in the colony. That thought alone drove him on. 'As the object of His Majesty in appointing me to the office I hold, was to provide for the welfare of the church', he pointed out to Bourke, 'I conceive that...I should...go where that object can be most efficiently promoted, rather than remain here while it is everyday in consequence receiving fresh injury.'

The injury done the church throughout 1832 had come from many sides, from within and from without. While the Governor contributed his share, a mischievous press had egged the ordinary people to add another portion to Broughton's burden. The people throughout that year complained of religious neglect. In Maitland they complained because they had no court house, no goal, no parson and no church. Up the Hunter River they complained because they saw the Archdeacon but to no good effect. He came, he went, and they lived on without church, minister, or a trustworthy school master. On the Goulburn plains they complained because their children were deprived of the

43. Broughton to Bourke, 24 September 1832, Encl. in Bourke to Goderich, 3 November 1832, C.O. 201/227.
44. Ibid.
45. Australian, 2 February 1832.
46. Sydney Monitor, 3 November 1832.
religious attention they were accustomed to in England. 47 In the Illawarra they simply joined in, and complained. 1832 became the season for complaints. 48 It was thought that Broughton was to blame. 'I trust', wrote one sturdy churchman, 'he is able to give some good reason for this apparent neglect of interests of the church.' 49 It was thought elsewhere that Broughton was not to blame. Even the Sydney Monitor, seeing that Broughton was right down, dipped a sponge in vinegar and ministered a comforting word. 'We believe Mr. Broughton to be a good man, desirous, as fast as he can, to put the spiritual and educational concerns of this colony on the best footing'. 50

The pace of movement was not Broughton's concern. His worry was that he was not moving at all, and he knew that many of the complaints were justified. Whether friends complained, or enemies jeered, the church suffered an equal loss of face; and would do so as long as matters remained as they were. Broughton urged Bourke to take this into consideration when determining the fate of his application for leave. 'The present inefficient state of the Establishment affords a fresh opportunity for those who view it with hostility to strengthen their own cause by pointing to our apparent condition of inactivity.' 51 It was as necessary for Broughton to go to England to maintain what the church already had as to advance it further.

47. Ibid.
48. Sydney Gazette, 8 September, 11 October, and 8 November 1832.
49. Sydney Monitor, 3 November 1832 (Philo Umbra to Editor).
50. Ibid., 14 August 1832.
51. Broughton to Bourke, 24 September 1832. op. cit.
Bourke said, 'No.' He needed Broughton in the colony; at least until the Corporation's affairs had been settled. Fresh instructions for this were due in the new year. Bourke had another reason for detaining Broughton. Abroad it was not the Governor's finest hour. Goderich was in a testy mood. He had just rebuked Bourke for accepting the address of welcome of 23 December 1831, containing as it did, offensive reflections on the previous governor and some officials still in the administration. Another despatch showed that Lang had fallen into disfavour over his pamphlet against the Corporation, and there were threatening allusions about a possible withdrawal of his grants. On the other hand, Broughton's reputation was riding high. Goderich was eager, too, to bestow some favour on the colonial clergy to expunge whatever obloquy the inadvertent acceptance of Lang's letter at the Colonial Office on 30 December 1830 might seemed to have implied. Bourke wanted Broughton out of England until this wave of contrition had passed. He suggested that the Archdeacon undertake a much deferred visit to Van Diemen's Land.

Bourke having denied Broughton assistance in the colony refused him the opportunity of rallying it from abroad. The church in the colony was crippled but not by Broughton's neglect. He had spent much

52. Bourke to Goderich, 3 November 1832, H.R.A., I.xvi.791.
53. Goderich to Bourke, 13 May 1832, H.R.A., I.xvi.646.
54. Goderich to Bourke, 3 April 1832, ibid., pp. 590-1.
56. Deduced from: Broughton to Bourke 29 December 1831, C.S.I.L. 31/10476, Box 4/2125.5 (N.S.W. S.A.); Colonial Secretary to Broughton, 31 December 1831, C.S.O.L. 'Letters to Clergy', 31/153 (N.S.W. S.A.); Broughton to Arthur, 25 February and 19 March 1832 (Arthur Papers, vol.12, M.L.); Broughton to Bourke, 14 January 1833, C.S.I.L. 33/518-9, Box 4/2169 (N.S.W. S.A.).
of 1832 travelling the countryside. 57 It was crippled by the regulation requiring local participation in all new developments whether it was to erect a building or appoint a school master. This arrangement seemed equitable in itself, Broughton admitted, but the peculiar circumstances rendered it impracticable. 58 Free settlers were in a minority. Many of them were too poor to give, the remainder too mean. At fashionable St. James, attended by the men of position and property, it had taken Broughton three years to raise £661 for extensions. 59 Yet these same men thought it right to contribute to the Hyde Park chapel. It was at that point that Broughton's temper broke. He also saw more money spent on furniture for Government House and Government Offices in 1832 than on new school rooms for the whole colony. 60 Broughton saw his predicament as a totally unreasonable one. He was caught between colonists who did not give and a Colonial Office that would not provide. And when he suggested he might look for assistance abroad, he was told to wait.

58. Broughton to Bourke, 24 September 1832, op. cit.
59. Broughton to Bourke, 6 August 1832, C.S.I.L. 32/6035, Box 4/2125 (N.S.W. S.A.).
60. Three new schools were erected at a cost of £242.5.0, and furniture supplied to Government House and Government Offices at a cost of £85.16.10, see 'Abstract of the Revenue of the Colony of New South Wales and its Appropriation for the Year 1932', V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 1833.
CHAPTER SIX

1833: THE ASSAULT

We but remind and warn the generation who are entering as it were by the gate of the Lord into another land of Canaan, that if they would enjoy happiness, whether national or individual, if the abundance of prosperity which it seems probable they may reap, is to prove to them a blessing not a curse, their principal care and concern must be to scatter plentifully the seeds of religion, the fear of God and the faith of Christ crucified, in all the quarters of the land.

Broughton preaching on the forty-sixth anniversary of the founding of the Colony.
Bourke was popular where, to him, it mattered most; among the people.\textsuperscript{1} He could afford a rupture with some of his chief councillors. His popularity sprang from the novelties that had marked the first year of his administration: a timely concession to the landed interests; the promise of trial by jury; the more regular use of the Legislative Council; the publication of the Estimates; and even some talk of opening the debates of the Legislative Council to the public. But in one matter Bourke had been the harbinger of a grave disappointment. The British Government, he had had to tell them, would make no concession to their request for some form of popular assembly.\textsuperscript{2} For the statesmen at the Colonial Office this issue was caught up in the vortex of English politics. Whatever might be the merit of the colony's claim, the British government could not afford to risk in the Commons, where an Irish party was gathering strength, a bill giving to a distant colony a measure of self government similar to that it was committed to withholding from Ireland. New South Wales must await the solution of England's other problems.\textsuperscript{3} In the meantime, a number of sops were offered to placate the democratic longings of the colonists.

One sop, the publication of the annual Estimates, misfired badly. It was meant to invite confidence by candidly declaring well

\textsuperscript{1} Kinchela to Hay, 23.9.1832 (Colonial Office Miscellaneou Letters 1832, A2146., M.L.).
\textsuperscript{2} Copy of Minutes of Instruction to Governor Bourke, June 1831, Encl. in Bourke to Goderich, 11 January 1832, C.O. 201/225.
in advance how the colony's money was to be spent. It served merely to inform the colonists that it was not to be spent as many of them would wish it. So, estimate times became agitated times. The people meditated on their constitutional shackles and rarely passed by an opportunity to speak upon how differently it would all be arranged if the people, in an assembly of their own, determined the matter. Ecclesiastical expenditure invariably found a place among the very worst of arrangements. 'Were the rulers at home and in the colony just, and were they also wise as well as just,' ran an editorial in the Sydney Monitor, 'they would not permit one third of the population of any colony to be baptised, married, preached to, and prayed with, by one single clergyman.' Such arrangements, the colonists vowed, would be reformed in their Assembly.

Broughton was not charged as the author of the iniquity. To the editor who laid the charge the Archdeacon was still a 'man of God'. Moreover, he conceded in one of his more lucid moments, every churchman had the right to be bigoted in favour of his own beliefs; 'It is his duty', he put it to his readers, 'to maintain all those privileges and immunities which he is sent out to New South Wales expressly to oversee, to cherish, and to respect'. Men higher in office than the Archdeacon must seize the initiative and reform such inequities. Opinions differed as to the proper solution. To some it was relatively simple. Downing Street must shut its ears to the 'obstreperous economy mongers' among its advisers, and make a necessary

4. Sydney Monitor, 7 April 1832.
5. Ibid.
and just provision for all denominations. But to most who voiced an opinion, the thought of any increase in ecclesiastical expenditure was heresy. Efficiency must come from a more equitable distribution within the existing provision. Over £500 could be transferred immediately to the neglected Roman Catholic community if, for example, the aboriginal mission was abandoned and the orphan schools closed. The one had been proved futile time and again, while the other was an artful dodge for keeping at public expense the illegitimate off-spring of the local rich. Other parings were suggested. But not once, in the Spring or Summer of 1832 when the discussion of these matters was running high, was it recommended that Broughton's allocation for the episcopal clergy or the parochial teachers be touched.

The Winter of 1832 brought a change. The huffing and puffing of some Roman Catholics about the handsome provision made for the Church of England prodded some churchmen into a little domestic stock-taking. They discovered that the allegedly princely episcopalian vote left much undone, and since it could not be increased it had to be overhauled. They began at the top; 'The Venerable the Archdeacon's salary is excessive by £1,250'. The ideas caught on and handed Broughton his first dishing in the public press. It may not have been expected of Broughton that he should surrender the money voted

7. Australian, 16 March 1832.
8. Sydney Monitor, 4 April, 16 October, and 17 November 1832.
9. Ibid., 6 October 1832.
10. Sydney Gazette, 6 October 1832; Sydney Monitor, 3 November 1832 (An Episcopalian to Editor); Australian, 21 December 1832.
to the episcopal establishment, ran an article in the *Sydney Monitor*,
but it was expected that he would see that his personal slice, amounting
to one sixth of the clerical vote, was morally indefensible.\(^{11}\)

He took, it was said of the Archdeacon, double the salary of
the Archbishop of Paris; or more to the point in Bourke's reckoning,
five times the salary of the senior minister at the Cape.\(^{12}\) Five or
six chaplains could be supplied on the fat of his salary, and the
threat was made, if Broughton did not voluntarily renounce it, the
day would come when the colonists would take it from him:

> We wish Archdeacon Broughton and the clergy of New South Wales
to understand... the right... to our money is derived solely
from the command of Lord Goderich... His Lordship will not be
allowed much longer to fiddle for us... And then there will be
a radical reformation in church matters. The colonists will
always be willing to pay for a working clergy... Such men will
be content with a salary double that allowed by our Archdeacon
to the Roman chaplains of the colony.\(^{13}\)

For Broughton one of the great differences between 1832 and
1833 was the emergence of this adverse image of him as a Mr. Moneybags.\(^{14}\)
He might have wondered what solvent had carried off that 'very severe
Christian esteem'\(^{15}\) which had restrained publicists, like Hall,

\(^{11}\) *Sydney Monitor*, 20 October 1832. The religious vote, not including
schools, was £11,494, see, 'Estimate of the Probable Expenses of
the Various Departments, forming a charge on the Treasury of New
South Wales, for the year 1833', V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 1832.
Hereafter referred to as 'Estimates'.

\(^{12}\) *Sydney Gazette*, 22 October 1832; *Sydney Monitor*, 12 December
1832; *Australian*, 21 December 1832. Mansfield had ceased
editing the *Sydney Gazette* in September 1832, and from then till
almost mid-1833 it joined hands with the critics of the
ecclesiastical establishment.

\(^{13}\) *Sydney Monitor*, 24 July 1833. A Payment double that of the Roman
Catholic chaplains would have increased the stipends of the 12
episcopal chaplains on £250 a year. The Roman Catholic chaplains
received £150; see, 'Estimates,' op. cit.

\(^{14}\) *Australian*, 1 February 1833.

\(^{15}\) *Sydney Monitor*, 7 April 1832.
dealing him the severe treatment given Scott. Much he might account for in terms of the inevitable. Once ecclesiastical expenditure had been singled out as the stalking horse from which to shoot at the official restriction on the colonial desire for self-government, a discussion of his salary could hardly be avoided. He might have realised on reflection that he had helped chill the atmosphere.

For almost three years Broughton had remained aloof from the public arena: his podium was an indoor pulpit; his words were chosen with circumspection; and his counsel was offered in secret and in an inner chamber. Broughton strove to have his conduct answer to the precepts set out in a little volume he had put on the reading list for the King's schools. The prejudices of men, ran one precept, were better overcome by the 'slow, soft' procedures of reason than direct attack. 16 Unhappily, and only for a brief moment, in August 1832 Broughton stepped from the shadow of this wisdom. His pamphlet attacking Roger Therry made him a public controversialist. Once in the public arena he could not lightly retire. If he could attack, he could be attacked. And so the opponents of the established order were able to cast off their former deference for him. The result was no mere skirmish. What was an Archdeacon? asked the editor of the Australian. In his ecclesiastical dictionary he found an answer which a year before he would not have published. An Archdeacon, it said,

16. Isaac Watts, The Improvement of the Mind (London 1814), p.279. The Chapter on 'The Prejudices of Man' throws light on Broughton's concept of a Christian man's public duty. The text was set for study in the final year at the King's Schools, see 'Proposed Course of Study and Instruction', Sub-encl. 3 in Darling to Murray, 10 February 1830, H.R.A., I.xv.362.
was 'a sly rogue, who fares sumptuously every day'.

The Archdeacon and his office gradually became a thing to talk of around the settlement. The indignant question of why the Archdeacon should receive £2,000 a year alternated with an equally indignant description of why he did. He received an inflated salary because he was the wrong sort of Archdeacon - a political one. The Colonial Office had compounded the office of a minister of the Gospel with that of a servant of the Crown, wrote one indignant colonist, and had decided to pay him on a scale commensurate with the latter. There were many errors in that mistake, he continued; it cost more, and it reduced the efficiency of the church without adding to the efficiency of the government. While other colonists could sit on the Councils and advise the Governor, none but the Archdeacon could traverse the countryside visiting the churches and the schools. If the Archdeacon confined himself to the latter tasks he would need much less; his travelling expenses and 'a provision which shall be ample enough to place him beyond the necessity of feeling the cause, or being harassed by the distraction of secular pursuits'. Given the opportunity many colonists believed that they could arrange for a cheaper, a more lively, and a more efficient church.

17. *Australian*, 16 November, 1832.
18. *Australian*, 10 February 1832; *Sydney Gazette*, 6 October 1832; *Sydney Monitor*, 20 October 1832 ('Philalethus' to Editor).
21. Hall to Goderich, 4 October 1832, being an open letter to the Colonial Office on the 'Estimates' for 1833, published in *Sydney Monitor*, 6 October 1832.
Late in January 1833 these simmerings of discontent took on a more menacing shape for Broughton. For the twelve months of 1832 the colonists had chafed under the disappointment of Bourke's news about the popular Assembly. Then they stirred themselves. In time honoured colonial fashion they decided to hold another meeting, express their opinion publicly, and raise a petition. Petitions, Goderich had forewarned, would achieve nothing. But the eyes of the colonists were not so dim that they could not see the lesson of the age; when many people did a little for a long time they achieved much. That, the Sydney Monitor had pointed out, was the secret of the success of both Wesley and O'Connell. One had raised up a great new religious hierarchy using only the pennies of the poor; the other, on a penny a week from the peasants, had raised Irish Catholics from political degradation. The colonists of New South Wales should imitate them. By persistently forwarding their petitions to the British Government, and by regularly contributing their pennies for the support of a vigorous agent in London, they would, in the end, win their constitutional liberties. So on the 26 January 1833, the public were called to meet again at the same old spot, the Court House in King's Street, and were there asked to resolve, what they had resolved many times before; 'that the people of this country are

22. Sydney Monitor, 7 January 1832; Australian, 13 July 1832.
23. Sydney Gazette, 8 January 1833.
24. 'Copy of Minutes of Instruction to Governor Bourke, June, 1832', Encl. in Bourke to Goderich, 11 January 1832, C.O. 201/225.
25. Sydney Monitor, 10 February 1830.
fitted for a participation in the constitutional rights enjoyed by their fellow subjects in Great Britain'.

A spark of genius shone in Wentworth that anniversary day. He occupied one of the principal places at that meeting, and as he took his audience along the tracks of familiar arguments he beguiled them into looking at new scenery. He told them what he had told them before; that they had not the rights of common Englishmen. But he told them not to dwell on that. Rather, he said, consider the iniquitous effects of it. And waving a copy of the recent Estimates before their eyes, he launched into an attack on 'this most iniquitous budget'. And the greatest iniquity in it was the Ecclesiastical expenditure, and that iniquity must depart from the land. With that purpose in mind, Wentworth moved to reap with gusto where others, for months past, had sown.

With a little wit to warm them to laughter and a clever turn of phrase to establish his ascendancy, Wentworth quickly made his audience his shadow. They would follow him wherever he took them. Then, when the applause was right, he released the devil in him. In England, he recalled, bishops, archdeacons, and the like, were rapidly sinking to their proper level, and all the venerable absurdities and nonsense attached to them were being got rid of.

27. Sydney Gazette, 29 January 1833.
28. Sydney Herald, 31 January 1833. For an adverse comment on Wentworth's behaviour from one who agreed with his case, see Lang, New South Wales, vol. 1, pp.332-5.
Strange tides, he said, seemed to have cast the effluence up on the shores of the colony. Eight years ago, Wentworth reminded them, an obsolescent creature, an Archdeacon, was foisted on them. For eight years he had fed lavishly at the colonial treasury. Every man, woman, and child, he fulminated was compelled to contribute £3 a year towards his upkeep and all the humbug that went with him. 'Gentlemen', he thundered, 'it is difficult to decide which is the greatest, - the absurdity or the wickedness of such a system.'

Wentworth spared Broughton little that day. He called him, by implication, a rogue for being the head of the most iniquitous land grant in the colony; a fool for hunting up the blacks at Wellington Valley, when the simplest of souls in the colony knew that it was contrary to their nature to remain more than three days in any one place; and a thief for taking his salary. He lampooned him. He accused him of self aggrandisement. He charged him with constantly wanting to add to 'his satellites of chaplains and catechists, wanting which, of course, he would be a sun without his system'. The point scored a laugh. Derision was Wentworth's weapon, but not the raison d'être of his performance. The Archdeacon was his target but the church establishment was his quarry:

Gentlemen, do any of you know the use of an Archdeacon?
(a laugh). I mean no personal allusion to the gentleman

who holds that office; on the contrary, although I have no personal acquaintance with him, I respect his character, which is that of a very amiable man. But, gentlemen ... 31

And in that 'but' Wentworth disclosed his purpose. Agitators for a better colonial society could no longer afford to defer to Broughton out of respect for his amiable and virtuous character. 32 If he was blameless the institution he headed was not. It was the prop of toryism, as the recent news of the bishops' vote against reform in the House of Lords had shown, and an impediment to a liberal and happy society in the colony. 33 The mood of the Scott era had returned once more to plague the colonial church.

Broughton was out of Sydney that anniversary day. He had left a few days earlier for Hobart. But when the news of the day's proceedings caught up with him, spread across the pages of the local press, 34 he did not dismiss his critics as sounding brass. Many a vessel fit for destruction had been the tool of the divine purpose. As a nineteenth century advocate of the English Reformation he believed the lecherous Henry just such a tool; and if Pharaoh and Cyrus in the days before Henry, why not Wentworth and Hall in these latter days? He had already advised his clergy against disputing the right of others to pass strictures on their

32. Ibid., 6 October 1832.
33. Australian, 17 February 1832.
34. Tasmanian, 8 February 1833.
conduct. It was better he said, to strive to be free of the cause of the criticism.\textsuperscript{35} It was that advice he began to think of applying to himself. Later he wrote to the Colonial Office suggesting that a portion of his salary might be used for the support of additional chaplains.\textsuperscript{36}

Broughton's ship the \textit{Duckenfeld} docked at Hobart on 29 January 1833.\textsuperscript{37} The unsatisfactory conclusion to his previous visit seemed to hang over his return. Apart from a brief notice in the \textit{Hobart Town Chronicle} his arrival received no acknowledgement beyond a formal listing in the shipping columns of the press. The shipload of horses which the \textit{Duckenfeld} also brought south created a greater stir.\textsuperscript{38} In the following weeks Broughton's movements were not reported and his sermons given only rare and brief mentions.\textsuperscript{39} Broughton remained aloof from colonial society, his natural reserve being reinforced by the humiliating publicity given to Wentworth's attack on him. The colonial papers, acting like a dubious old dame, first charged Wentworth with intemperate behaviour in holding up a church dignitary to ridicule,\textsuperscript{40} then, under the pretence of not being able to resist a good joke,

\begin{itemize}
    \item \textsuperscript{35} Broughton, \textit{Charge 1829}, p.33.
    \item \textsuperscript{36} Broughton to Hay, 24 December 1834, \textit{C.O.} 201/244.
    \item \textsuperscript{37} \textit{Hobart Town Courier}, 1 February 1833.
    \item \textsuperscript{38} \textit{Tasmanian}, 1 February 1833.
    \item \textsuperscript{39} \textit{Hobart Town Courier}, 8 February 1833; \textit{Tasmanian}, 8 February 1833.
    \item \textsuperscript{40} \textit{Tasmanian}, 3 March 1833.
\end{itemize}
published a versified account of the proceedings got up by some wag with a good eye for a malicious turn of phrase. It dealt cruelly with Broughton:

What do we want with Bishop or Archdeacon,
Is not good sense, salvations safest beacon?

What do we want with him, can any tell
The use of such an animal, or hear
That catechists and humbugs should compel
Us to reward them for each psalm or prayer?
Must we still 'have our pockets picked' to swell
Their o'ercharged purses and their dainty fare
And also pay those hungry visionaries
The unlettered, black polluting Missionaries. 41

Broughton could anticipate little willing change in a society, however prim, which could chuckle so deliciously at the delinquencies of its sister colony. He sensed the presence of incipient hostility, and was unwilling to arouse it further until he had made his position more secure through consultation in England. This time he did not stay with Arthur, but took a house of his own where he could enjoy the companionship of his family and the convenience of the household servants who had accompanied him from Sydney. 42 The visit became a retreat; a rest from the frictions of the year gone by, and a time in which to contemplate a trip to England, should his appeal over Bourke's head to the Secretary of State be approved.

41. Ibid.; originally published in Sydney Gazette, 16 February 1833.
42. Hobart Town Courier, 1 February 1833; Broughton to Bourke, 14 January 1833, C.S.I.L. 33/519, Box 4/2169 (N.S.W. S.A.).
The aboriginal problem, which had engaged his attention on the previous visit, was as troublesome as ever, yet he did not bother himself with it. Officially he was still chairman of the Aborigines' Committee, but he either did not attend its meetings or it did not meet during the five months he was in Hobart. He had however nothing new to suggest to it. He had abandoned all optimism and hope for a quick solution to the conflict between black and white. By 1833 he believed the trouble was rooted in the natives' lack of civilization. That the white settlers were the original provocateurs he readily acknowledged. They had pressed inland staking their claims with compassionless energy, wantonly seizing whatever they could of the land, the waterholes, and the women of the original inhabitants. These white outrages had led to black retaliations; and each retaliation had brought its own reprisal, until, in the compounding of violence, a 'lurking spirit of cruelty and mischievous craft' was unleashed inside the native. This was the spirit which had prompted them to take their present indiscriminate revenge on every stock or hut keeper that came within casting range of their spears, Broughton said.

Whatever the origins of the conflict, the immediate need of the innocent white settler was protection. Broughton saw no

alternative to an armed frontier. 'Nothing would so effectually
deter the native from hostile attempts on dwelling houses', he
had advised Arthur, 'as the certainty that they would encounter
resistance, and a few instances of their incurring a severe
chastisement in retaliation for predatory attacks'. To counter the
possibility of excessive bloodshed he proposed a system of
government rewards, running as high as conditional pardons, for the
unharmed capture of marauding natives. These prisoners, he had
suggested, should be supped and charmed, and returned to their
tribes as evidence of the white settlers' peaceful disposition.  

These measures, designed to placate the black, had failed.
Other efforts had proved equally futile. Anstey's roundups had
struck Broughton as particularly horrible, and their failure under-
pinned his conviction that black and white were destined to live in
tense opposition until the civilizing influence of Christian missions
had weaned them of the 'wanton and savage spirit inherent in them'.
The present bloodshed was the divinely ordained goad to prod the
colonists into providing those missionaries. But, in the 1830's
the mood of the colonists was not for missionaries. They believed
they could find a cheaper and more effective means. So Broughton
could only patiently await their change of heart. He did, however,

45. Ibid.
46. Ibid.; Broughton to Arthur, 16 November 1830 (Arthur Papers,
vol.12, M.L.).
47. Plomley, Friendly Mission, p.32.
successfully persuade the Governor to appoint one missionary to the new native settlement on Flinders Island. It was an ill-fated effort. The catechist, Mr. Wilkinson, found himself unequal to the challenge, and soon switched his talents to caring for the Island's store, leaving the natives once more to the amateurish efforts of whoever wanted to try. After his experience with the C.M.S. in New South Wales, Broughton would not refer the matter to England. In the colony itself his choice was restricted to amateurs who had good hearts and, too often, a needy pocket.

Broughton was aloof, but not remote, from colonial affairs, and did interfere where the opening was offered him and the matter concerned him. One matter which, in his opinion, affected him dearly was an application from the Hobart Wesleyans for a loan of £800 to extend their Sunday School. The Wesleyan Chapel, as it stood, owed much to the succour Arthur had provided in timber and labour at colonial expense in earlier days when he followed Governor Brisbane's policy of affording every assistance, short of money grants, to all religious denominations ministering to settlers. In 1833 the Wesleyans in Hobart might have anticipated his ready approval of their request.

Arthur's policy in the 1820's had conformed to ideals made

49. Plomley, Friendly Mission, pp.823 and 919 (note 116). Plomley dates Wilkinson's appointment as June 1832. The Minute of the Executive Council referred to in the previous footnote reads as though Wilkinson's appointment was originally made in 1833, and that Broughton selected him for the work.
fashionable by Whately, an Oxford don. Whately taught Englishmen to apply the rules of the marketplace to the affairs of the church, and to accept that the best and only just means of combating dissent was a vigorous and open competition with it. All other tactics, he charged, connived at the principle that 'heresy and schism ought to be checked by coercion'. But by 1830 Whately's ascendancy had been challenged. Southey for one had refurbished older and less liberal doctrines, attacking in particular a growing sentimentality towards Wesleyanism.

In Southey's reckoning Wesleyanism was a legitimate debt charged against the Established Church for its neglect of the poor. To erase that debt the Church had to be doubly busy setting up its own schools and churches for the same poor. To assist the Wesleyans to do their work more thoroughly, because they were already doing it well, was tantamount to giving a burglar the key to the family safe. In 1833, when the Wesleyans asked for aid towards their Sunday School in Hobart, Broughton lifted a page from Southey's propaganda and read it to Arthur.

He had an immediate, though not a lasting, effect on Arthur. The Lieutenant-Governor was unwilling to scotch the Wesleyan request himself, but Broughton prevailed upon him sufficiently to have him agree to read to the Executive Council an address he, Broughton, had prepared, condemning aid to other denominations as destructive of the

growth of sound religion in the colony. In the Council Broughton gathered support from the Chief Justice, Pedder, and William Bedford the Senior Chaplain. The two other members of the Council asked Arthur to continue in the spirit of his former policy. Arthur decided to do nothing. But a few months later when he was free of the physical presence of Broughton, he gave in to his better nature. 'There is a slight difference in our opinion as to the countenance which other communions should receive', he wrote to the Archdeacon, and the Wesleyans got their money.

This matter remained concealed from the public. Another did for a short time draw Broughton into the open, and focus attention on him. Soon after his arrival a committee was formed to make certain that the Archdeacon did not depart the colony a second time without a decision being made on a new College for Hobart. In May, after due consultation with the Archdeacon, Arthur agreed to loan government assistance to a College provided it was moulded in the image of one of Broughton's King's Schools. This decision disappointed the learned editor of the *Hobart Town Courier*. A mere Grammar school, he protested, shaped after the pattern of ancient seminaries of vice and oppression like Eton and Winchester, would not satisfy the colony's need.

55. Bedford was a convert to Broughton's point of view. He had earlier in his colonial ministry given the Wesleyans valuable support much to Scott's great annoyance. See Scott to Bishop of London, 1 July 1825 (*Bonwick Transcripts*, Missionary, Box 53, vol.5, pp.1512-3, M.L.).
57. *Hobart Town Courier*, 17 May 1833; also *Tasmanian*, 1 February 1833 (Letter to Editor).
For some weeks after the announcement, James Ross, editor of the *Hobart Town Courier*, tutored Broughton through the columns of his paper towards a better understanding of the situation which had developed in the southern settlement. Though the colony had only a short history, a critical hour had nevertheless arrived. The older parents educated in England were, one after another, sinking into the grave and leaving the future to their children. Ross himself had a quiver full but, like most of his fellow settlers, he had an empty treasury and no means for educating them abroad. The colony's existing schools, he insisted, could successfully bring the young up to a standard equal to that demanded of the best young men who went up yearly to Oxford and Cambridge. There, however, their education ceased; and that was the blight on the colony's future. What was to become of these young men of unrequited intellect, numbering, Ross ventured to suggest, upward of a hundred? Were they to remain half men, filled with half knowledge, and as likely as not, to repeat the blunders of their colonial predecessors? Were there not sufficient impassable roads, collapsing buildings, and misplaced lighthouses in the colony? No Grammar school would do more than wastefully duplicate what already existed. The colony's need, in Ross's opinion, was an institution where colonial youth could acquire as good an education as the best educated among their parents. In short, he wanted a university college.58

For once Broughton found his most vociferous opponent more isolated than himself. Though the colonists did not want too classical

an education for their children, they were pleased with the general
drift of Broughton's scheme. They were exceptionally pleased, however,
for the Archdeacon's help in delivering a death blow to Ross's
fantastic scheme for saddling a tax on the colony to provide a
university education for an exclusive coterie of thirty colonial
youth. In a moment of irony, Broughton was hailed for his opposition
to excellence. But Broughton was not interested in saving taxes. He
wanted that university college, but not until he had a sufficient
supply of young men properly formed in mind and affection to profit
from it. A mind properly formed was clerically formed. 'Excepting in
the mere mechanical department', he had told these southern residents
on a former occasion, 'no single step should be taken but under the
cognizance of the clergyman.' Another generation of half men, as
Ross called them, was, for Broughton, a small sacrifice compared with
the immense gains to be reaped from laying first the proper foundation.

As his adjournment to the colony drew to its close Hobart was
stirred by the arrival of a group of shipwreck survivors. Their ship,
the Hibernia, had been set ablaze by an incautious officer drawing
rum from a cask by the light of a burning candle. One hundred and
fifty souls perished, and the eighty who survived told harrowing tales
of seven days adrift on the open seas eating raw pork and slaking their
thirst with brandy mixed in swine's blood. All Hobart discussed the
affair; but when some were asked to contribute to a relief fund they
put it around that every immigrant properly insured had no need of

59. Tasmanian, 21 June 1833.
60. Broughton, Charge, V.D.L., 1830, pp.15 and 17.
61. Tasmanian, 24 and 31 April 1833.
relief, and those who were not did not deserve it. Broughton led the opposition to this hardhearted view; and it being Whitsuntide, he called upon every Christian gentleman to minister comfort in imitation of the great Comforter.

For Broughton the moment was ripe for more than charity. With some of the survivors present at Divine Service at St. David's Church, he drew a lesson which he felt the colony badly needed. They had heard much about the anguish of those who had survived, he said. But what of those that perished? What had filled their last moments as they rushed from beam to beam escaping the fire only to be caught up in the flood? Almost everyone present, he went on, had in some sense or other escaped the flood in a safe crossing of two great oceans to come to this continent. But were they at their final journey's end and beyond terror's grasp? Who among them believed that having escaped the flood they had forever been spared the fire?

The image of that stately ship consuming, with so many that it contained, in the devouring rage of that conflagration, cannot but awaken and stir up, even the least sensitive, I think, to a remembrance of that day, when a consuming fire shall go forth from the presence of the Lord.

Broughton performed without mercy. He had assembled the survivors for a spiritual and a material comforting. He dismissed them bearing freshly bruised memories of a hideous past. In this absence of compassion Broughton revealed the distraught state of his

62. Ibid., 24 April 1833.
63. W.G. Broughton, A Sermon Preached on Whit Sunday, 1833, in the Church of St. David's, at Hobart Town, Van Diemen's Land; on which day a Collection was made for the Relief of the surviving passengers and crew of the Ship, 'Hibernia' (Hobart, 1833), pp. 5 and 12.
64. Ibid., p.15.
mind. As his retreat drew to its close, he braced himself for the return to the hostility of New South Wales by taking refuge in the gospel of the beleaguered prophet - an exultation in the elemental grandeur of the Divine that no human will could stay. Whether or not the colonists sang the Lord's song in their new land, there would be the fire and heat, the lightning, storm, and tempest, to praise and magnify His name forever.

That was Broughton's parting gift to the colony. The colony's parting gift to him was scarcely more reassuring. The cost of the visitation exceeded its value, moaned one newspaper; 'Had (he) even been visible at some known place for one single hour per diem, we should not have begrudged all the expense'. All in all, said another paper, the colonists were to be congratulated on the Archdeacon's departure. He was pious, learned and charitable but his mind had become so tinctured with prejudice that the 'march of intellect' was passing him by. Broughton departed with the assurance that the colony needed either a different Archdeacon or none at all. It was a lonely journey back on the Jupiter to another colony where many were saying the same thing.

When the Jupiter docked in Sydney on 8 July 1833 it was winter, and for Broughton, a season of adamantine disappointments. Many of the matters referred to London the previous year had been resolved. For one thing, Goderich would not interfere in the arrangements with the Church Missionary Society. Murray had worked them out in

65. Colonist, 11 June 1833.
67. Sydney Gazette, 9 July 1833.
consultation with Archdeacon Scott and they could not be changed without a breach of faith. It was, nevertheless, Goderich's wish that Broughton should keep a close watch on the management of the mission and refer all recommendations for change to the Governor. The Governor for his part must not decline to avail himself of the Archdeacon's advice. 'I rely upon your own discretion, as well as upon that of Mr. Broughton, in any attention which it may belong to either of you to give to this matter' Goderich told Bourke. That, in June 1833, was asking for too much. Discretion was a shrinking commodity in the relationship between the Archdeacon and the Governor; so Goderich's solution amounted to an abandonment of Broughton's claim. Broughton, moreover, was not interested in the tacit management of the mission. He wanted it openly acknowledged that he was the head in all things belonging to the Church Establishment in New South Wales.

There would be no reallocation of precedence in the Councils. To Goderich it was as clear as crystal that, since in the absence of the Governor the duties of government devolved on the senior military officer next in command, that officer should take precedence immediately after the Governor. Goderich, noting with relief that Broughton had no personal interest in the issue, felt he would be more than satisfied with that as a reasonable explanation. Let the

68. Goderich to Bourke, 13 June 1832, *H.R.A.*, I.xvi.658-62. The C.M.S. was determined that there should be no change and tried to forestall any advantage Broughton might attempt to reap from Stanley's succession to Goderich, see Coates to Stanley, 5 July 1833 ('London Letter Books', C.H./L.2, *C.M.S. Papers*, m/f, A.N.L.).

69. Broughton to Hill, 28 August 1832 ('Correspondence between Sydney Corresponding Committee and Missionaries and Others in New Holland Mission 1821-37', C.N./0.5a, *C.M.S. Papers*, m/f, A.N.L.).
Archdeacon rest assured, he added by way of comfort, that the Colonial Office holds his office in high esteem, and let the matter rest.  

That Broughton did not intend. He had disclaimed all personal interest in the matter not to save it from discussion but to ensure that it was treated as a serious one involving consideration of the rightful place of ecclesiastical authority in the State. He put the matter aside as one to be taken up in England. The truth was that Goderich had no idea as to why the change had been made.

In strictly ecclesiastical matters Goderich was full of sympathetic understanding and professions of co-operation. Unfortunately, in most of what Goderich did there was a fair sprinkling of contradictions. He promised that only chaplains with minds and tempers adapted to contend against the vitiated and unruly passions of the settlement would be sent out in the future. The first fruit of this resolution was the Reverend Henry Stiles, a Church Missionary Society reject. Stiles, at one time a tutor in James Stephen's household, had been pronounced unfit for missionary work because

---

70. Goderich to Bourke, 5 August 1832, H.R.A., I.xvi.690-1.

71. Broughton's subsequent action in this matter is discussed in chapter 7.

72. James Stephen supplied Goderich with an explanation of Broughton's demotion which Goderich did not care to repeat. By the original warrants setting up the Councils the Chief Justice, Archdeacon, and the Senior Military Officer next after the Governor, were to take precedence according to their length of service in the colony. Lindesay should therefore have taken precedence over Broughton in 1829, but Broughton should have regained his precedence after Lindesay's departure in 1832; see Minute of James Stephen attached to Bourke to Goderich, 2 January 1832, C.O. 201/225.

73. One biographer has said of Goderich: 'Intellectually he was never able to be a violent partisan because he could understand so perfectly both sides of an argument'. See, Wilbur Denver Jones, Prosperity Robinson. The Life of Viscount Goderich 1782-1859 (New York, 1967), p.20.

exposure to extreme heat brought on temporary aberrations of the mind. 75 'I am sorry', Broughton wrote with dismay, 'that the Secretary of State should have been recommended by Mr. James Stephen, as I hear, to make this appointment; for the occurrence of any fresh casualty at this moment would do us more injury more than good'. 76

In other matters the Secretary of State was equally baffling. Goderich approved of Broughton's scheme for replacing lay catechists with regular clergy, without increase in stipends, but warned him not to expect the Colonial Office to be able to recruit them at that low rate of pay. 77 As for the long neglected penal settlements, Goderich was relieved to be able to say at last that they would have chaplains. When the two masters in Holy Orders arrived for the King's Schools he wanted Broughton to release one chaplain from Parramatta and another from Sydney for that work. 78 Not only had Innes been dead and three months in the grave when Goderich hit upon that idea, but the Archdeacon's Report of 29 September 1831, which he was purporting to answer, made it clear that the only chaplain at Parramatta was the septuagenarian Marsden, and in Sydney both Hill and Cowper looked after their own churches without regular assistance. 79 Goderich also

75. Ibid., p.832. For Stiles' patrons, see Lady Kennedy to Bourke, 27 January 1833, and James Stephen to Bourke, 2 March 1833 (Bourke Papers, vol.10, M.L.).
76. Broughton to Bishop of London, 30 September 1833, Encl. in Bishop of London to Secretary of State for Colonies, 3 May 1833 (sic.), C.O. 201/235. (Broughton's letter would be correctly dated 1833 as it contained news of his visitation in Van Diemen's Land. The Bishop of London's letter should therefore be, 1834.)
78. Ibid., pp.831-2.
79. See 'Table A. Proposed numbers, stations, and services of the Clergy in New South Wales', Appendix to 'The Report of Archdeacon Broughton on the State of the Church and Schools Establishment in N.S.W., 29 September 1831', Encl. in Bourke to Goderich, 28 February 1832, C.O. 201/225.
dismissed Broughton's claim, to have his salary paid in the same manner as the salaries of the Governor and Judges. The Archdeacon's claim, he said, rested on the groundless fear that, in the event of the Legislative Council declining to vote his salary, he would be left penniless in the colony. That, Goderich assured Broughton, would never be. Should the colony refuse his salary the British Government would meet it.⁸⁰

Goderich breezed through problem after problem with an optimism that Broughton could not share. In all his decisions Goderich seemed to imply that, since the British Government did not contemplate any change in the colony's Councils, the noisy agitators outside them could be safely ignored.⁸¹ Goderich's optimism reflected something of his own powers of political survival. It might have seemed to one whose ministerial fortune had survived the changeover from Tory to Whig rule that underneath all the shuffling of the times no fundamental changes were intended. News coming to Broughton from abroad, and in particular the news of June 1833, was not so reassuring. The British Government had agreed to abolish ten Irish bishoprics as the price for peace in Ireland, and to place the profits of this foreclosure at the disposal of the British Government.⁸² A sound victory for the agitators against tithes! Noises outside England's Councils were clearly not ignored. If the British Government had been forced to capitulate in the face of agitation against tithes, how long would it remain deaf to the ever increasing agitation against church grants in the colony? Moreover, the protests were no longer simply outside the Council, as Goderich

⁸⁰ Goderich to Bourke, 4 July 1832, H.R.A., I.xvi.672-3.
⁸¹ See for example, ibid.
⁸² Sydney Herald, 11 February 1833; Sydney Gazette, 28 February and 29 June 1833.
seemed to assume. Bourke had opened the door to criticism by inviting comment on the Estimates, and in it had walked, ever so modestly for the moment, with John Blaxland.  

The news awaiting Broughton's return was not reassuring. Events were no better. On 9 July, the day following his landing, Bourke welcomed him back into Sydney's society at one of those urbane parties where the tongues of leading citizens could wag on until two or three in the morning on the lawns of Government House. The day following that again Wentworth paid his compliments and congratulated Broughton on his return. Wentworth was, of course, playing the lion at another of those 11 a.m. meetings at the Court House. The petition of the previous 26 January had not gone well in the countryside and there was a danger that it might be dismissed as an embodiment of Sydney sentiments, with the settlers out of town more inclined to want policy directed by the men in London rather than the boys in Sydney. To stir up flagging supporters and urge the waverers to consider the cost of their indecision, Wentworth, and a few hardy campaigners, preached another round of sermons on the expense of Mr. McLeay and his pension, Mr. Busby and his New Zealand sinecure, and Mr. Broughton and his satellites.

From the manner in which Wentworth on this occasion savaged the chairman before the real business of the day had been broached,

---

83. Bourke to Goderich, 28 October 1832, H.R.A., I.xvi.775; Bourke to Goderich, 3 August 1833, H.R.A., I.xvii.181; V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 9 October 1832 and 28 June 1833.
84. Sydney Gazette, 11 July 1832.
85. Ibid., 13 July 1833.
86. Ibid., 12 and 26 March, and 11 May 1833; Sydney Herald, 22 April 1833.
87. Sydney Herald (Supplement), 15 July 1833; Sydney Monitor, 24 July 1833.
it was clear that his jaws were set for a merciless massacre. As soon then as he had congratulated Broughton on his return, he asked what the colony wanted of an Archdeacon who spent half his year away from Sydney? Was not this a gross neglect of those who paid him? Wentworth complaining of spiritual neglect! Broughton might have been amused, if also a little bewildered, for it was not long since he had been taken to task for laziness in not moving away from Sydney! But it was not the cost of having Broughton out of Sydney that nagged at Wentworth, or the cost of having him in Sydney, but the cost of simply having him. What had happened to the Archdeacon's princely salary since their meeting in January? Wentworth asked. Had it shrunk towards a reasonable figure? No! On the contrary it had swelled, as a result of the visit to Van Diemen's Land, to an outrageous £2,750! That, at least, was Wentworth's conviction. The extra costs of that visit had actually amounted to a modest £87. But fiction and fact served Wentworth equally well. He was not out to reduce Broughton's salary but abolish it. He cocked his nose at the moderates who pleaded for efficient functionaries at moderate salaries, and, in its place, proclaimed his own new deal for Colonial religion; 'those who require ministers should support them'.

The other speakers of the day, except for Hall, were more moderate and content to raise pedantic objections to the wastage of a few pounds here and there. Hall, however, had to get it off his

88. Sydney Gazette, 13 July 1833.
89. Ibid.
91. Sydney Herald, 1 and 25 July 1833.
92. Sydney Gazette, 13 July 1833.
chest that even Wentworth's scheme for throwing the cost of the churches on the individual believers was not satisfactory. After all, Scott had thrown him out of his pew at St. James for not paying his rent. No man therefore, in Hall's reckoning, who accepted a penny for preaching the Gospel, whether freely offered or officially paid, preached with integrity. No man, retorted the Reverend Henry Fulton, preached so wearisomely as the editor of the *Sydney Monitor*, and took a fee for every edition.

Others besides Fulton struck back at Wentworth and his cronies on this occasion. Some were churchmen, some were not. One who was not greatly encouraged Broughton with a scathing indictment on the day's mummery about virtuous poor parsons. 'I have always imagined,' wrote 'Alpha' in a letter to the *Sydney Gazette*, 'that poverty, such is human nature, is despised and rejected'. Mr. Wentworth, wrote in another correspondent was out of touch with the sentiments of most colonists. For them religion was not the farce he and his circle had made of it, nor was the public sense so monstrously vitiated that it would consent to throw its churchmen like beggars upon the charity of their hearers.

Broughton might dearly hope that Wentworth was out of touch with a great many colonists. The correspondence published in the

95. *Sydney Gazette*, 23 July 1833 ('Alpha' to Editor).
Sydney Gazette was one cherished sign pointing in this direction.97 The meeting of 11 July itself was another, called as it had been to stave off the collapse of the petition of 26 January. But more encouraging than either was the new petition on ecclesiastical expenditure adopted at the July meeting. Its sponsors admitted to there being a cleavage in colonial opinion and to the improbability of the more radical point of view having much popular support.

'Your petitioners', read the final draft of this document, 'whilst they protest against the principle of being compelled to support the clergy out of the colonial revenue respectfully contend, so long as any portion of it is so applied, that all sects have a right to equal participation in it, according to their respective numbers'.98 This alternative proposal to the outright abolition of aid was scarcely more acceptable to Broughton. But it was one of the ironies of Broughton's predicament that those who spoke out most strongly against reducing his clergy to beggars before their congregations were equally determined that the ministers of other denominations should not be reduced to begging from theirs.

Among other events to gain Broughton's early attention was a Bill to extend trial by jury in criminal cases. Bourke had not received the official permission he had expected to proceed with the sweeping changes outlined the year before, but noting that Howick

97. The Sydney Gazette changed its editor in May 1833 and divested itself of its temporary radical pose. For this reason the newspaper published letters defending Broughton and the clergy after the attack of 11 July 1833, whereas after the January attack it had kept silence.

had already pledged before the English Parliament his intention of bringing all legal procedures in New South Wales into line with English practices, Bourke felt free to do something 'to satisfy the expectations that had been raised'. Accordingly, he had a Bill drafted to provide for Petty Juries to deal with certain classes of criminal proceedings. The measure, mild though it was, met with unexpected opposition. The *Sydney Gazette*, which had commended Bourke for his intention the previous year, now condemned the measure, and called on all members of the Legislative Council to block it in the name of the ordinary people. It was a fallacy, the newspaper continued, to believe that transferring English laws to colonial sands guaranteed settlers British justice. Men whom Britain did not consider fit to live on English soil would become, should Bourke's law pass, the backbone of the jury system. Such a step, the *Sydney Gazette* concluded, was better 'calculated to subject trial by jury in this colony to the ridicule of sensible men' than dispense justice. Even the *Sydney Monitor* saw the point, and uttered mild cries of disbelief in the efficacy of the proposed change.

The man behind Bourke's move was Roger Therry, and he encouraged the Governor to see political as well as juridical wisdom in the proposed change. The colony desperately needed to soften the dangerous cleavage between the emancipist class and the free settlers,

1. *Sydney Gazette*, 30 May, 9 July, 17 August 1833. For the newspaper's earlier approval of the measure, see *ibid.*, 21 January 1832.
2. As recorded in *Sydney Gazette*, 4 June 1833.
he said, and a show of confidence, such as the new jury measure entailed, was ideally suited to restore the self respect of the depressed emancipists. Therry believed that when men were trusted they, by and large, proved trustworthy. Yet in the eyes of many of the colonists of 1833 this was an ill-founded optimism, amply illustrated by Bourke's experiments with convict discipline.

In mid-1832 Bourke, convinced that severity never subdued the temper of a violent man, had hindered the felicity with which enraged masters could visit their wrath upon assigned servants. Whereas the law had once required the consent of only one Justice of the Peace before allowing a master to chastise a lazy, disobedient, or abusive servant, Bourke demanded that two Justices, brought together at the same time and in the same place, must henceforth concur in all such sentences. By interposing this element of inconvenience between wrath and its expiation, Bourke ensured that only desperate masters beset by refractory servants would resort to the expedient of summary punishment. He hoped, too, that the restraint imposed on masters would be matched by a respectful subordination in their servants, and, through this give and take, the inflammable element in rural society, where free and unfree were mixed in fairly equal proportions, would be reduced.

3. 'Communication from Roger Therry Esquire, Commissioner of the Court of Requests to His Excellency Major-General Bourke as to the extension of Trial by Jury in New South Wales', Enclosure B to minute No.1, 1832, Appendix (for half year ending 30 June 1832), Proc. Ex.C. (N.S.W.), C.O. 204/5.
The Hunter Valley district yielded a result contrary to expectation. 'The prisoners thought a New South Wales millenium had arrived', commented the *Sydney Gazette*, a newspaper at first sceptical of the complaints of the northern settlers. These settlers had alleged that the only dividend of their restraint was an 'increase of crime and insubordination'. Assigned servants who feared their masters less seemed neither to love them more nor to co-operate with them better. Instead, they had found a sphere of laxity in which they could indulge their wanton impulses with impunity; 'they saw a disposition evinced by the government to protect them from possible injustice - they beheld the authority of the magistrate defined, and they became what among them is colloquially termed "bouncible".'

It was precisely the fear of this tendency to bounce authority that had turned Broughton against the measure when Darling proposed it. Now that he had seen his worst suspicions confirmed, not only by the behaviour of convicts in the Hunter Valley, many of whom would join the emancipist class in a matter of time, but by the cohort of 4,000 who had hooted Darling out of the colony, he came out more strongly than ever against the measure. The Bill was politically wrong, he told Arthur, and morally wrong too. In a colony where the precepts of

---

religion received so little countenance from all classes of people, the average man's oath, whether free or freed, was of doubtful or, at best, of unknown value. For its proper functioning trial by jury relied on the good state of a man's conscience: conscience alone checked those secret dishonesties that lurked in every man's heart; conscience alone inhibited a man from indulging those calculated frauds which he might reasonably hope would escape human detection. But what was there to sharpen conscience but the regular practice of religion? What restrained a man from those undetectable perjuries which could ruin the administration of justice, but a recollection that the unseen, but all seeing, God had promised, 'I will repay'.

So long as religion was so little practised, Broughton judged it morally wrong for him, as a churchman and as a councillor, to approve a measure which required truthful and honest behaviour from men who, in his estimate, possessed no motive for respecting it under all conditions. 9

Bourke found Broughton's unwavering opposition to the Bill particularly galling. He pointed out to the Colonial Office that all other official members of the Legislative Council, himself included, had agreed to some form of compromise in pushing the measure through. Broughton alone made no concession, and had Robert Campbell

9. Based on W.G. Broughton, Religion, essential to the Security and Happiness of Nations. A Sermon, preached in the Parish Church of St. Philips, at Sydney, in New South Wales, on Sunday, January 26, 1834, (Being the Forty-Sixth Anniversary of the Founding of the Colony), (Sydney, 1834), pp. 2-3. Broughton could well have been influenced in this matter by his close friend Judge Burton who was attacking the prevalence of perjury in the colony's courts, see Sydney Gazette, 26 September 1833.
not bungled his appointments for 28 August and missed the third Reading, the measure would have been defeated. Broughton, Bourke gave the Secretary of State to understand, belonged to the party pledged to keep the emancipists 'in a state of entire disfranchise-
ment'. Robert Campbell, he added, was another. 10

Bourke was right about Robert Campbell. He had opposed the Bill to teach colonial youth through 'the marked exclusion of convicts from the jury box, to value a character for honesty and integrity as the great qualification on which their own right to sit there must depend'. 11 Broughton had never uttered so extreme a sentiment. Neither was he awaiting, as were others, an influx of free immigrants who might supply the requisite number of unblemished jurymen. 12 He still envisaged trial by jury taking its proper place in the colony along with the growth of complementary institutions, the churches, schools and colleges, which would nuture the virtues on which a sound jury system was based.

Bourke, compelled by some inner motive, singled out Broughton's behaviour for adverse comment in his despatch. The rest of the affair he reported in subdued tones. He did not mention that John Blaxland, who in 1830 had signed a petition calling for trial by jury, turned

12. Ibid.; J.D. Lang, Emigration; considered chiefly in reference to the practicability and expediency of importing and of settling throughout the Territory of New South Wales, a numerous, industrious and virtuous agricultural population (Sydney, 1833) pp. 2 and 5; Lang, New South Wales, vol.1, pp. 157-8.
and voted with Broughton against it in 1833. He did not report that some of the official Councillors who supported the final form of the Bill, amended to allow for the choice between a military and a civil jury, did so against their conscience, and only because they had been told that they were not free to oppose it outright.

Bourke singled out Broughton's behaviour for adverse comment not because it explained the near defeat of the Bill, but to emphasise that the Archdeacon was in league with a group of extremists. A group, Bourke added, whose only strength was their control of the Legislative Council. They were not numerous, not talented, out of step with public opinion, even, he added, unrepresentative of the property class they belonged to. By identifying Broughton closely with this group Bourke could hope, if nothing more, to create an unfavourable climate of opinions for Broughton's reception in London should he be allowed to return in the near future.

While many items of ecclesiastical expenditure in the Estimates for 1833 had prompted men to vent their anger on Broughton, those very same Estimates contained items which sent a chill up Broughton's spine. In particular he was disturbed by the sight of the Roman Catholic grant being more than doubled, from £450 to £1,100 for chaplains alone. Though only one-seventh of the size of the grant

13. Bourke to Stanley, 2 October 1833, H.R.A., I.xvii. 236. For a consideration of Blaxland's vote see Appendix B.
16. Bourke repeated this with a vengeance when his friend Spring-Rice took over from Stanley. This matter is taken up early in Chapter 7.
17. 'Estimates of the Probable Expenses of the Various Departments, forming a charge on the Treasury of New South Wales, for the year 1845', V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 1833.
for episcopal clergy it was menacingly large in other ways. The colony had had one official Roman Catholic chaplain when Broughton arrived.\footnote{18. The Reverend Daniel Power.} It became two in 1832.\footnote{19. The Reverend Christopher Dowling and the Reverend John McEnroe.} Goderich offered to make it three.\footnote{20. Goderich to Bourke, 20 August 1832, \textit{H.R.A.}, I.xvi. 707-8; Goderich to Bourke, 26 March 1833, C.O. 202/30.} Bourke asked for four.\footnote{21. Bourke to Goderich, 3 November 1832, \textit{H.R.A.}, I.xvi. 790.} In May 1833 it was settled at seven,\footnote{22. 'Minute of His Excellency the Governor to the Legislative Council, explanatory of the several Leads of Expenditure, and of Ways and Means, as estimated for the year 1834', \textit{V. \& P. (L.C. N.S.W.)}, 1833.} which, together with the Reverend J.J. Therry, would make for eight Roman Catholic priests actively at work in the colony in the near future. 'It could not be less without neglecting the religious instruction and education of the numerous poor persons of that persuasion,'\footnote{23. Bourke to Goderich, 29 June 1833, \textit{H.R.A.}, I.xvii. 157.} Bourke explained to Goderich.

For Broughton it could well be much less. This was half the size of the clerical establishment given the episcopal church and, with Bourke reckoning the Roman Catholic population as about one-fifth of the population (and not one-third as did the Roman Catholic spokesmen), it placed Roman Catholics on a most advantageous footing.\footnote{24. Bourke to Stanley, 30 September 1833, \textit{H.R.A.}, I.xvii.225; Ullathorne to McLeay, 29 April 1833, Encl. in Bourke to Stanley, 22 August 1833, \textit{H.R.A.}, I.xvii. 204.} Moreover, if Bourke succeeded in carrying the plan, he had outlined to the Legislative Council in May 1833, to station a Roman Catholic chaplain wherever there was a numerous settlement of Roman Catholics, Broughton could expect, over the next few years, to see an efficient
Roman Catholic opposition spread its net comprehensively over the countryside, matching the episcopal establishment almost priest for priest, perhaps school for school, and to have the expense carried by a Protestant government. It was the beginning of a system, he told Arthur, 'of which I cannot venture to calculate the consequences'.

Ecclesiastical policy had undergone a revolutionary change in the months Broughton had been away. One element in that change was the presence in the colony of the new Roman Catholic Vicar-General, the Reverend William Ullathome. He was a prince of action. Within two days of arriving in February 1833 he had 'put a ponderous tomb of oblivion' over the domestic divisions within the Roman Catholic community. Within two weeks he had begun a personal reconnaissance of the country areas. At the end of two months he addressed Bourke on the need for a spiritual pastor in every principal settlement in the colony. Teachers could wait. He wanted priests. 'They would produce all the good effects of a vigilant, zealous and disinterested police', he promised Bourke who was very much concerned with the rise of nuisance crime and the possible need to increase the police establishment. Between the lame and the middle-aged Broughton, and the youthful and vigorous Ullathorne who promised such glowing changes, there was no comparison. Bourke, hitherto cautious in his approach to the Colonial Office on behalf of the Roman Catholics, threw that

caution to the wind, and a new chapter in the colony's religious history was ushered in earlier than even the Governor had expected.

Broughton and Ullathorne had first met early in February 1833, during a polite dinner party at Government House, Hobart. Their subsequent encounter in Sydney was less civil. After Ullathorne had repaired the cracks in the fabric of the local church community and made his whirlwind tour of the countryside, he decided to interfere in the war of words on Rome's alleged idolatry touched off by Broughton's pamphlet on the Reformation. He threw a side glance at Broughton's original contribution. Vindicating the Reformation, he puffed, was vindicating a non-entity; and the Archdeacon's pamphlet was evidence only of his ignorance of St. Paul, St. Augustine, and the more modern masters of theology. So the young twenty-seven year old monk took on the Cambridge wrangler. For Ullathorne, however, it was a sport that had to end with drawing blood. Why had the Archdeacon mismanaged his reasoning? he asked. Because he was neither an honest man nor a skilled theologian, but the senior official of an organisation which existed to collect tithes. That comfortable little church which the Archdeacon called his own, Ullathorne predicted, was destined soon to tumble, and have its place taken by that rock which had withstood reformations, revolutions, the eighteenth century, and a host of penny pamphlets like the Archdeacon's. 28

Broughton had no doubt that Ullathorne had come to preside over just such a change.

In the formidable new combination of Ullathorne and Bourke, Broughton realised he faced a new challenge. To meet it he needed more chaplains. Yet so many things seemed to unite to deprive him of them. The episcopal establishment was in every sense a thing of threads and patches, and the victim of its past. If its income increased it was never to any good advantage. Quite sizeable sums, rising from £500 in 1832 to £1,296 in the Estimates for 1834, were gobbled up requiting the perquisites attached to appointments made in earlier years and under more lavish masters. Some of this money went in the upkeep of a contingent of convicts to till the few acres of glebe around the churches. Up to another £500 could annually vanish into the coffers of the older chaplains who had surrendered their glebes to the Corporation.\(^29\) And in 1833 and 1834 there was the consequences of an earlier, but short lived, policy of land grants for long service to be borne with. As a result of the new land Regulations the grants were converted into a cash settlement of £320 for each of the chaplains involved.\(^30\) So, in the same year as the Roman Catholic vote went up from by £700, the Reverend Mr. Vincent and the Reverend Mr. Docker, the latter by the skin of his teeth for having succumbed to the bottle was about to be dismissed, received almost the same amount for just being around.\(^31\)

\(^{29}\) See under Section IV of 'Estimates of the Probable Expenses of the Various Departments, forming a charge on the Treasury of New South Wales, for the Year 1832', V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.) 1832; also the same for 1833 printed in, \textit{ibid}, 1833, and for 1834 printed in \textit{ibid}. 1833. \\
\(^{30}\) Goderich to Darling, 22 March 1831, \textit{H.R.A.}, I.xvi. 113. \\
\(^{31}\) See Estimates for 1833 and 1834 as in footnote 29 above. For Docker's troubles see further on this chapter.
Bourke, disgusted with the ability of the episcopal establishment to consume money in this way, took over the task of planning church expenditure, and decided to pour £4,000 over the next few years into building parsonages.\(^{32}\) He wanted eventually to relieve the government of the £500 it paid out annually in rents for ecclesiastical residents. The flaw in this generous offer was that Bourke, not Broughton, proposed it. It reflected the Governor's priorities, not the Archdeacon's. It was formulated with a shrewd eye to future economies rather than present ecclesiastical expansion. Bourke showed that he was not to be swayed by the howls outside for retrenchment. He showed, too, that he was unwilling to be directed by Broughton's wishes.

For Broughton this symbolised the anomaly of his situation. He had lost all control over the financial management of the ecclesiastical establishment, and with that the power to direct its growth. The machinery which gave the Archdeacon the right to report on the needs of the Ecclesiastical Establishment, and which obliged the Governor to receive his reports, read and comment on them, and then forward them to the Colonial Office, had broken down with the suspension of the Church and Schools Corporation. Broughton had not submitted a written report since September 1831. Nothing required Bourke to receive one and he had not asked for one. Broughton's recommendations were no more than suggestions, and what the law had once guaranteed would reach the desk of the Secretary of State for Colonies need, in 1831, go no further than the Governor's drawing

\(^{32}\) Bourke to Goderich, 22 September 1832, *H.R.A.*, I.xvi. 750.
room, and did not. Bourke had blocked Broughton's access to the Colonial Office with a high handed erastian disregard for ecclesiastical authority reminiscent of Macquarie's treatment of Marsden.  

Early in August 1833, Broughton learned that the Church and Schools Corporation was no longer in suspension, but had been finally and utterly abolished. The decision had been a long time coming, and Broughton might have hoped that it augured a strong tussle between opposing forces that might well issue in his favour. The Corporation's abolition, however, had been a formality. It might have been settled a year earlier had not James Stephen insisted that, although the original Warrant dissolving the Corporation was valid, it was more important to extinguish the Corporation to the satisfaction of the Judges of the Supreme Court of New South Wales, than for the legal officers of the Colonial Office to satisfy their ego insisting that there had been no mistake. The King-in-Council was asked to review

---

33. See Marsden to Bishop of London, 26 August 1821, C.O. 201/127 (Bigge Appendix). Broughton like Marsden finally appealed to the Bishop of London to interfere on behalf of the Colonial Church against the Governor; see Broughton to Bishop of London, 30 September 1833, Encl. in Bishop of London to Secretary of State for Colonies, 3 May 1833 sic (1834) C.O. 201/235.

34. The first record of any correspondence on the matter is a letter passing between the Governor and Archdeacon on 12 August 1833. The letter is not available but its subject matter is recorded under No. 33/5219, Index to Register of Letters Received and Register of Letters Received, C.S.I.L. (N.S.W. S.A.).

the matter in May 1832. In May 1832 the King and his Council were more busy reviewing other things. The House of Lords was in committee hacking at the Reform Bill, turning the House of Commons, as young Boz put it, into a conglomeration of noise and confusion.\(^{36}\) So long as the Lords upset the Commons, and Ministeries, like good order in the streets, hovered around vanishing point, the King's thoughts were not to be detracted to the problems of the barren acres of a distant Corporation. The matter waited until 4 February 1833.\(^{37}\)

Then, when the King finally did 'dissolve and put an end to the said Corporation', James Stephen warned Goderich that he had as yet to put an end to another matter.\(^{38}\) Since the Judges had ruled against the provision in the original Warrant, which returned the Corporation lands to the Crown in as full and ample a manner as if they had never been granted, it was necessary to decide who was legally entitled to benefit from the revenue that would arise from the lands in the future. Goderich preferred to leave that vexed decision to a future day. He was happy simply to have the Corporation irrevocably dissolved.

After September 1833 Broughton accepted that he had lost the battle to save the Corporation. He spoke from then on only of the


\(^{37}\) Goderich to Bourke, 10 March 1833, H.R.A., I.xvii. 34.

\(^{38}\) Minute of James Stephen to Hay, n.d., attached to Darling to Goderich, 28 September 1831, *op. cit.*, p. 1009. Goderich's failure to heed Stephen's warning led to many a vexed contest between Broughton and Secretaries of State for Colonies in the 1840's when attempts were made to sell off the Corporation lands.
'late Church and Schools Corporation', and never without a shade of bitterness in his voice. 'That body', he told a public gathering '(was) the most unjustly aspersed of any with which I am acquainted.' Not only aspersed but betrayed. And when Hannibal Macarthur and other Macarthurs, within a month of the decease of the Corporation, crowned a five year struggle with the Colonial Office by snatching another 17,500 acres of land from the Crown, including 3,000 acres once earmarked for the Corporation, this bitterness overflowed. He told Bourke one day in the Council that he wanted it recorded in the minutes of the Executive Council where His Majesty's Government could see and read it, that these were the men and the means which had defeated the Royal Instructions and prevented the Corporation making the required provision for churches and schools. Henceforth he prayed, in private and public, that the colony would be delivered from the grip of the spirit of covetousness.

Though Broughton had lost the struggle to save the Corporation, he believed he had won the battle to save the lands. Since no fresh instructions had been received to the contrary he concluded that the lands were now a perpetual Crown trust for the maintenance and promotion of religion and the education of youth. 'It seemed to me improbable that the King of England in making provision for "the promotion of religion" should have had it in contemplation to make provision for the promotion of the Roman Catholic religion', Broughton

39. W.G. Broughton, A Charge delivered to the Clergy of New South Wales, at the Visitation, held on Thursday, February 13, 1834, in the Church of St. James, at Sydney (Sydney, 1834), p.16.
reasoned with an eye cast backward into history. 'I could not bring my mind to any other conclusion than that the estates in question were to be... applied to the exclusive support of the clergy of the Church of England and Parochial schools under their superintendence'. Fortified with such logic, Broughton ordered his carriage one early September morning and drove to Government House bearing a memorandum entitled, Proposed System for the Future Management of the Church and Schools Estates in New South Wales. Broughton explained to the Governor that the problem confronting them was one of management. Though the former Corporation land might never be increased, they may never be decreased, and were potentially highly profitable. If the Governor would appoint him and twelve other Protestants trustees, with responsibility for the management of the estates, he would strive as quickly as possible to have the lands return sufficient revenue for the support of a system of primary schools adequate for the needs of protestant children in the colony. It was as wild a hope as Broughton ever expressed; remarkable for its fantasy, but more remarkable for its tacit admission that henceforth the Archdeacon would be concerned with protestant education only.

42. Broughton to Bishop of London, 30 September 1833, Encl. in Bishop of London to Secretary of State for Colonies, 3 May 1833 sic, (1834) C.O. 201/235.
43. Bourke to Stanley, 1 October 1833, H.R.A., I.xvii. 233. A copy of the Memorandum is found in Despatches from Governor of New South Wales. Enclosures etc. 1832-5, pp. 1215-23 (A1267/13, M.L.). In the discussion which follows this document will be referred to as the 'Memorandum'.
44. 'Memorandum', pp. 1216, p219-20.
Bourke turned pale with dismay. There was Broughton, seated before him, attempting to 'revive the Corporation but under another name'. He promptly informed the Archdeacon that, in the absence of definite instructions to the contrary from the Colonial Office, he had come to a very different conclusion. He intended to apply the revenue of the former Corporation's estates to the maintenance of religion and education 'without any limitation whatever'. But he had more to say. Not only had the old style Corporation gone for good, but the old style Archdeacon had gone with it. The land would be managed by an agent appointed by the Governor and responsible to him alone. The Orphanages, once controlled by the Corporation would be taken over by the Governor and placed under the management of committees appointed by the Government and the Council. The Archdeacon may, as in the past, be chairman of that committee. But, Bourke added, 'he may not'. He may not even be on the committee. He would continue as Visitor; that meant that he could look around the place and report on needed changes. He could no longer appoint or dismiss staff. And that, moreover, applied to the schools as well as the orphanages.

The Archdeacon's right to appoint school masters had been granted by and expired with the Charter of the Church and School Corporation, Bourke insisted. The Governor would control the

45. Governor Bourke's marginal comments in 'Memorandum', p. 1216.
46. Ibid., p.1215.
47. Ibid., p.1216.
48. Ibid., pp.1220-1.
49. Ibid., p.1222.
schools in every aspect; set the syllabus, appoint the staff, approve repairs, decide on new sites and pay the salaries. He hoped one day to appoint local committees as his agents in these matters. In the meantime he would be pleased to work directly through the local chaplains. 50

Broughton left Government House that Spring September day with the feeling that a sudden crisis had come upon the affairs of the church. Given their way, he wrote to the Bishop of London, the temporal powers of the colony 'will deliver her over bound hand and foot to the will of her enemies'. 51 He did not believe that the King-in-Council had intended the dissolution of the Corporation to be an excuse for stripping him of two-thirds of his office. 52 The Chief Justice, however, knew that the law could be stretched to do just that. Eight years before, in the case of Walker against Scott, he had ruled that thevisitorial authority of the Archdeacon resided solely in the Letters Patent creating the Corporation. All other documents, including the Patent creating the Archdeaconry and the Governor's own Instructions, merely expressed the royal pleasure that the Archdeacon should be Visitor to all schools and religious foundations maintained by grants from the crown. 53 Bourke pressed this distinction to the limit, perhaps counselled and guided by Forbes, but certainly inspired by his own wrath.

50. Ibid., p.1222-3.  
52. Ibid.  
The Order-in-Council for dissolving the Corporation had arrived in the first weeks of August. That was the month Broughton had so grossly offended Bourke by his opposition to the Jury Bill, and had come within a hair's breadth of dealing a Governor as humiliating a defeat as when Forbes had vetoed Darling's press censorship bill in 1827. So throughout that month Bourke worked steadily at the details of the Archdeacon's demotion and was ready within two days of the passing of the Jury Bill to deliver to Broughton, for distribution to the clergy, instructions directing chaplains in future to communicate directly with the Auditor General on all matters concerning their own salaries, school salaries, forage allowances, building repairs and incidental expenses. For the chaplains it meant five separate returns every month, in duplicate, in place of the former quarterly claim for salary and half-yearly report on buildings, lodged with the Archdeacon. Broughton warned Bourke that he had gone too far. The Archdeacon, not the Governor, he reiterated, was responsible to the Secretary of State for the good order of the ecclesiastical establishment. Even if the Governor could arrogate this authority to himself he did not have the local knowledge to render it efficient. Either the Governor must extravagantly authorise every claim, or decline to authorise any, pending inspection, itself an expensive business, and doubly expensive if the inevitable delay caused added damage. Only the Archdeacon had the knowledge the

56. Colonial Secretary to Stiles, 16 September 1833 (Stiles Papers, Ms. No. A269, M.L.).
Governor needed to go about his scheme. If he by-passed the Archdeacon he would be pandering to his own whims at the expense of the colony's education and religious system.57

When the first returns came back Bourke realised he had gone too far. To keep the politically contentious forage allowances at a minimum he found he required the Archdeacon's approval on the peregrinations of the chaplains. So the forage claims were forwarded for the Archdeacon's scrutiny.58 Next came the claims for building repairs.59 Finally, Bourke relented on his ruling and reinstructed the chaplains to communicate, in the first instance, with the Archdeacon on all ecclesiastical matters.60 So it was over the hay that went into the horse's mouth that some equilibrium was restored in the relationship between the Archdeacon and Governor.

Bourke found Broughton's co-operation indispensable in keeping the school system in order as well. Yet the matters he referred to the Archdeacon came without regularity or system, and there was confusion and friction. When, on a tour south, Broughton acted promptly to replace an unsatisfactory school master at Wollongong, Bourke begrudgingly confirmed the appointment; 'but without admitting,' he wrote back to the Archdeacon, 'that you have any rights to nominate

57. Broughton to Colonial Secretary, 26 September 1833, C.S.I.L. 33/6451, Box 4/2169 (N.S.W. S.A.).
58. Colonial Secretary to Broughton, 28 October 1833 C.S.O.L. 'Letters to Clergy', 33/171 (N.S.W. S.A.).
59. Colonial Secretary to Broughton, 22 October 1833, ibid., 33/163.
60. Memo to Governor Bourke attached to Broughton to Colonial Secretary, 17 February 1834, C.S.I.L. 34/1150, Box 4/2220 (N.S.W. S.A.).
to schools'. Broughton was bewildered. He noticed, with some vexation, that he was promptly called in to attend to broken water pumps and crumbling fireplaces, but not so much as consulted when matters of the general control and discipline of the schools were discussed and decided. 'I have the honour to require,' he finally addressed Bourke,'... that some more definite principle than at present appears to prevail with respect to my interference with these schools should be established.' Bourke made no concession. Broughton acted, and would continue to act, by invitation.

As the year 1833 drew to its close, Broughton, five years after his appointment to the colony at £2,000 a year and as the director of a great department of state responsible for setting up a church and a school within reasonable distance of every settler, was handed notice to quit his office and dismiss his staff. It was not certain that he would be allowed to retain one clerk to help sort his papers or write those trifling recommendations to His Majesty's Captain-General and Governor-in-Chief detailing the need for spending £12/16/- promptly on windows on one church, and for

62. Broughton to Colonial Secretary, 18 February 1834, C.S.I.L. 34/1475, Box 4/2220 (N.S.W. S.A.). When Marsden administered the Archdeaconry in Broughton's absence 1834-1836, Bourke gave him the free hand he denied Broughton; see Marsden to Bourke, 17 November 1835, C.S.I.L. 35/9209, Box 4/2266.1 (N.S.W. S.A.).
63. Bourke to Stanley, 4 October 1833, H.R.A.,I.xvii.240; Colonial Secretary to Broughton, 7 March 1834, C.S.O.L. 'Letters to Clergy', 34/60 (N.S.W. S.A.).
repairing school roofs with screws rather than nails. It was a change Broughton himself did not understand: it was a change he decided he could not accept. To reason with Bourke was hopeless; 'His decision was so formed that it was not to be changed by any argument from me.' But reasoning with Bourke was not the only avenue of change open to him. He called on the Bishop of London to stall any further decisions on local ecclesiastical affairs and help bring him back to England.

There was one bright patch in Bourke's reforms. The Governor gave every indication of believing that the state had a duty to ensure that the colony received competent teachers and clergy. Bourke's problem was to discover a first premise on which to build a new system of church aid. Much of the current debate on ecclesiastical reform in England borrowed its assumptions from the constitutional settlement of 1688, and the idea that England's enemy had ever been, and would remain, papal aggression from abroad. Whenever Broughton expounded his views of national progress, he went back a century further to the Tudor Reformation and the assumption that God elected England to be his vessel for the purification of

64. Broughton to Colonial Secretary, 18 December 1833, C.S.I.L., 33/8347, Box 4/2169 (N.S.W. S.A.); Broughton to Colonial Secretary, 23 December 1833, ibid., 33/8463, Box 4/2169.
66. Ibid.
religion, and the preservation of that purity was the first task of its rulers.\textsuperscript{69} To Bourke, New South Wales was neither Stuart or Tudor England, but 'a new country to which persons of all religious persuasions are invited to resort'.\textsuperscript{70} Its security did not consist in walling itself up against papal invaders, but in placating the aggrieved bodies dwelling within its shores.\textsuperscript{71} If he had found a worthwhile lesson in the past it was that the removal of 'a dominant and endowed church' was a vital element in the contentment of modern states.\textsuperscript{72}

To remove an endowed church, without removing Christianity, it was necessary to offer aid to several churches. Bourke felt it would be sufficient in New South Wales to acknowledge the presence of three churches, the Church of England, and the Roman Catholic and Presbyterian churches, as they covered the majority of the settlers.\textsuperscript{73} Or if it was more palatable, the Church of England and such other bodies as approved by the Governor and Councils.\textsuperscript{74} Guiding Bourke was the simple principle, that Christianity in its many forms served equally well to secure 'to the state good subjects and to society good men'.\textsuperscript{75} Being an administrator, Bourke confessed, he could not afford to talk in terms of truth and error, as Broughton

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{70} Bourke to Stanley, 30 September 1833, \textit{H.R.A.}, I.xvii. 227.
\item \textsuperscript{71} Bourke to Arthur, 17 August 1835 (\textit{Arthur Papers}, Vol. 8, M.L.).
\item \textsuperscript{72} Bourke to Stanley, 30 September 1833, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 227.
\item \textsuperscript{73} \textit{Ibid.}
\item \textsuperscript{74} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 229.
\item \textsuperscript{75} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 230 and 232.
\end{itemize}
did, but must have in mind the overall happiness of the people.  

This policy for a multiple church development made a regular system out of the *de facto* policy which had grown up around a succession of Colonial Office rulings designed to fill the gap created by Murray's repudiation of the idea of a Corporation and his, and his successor's failure, to provide an alternative. By contrast Bourke's thoughts on education foreshadowed a more radical change. As late as 9 July 1833 the Governor had intended subsidising the development of denominational schools. Then news arrived of Stanley succeeding Goderich at the Colonial Office. Almost immediately, Bourke proposed that Stanley's brainchild for Ireland, a single system of schools uniting diverse religious groupings for general education and separating them for dogmatic instruction, would be admirably suited to the circumstances of New South Wales.

Bourke grew so enamoured of the idea that he boldly proposed wiping out the past and beginning afresh, as if the colony had been settled only yesterday. The thirty-five existing parochial schools were 'of no great importance or value', he admitted in a damning indictment of his own administration. Broughton, as far as he was concerned, could have the lot, buildings, furniture and all. He

76. *Ibid.*, p. 232; Memo of Governor Bourke attached to Ullathorne to Colonial Secretary, 29 April 1833, C.S.I.L. 33/3059, Box 4/2175.2 (N.S.W. S.A.).
78. Bourke's first despatch to Stanley was dated 21 August 1833.
79. On Stanley's scheme, see *P.D.*, third series, vol. 6, 9 September 1831, col. 1257.
would build new and better schools. He would appoint only well qualified teachers. If necessary he would bring them out from Europe. He would pay them salaries comparable to those paid to the chaplains; nothing below £100 to £150. He would do, in fact, everything Broughton had been recommending to Governors for four years.

Despite the heavy drain these programmes would place on the treasury, Bourke believed the colonists generally, and certainly the more intelligent citizens, were behind him. Broughton and the clergy would object, he warned, as would others with more radical ideas of reducing colonial expenditure. Bourke realised that by the standards of the eighteenth century his scheme was radically new, but by other more modern standards it could appear conservative. Indeed, in Bourke's opinion, it was the most conservative arrangement likely to succeed for, as he told Stanley, 'the inclination of these colonists ... keeps pace with the Spirit of the Age'.

At the very mention of the Spirit of the Age Broughton turned pale. Behind that phrase, and the high sounding title of liberal which the disciples of that Spirit had arrogated to themselves, Broughton saw a lurking spirit of sordid self interest. Liberals trimmed between one opinion and another, served one cause today and another tomorrow, not because they saw something of the truth in

82. *Ibid.* p. 231; see also Bourke to Arthur, 12 March 1835 *(Arthur Papers*, vol. 8, M.L.), and Bourke to Richard Bourke Jnr., 26 July 1836 *(Bourke Papers*, vol. 6, M.L.).
everything as many fondly imagined, but because they were exclusively
dedicated to staying in power and therefore could not afford to
acknowledge an absolute truth in anything. So beware, he warned
Arthur whom he suspected of being tainted with that Spirit, when
the liberals triumph, 'self-interest will rule the world'.

Broughton believed, too, that the nation would suffer a
more subtle deterioration long before that ugly day should the
present temper of the government be suffered to continue its
course unchecked. Whether governments liked it or not, people did
not look to them for a lead in religious and moral matters, Broughton
insisted. And should governments show themselves to be indifferent
to truth, then, Broughton continued in his letter to Arthur, 'I am
convinced they are doing what in them lies to root out all sense
of the importance of truth from men's minds'. Only belief in a truth
could inspire men to strive after the unheroic virtues which were the
marrow of family and community life, virtues like probity, uprightness
and charity. If after ten years of Bourke's liberal Christianity
these virtues were prospering and spreading in the colony then,
promised Broughton, 'I, if alive, will recant my error and become
as liberal as you like'.

Broughton learned on 8 November that he was free to return to
England for consultation with the Colonial Office. The tattlers

84. Broughton to Arthur, 24 January 1834 (Arthur Papers, vol. 12,
M.L.).
85. Ibid.
86. Colonial Secretary to Broughton, 8 November 1833, C.S.O.L.
'Letters to Clergy', 33/178 (N.S.W. S.A.).
were soon 'speculating that this amounted to a resignation. 'Reports say - he means to throw up the Archdeaconry!', ran a note in the *Australian*. 'We doubt it. Church benefices are good things at the best of times. In times like these a snug well paid £2,000 per annum is not a thing to be sneezed at. The colony could well spare the benefice it is true, but could the Incumbent?' The sceptical editor was over optimistic. 'I should think it my duty to return', Broughton wrote to Arthur the very day before. 'Nevertheless I have no wish to come, but quite the reverse; and therefore have no personal fear of consequences which may arise from insisting upon what I consider proper terms'.

As he brooded over the gloom of infidelity encircling the colony and what he might do abroad to dispel it, the twenty-sixth day of January came around. In 1834 it fell on the Lord's day. So Broughton went up to St. Philip's Church and proclaimed that day the fourty-sixth anniversary of the founding of 'another land of Canaan'. All Canaans were alike, he added, and since it could be his last anniversary in the colony, he retold the message of his first sermon, of the inseparable connection between obedience and prosperity on the one hand, and between wickedness and destruction on the other. Yet it was a remarkable thing, he said, that amid a wave of crime men showed an increased determination to rest the well-being of their society on rules and regulations dreamed up by their own ingenuity.

His congregation knew what he meant. Sydney streets had become alarmingly unsafe, bushranging increasingly audacious and the Hunter Valley was allegedly aflame with disorder. To add substance to rumour and spice it with sensation, Bourke had begun his lugubrious death pageants and the execution of selected criminals in didactic style. On the eve of this particular anniversary the colony had been stirred by reports of the last days of poor Hitchcock and Poole, two mutinous convicts sent up country to die by the hangman's rope on the hot fly-infested plains of the Hunter Valley region as a stern reminder of the end that awaited such lawlessness.

Crime, Broughton went on to explain, began in the unpunishable offences of the heart, in the promptings of greed, anger and wrath. To subdue these impulses men needed to acquire habits of meekness, forgiveness and forbearance. Only the church could properly instruct men in these. Should the remaining tender threads tying the state to the church be severed, then flee the colony, Broughton warned his congregation, for it must in time become a tottering heap of iniquity. 'A society made up of persons wholly devoid of religion, could not subsist', he continued, explaining how he saw the end would come. 'It is by allowing the wicked full scope to prosecute their abandoned purposes without check or hindrance from the example of any who fear

90. Based on Bourke to Stanley, 19 September 1834, H.R.A., I.xvii.540; Bourke to Stanley, 2 October 1833, ibid., pp.233-5; Bourke to Stanley, 15 September 1834, ibid., pp. 520-1; Bourke to Spring-Rive, 14 December 1834, ibid., pp.601, 603-5.
91. Sydney Gazette, 23 and 30 December 1833; Sydney Monitor, 10 January 1834.
the Lord...(that) they will bring down vengeance upon themselves through that inseparable connection between wickedness and destruction, which sooner or later is found to prevail in all human affairs.' To avert that disaster Broughton intended returning to England to save and strengthen the ties between church and state.

Disappointments dogged Broughton's last months; things occurred, he confided to the Bishop of London 'such as filled me with shame and vexation on behalf of the Church of England.' Drink had got the better of Docker, the chaplain at Windsor, and loosened his tongue after a fashion unbecoming to his profession. To avoid the scene of an Archdeacon's court he resigned, then created another by refusing to vacate the parsonage. While the new chaplain stayed at the local hotel, Docker, Sunday by Sunday, marched his family to the church and presented himself at the altar rail. At first Broughton wanted to evict him but, realising that Docker had squatted in the parsonage out of desperation for a roof for his family, left him alone. He remained five months then quietly moved on.  

Wilton, the chaplain at Newcastle, got himself into hot water as well. He had failed to turn up for the execution of poor Hitchcock and Poole at Patrick's Plains. Bourke demanded an explanation.

94. Colonial Secretary to Broughton, 13 August 1833, C.S.O.L. 'Letters to Clergy', 33/106 (N.S.W. S.A.); Broughton to Stiles, 24 September 1833 (Stiles Papers, Ms. No. A269, M.L.).
Wilton, Broughton explained, was up country and unaware of the unusual arrangements. 'Could I have had your letter in time, I would have travelled all night to have been on the spot', Wilton explained to Broughton. Bourke thought the excuse weak. Hall, who had got wind of the matter, declined to believe there could be an excuse. 'Your Grace', he wrote in yet another of those open letters to officials abroad, 'our clergy are few, and such as we have are not all attentive to their duty'. This incensed Broughton. He informed Bourke that Wilton had diligently attended the criminals in question every day while they were lodged in Newcastle awaiting shipment to Sydney for trial. He reminded him that he had given only six days' notice of the unusual place of execution. He reminded him, too, that chaplains did undertake prolonged tours of duty up-country. And, in case others wanted to stir up trouble of the same kind, Broughton lodged a file of correspondence on the subject with McLeay and authorised him to show it to them.

In the hostile mood of the times Broughton was charged with wasting the colonists' money putting a set of elegant porticos and a new gallery in St. James' Church. He was accused, too, of

95. Broughton to Bourke, 8 January 1833 sic. (1834) C.S.I.L. 24/229, Box 4/2220 (N.S.W. S.A.).
96. Wilton to Broughton, (N.d.), Encl. in ibid.
97. Colonial Secretary to Broughton, 13 January 1834 C.S.O.L. 'Letters to Clergy', 34/7 (N.S.W. S.A.).
98. Sydney Monitor, 10 January 1834.
1. Sydney Monitor, 3 August 1833.
wasting his own time. 'Our Archdeacon is a never failing Visitor to a Board of Enquiry,' the *Sydney Monitor* informed its readers. 'The subject of inquiry is, whether the woman kept as a mistress at the house of a settler in the interior by a civil servant of the Government, was the prisoner of the Crown or a free woman.'\(^2\)

The subject of the enquiry was a little more delicate. The Secretary of State for Colonies wanted to know whether Mr. John Stephen, the civil servant in question, had made a mistress of an assigned servant knowing that she was the wife of another man.\(^3\) The case, touching as it did a sensitive area of public morals, interested Broughton, but he was involved in it by command, not by choice. The Executive Council was directed to review the evidence and file a report.\(^4\)

It sat almost every second day throughout November and December, and when Broughton departed the Colony it was preparing to sit again.

A few of his activities passed without censure. He continued to work for the 'Hibernia' victims after returning from Hobart, and through the chaplains raised several hundred pounds more for them.\(^5\) He was busily involved, too, with the Emigrants' Friends Society.\(^6\) Through the clergy and his own inland journeys he became their job spotter. The arrival of the 'Red Rover' and its cargo of female emigrants, had had its moment of drama for him. At a very late hour it was discovered that such of them as were destined for service out

---

of town had nowhere to lay their heads between disembarkation and assignment to suitable occupations. The Society had asked Broughton to help deal with the problem. He did. He stayed with it a long time and he never forgot the experience. When it was all over he advised the Colonial Office, that it would be inexpedient and improper to repeat the experiment until the colony had better geared itself to cope with such ladies. 7

When finally the time for his departure arrived Broughton assembled his clergy for a final Visitation and told them that if he were to sum up his colonial experience in one statement he would say that he had lived the last four and a half years among an unreflecting people. The recent drought and the even more recent rains had taught them nothing. Earlier he had expressed the hope that a renewed sense of dependence upon God would spring up alongside the new plants and crops. It had not. The prevailing colonial disposition was to regard prosperity and success as the fruit of good fortune and human industry. 'Men are thrown so much upon their own resources they acquire a habit of ascribing all to their own policy and exertion', he said. So their most urgent task as God's ambassadors was to prevent a spirit of self-dependence becoming, as he believed it fast was, the sole national characteristic. 8

As chaplains they had a difficult task; for it was their misfortune, Broughton added, to have an uncooperative government. It was Broughton's misfortune that day to have Bourke ill at home in

8. Broughton, Visitation Charge, 1834, pp. 5-6, 8-9, 20.
Paramatta and unable to receive the censure prepared for him.\(^9\) The sabbath, for example, was a drunken holiday, Broughton added giving substance to his accusation. Men's behaviour ruined Sunday worship and robbed the colony of days of useful labour each week and yet the government had done little to arrest the spread of the plague.\(^{10}\) The government had done nothing either to enforce the attendance of ticket of leave men at Sunday worship.\(^{11}\) Masters with assigned servants beheld the government's negligence, and copied their carelessness. 'Nevertheless these discouraging appearances must not abate our diligence', Broughton concluded.\(^{12}\) They must all go about their business with determination, the chaplains in the colony and he, for a while, abroad.\(^{13}\)

A few days later the Archdeacon's household goods went under the hammer.\(^{14}\) He sold all that he could not carry with him, partly to help defray the costs of his journey which, to his amazement, the Colonial Office had ruled must be met from his own pocket.\(^{15}\) Officially he was holidaying abroad. So he hired the most comfortable quarters he could find and on the 15 March, after many a wearisome delay, sailed away in the ship \textit{Henry}.\(^{16}\) With him went a cargo of

\(^9\) Sydney \textit{Gazette}, 18 February 1834, Bourke's name not listed as among those present at St. James' Church, see \textit{ibid.}, 15 and 17 February 1834.

\(^{10}\) Broughton, \textit{Visitation Charge}, 1834, pp. 10-11.


\(^{12}\) \textit{Ibid.}, p. 11.

\(^{13}\) \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 20-1.

\(^{14}\) Sydney \textit{Herald}, 24 February 1834 (Advertisement).

\(^{15}\) Colonial Secretary to Broughton, 8 November 1833, \textit{C.S.O.L. 'Letters to Clergy'}, 33/178 (N.S.W. S.A.).

\(^{16}\) For a reference to his luxury accommodation, see Sir George Grey to Broughton, 23 December 1835, \textit{C.O.} 202/23.
fine colonial wool. It was an unobtrusive farewell, gingered a little by an appeal from Ullathorne for 'liberal and kind' Protestants to share the cost of erecting an altar in St. Mary's chapel. 17

CHAPTER SEVEN

WAITING IN CORRIDORS

Must we quit the field at once, because opponents are prepared to enter it? Let us rather hold the Christian advantage which prior occupation always gives.

British Critic 1836.
The departure of the Henry gave Bourke little relief. Broughton might have been a troublesome obstacle in the colony: in 1834 he was a decided danger abroad. The attempt to calculate a safe period for the Archdeacon's absence had misfired. By December 1834, and for no reason that he could have foreseen, Bourke stood to have many powerful opponents abroad. Parry, a close friend of Broughton, had fallen out with Bourke over land grants for the Australian Agricultural Company, and had decided to sail for London and take the matter to the Colonial Office in person.  

Parry had acted as a Hunter River spokesman in the dispute on convict discipline, and in 1834 Hunter River tempers had flared up again. This time it was over an official censure passed on one of the magistrates, John Bingle, for allegedly overplaying his hand in a spot of strife. Bourke had engineered the censure by way of a general rebuke on the Hunter River community, and the Sydney Herald in retaliation called on all magistrates to protest and resign.  

It was a declaration of war; and the paper's editors left little doubt that they were after the skin of Bourke and his 'satellites of maladministration'. Others left no doubt that they knew what was going on; and a literature purportedly exposing 'the political juggery now in existence to obtain the removal of Governor Bourke' began to flow on to the market. As for himself, Bourke felt sure

---

1. Parry, Journal 1829-1832, 4 June 1832; Bourke to Goderich, 6 May 1833 and Enclosure Marked D, H.R.A., I.xvii.104 and 114-5; Sydney Herald, 17 February 1834.
3. Clark, Australia II, pp.206-9; Sydney Herald, 10 February, 1834.
the Macarthur family interests in England were at work lobbying for his removal. So as Broughton sailed into this gathering storm, it seemed to Bourke that he would add to its fury.

Bourke was confident that Broughton would not deliberately attempt to injure his reputation. He was equally confident that Broughton would leave no stone unturned in his attempt to overturn Bourke's policy on religion and education. 'Though very correct in the discharge of his professional duties he still finds time for politics', Bourke warned his Whig friend, Spring-Rice. 'As he will probably mix with some of the Macarthur family and others of that faction, he is likely to be influenced by their views and his own feelings, and to assert in those general terms which hardly admit of refutation that the colony is not better for my government.' Broughton's recent Visitation Charge had been an excellent exercise in this form of innuendo, and Bourke could well expect the Archdeacon to practise it further.

Bourke had originally planned to install his son Richard in London and to have him lobbying on his behalf before Broughton, or any of his other opponents, had arrived in England. The material for such a lobby was excellent. Spring-Rice, a senior Whig and veteran chairman of many enquiries into Irish education, was an old friend. The two shared an interest in Rhododendrons and had once owned neighbouring estates in Limerick. Through Spring-Rice Bourke hoped

5. Bourke to Spring-Rice, 12 March 1834 (Bourke Papers, vol.9, M.L.).
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
to reach Stanley, for those two had once worked together in the battle for Irish National Schools. The second string to Bourke's bow was his own son-in-law, Mr. Percival. Percival and James Stephen, the senior legal officer of the Colonial Office, were close friends. Though Percival and Bourke did not see eye to eye on the drift of political affairs, Bourke had once attempted to have his son-in-law appointed to McLeay's job, and was relying on his sense of duty to repay the debt.

In the end Broughton had moved too quickly, and a letter had to do the job Bourke had singled out for his son. Spring-Rice could expect to find the Archdeacon a very amiable and agreeable person but, Bourke cautioned his friend, he was illiberal to the core. He was a 'pillar of the emigrant party', a Tory minded group dedicated to the exclusion of emancipists for ever from a share in the government of the land. He was, moreover, a decided highchurchman who 'would keep the Presbyterians and Catholics in fetters and chains of iron'.

While Bourke admitted that Broughton would do nothing underhand to deliberately sabotage his reputation, Bourke was less generous in reciprocating the sentiment. The remarks left the colony in a private letter to a friend; they came to their journey's end on the desk of the Secretary of State for Colonies. Before Broughton had rounded the

Cape, Bourke's friend Spring-Rice had taken over that office from Stanley.11

A summer warmed Brighton welcomed Broughton to England on Saturday 16 August. He rested there on the Sunday, and then took his family on a sentimental journey up through the countryside they loved so well to London where he met his mother. Then it was on to Canterbury.12 There, in the shade of memories that were the starch of his soul, Broughton hired a house and settled down to await the outcome of the plans to which he had tied his future. On the green downs of Kent and among the old grey stones of Canterbury, Broughton felt he was where he belonged. 'If I thought myself free to consult my own inclinations', he confided in a letter to Arthur in these early days, 'I should prefer a very humble station at home to the highest that could be offered me abroad.'13

During these early weeks many good things happened in Canterbury, and the gathering of the King's School Feast Society on 18 September was the best of them all. By a stroke of luck the Duke of Wellington had been elected patron of the day's celebrations. With him came a distinguished coterie of local political worthies, and the inevitable national publicity which dogged his steps. It was just such an occasion that Broughton needed to sharpen up his knowledge of the

political situation he had to penetrate. He met and talked with his old patron the Duke, and both men had tales to tell of sands which had run out from beneath their feet. He met, too, during the day's mixed ritual of worship, prize-giving, and feasting, eminent Tories like the Earl of Winchelsea, Stephen Lushington, and Sir Edward Knatchbull, who could each appraise him of the men he would be dealing with in the Whig Ministry. Their communications were not heartening, but their mood was defiant; so defiant indeed that, with the aid of a little wine, the Feast's dinner at the Fountain Hotel turned itself into a Tory rally.

Few present that night turned on a more defiant show than Howley the Archbishop of Canterbury. He chose to defend traditional education, a choice of subject possibly influenced by Broughton's meeting with him a few days previously. The reform-minded men of the present generation might manage to change but they would never succeed in improving the training imparted through the classical syllabus which flourished in England's endowed schools, the Archbishop testified. In seminaries like the King's School, Canterbury, the young learned to unite the manliness of the ancients with the morality of Christianity. That, Howley proclaimed, had given the English nation its fibre. At the sound of that some of the strongest of those


15. See Broughton to Hay, 6 September 1834, C.O. 323/172.
fibres rose up and cheered. Broughton seized the opportunity to add that 'there was now a King's School in the antipodes'. They stood to cheer again, and to raise a toast to the Archdeacon's health. Broughton, finding them so full of good cheer and warm to ancient institutions, craved the liberty to add a few words explaining his presence in England. 'He had been placed at the head of Christianity in a land where education was unknown', ran a report of his speech, 'and it was part of his duty to attempt the removal of difficulties produced by the absence of an establishment for inculcating religious and general knowledge.' He had come to England to see to that. Someone present noted down the facts, and a week later The Times reported them to the nation.  

Broughton met many people in the early months of his return. Some were important and a few eminent, but they were mostly the wrong people. The Whigs ruled England, not the Tories. The staunch Tory community around Canterbury and East Kent added agreeableness to his sojourn, but it isolated him politically.  He grew daily more familiar with the opinions of those with whom he agreed, while the men who would decide his fate remained strangers to him. Even the Archbishop of Canterbury, to whom he had ready access, carried less influence than the Bishop of London in circles where decisions were

16. Based on The Times, 25 September 1834; Edwards, King's School, pp.122-3; Broughton, Sermon on Church of England, p.xviii.  
17. For an insight into the Tory Kent Broughton knew see the report of the great Tory rally celebrating Melbourne's dismissal from office in The Times, 21 November 1834. The official guest list at this rally bore a striking resemblance to the guest list at the King's School Feast Society.
made. By the end of September Broughton could ruefully reflect that he had got into the pages of *The Times*, but not into the Colonial Office.

Broughton had appraised the Colonial Office of his arrival and requested an appointment with the Secretary of State before the end of August. He received a cool acknowledgment. First he must state in writing to the Under Secretary, Sir George Grey, the nature of his business. It surprised him to think there was any element of mystery surrounding that. But it so happened he had prepared a number of written submissions which it suited him to have read and digested before any meeting was arranged. These, and the business list solicited by Grey, were in the hands of the Colonial Office by the first week of September.

The written submissions probably hindered Broughton's cause. They revealed a spirited and aggressive Archdeacon determined to hound

---

18. Howley's greatest influence was with the King and his fellow ecclesiastics, see Chadwick, *Victorian Church*, pp.11 and 15; outside this circle he was considered too prejudiced to be right, see G.F.A. Best, *Temporal Pillars*, p.166 (note 1). Both Lord Brougham (Lord Chancellor) and Lord Althorp (Whig leader in House of Commons) considered Blomfield the most able prelate and repeatedly sought his advice, see A. Blomfield, *A Memoir of Charles James Blomfield, D.D., Bishop of London, with selections from his correspondence* (2 vols., London, 1863), vol.1, pp.170 and 179. Sydney Smith believed Blomfield's abilities and Whig support had, by 1837, set him on the road to becoming the most powerful prelate since Laud, see Sydney Smith, 'First Letter to Archdeacon Singleton', in *Works of the Reverend Sydney Smith*, new ed. (London, 1869), pp.726-7.


20. Minute of Sir George Grey attached to *ibid*.

21. Broughton to Spring-Rice, 1 and 3 September 1834, *C.O.* 201/244.
the Colonial Office on matters considered closed. In one of these Broughton set out the reasons he rejected the explanation offered earlier for his demotion in the Councils. It was fraught with inconsistencies, he said. Yet he did not seek reinstatement. Instead, he asked that the Colonial Office make good its claim that the security of the colony depended on the senior military officer holding precedence immediately after the Governor and to that rank in both Councils. That meant demoting the Chief Justice one rank in the Legislative Council. Until they did that, Broughton said he must view the whole matter as a piece of mischievous meddling designed solely to denigrate his office and lower the place of the Church of England in the colony. 22

In a second submission Broughton declaimed against the injustice of the ruling that allowed him only half salary during his absence. The half salary regulation, as Brought understood it, was for the benefit of officials required to return to Europe for relaxation or private business. He had no private business to transact and sufficient public business to preclude any likelihood of relaxation, he told the Colonial Office, and accused it of retreating into fiction when it maintained that he had come of his own free choice. That, he said, implied that he was equally free to choose not to come. The history of his appointment told another story. In 1829 he had departed for the colony with a clear set of instructions. In less than

22. 'To the Right Honourable Thomas Spring Rice, M.P., H.M. Principal Secretary of State for Colonies. The Memorial of the Reverend Grant Broughton M.A. Archdeacon of New South Wales and its Dependencies', 1 September 1834, C.O. 201/244.
five years he had lost them. What the Colonial Office had not changed it had varied, and so often changed and varied, he emphasised, that 'the disorganised state of all matters connected with the church left me no choice but that of proceeding hither for fresh instructions'.

And if there was one thing to which he took greater exception than their refusal to acknowledge this, it was their persistent habit of referring to him as being absent in England from his duties as Archdeacon. In England he was as busy as he had ever been on behalf of the affairs he had ever considered the first responsibility of his office, the maintenance and extension of the religious and educational affairs of the colony. 23

Throughout September the post remained Broughton's one means of entry into the Colonial Office. Its doors just would not open. He arranged appointments only to have them vanish as the hour struck. Spring-Rice agreed twice to interview him and twice cancelled the arrangements. 24 Sir George Grey called him to London for an extensive working session and Broughton, laden with pamphlets, papers, and draft plans, stepped from the Canterbury coach only to learn that the meeting had been postponed. He stayed on in London for a week waiting for the offer of alternative arrangements. 25 None was made.

23. Broughton to Spring-Rice, 1 September 1834, C.O. 201/244; Broughton to Hay, 4 October, 27 November, and 4 December 1834, ibid.; Hay to Broughton, 2 October 1834, C.O. 202/31.

24. Broughton to Spring-Rice, 3 September 1834, C.O. 201/244; Broughton to Hay, 6 September, 1834, C.O. 323/172; Minute of Spring-Rice attached to Broughton to Spring-Rice, 30 September 1834 C.O. 201/244; Broughton to Hay, 4 October 1834, ibid.

25. Broughton to Sir George Grey, 13 September 1834, C.O. 201/244; Memo, signed by W.G. Broughton and dated 23 September 1834, left at Colonial Office, C.O. 201/244; Broughton to Spring-Rice, 30 September 1834, ibid.
Broughton did what he could to turn the futility of his journey to Arthur's advantage. Before leaving the colony he had promised to lobby on the Lieutenant-Governor's behalf should he find substance in the report that his recall was imminent. 'They evidently wish it to be thought that no such thing was ever in contemplation', he was relieved to write back to Hobart. But around the corridors he had picked up sufficient rumours to know that the Colonial Office had thought of sending out James Stephen until the King, hearing that there was to be a vacancy, interfered on behalf of a candidate of his own. In his own affairs he was less fortunate with mother rumour. He heard not so much as a whisper penetrating that wall of silence guarding ministerial opinion on the plans Bourke had sent over. The one thing he could say for certain was, he told Arthur, that if matters continued to proceed as they had he would be in England indefinitely.

While the latch was down at the Colonial Office Broughton busied himself at the Bow Street Offices of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. This venerable Institution, he wrote in an address to its secretary, had through its timely intervention saved the name of sterling protestantism from extinction in many of His Majesty's American colonies. He invited it now to do the same for New South Wales. To his dismay, however, Broughton found two competitors

27. Broughton to Arthur, 13 October 1834, ibid.
on the doorstep of the Society, a newly formed Mission to Western Australia and the South Australian Church Society. To his even greater dismay, each approached him to loan his name to their appeals. He had rather ruthlessly to decline. The Society was struggling to overcome a severe financial setback, and while Broughton hoped it might assist one antipodean suppliant, he knew it could not support three.

The Society was one early victim of Whig budget reforms. In July 1832 it lost a parliamentary grant worth £15,500 a year. The Society's North American missionaries took the full force of the blow. In one stroke half their salaries disappeared. To prevent further deterioration in its missions the Society overhauled its obligations with an eye to terminating odd payments to works undertaken outside its principal areas of concern. Broughton arrived in the middle of this overhaul and unaware that New South Wales had been singled out for total exclusion from the Society's coffers. Two letters had crossed him in mid-ocean, one to Parry cancelling the Society's earlier offer to help provide a chaplain for the chapel he

had erected in the colony, and the other to Marsden terminating an arrangement of thirty years' standing whereby the Society had paid part of the salary of a teacher at Parramatta.\textsuperscript{34} The money involved was negligible, possibly no more than £60 a year,\textsuperscript{35} but the decision severed the nominal link between the colony and the Society which Broughton had hoped to build on.\textsuperscript{36}

This quite tenuous link might never have been severed, despite the Society's strained finances, had Archdeacon Hamilton still been the Society's secretary. He had retired in February 1833.\textsuperscript{37} That was a great blow to Broughton. Hamilton had been Secretary to the


\textsuperscript{35} Marsden received £10, see Minutes of February 1834, \textit{Journal of S.P.G.}, vol.41, p.392 (\textit{ibid.}). Parry was to receive £50, see correspondence between Campbell and Directors of the Australian Agriculture Company, January and February 1832, Items 118, 120 and 121 ('C' Mss. Aust. Papers, Box 10, Miscellaneous 1789-1836, \textit{S.P.G. Papers}, m/f. A.N.L.).

\textsuperscript{36} The S.P.G. entered the Australian colonies in the 1790's to supply teachers and books for the education of the children of free and convict parents. At least four arrived in that decade. Whether more came is not clear, but by 1805 the Society's policy seemed to have been to sustain those already sent out, but not to replace them. In 1821 Marsden still drew on the S.P.G. for teacher salaries at Sydney, Liverpool, Port Dalrymple, and Hobart. The question the S.P.G. raised with Marsden in 1832 apparently involved the sole survivor of this group. See: Rev. J. Bain to Rev. Dr. Searle, 25 November 1789 ('C' Mss. Aust. Papers, Box 10, Miscellaneous 1789-1836, \textit{S.P.G. Papers}, m/f A.N.L.); Rev. Richard Johnson to Rev. W. Morris, 21 March 1792 (\textit{ibid.}); Rev. Richard Johnson to Secretary S.P.G., 6 December 1794 (\textit{ibid.}); Marsden to King, 7 January 1805, and Marsden to Secretary of S.P.G., 19 March 1821, and Marsden to Secretary of S.P.C.K., 3 October 1833 (\textit{ibid.}).

Ecclesiastical Board at the same time as he had been secretary to
the Society, and while serving the Board he had received all Scott's
and Broughton's official reports, and from Scott a good deal more in
private letters. 38 By the time the Board fell victim to Whig thrift
in 1831, 39 Hamilton had formed the opinion that New South Wales
desperately needed outside aid and had persuaded the Society's London
Committee to step in. 'The Society', he had been authorised to inform
the Colonial Office, 'if encouraged by His Majesty's Government are
prepared to devote themselves with renewed order to the propagation of
the Gospel in New South Wales.' 40 The proposal withered the moment
Howick realised that 'encouragement' was the Society's euphemism for
cash. 41 It was the Society's second failure in ten years to adopt
the colony as a mission. 42 The links which Broughton had hoped to
build on were therefore stronger than the few donations sent annually
to the colony might have suggested. That strength, unfortunately,
had its roots in the mind and heart of Archdeacon Hamilton, and
largely retired with him. In dealing with his successor, the

38. Copies of Scott's and Broughton's official reports to the
Ecclesiastical Board are to be found in the file, 'C' Mss. Aust.
Papers, Box 10, Miscellaneous 1789-1836, S.P.G. Papers, m/f,
A.N.L.). Scott's private reports to Hamilton on his troubles
in N.S.W. are to be found in Scott Letter Books, vol.2, M.L.
323/213; Goderich to Archbishop of Canterbury, 20 January
1831, C.O. 324/146. (These references were supplied by
Dr. John Eddy, S.J., Research School of Social Sciences,
A.N.U., Canberra).
40. Hamilton to Goderich, 13 August 1831, C.O. 201/222.
42. For the earlier offer, see Minutes of S.P.G. Meeting, 16 March
1821 (Bonwick Transcripts, Missionary, Box 57, vol.3, p.788,
M.L.).
Reverend A.M. Campbell, Broughton found himself starting a little behind scratch. Campbell was willing to do what he could for New South Wales, but it was up to Broughton to supply him with a case that would sway the Society's directors.

The bulk of Broughton's case was wrapped up in the facts and figures of peoples and places without a ministry, while the heart of his appeal was lodged in an accusation that the government and people of England were guilty of a grave dereliction of Christian duty in pouring 4,600 convicts a year into the Australian colonies without contributing so much as one shilling towards any religious provision for them. Since 1826 the local community, and for them he had only words of praise, had carried the burden alone. Not only had the colonial government gallantly struggled to preserve intact the religious and educational facilities so abruptly abandoned by the British government, but the colonists themselves were dipping into their pockets to keep the struggle alive. The task was obviously beyond them. But, and this was the point he wanted to put most earnestly before them, was the community which received those felons more obliged to care for them than the community which expelled them? In his opinion every man in England who could nightly rest more securely on his pillow because thousands of his felonious countrymen were now half the world removed from his person and property, could be expected to bestow some anxiety on the means of retaining within Christ's fold those banished in the interest of peace and safety. He had seen no evidence of such a concern; 'So far as the Government and people of this country are concerned those crowds of offenders are cast
forth upon the shores of New South Wales without the slightest concern being displayed whether they and their posterity from want of religious ordinances degenerate into heathens and pagans'. This method of proceeding, he pointed out to the Society, involved so obvious a dereliction of Christian duty and feeling that it doubtless had only to be pointed out to be amended.  

The Society capitulated. In January 1835 Broughton received the key to its nationwide organisation. The London Committee voted to have his tale relayed, just as he had told it, to local committees throughout England, and invited the Archdeacon to travel in the Society's name, as far and as wide as time allowed, driving home that appeal. By way of an immediate amendment on behalf of all Englishmen the Society handed over £1,000, and pledged to be ready at all times to meet the Archdeacon's claims 'with the largest possible measure of relief which the state of its finances may enable it to bestow'. Almost immediately the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge followed up with another £3,000. Broughton had justified his journey.

The religious societies earmarked their gifts for buildings;

the S.P.G. gave for churches and the S.P.C.K. for schools. The man-power problem remained to be solved by other means. While the doors of the Colonial Office had remained shut Broughton devoted some attention to the problem, and finally drafted a third submission on the subject. 47 This document blew into the Colonial Office like a spring breeze; it showed the first signs of a new and mild reasonableness breaking in on Broughton's thinking. He had departed the colony pledged to retrieve the clergy reserves, or failing that, the exclusive right to their revenues. 48 Two months had sufficed to convince him of the futility of the idea. He seemed at last prepared to settle for a fixed annual grant.

James Stephen, for one, would have laboured to unburden Broughton of any hope for land in any shape or quantity. Stephen, being Arthur's friend, was available to Broughton though not much use to him. 49 He was, however, perfectly familiar with the thinking

47. 'Memorandum to Sir George Grey on the Ecclesiastical Establishment in New South Wales', Encl. in Broughton to Sir George Grey, 23 September 1834, C.O. 201/244.
48. Broughton to Bishop of London, 30 September 1833, Encl. in Bishop of London to Secretary of State for Colonies, 3 May 1833 sic., (1834), C.O. 201/235; Colonist, 9 June 1836. From a document entitled 'Heads of Subjects for conference with Archdeacon Broughton; comments prepared by Mr. Hay', it is clear that Broughton did, sometime after his arrival, ask the Colonial Office for exclusive use of the revenue of former Corporation lands. This document is undated, but its sequence in the file C.O. 201/250, p. 155, suggests a puzzling January 1835. However, it clearly refers to submissions made before the Memorandum of 23 September 1834 referred to above. Its position in the Colonial Office file is perhaps best explained by regarding it as a document extracted by Hay from another file and forwarded to the new Secretary of State, Lord Aberdeen to brief him on developments with Broughton.
behind the dissolution of the Church and Schools Corporation, and
would have directed Broughton to the findings of the 1830 enquiry on
colonial expenditure as a repository of the basic dogma of
colonial administration. 50 A mild Canadian crisis came conveniently
to hand to allay any doubts. The Legislature of Upper Canada, as
little disposed as Broughton to acquiesce in the loss of clergy
reserves, had boldly thrown out a Bill drafted by the Colonial Office
to resume them. Broughton was around to feel the tremors of
indignation which shook the Colonial Office. Colonial legislatures,
the ruling went out, might modify but may not reject the principles
of Bills presented to them by authority. 51 The Report of 1830,
and Broughton took pains to make himself conversant with its details, 52
made it clear that with or without a separate investigation, New
South Wales, from an official point of view, was believed to have
suffered as adversely as Canada from the creation of its original
reserves. 53 Where the Legislature of Canada had failed, Broughton,
singlehanded, could hardly expect to succeed.

Simply being in England also had its effects on Broughton.
He could see clearly that the mother church of the Empire was as

50. Minute of James Stephen on the Ecclesiastical Establishment
in New South Wales, 17 May 1833, C.O. 325/28. (This minute
is unattached and out of sequence, and is to be found in
the file, C.O. 325/28 on pp. 157-165.)
51. 'A Minute showing in what manner the Recommendation of the
Canada Committees have been carried into Execution by His
Majesty's Government', in, 'Copies or Extracts of Correspondence
Respecting the Clergy Reserve in Canada, 1819-1840', P.P., 1840,
xxxii, (205), 115-6.
52. For an example, see Broughton to Hay, 24 November 1835, C.O.201/250.
53. 'Third Report on Receipt and Expenditure of the Revenues in the
Colonies and Foreign Possessions', P.P., 1830-31, iv. (64), 74 and
77; Goderich to Colborne, 21 November 1831, in 'Copies or Extracts
of Correspondence Respecting the Clergy Reserves in Canada, 1819-
1840', op. cit., p.80.
much besieged by invective and fraud as the church abroad, and that the debate on church property was not so much a colonial problem as a Church of England one. Property bestowed eight hundred years ago seemed no more sacred than property received but eight years before. 'Everything valuable to us as Churchmen is at stake', one highchurch editor summed up his impression of 1834. 'We are still in a state of fearful expectation as to the future that awaits us.' And nothing was more at stake than the property of the church. Did it, or did it not, belong to the state? Lord Althorpe had asked that question in 1833. Lord John Russell had suggested then that it did, and a simple majority vote in Parliament could alienate it to other purposes. Lord Grey was for putting off a final discussion of the matter, but the rumour in 1834 that a church property bill for Ireland was in the drafting stages, pepped up the expectation that time had run out on Grey's restraining influence. So in the late months of 1834 churchmen discussed the proper thing to do. Broughton sailed into this discussion. Some were for bending with the wind, some were not. The British Critic, dedicated 'to fight under growing disadvantages the battle of a dispirited side', counselled its readers to mix high principles with circumspection. 'The wishes

57. Ibid., vol. 18, 21 June 1833, col. 1095.
59. The Times, 17, 18 and 21 November 1834.
of the administration - at least, of its most able and estimable members - are not hostile to the church', it insisted; 'but we do exceedingly fear, that ministers are not masters of their own purposes.' 61 Surrender nothing essential ask for nothing impossible, and remember at all times that the bargain the moderate Whigs will strike may be the best the age can offer. Broughton a British Critic reader, learned to respect the advice. 62

Broughton seemed to find the basis for a reasonable compromise on church expenditure in the very document which Stephen pointed to as fundamental to an understanding of colonial administration, the Report of 1830 on colonial expenditure. That Report, though hostile to church reserves, had not quibbled with the size of church expenditure. If it was higher than might be expected in a small settlement like New South Wales, the Commissioners were satisfied that the nature of the ministry alone was to blame. 63 So, if it was not an age in which to lay claim to the impossible or the time to ask for more, it was at least fitting and circumspect to begin the struggle by attempting to preserve what one had. Broughton decided to launch his negotiations on church expenditure with an offer to freeze his demands at the level reached in 1832. 64

61. Ibid., vol.15, 1834, p. 495; also ibid., vol.16, 1834, p.178.
62. The British Critic for the 1830's was in the original Diocesan Library, and is now housed at Moore College, Sydney.
63. 'Third Report on Receipt and Expenditure of the Colonies and Foreign Possessions', op. cit. , p. 75.
64. See, in addition to the document mentioned in footnote 47 above, another document entitled 'Being a draft of a reply to the Memorial of the S.P.C.K. such as Archdeacon Broughton would like to receive from the Colonial Office', Encl. in Broughton to Hay, 2 December 1835, C.O. 201/250.
In 1832 the Church of England had cost the colonial government about £9,200. 'If this sum continue to be voted by the Council', Broughton informed the Secretary of State, 'any and every expense incurred beyond this will be defrayed from sources which the Archdeacon will point out.' Broughton baited the offer with a promise to radically overhaul the distribution of that £9,200, and to free it as much as possible for the supply of clergy alone. A local pew rent system would be set up to cope with the cost of church repairs. Parsonage repairs, as in England, would be shifted on to the individual chaplains. These chaplains, the real victims of the scheme, were to lose in other ways. Standard stipends were to drop by £50 to £200, with an annual £30 limit on horse and forage allowances. Gone were the days when Broughton would insist that no man could carry out his vocation on less than £350 a year. Gone, too, were the opportunities for perquisites; affection alone would honour long service and good will reward the call of extra duties. From the older established clergy Broughton could take little. All the same he would ask them, he said, to accept less compensation for their glebes. For himself he proposed a fifteen percent cut in salary, a drop from £2,000 to £1,700 a year.65

Broughton believed that this reorganisation could add eight new

---

65. 'Memorandum to Sir George Grey on the Ecclesiastical Establishment in New South Wales', Encl. in Broughton to Sir George Grey, 23 September 1834, C.O. 201/244. For Broughton's earlier insistence on higher salaries, see 'The Report of Archdeacon Broughton on the State of the Church and Schools Establishment in N.S.W., 29 September 1831', in Despatches from Governor of New South Wales. Enclosures etc. 1832-5, p. 1129 (A1267/13, M.L.).
chaplains to the colonial establishment without increased cost to the government, and that this would impart irresistible appeal to the scheme.66 'So long as anything can be accomplished without increase of expense,' he wrote to Arthur soon after posting off the scheme to London, 'I think they are willing to comply.'67 He confidently believed the scheme was a winner. It stunned him to see it set aside. The Colonial Office not only turned down the suggestion of eight 'free' chaplains; it refused, when pressed, to agree even to one.68

The scheme had many faults. Its hasty composition left hidden costs lurking behind every proposed economy. Broughton gave no consideration to the expense of transporting the eight new chaplains to the colony, or of the expense of building them parsonages and of renting suitable accommodation in the meantime.69 Yet one interview might have straightened out these and other difficulties, for they were the errors of a mind that had suddenly changed course. Unfortunately, there was little point in straightening them out for Broughton had altered course too late. A few years earlier the Archdeacon's offer

66. 'Memorandum to Sir George Grey on the Ecclesiastical Establishment in New South Wales', op. cit., p.120.
68. Broughton to Hay, 5 February 1835, C.O. 201/250; Hay to Broughton, 9 February 1835, C.O. 202/33. The cost of making Rusden (the subject of the above correspondence) a permanent chaplain was £67/10/-, per annum. No fare was involved as he already resided in the colony.
69. In time the cost of passages for extra chaplains was singled out as the chief cause for Broughton's failure to have more chaplains appointed, see W.W. Burton, The State of Religion and Education in New South Wales (London, 1840), p. 103.
would have delighted Goderich's heart. The policy of that Secretary of State had been to couple with the 'widest extension of the Church of England' such modest payments to other churches as would allay their jealousies. In those days Broughton had fought on for exclusive government patronage. Now that he had come to accept a modest priority for the Church of England, the Colonial Office was considering an offer of equality to all churches.

There may have been an element of cunning as well as desperation behind Broughton's offer to settle for a fixed annual grant. When he first put forward the idea Spring-Rice controlled the Colonial Office, and Broughton may have despaired of his earlier hope of upsetting Bourke's scheme. Instead he decided to capitalise on it. Since Bourke recommended subsidising only organised congregations in the colony, Broughton would have calculated that those churches would do best from the scheme which had most clergy on hand to get those congregations organised. So he gambled on a scheme which exchanged a change of heart for eight more clergy. For the Colonial Office, however, the idea of a fixed sum for the Church of England was a third and confusing suggestion as to how it should distribute money to the churches. Bourke wanted local effort to be the yardstick of aid, while the citizens' petition of July 1833

70. Goderich to Colborne, 5 April 1832, in 'Copies or Extracts of Correspondence Respecting the Clergy Reserves in Canada: 1819-1840', P.P., 1840, xxxii, (205), 95-6.
72. Ibid., p. 227.
favoured a distribution proportionate to church membership. Each recommendation proceeded on a different principle, and, as it was clear that churches other than the Church of England would regularly participate in future religious subsidies, the Colonial Office was not to be hurried into fashioning a new formula.

Whatever the motive which inspired Broughton, his failure to extract approval for a single additional chaplain depressed him. In the wake of this disappointment he turned to deal with a query on the supply of Bibles available to convicts in the colony. Communications reaching the Colonial Office had suggested that the supply was inadequate. In case this should be so, the Colonial Office passed on an offer from the Bible Society to rectify the matter. The offer merely inflamed Broughton's indignation. He had asked for men and they were offering him a crate of books! He thanked the Colonial Office for its offer and assured them the supply of Bibles was adequate, though, he had to confess, the ownership of them was rare among the convict classes. In the colony Bibles were a marketable commodity and quickly changed hands. Should the Bible Society send out more they

73. This petition had not reached London (as it had first to be presented to the Legislative Council) but Bourke had outlined its contents in a despatch, Bourke to Stanley, 3 March 1834, H.R.A., I.xvii. 382. This despatch left Sydney at the same time as Broughton, and was probably another move on Bourke's part to combat Broughton's influence in London by showing the size of local opposition to perpetuating the exclusive privileges of the Church of England.

74. The Colonial Office revived its interest in Broughton's proposals later in the year, see Broughton to Sir George Grey, 13 November 1835, C.O. 201/250, and Broughton to Glenelg, 19 November 1835, ibid.
would doubtless swell this traffic, but little more. It would be better for someone to offer him men who could teach what was in the Book. 75

So much for Broughton's failure to win a snap victory in church matters. The schools question was even slower getting off the ground. As Stanley had promised in 1833 to consult Broughton before reorganising colonial education, he had put Bourke's proposals to one side. 76 He may, too, have been a little uneasy about some aspects of them. Stanley belonged to a peculiar genus of Whig reformers. He upheld the right of parliament to direct the church in the deployment of its wealth provided all such directives were to the advantage of the protestant establishment. 77 He dismissed the phony chatter of his colleagues who boasted that purity alone would save the church. As a virgin in danger needed more than purity to rescue her, 78 so Stanley insisted that the church needed all her property in the struggle against ignorance and evil. 79 Such of Bourke's proposals as recommended abandoning existing protestant schools and dividing up the income from church lands, flew in the face of these convictions.

75. Broughton to Hay, 29 April 1835, C.O. 201/250.
78. The metaphor belongs to Quarterly Review, vol. 41, 1829, p. 6.
In mid-1834 these convictions had reached the peak where Stanley was prepared to risk ministerial office in defence of the integrity of church property. Moreover, he could see one great difference between the system he had introduced in Ireland and Bourke's plan. In Ireland he had received the powerful backing of the Archbishop of Dublin. In New South Wales Bourke was advancing in defiance of local ecclesiastical authority; and, to all appearance, the Bishop of London supported that opposition.

His successor Spring-Rice had fewer inhibitions. Though an Irishman and a proud protestant, he was heir to one of the largest land fortunes in Ireland. He had much to gain from the sale of a little church property if that helped placate Irish discontent. The Times was given to suggesting that Spring-Rice was honoured with appointments above his abilities. If so, he never lacked the cunning to rationalise his odd spots of radicalism. The church, in his reading of history, had acquired it property by grant and bequest on behalf of the nation in an age which considered it the natural and sole educator of the nation. Years of religious toleration had changed that. Over the centuries competitors had

82. Bishop of London to Secretary of State for Colonies, 3 May 1833 sic. (1834), C.O. 201/235.
83. On Spring-Rice's protestantism, see P.D., third series, xxvii, 7 April 1835, col. 968; on his property, see The Times, 11 November 1834.
84. 12 November 1834.
flourished till, by 1830 the Church of England was but one tutor among many. That, in Spring-Rice's opinion, deprived it of the exclusive right to the revenues of property set apart for the education of the whole nation. Statesmen must accept the obligation, however unpopular, of bringing the distribution of property into line with the needs of the nation and the intentions of its ancestors. 85

So he approved Bourke's attempt to do for the colony what he was pledged to do for Ireland. He approved even more Bourke's decision to abandon a sectarian system in favour of a system almost totally out of the hands of the clergy. 86 That accorded with a longstanding prejudice of his own. On 22 July 1834 he took Bourke's scheme off the shelf where Stanley had put it, and circulated it amongst the ministry. 87

In October 1834 when Broughton enquired after the progress of Bourke's recommendations he was told nothing. 88 The young Richard Bourke, by then in England, had access to quarters closed to Broughton. Spring-Rice showed him the comments of the Cabinet. 'They all agreed in praising the system', he assured his father, 'and the decision of Government on the point is therefore no longer doubtful'. 89 Six weeks

87. See footnote 76 above. For the differences between Stanley and Spring-Rice on Church property and the protestant establishment see the account of their clash in the House of Commons in 1835 in *Annual Register*, 1835, pp. 199-206.
89. Richard Bourke Jnr. to Bourke, 30 September 1834 (*Bourke Papers*, vol. 12, M.L.).
later William IV interrupted its fair passage. He cast Lord Melbourne's ministry to the ground. They turned as merry as grigs. They toasted their God and his protestant cause and decorated the King with Addresses praising his 'glorious declaration of inviolable attachment to our constitution in church and state'. But as the last toasts were downed and business drove this pleasant madness into hiding it became clear to Broughton that, however much the King had hoped to put off the evil day of church reform in England, His Majesty's new Secretary of State for Colonies, Lord Aberdeen, was as fond as his predecessor of the idea of planting the Irish system in New South Wales.

*The Times* remarked, when Melbourne fell, that the difference between the out-going and in-coming ministeries would be one of style. Church reform must proceed. Broughton felt the benefit of that change in style. Aberdeen opened the doors Spring-Rice had kept shut. But Broughton found talking across a desk had its embarrassing moments, especially as Aberdeen probed him deeper and deeper for his specific objections to the Irish system. After one session in January

---

90. *The Times*, 15 November 1834.
92. *The Times*, 21, 24, 28 November 1834. See also Lord Kenyon's 'Manifesto' in ibid., 4 December 1834; and *Annual Register*, 1834, p. 335.
94. 18 November 1834.
1835 Broughton was forced to break off discussion. "Upon the point of extending to New South Wales the system of education which is now established in Ireland I am naturally anxious to learn more than I know at present of its nature and probably effects', he wrote to Hay. He intended taking up the topic with an old Pembroke friend, the Dean of Kildare, before returning to discuss it further with the Secretary of State.

In time Broughton formulated his objection. The system was fundamentally an unequal bargain which weakened protestant repugnance to Rome without increasing Rome's tolerance of protestantism. Rome's principle, that only those parts of Scripture may be read which priestly authority approved, was fully incorporated into the system, while, in the interest of harmony, the protestant principle of 'the whole Bible' was suppressed. Six days a week Roman Catholic children read their book of carefully selected Bible passages and acknowledged the authority of the priest to put bounds to divine knowledge. Six days a week protestant children joined them, acknowledging only that their principle was not a thin to insist on. Where, Broughton asked, was the 'principle of perfect impartiality' that Bourke saw as the system's shining virtue?

While Aberdeen pondered Broughton's objections the Tory administration fell. Broughton's spirits sagged with it. In May 1835, nine months after his return he found himself again loitering in

98. P.D., third series, vol. 27, 8 April 1835, col. 980-2; Annual Register, 1835, p. 230.
corridors waiting for the opportunity to explain his ideas to yet another incumbent at the Colonial Office. While the Whigs weathered a series of crises in forming a ministry and having it confirmed by the electorate, Broughton found he could command no attention. 'I live in hope that after the prorogation we may enjoy a share of ministerial attention', he told Arthur. He could hope for nothing earlier and was dispirited by the delay. 'I am tired of inactivity and uncertainties and would fairly surrender my trust tomorrow if I did not think it would look like an abandonment of my proper post.'

The Tory interlude had had its one decisive moment. At the beginning of April, when a month of Whig threats looked like shaping into an assault that could topple the Tory ministry, Aberdeen authorised the Archbishop of Canterbury to offer Broughton the new bishopric in New South Wales. The offer was an attempt to secure Broughton's appointment, and was not a sop to compensate him for other disappointments, and it presented Broughton with a problem. Before leaving the colony he had vowed not to return to New South Wales except on proper terms. In April 1835 the terms looked anything but proper. Except for the possible restitution of the King's School

99. Annual Register, 1835, pp. 235-9; Richard Bourke jnr. to Bourke, 6 April 1835 (Bourke Papers, vol. 12, M.L.).
2. Ibid.
in Sydney, none of his requests seemed then likely to succeed.  

Against these disappointments Broughton had to weigh his own ambition. He had coveted the appointment from the beginning. 'Whether the appointment would be offered to me I cannot decide: but I think it ought to be', he had confided to Arthur. Bourke wanted him to have it. So when the offer confronted him in April he decided he would have it, and to set the 'proper terms' very low. The government must free him of any obligation to support or participate in any educational establishment modelled on the Irish system. Moreover he would require, he wrote to the Archbishop, 'such arrangements made as will leave me at full liberty, in the event of the colonial funds being withdrawn from the Church of England schools, to use any means or influence which I may possess to keep them in existence by voluntary contributions'. He sought freedom for competition with Bourke's scheme, not opposition to it. But in case the thin line separating the two should disappear, Broughton was anxious to remove beyond Bourke's grasp that muzzle of official silence he had tried to strap on him in the jury debates of August 1833.

8. Bourke to Arthur, 17 August 1835 (Arthur Papers, vol. 8, M.L.); Bourke to Richard Bourke jnr., 13 October 1835 (Bourke Papers, vol. 6, M.L.). In Ven. S.M. Johnstone, The Book of St. Andrew's Cathedral (Sydney, 1937), p. 14, the author states that Bourke had hoped for the appointment of someone other than Broughton and had dropped hints to that effect at the Colonial Office. This not uncommon opinion is in conflict with Bourke's own evidence.
For a brief period after he had accepted the bishopric in April, Broughton seemed willing to return promptly to the colony and leave his cause in the hands of the Archbishop of Canterbury.\(^\text{10}\) Howley's opinions coincided with his own, and Aberdeen, to young Richard Bourke's distress, had made the Archbishop a permanent third party in all the discussions to date.\(^\text{11}\) In May 1835 Broughton changed his mind. When the Whigs took over he decided to stay in England and oversee his own interests. The Honourable Charles Grant (soon to be created Lord Glenelg) who took over the seals of office from Aberdeen was reputedly intelligent and a man of deep religious convictions.\(^\text{12}\) He was also tight-lipped. Few men would have ridden to higher office on less words. He could with ease maintain a year's silence in the House.\(^\text{13}\) His opinions were unknown. He had divulged no sentiment on the question of church property. His attitude to Howley was untested. He was a Whig; and the best of the Whigs were known to prefer the counsel from Fulham above that from Lambeth.\(^\text{14}\)

The counsel from Fulham was always more sanguine than that from Lambeth. Howley, ever suspicious of change, saw only the evils of concessions.\(^\text{15}\) Blomfield on the other hand could be relied on to

\(^{10}\) This is implied by considering together, Broughton to Archbishop of Canterbury, 2 April 1835, *op. cit.*, with, Minute of Glenelg attached to Broughton to Glenelg, 22 May 1835, C.O. 201/250.

\(^{11}\) Richard Bourke jnr. to Bourke, 15 April 1835 (Bourke Papers, vol. 12, M.L.).


\(^{13}\) He spole on 3 March 1835, and not again till 11 March 1836; see *P.D.*, third series, vol. 26, 3 March 1835, col. 511, and *ibid.*, vol. 32, 11 March 1836, col. 189.

\(^{14}\) See footnote 18 above.

\(^{15}\) *P.D.*, third series, vol. 19, 19 July 1833, col. 945.
weigh the dangers of compromise against the disasters of intractability, and to defend with cunning and skill whatever moderate compromise he agreed upon. He swore never to abandon essentials and he championed the cause of national ecclesiastical establishments. But in most of what he said Blomfield left room for retreat, and grounds for the speculation that in the last resort he saw only one protestant establishment as essential, and that was England's. Elsewhere in the empire they might be abandoned with less serious effect. The destinies of the English and Irish church establishments, he was heard to say, were not so linked to each other that 'if, by the irreversible decree of providence, the Irish protestant church should be severed from that of England, and laid prostrate in the dust, its sister branch must necessarily encounter a similar fate'.

Too many English churchmen were willing, in the last analysis, to beat a retreat and rest the case for the defence of the English Church establishment on the 'peculiar nature of English circumstances'. From this, a short step took them on to the conclusion that in different societies abroad other arrangements might be equally beneficial. The slide was the price of subtility, and Broughton, following his first brief encounter with Blomfield in 1829, decided

16. Ibid., col. 928-9 and 934.
that the bishop was a most subtle man. 21 The Times, in the first few weeks after his return, confirmed these suspicions. In a series of pungent attacks it accused the Bishop of sly and slippery dealings on the Poor Law Commission and an equivocal approach to church reform. 22 Yet Broughton's doubts about Blomfield were not the only impediment to the Bishop's usefulness. Blomfield, by his own admission, was too much engrossed in the internal matters of the church to be bothered with the problems of the colonial churches. 23

Without Howley to rely on Broughton decided to stay. This change in plans disappointed Glenelg. To tempt him to change his mind and to 'turn bishop' immediately, Glenelg agreed to his having full liberty to act as he wished about the schools in the colony. 24 The offer impressed Broughton, and he decided to press the Secretary of State a little further. If Glenelg would agree to maintain the existing thirty-five parochial schools under the new bishop as Visitor, he would return. 25 He would continue to hope for a better deal than that in the final settlement, but he was willing, with that pledge of good faith, to trust to what his friends and the S.P.C.K. might obtain for him. 26

22. The Times, 15 and 16 September 1834.
24. Minute of Glenelg attached to Broughton to Glenelg, 22 May 1835, C.O. 201/250.
26. See 'Memorial Addressed to His Majesty's Government by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge', and Archbishop of Canterbury to Lord Melbourne, 8 May 1835, Encls. in Lord Melbourne to Glenelg, 9 May 1835, C.O. 201/251. (These items are out of sequence and to be found at C.O. 201/251. pp.211-14, 219-24).
The offer did not appear unreasonable to Glenelg; and he nibbled at it sufficiently for Richard Bourke to report despairingly to his father that the new Secretary of State seemed bent on pleasing both parties. One attraction of Broughton's offer was its economy. Why tear down schools which were doing a good job? he asked. Indeed it was the question many churchmen were asking of those currently itching to recast England's schools in the mould of some new continental system. The appeal to economy was not lost on Glenelg. He approved it and, being a good Whig, he approved of self-help. So he decided to explore the possibility of giving New South Wales a scheme similar to that just settled for the West Indies.

The compromise worked out for the West Indies suited Broughton. There the government 'availed themselves of the agency of the different religious bodies previously engaged in promoting education in the colonies' and invited each society to apply for a share in an annual parliamentary grant to subsidise its school buildings and teacher training. Moravians and Baptists as well as the Wesleyans,

28. Broughton to Glenelg, 22 May 1835, C.O. 201/250. See also Broughton to Glenelg, 4 and 11 November 1835, ibid.
32. 'Copy of the Instructions addressed to the Inspector to visit the Schools of the West Indies, which have received a share in Parliamentary Grants of 1835 and 1836 for Negro Education', P.P., 1837, xliii, (393), 311.
Presbyterians, and the S.P.G. benefited from this. In areas where the societies were not at work, local committees could begin a school and receive a subsidy provided they adhered to the principles of the British and Foreign School Society or the National Board of Education in Ireland. So Glenelg tempered his preference for the new with a respect for the old. Bourke had advised against such a scheme in New South Wales. Broughton, though he had once fulminated against it and could still pass strictures on the passion of protestantism for dividing against itself, realised that it was his only hope for keeping up an independent system of schools. Moreover, with the S.P.C.K. offering £3,000 for the next few years, and promises of more modest aid following that, Broughton knew he was well placed to slice handsomely into whatever subsidy was offered.

As he nodded more and more in the direction of a compromise Glenelg pressed Broughton, for the second time, to return to the colony and leave the details of the educational settlement to be worked out by the government when the pressure of business subsided. Broughton evaded the suggestion. Whereas he could trust Glenelg he

33. 'Statement showing the appropriation, in detail, of the sum of £20,000 voted by Parliament in 1835 towards the Erection of School Houses in the Colonies', P.P., 1836, xxxix, (211), 571-2.
34. 'Estimates of Miscellaneous Services for the year ending 31 March 1836', P.P., 1835, xxxviii, (481), 543.
Broughton to Glenelg, 7 September 1835, C.O. 201/250.
began to doubt, as a fresh debate on Irish Church property arose, whether men of temperate opinion, like Glenelg, could long survive in the government. The radicals and the Irish seemed to him to have the initiative. 'They will be able to carry their views into effect in opposition to the opinion of the majority of English members, and I think it may be said, of the English nation', he informed Arthur.38 If control fell into their hands, he saw only a bleak future for men with views and opinions like his. He confessed to having no desire to venture into a new job amid such uncertainties. Should political forces change rapidly and for the worse, he could find himself struggling to lay the foundations of episcopacy under masters who, at best, cared little for the system, and at worst disbelieved in it. 'I have not taken so long a voyage only to be then placed in a worse situation than before', he said; and informed Glenelg that he would resign if pressed to return.39

There was no question of a resignation. Broughton found a perfect alibi for keeping himself in England until October. A Doctor's degree in Divinity was one indispensable preliminary for consecration to the episcopal office. Broughton approached the University about it in mid-June but found he was too late to proceed through the normal channels. He would have to wait till October. He had, however, if he wished to exercise the privilege, one week left in which to proceed by Royal Mandate. Glenelg told him to get the

degree by whatever method he could, and as far as the government was concerned he could keep it whether he ultimately returned as bishop or not. The University felt less generous. To proceed by Royal Mandate his appointment as bishop needed to be 'fixed and certain'. It was precisely that, as far as the government was concerned, Glenelg affirmed. It could be precisely that as far as he was concerned too, Broughton added, if in that one remaining week the government showed a clear hand on its educational policy.  

An impasse had arrived. Glenelg turned aside to deal with a fresh crisis in Canadian affairs. Broughton abandoned the corridors of power and returned to Canterbury. After a brief rest he went off to spend a week at Hartley Wespall with Dr. Keate, then on to London for three weeks with his mother. At the end of July the family took a summer vacation around Dover and Hastings. Broughton relaxed. He delighted in ambling walks along the cliffs or to clamber around the old romantic ruins of the castle, and then of an afternoon to take the children for donkey rides. Of a week-end he often went off on deputation work on behalf of the missionary societies or the National School Society; once to Margate, where in 1826 he had almost become curate, another time to Reading, to Bath, or more often, to one of the London churches. On week days he sought out familiar faces in old places. There were dinners at Strathfield Saye, the wedding of Fanny Keate at Hartley Wespall, and

many a pleasant evening at the homes of the local gentry, Lord Irvine, General Fellows and so on.  

Sarah Broughton found a blessing in the confusion of politics. Every upheaval in the Commons that kept her husband in the ante-chambers of the Colonial Office, gave her those treasured extra days with her ailing mother. Once parted they would never meet again. Though she could enter with gusto into trips to Dover Castle, to London, Bath and Winchester, dine at Lambeth or at Strathfield Saye with the Duke, or take in a concert at Drury Lane, her delights were in the more simple things. She loved to drink tea with her mother, to dress her daughters for a party, and then of an afternoon, to stroll into the parks and on to the cathedral where, by the monuments raised to heroes of a greater past, she could hear the Evensong anthem. Out of quiet prayer and music came the strength to bend her life in perfect harmony with her husband's. She loved Canterbury, and she enjoyed the gift of the delay.

While the business of state gave way to pleasure the affairs of the Archdeaconry followed him; a fact Broughton duly emphasised in his struggle for full salary. Every post brought a string of

41. Keate to Broughton, 10 July 1835 (Broughton Papers 1824-98, Ms. No. 913, M.L.); Sarah Broughton, Diary Part I, 15 March 1834 to 13 February 1836, 12 May, 4 June, 26 and 28 July, 3, 6, 9, 10, 18 and 20 August 1835 (Sarah Broughton Papers, m/f. A.N.L.).

42. Sarah Broughton, Diary Part I, 12, 14, 15, 20 and 29 January, 17 February, 28 March, 2 April, 20, 26 and 13 May, 3 June, 31 October, 25 December 1835 (ibid.).

complaints from Arthur about the Archdeacon's 'troops', in the southern colony; and Dr. Drought, the chaplain of Green Ponds was at the centre of them. Drought could behave oddly, and Broughton had censured him in 1833 for solemnising marriages in inns and taking part of the fee in orders for spirits. In 1834 Arthur took more drastic action. He read reports from snoopers around Green Ponds and decided that the degree of affinity between Drought and his 'daughter-housekeeper' was one neither registered in the Book of Common Prayer nor hallowed by it. Arthur had waged an unceasing war on evil and earned the title 'the Just', and he intended carrying it into the resurrection. And because his heart was pure, he felt as free to dispose of the affairs of the clergy as of convicts. This 'disgraceful member of your corps' must go, he informed Broughton; and he, Arthur, being the Archdeacon's alter ego had already instituted proceedings to accomplish that.

Broughton refused to accept Arthur's interference. 'As I am appointed to correct and superintend the clergy, I feel very deeply


47. Arthur to Broughton, 12 May 1834, op. cit. On Arthur's view of himself as the Archdeacon's alter ego, see sheet 3 of a rough draft of a despatch to the Secretary of State, undated, (and placed immediately after the letter Arthur to Gregory, 31 December 1835) in Arthur Papers, vol. 39, M.L. (This draft can be dated about May 1835, as Pedder read it and returned it with a covering note dated 28 May 1835).
how incumbent it is upon me to be their protector also', he wrote back to Hobart and ordered Drought's reinstatement.\footnote{48} The case against Drought rested largely on the evidence of an immigrant who had once resided in Drought's former London parish, and Broughton insisted that his tales must be either confirmed at their source or dismissed. In mid-1835 he was busy checking out those tales.\footnote{49}

The most reprehensible aspect of the Drought affair, in Broughton's opinion, was Arthur's apparent willingness to receive whisperers. Those whisperers were also at work against Bedford, the former senior chaplain. Bedford had resented the elevation of an outsider, the Reverend William Palmer, to the office of Rural Dean with authority over all chaplains, and refused to submit.\footnote{50} In 1833 Broughton had warned that the appointment, a legacy from Scott's day, would not succeed, as the office of a Rural Dean carried no regular jurisdiction at law.\footnote{51} He had tried to salvage the idea by persuading

\footnote{48} Broughton to Arthur, 13 October 1834 and 27 July 1835 (\textit{Arthur Papers}, vol. 12, M.L.).

\footnote{49} The immigrant, a Mr. Thomson, was a former vestryman and tailor in the Parish of Shadwell, and he claimed that the woman Drought lived with was the wife of his former business partner in Shadwell; see 'Notes on Drought's case', Encl. Pedder to Arthur, n.d., \textit{op. cit.} Drought died before the case was concluded, but at the time of his death Broughton had uncovered nothing to substantiate the allegations Arthur had acted on; see Broughton to Arthur, 13 June 1836 (\textit{Arthur Papers}, vol. 12, M.L.).


\footnote{51} Broughton to Bishop of London, 30 September 1830, Encl. in Bishop of London to Secretary of State for Colonies, 3 May 1833 sic. (1834), C.O. 201/235; Broughton to Arthur, 27 July 1833 (\textit{Arthur Papers}, vol. 12, M.L.).
Cowper or Cartwright to go south, hoping that a respect for their long service in the colony might compensate for the lack of a regular jurisdiction. He failed. His remaining hope lay with the Colonial Office and its inclination to appoint a second Archdeacon. In London in 1835 he was busily sifting candidates, and his eye had fallen on an old Pembroke friend, the Reverend William Hutchins, of Kirk Ireton, Winksworth. Hutchins was more an evangelical than Broughton, but that, the Archdeacon believed, would enhance his chances of succeeding with Arthur.

While the Colonial Office and Hutchins still pondered the idea, the feud between Bedford and Palmer came to a crisis. Palmer tried to discipline and humiliate Bedford before his churchwardens, and was rebuked by Broughton. Thereafter Palmer whispered to Arthur about Bedford's pecuniary affairs, a subject the colony at large discussed from time to time. Bedford in return whispered to Arthur about Palmer's methodistical habit of using lay preachers at the Hobart jail. Arthur was bewildered; but in the end he preferred

56. Arthur to Hay, 30 September 1835 (Arthur Papers, vol. 1, M.L.);
57. Sydney Monitor, 26 November 1831; Australian, 23 December 1831 (reprinted from the Tasmanian); Colonial Times, 7 May 1833.
58. See sheet 11 of a rough draft of a despatch to the Secretary of State, undated, (and placed immediately after the letter Arthur to Gregory, 31 December 1835) in Arthur Papers, vol. 39, M.L. This document contains an extended summary of the whole feud between Bedford and Palmer to May 1835, but ought not to be read apart from the other evidence listed above. Arthur drafted it in defence of his support of Palmer after he had discovered that Broughton seemed disposed to defend Bedford.
Palmer's whispers to Bedford's, and decided to quietly write over to Canterbury and tell Broughton that Bedford had outlived his usefulness in the colony.  

This proved too much for Broughton. He saw Bedford's reputation being maliciously and systematically destroyed, and declined to respect the confidential tag Arthur had tied to his communication. 'I cannot at pleasure assume a private character, and in that character receive communication upon points which it would be a breach of public duty in me to neglect', he wrote back to Arthur.

Moreover, since arriving in England he had found ruinous tales about Bedford planted all over the Colonial Office. These whisperings must stop, he said, the accuser and the accused be brought face to face, and Bedford either convicted or cleared; and he, Broughton, left in no doubt as to whom he might or might not entrust responsibilities in Hobart. So Broughton blew the lid on Arthur's confidential letters.

Broughton wrote to Bedford for an explanation wrapping his letter in the hope that all 'charges have originated in misinformation'. He wrote to Arthur too, warning him of the dangers of being the Rural Dean's echo chamber. 'The private enemies of any of the clergy would have nothing to do but to convey unfavourable reports to the Rural Dean, who might communicate the same to you; and thus the character

61. Broughton to Arthur, 13 October 1834 (ibid.).
62. Postscript to ibid.
of an individual may be blasted and his prospects ruined without his being able to trace the influence through which all this has been accomplished. But for Palmer, the author of the accusations, he reserved the severest censure. Remember, he admonished the Rural Dean, you are 'sitting in judgment on one of the most laborious and useful men who have been in the colony'. Nothing dragged up from Bedford's past would carry any weight with Broughton. He had investigated it, he continued, and come to the conclusion that Bedford's labour and record in public charities, 'should in equity be allowed its full weight as a counterbalance to any human frailties which may have been in the course of years discoverable in his conduct'.

Arthur, frozen with mortification, struck back with two well placed letters in high places. He asked James Stephen at the Colonial Office to block any arrangement which might afford Broughton a say in the selection of clergy for Van Diemen's Land. He informed Hay that the Archdeacon was meddling like a partisan and raising a party in favour of Bedford on the Executive Council. In the colony he began to communicate with any who might have a grudge against

---

Bedford, and to collect evidence to prove that Palmer's whispers were well founded complaints and not tattle. When the lapse of time extracted the heat from his indignation he tried to forgive Broughton his indiscretion, but failed. A year after the affair he confided to Bourke that things had 'occurred between Mr. Broughton and myself...which render it improbable that any cordiality will ever exist between us'.

In those same days Broughton's principles came close to costing him Parry's friendship as well. About the same time as Broughton sailed out of Sydney, Wilton, the chaplain at Newcastle, began mumbling about a studied discourtesy around the Australian Agricultural Company's estates towards chaplains of the church establishment. The mumblings became a rumour, and the rumour a tale which Parry feared might prejudice the Company's land claims. So in London Parry sought out Broughton and asked him to discredit the tale. The tale was an exaggeration, Broughton replied, but not an untruth.

Parry had first disappointed Broughton in July 1833 when he appointed the Reverend Mr. Price, an unemployed Independent minister in Sydney, to a temporary chaplaincy on the Company's estates. To forestall Broughton's objections, Parry had promised to replace

Price as soon as an official chaplain was provided. Price in a
gesture of goodwill promised to conduct all services according to
the ceremonies of the Book of Common Prayer except Holy Baptism,
where, he regretted, he found the notion of baptismal regeneration
repugnant. To that deviation, Parry added, 'the people here as
well as ourselves, have no objection'. The Archdeacon did not
approve, stated his objections and refrained from interfering.
The rest he left to Parry’s conscience. Wilton, on Parry’s
instructions, ceased visiting the Company’s estates; and when
in due time Lady Parry was delivered of a male child, he was placed
into the hands of a Dissenter to be received into Christ’s Church
according to the rites of the Reverend Mr. Price.

A day came in December 1833 when four of the Company’s senior
officers disdained the novelty Parry had introduced among them, and
applied to Broughton for a chaplain who would baptise their infants
according to the rites they had known in times past. Broughton
ordered Wilton to attend the township of Shroud on 29 December.
Parry denounced the move as 'little, if anything, less than a
trespass'. He accused Broughton of discourtesy, and instructed
Wilton 'to intimate to the authorities under whom you act that I

73. 'A Statement of the religious affairs on the Estates of the
74. Parry to Broughton, 29 July 1833, ibid., p. 21.
75. Broughton to Parry, 15 July and 6 August 1833, ibid., pp. 25-32.
76. Parry to Wilton, 29 July 1833, ibid., p. 22-4.
77. Broughton to Parry, 26 November 1834, ibid., p. 49.
cannot in future permit any arrangement to be made for the
performance of Divine Service on this Estate without my previous
consent'.

Wilton had preserved a silence on this sudden outburst of
hostility, and Broughton, coming on the details in England at a time
little was going well for him, handled Parry roughly as another
interfering layman with a hazy head at odds with a good heart; the
one, he said busily tore down the only barriers which could
successfully preserve the truth the other clasped in deep affection.
Broughton asked who was the more guilty of irregular conduct, Wilton
who rode into Shroud to fulfil the King's command 'to provide for
his subjects who praise God according to the Rites of the Church of
England and Ireland', or Parry, who, by depriving Wilton of his
right to pay regular visits, removed the King's subjects from the
benefit of those Rites? Broughton praised God for clergy of Wilton's
stamina who boldly pursued every call to minister God's word in its
purest form. He thanked God too, he told Parry, that the Company
had in its service men 'who were not satisfied to follow your
example'.

The incident, while certain to corrode a once firm friendship,
was not inimical to good results. The Directors of the Company abruptly
terminated a five year quibble over the Company's obligations to provide
a full salary for a chaplain, and supplied one. Within months, and

81. Broughton to Parry, 26 November 1833, ibid., pp. 49-55.
82. Murray to Darling, 21 April 1830, H.R.A., I.xv.430; Parry to McLeay,
26 November 1833, Enc1. in Bourke to Stanley, 18 February 1824,
H.R.A., I.xviii. 374-5; Spring-Rice to Bourke, 8 September 1834,
ibid., p. 507.
with studied discourtesy to Broughton for they bothered neither to consult nor inform him, they appointed the Reverend William Macquarie Cowper, a 'Currency' lad polished up at Oxford and serving a curacy in Dartmouth. The appointment slightly disappointed Broughton who had singled Cowper out for a chaplaincy at Goulburn; a rugged place, Cowper's brother had already warned him, where 'they dislike religion in every shape'. Macquarie Cowper was happy to accept the Company's offer.

Early in August 1835 a message arrived at Canterbury asking Broughton to call on Mr. Fowell Buxton M.P. when he next came to London. Buxton was laying plans for a parliamentary enquiry into the condition of native peoples in all His Majesty's colonies, and wanted Broughton's opinion on the present state of the Australian aboriginals. The Australian aboriginals were a quick and intelligent people for whom the Europeans had done no good, Broughton said. Moreover, he doubted whether they ever could. Their cultures were incompatible; 'whenever Europeans meet with them they appear to wear out, and gradually to decay'. All efforts made to reverse this had failed, so that from a missionary point of view, Broughton yielded before his enquirers, the natives were, with trifling exceptions, abandoned to their ignorance and degradation. Broughton saw no prospect of change. It was impossible to uncover a want for which

84. Ibid., pp.84 and 106; see also, Broughton to Macquarie Cowper, 22 May 1835 (Correspondence from W.G. Broughton, Ms. No. Ab29/4, M.L.).
the knowledge of Jesus Christ was a fair exchange, he said. Build
them a house, and they will live in the open; or offer them land for
tilling, and they go off and hunt. He knew of no way to break in on
the lives of these people: he doubted whether there would be many
there to break in on in years to come. 'Within a very limited
period those who are very much in contact with Europeans will be
utterly extinct', he told Buxton. 'I will not say exterminated,
but they will be extinct.' And with those words he took leave of
his hearers and set off by coach for Bath and the good company of
old friends.85

On 5 September Broughton finished tripping around and returned
to Canterbury.86 Within a few days Glenelg wrote suggesting he
should return to New South Wales. 'If the points of adjustment were
of minor importance', he wrote back to Glenelg, 'no obstacle could be
raised on my part to an immediate acquiescence.'87 He had much to
gain, including another £1,000 a year. His unsettled condition had
destroyed much of the enjoyment of his holiday, and the thought of the
colony remaining so long in the hands of an old man worried him.88
Marsden, more in need of help to run his own church than the added
burden of the Archdeaconry, had never, even in good health, struck
Broughton as an able administrator.89 In September 1835 Marsden

85. Based on Sarah Broughton, Diary Part I, 3 and 4 August 1835
(Sarah Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.); 'Report from the Select
Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements), together with
86. Sarah Broughton, Diary Part I, 5 September 1835 (op.cit.).
87. Broughton to Glenelg, 7 September 1835, C.O. 201/250.
88. Broughton to Marsden, 25 September 1835 (Marsden Papers,
vol. 1, M.L.).
89. Broughton to Arthur, 25 February and 19 March 1832 (Arthur
was even more decrepit than Broughton imagined; crippled by grief at the loss of his wife, he was spreading it around that the burden of his responsibilities was more than he could carry. 90

So long as the schools question remained unsettled it was impossible for Broughton to go back as bishop, for once there he must stay on through thick and thin. He might have returned as Archdeacon, he let Glenelg know, had the Colonial Office not tumbled so quickly into allowing a Roman Catholic bishop into the colony. As an Archdeacon he could resign later if the government decided too unfavourably about schools, and another come out as bishop. If he stayed he must needs be consecrated bishop to maintain parity with the Roman Catholics, and so again return to England. He made it clear that just as he would not go out as bishop and resign, he would not return as Archdeacon and remain under another bishop. 91

Having set the hounds of the Colonial Office at bay, Broughton gave his attention to preparing for a distinguished engagement. A year had elapsed since his return to Canterbury and the joyful reunion with old friends at the King's School Feast Society, and he had been invited to return as the Society's distinguished preacher for 1835. Throughout August he had studied a manuscript on the spread of popery in England loaned him by its author, the Reverend H.H. Norris, an old friend. 92 For years Broughton had imagined Rome to be edging

90. Marsden to Coates, 25 June and 26 November 1835, and 22 January and 23 February 1836 (Bonwick Transcripts, Missionary, Box 54, vol.6, pp. 1872-8, M.L.).
91. Broughton to Glenelg, 7 September 1835, C.O. 201/250.
92. Norris to Broughton, 26 September 1835 (Broughton Papers 1824-98, Ms. No. 913, M.L.).
her way back into England, but not until his eyes fell on Norris's manuscript, painstakingly researched in the British Museum, did he realise that Rome already stood four square in the mainstream of English life. What had been hitherto a prejudice became an obsession, and when his turn came to go into Canterbury's Cathedral on 17 September⁹³ and, amid monuments rich in praise of Cramner, Latimer and Ridley, to address the King's School Feast Society, he felt he could leave England no finer legacy than a timely warning of what the enemies of true religion were at.⁹⁴

Rome had conceived a gigantic design to replant her errors in every land from which the Reformation had driven them, he warned his congregation. And with the accusing finger raised high he singled out those statesmen of the hour who boasted of having outgrown 'the ancient prejudice' as their chief abettors. This so-called 'ancient prejudice', he continued, was the desire once praised of wanting to impress religious opinions on others. But this was a new age, the statesmen objected, and a new spirit lived in man. And by that they meant, Broughton continued, that 'we shall be at liberty to think as we please provided only we admit that all opinions are equally indifferent, and that there is no essential distinction between truth and falsehood'. Having discarded the cloak of prejudice and donned the mantle of 'bland conciliation' towards all

---

⁹³. Sarah Broughton, Diary Part I, 17 September 1835 (op. cit.).
beliefs, those statesmen were confident that the old hostilities born of former rivalries would never return to England. But their indifference was no match for Rome's passions, the preacher warned. Rome disdained all compromise, modified no opinion of her own, and tolerated none belonging to others, and, Broughton concluded, 'will never permit us to enjoy repose upon any other terms than of a complete surrender of that liberty of conscience which our forefathers vindicated and won for us by their unbending firmness'.

The congregation agreed that Broughton had a point, and commissioned the publication of the sermon. To add weight to his accusations Broughton compiled an historical appendix from Norris's notes illustrating the slow but sure gains of Rome in England since the Reformation. 'It might be one means of awakening public attention to the subject', he confided to Marsden. The British Critic found it all delightfully different. Among a literature distinguished for its extravagances it praised Broughton's discourse as 'the production of a man eminently distinguished for sobriety of mind'.

Broughton's antipathy was for Rome's system, not for its servants; and he directed his anger against the protestants who aided it, and not the Roman Catholics who reaped the benefit. He made this clear when the Colonial Office reopened the case on the Reverend J.J.

95. Ibid., pp. 5 and 9-1.
97. Norris to Broughton, 26 September 1835, op. cit.
Therry's suspension with a view to reinstating him. As Scott had originally recommended removing Therry for disrespect towards civil authority, and in particular the authority of the Church of England, the Colonial Office called for Broughton's recommendations in the light of his experience with Therry since 1829. Broughton reported that he had nothing to say against Therry; yet twice in the Executive Council Broughton had come close to recommending his prosecution at law.

On one occasion Therry had created an ugly scene in a cemetery following a public execution by interrupting a burial service with the demand that the corpse of the prisoner just executed be handed over to him for internment in a catholic burial ground. In view of the tumult and public excitement that could be stirred up over the body of an executed prisoner, Broughton recommended that Therry be dealt with for a breach of the peace. 'If any protestant clergyman had so offered resistance to the civil power', Broughton explained to the Executive Council which had called on him to investigate the incident, 'I should not only have felt it my duty to visit him with severe ecclesiastical censure but to recommend to Your Excellency that he should be held amenable to the utmost strictness of the law.'

In England Broughton overlooked the matter.

The other matter was more serious, and centred on an incident that began a decade before Broughton's arrival in the colony. Around

---

2. Minute No.32, 7 September 1830, Proc. Ex.C. (N.S.W.), C.O.204/3; Enclosure H.H. to Minute No.32, 1830, Appendix (for half year ending 31 December 1830), *ibid.*
1820 Marsden had united in holy wedlock John Ready and Elizabeth Curtis. For Ready it was a second marriage. His first wife had removed herself so completely from his life at the time of his transportation in 1820, that a decade of enquiry had failed to establish her as living or dead. So Elizabeth Curtis became, in Broughton's opinion, the woman to whom according to every just view of the obligation of marriage Ready had been solemnly united in the sight of God and man. Ready felt that way too; and for many years the colony saw the couple live as man and wife. Then suddenly Elizabeth Ready appeared sporting another husband; one this time united to her by rites and ceremonies as performed by the Reverend J.J. Therry. Tongues wagged. To still them Therry prevailed upon John Ready to place an advertisement in the local press declaring his marriage to Elizabeth Curtis null and void by reason of news, recently received from England, that his first wife was hale and hearty this side of the vale. No authority, civil or ecclesiastical, could ignore Therry's action, Broughton insisted; 'it strikes at the root of the sanctity and security of the marriage vow,... and in its moral effect it encourages a system of vice as disgusting as is to be found existing upon the face of the earth'.

Broughton chose not to remember either incident in England because he believed Therry's faults arose from a fervid and strict application of the dogma and rules of the religious system to which

3. Ibid; also Minute No.34, 24 September 1830, ibid.
he had pledged his adherence, and not from a cholic or querulous disposition. To Broughton fervour and strictness in religion was a virtue not an error. If he had any objection it was to the admission of Therry's system to New South Wales, and not Therry. 'I should be sorry to be supposed to feel any greater repugnance to his restoration than to the appointment of any other person', he advised the Colonial Office. Therry, he went on to admit, had always shown a very high degree of hostility to the protestant faith and expressed himself occasionally in acrimonious language both concerning it and its ministers. Yet, was not this fair play within the rules once the government had authorised the presence of Roman Catholic chaplains? So against the admission of Therry to a chaplaincy he refused to raise a finger, but 'to the lawfulness and expediency of a Protestant Government giving countenance and support to the Roman Catholic priesthood' he promised unending opposition.4

Early in November Glenelg showed signs of having employed his respite from parliamentary sittings to attend the colony's affairs. He told Broughton that he had decided the colonial government should accept full responsibility for education in New South Wales, and that the Governor should determine each year what the treasury could afford to spend on it. But he was inclined, he added, to hand over to the Legislative Council the right to determine, by a majority vote, how that money should be distributed. The Council could use it exclusively for national schools, or for denominational schools, or for a mixed

4. Broughton to Hay, 28 November 1834, C.O. 201/244.
system as in the West Indies. Glenelg clearly wanted still to support Bourke without deserting Broughton; and he had decided he could best do this by passing on to the local legislature the decision he could not make for himself. Yet if Glenelg took seriously Bourke's complaints about Broughton being one of the chiefs of the dominant Tory party in the Legislative Council, he must have believed he was handing the Archdeacon a fair chance of winning substantial support for Church of England Schools. 5

The proposals satisfied none. Neither Broughton nor Bourke wanted to gamble on the outcome of a political tussle in the colony. Bourke openly condemned the Legislative Council as unfit to decide on the fate of any of his vital proposals for reform, and asked that they be settled out of the colony and in the British Parliament. 6 Broughton for his part did not agree that Bourke lacked influence in the Legislative Council. The Governor had won the vote in 1833 on jury reform, and Broughton believed he would fight again as bitterly as before to win on educational reform. 'When the influence

5. No copy of Glenelg's proposals exist (they may even have been communicated orally to Broughton), but their general outline may be inferred from the comments Broughton submitted in criticism of them, see W.G. Broughton, a Memo left at the Colonial Office, 4 November 1835, C.O. 201/250. (This Memo is not attached to any correspondence, and is found in the file, C.O. 201/250, pp.177-8. Hereafter it will be referred to as 'W.G. Broughton, Memo, 4 November 1835'). As at this time Glenelg was keeping Broughton fully informed on the progress of the West Indies scheme, he probably, hoped for a compromise not unlike that reached in the West Indies, see Broughton to Grey, 13 November 1835, C.O. 201/250.

of the Governor over that body (Legislative Council), coupled with
the express opinions of His Excellency upon the subject of education,
is considered', Broughton told Glenelg,' he (Broughton) would
have but a slender prospect of obtaining such regulations with
respect to religious instruction as would afford security to the
Church of England.' He begged that the decisions be made at the
Colonial Office, and embodied in firm instructions which left no
room for local manipulation.

To assist Glenelg Broughton chiselled his requirements down
to a minimum. He asked that the existing school houses be secured
to the Church of England, that the Bishop be appointed Visitor to those
schools with sole right to appoint and dismiss staff, and that 'a sum
not exceeding £1,000 p.a. be appropriated to support the schools...
upon condition that an equal sum be contributed from private sources
towards the same object'. For the rest, Broughton would trust to
the S.P.C.K., his own energy, and local goodwill. He failed to
conceive of a more liberal offer: a less liberal one he declined to
accept;

I ask, it will be perceived, for no new establishments;
but only that those which have existed from the beginning
of the settlement ... should be preserved from destruction.
I advocate no new principle; but one which was recognised
and recommended by the House of Commons Committee on
Education so long ago as 1818; and which was prominently
dwelt upon by Lord Brougham in the House of Lords on the
21st of last May - if you will subscribe a certain sum,
Government will grant you the rest.

7. 'W.G. Broughton, Memo, 4 November 1835', op. cit.
Glenelg patiently received Broughton's objections and then decided, at the end of November 1835, that he could no longer attempt to reconcile the opposing parties in the dispute. Each had appealed to something which existed elsewhere in the empire, and that, Glenelg admitted, had been a red herring from the beginning. 'In a case so new as that of the Australian colonies, few analogies can be drawn from Institutions of the parent state to our assistance', he told Broughton and Bourke.\textsuperscript{12} That admission freed him from the tangle of trying to appease Broughton and still support Bourke, and swept away the confusion of Irish, West Indies, National and British and Foreign systems, each with their merits but each with their defects. Glenelg saw his task in November 1835 as confined to laying down a set of broad principles which the local Legislative Council must work up into a detailed scheme answering local needs.\textsuperscript{13} Glenelg intended that the system in New South Wales should have a decidedly indiginous flavour; 'a system', he said, 'which, excluding no class of conscientious religionists from its benefits, shall be in a true sense National'.\textsuperscript{14}

Glenelg envisaged a scheme which had at its centre a network of National schools proper, wholly supported by the government. These

\textsuperscript{12} Glenelg to Bourke, 30 November 1835, \textit{H.R.A.}, I.xviii.203; Glenelg to Broughton, 1 December 1835, \textit{C.O.} 325/28 (p.123). The original draft of this crucial despatch on education is to be found in \textit{C.O.} 325/28, pp. 172-82 and differs in some aspects from that sent to Bourke on 30 November 1835. One sentence not in the original is that referred to by this footnote, and Glenelg's only reason for adding it would seem to have been a desire to make explicit his own understanding as to why he felt himself finally able to make a decision on the matter, see Minute A.A. (in Glenelg's handwriting), \textit{C.O.} 325/28, p. 183-4.

\textsuperscript{13} Glenelg to Bourke, 30 November 1835, \textit{op.cit.} p. 202.

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 206.
offered a Christian education but without doctrine or dogma, and were to be arranged so as to attract a majority of settlers, including a majority of the members of the Church of England; for it was important in Glenelg's reckoning, that the Church of England should remain numerically dominant in the colony. To forestall Broughton's threat to take as many members of the Church of England as would follow him out of any scheme which used a set of mutilated scripture readings in place of the Bible, Glenelg recommended that the New Testament should be squeezed somewhere into the scheme. So on one vital point Glenelg showed Bourke that, as much as he favoured the general principles of the Irish System, he did not want it slavishly imitated in New South Wales.

From the start Glenelg saw that there would be parties dissenting from the scheme, and that the local government should provide some assistance for them. At first he simply commended them to the mercy of the local Legislative Council. Then on thinking the matter over he decided to be more explicit, and to emphasise that in his opinion every Englishman had a right to be educated in accordance with his conscience. So for Bourke's guidance he laid it down as a principle that a sum of money should be set aside annually for subsidising dissenting educational establishments. At the time he made it clear, that Bourke's chief task was to devise a comprehensive system acceptable to the great body of inhabitants, and which reduced these dissenting establishments to a minimum.

16. See Broughton to Glenelg, 22 May 1835, C.O. 201/250; Glenelg to Bourke, 30 November 1835, op. cit., p. 206.
17. Glenelg to Bourke, 30 November 1835, op. cit., p. 206. For the contrast between these recommendations and those in the original draft, see Appendix C.
Glenelg forwarded these details to Canterbury on 1 December 1835, together with copies of the despatches Bourke had sent over in 1833 and hitherto withheld from Broughton. With them came a final offer of the new bishopric. Bargaining time was over. The terms of settlement fell short of Broughton's oft repeated demand that he must know the shape of the situation he was to return to. Indeed the essence of Glenelg's decision was to leave that to the play of local political forces. While Broughton had been prepared to return to an ecclesiastical establishment diminished in income and status, he had declared, as recently as 19 November, that he would never return if the Church of England schools were wiped out. Glenelg knowing this nevertheless asked Broughton to return as the first bishop, and to loan 'his countenance and co-operation' in the working out of a new system of education. He could do so because he believed that, from a position of influence, Broughton could bias developments towards a system of instruction not inimical to a sound Church of England education.

Broughton promised neither concurrence nor co-operation. He might agree to work in conditions contrary to his principles, he certainly would have no part in creating them. He was at the same time, ready, anxious, and ambitious to enter upon the episcopal office in New South Wales provided he was allowed to exercise the prerogative

19. Sir George Grey to Secretary of S.P.C.K., 2 December 1835, C.O. 202/23 (p.120).
of a Protestant Bishop and oppose the enemies of the Reformation whenever and in whatever guise they appeared. That could mean, he warned, speaking up against moves to subsidise Roman Catholic churches and exhorting Protestants to forsake schools which prohibited the use of the Bible.\(^\text{22}\) Glenelg raised not so much as an eyebrow. 'It was not my intention to impose any condition upon your acceptance of the bishopric ', he wrote back to the Archdeacon, 'or to fetter the free exercise of your judgment, in the course which you may feel it incumbent upon you to pursue, either in your episcopal or legislative capacity.'\(^\text{23}\) So on 10 December 1835, with an open ticket to return to the colony and raise hell against Bourke, Broughton formally accepted the bishopric of New South Wales.\(^\text{24}\)

A week later the arrangement almost lay in ruins. Broughton withdrew his acceptance of the See, asking instead for a pension of the type customarily given to public officials whose office is suppressed.\(^\text{25}\) He made the decision in a fit of pique over official hard heartedness towards his claim for full salary. On top of having refused to budge one inch on the half salary ruling, or to pay the full costs of his episcopal consecration, the Colonial Office ruled, in mid-December, that even after consecration he would not be entitled to his full salary until he stepped ashore in Sydney.\(^\text{26}\) To

\(^{22}\) Broughton to Glenelg, 13 December 1835, C.O. 201/250.
\(^{23}\) Glenelg to Broughton, 17 December, ibid.
\(^{24}\) Broughton to Glenelg, 12 December, ibid.
\(^{25}\) Broughton to Sir George Grey, 17 December 1835, ibid.
\(^{26}\) Sir George Grey to Broughton, 16 December 1835, C.O. 202/33.
compensate for a total loss of over £4,000, Glenelg offered him £1,000.\textsuperscript{27} He would quit England a bishop, he said, poorer than he had quit Hartley Wespall a curate. 'Justice to my family forbids me to involve myself in such formidable difficulties', he wrote to Glenelg, and resigned.\textsuperscript{28}

Glenelg coolly put the resignation aside.\textsuperscript{29} He tempted back Broughton's equilibrium with an offer of increased compensation. He would be entitled to the full costs of his Letters Patent, the D.D., and such personal expenses as a quick trip back for consecration would have incurred. That meant he could claim fares for himself and his family, but not his servants, the cost of carting moderate luggage but not all his worldly possessions. Glenelg reckoned this at £1,350.\textsuperscript{30} Broughton wanted £2,058.\textsuperscript{31} Glenelg reminded him that as he was being offered an equivalent alternative to the position of Archdeacon he could not expect a pension.\textsuperscript{32} He was being offered an expensive substitute, not an equivalent alternative, Broughton retorted; and the days ticked on to Christmas without a final decision.\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{27. Sir George Grey to Broughton, 15 December 1835, ibid. Broughton calculated his loss as:- 2 years on half salary, £2,000; passage money both ways £800; expenses of consecration £758; loss in breaking up his Sydney establishment and then re-establishing it £500; see 'Schedule of Expenses' attached to Broughton to Grey, 21 December 1835, C.O. 201/250 (p.244).}

\textsuperscript{28. Broughton to Grey, 17 December 1835, C.O. 201/250.}

\textsuperscript{29. Sir George Grey to Broughton, 18 December 1835, C.O. 202/33.}

\textsuperscript{30. Sir George Grey to Broughton, 22 December 1835, ibid.}

\textsuperscript{31. Broughton to Sir George Grey, 21 December 1835, C.O. 201/250.}

\textsuperscript{32. Sir George Grey to Broughton, 18 December 1835, C.O. 202/33.}

\textsuperscript{33. Broughton to Sir George Grey, 21 December 1835, C.O. 201/250.}
Broughton, however, had serious doubts about the rightness of his action, and began to worry over whom the Whigs might send out in his place. Perhaps they would appoint one of their favourites from the Arnold and Hampden school who would be delighted to join hands with Bourke, and link up all protestants in one big church without respect to the doctrines of the Church of England. Had there not been as many sacrifices as gains in his office from the beginning? he asked himself. Was mid-stream the time to start quibbling about them? On Christmas eve he relented; 'I feel that though I cannot yield my conviction, I am bound to overcome my reluctance and to sacrifice my interest', he wrote to Glenelg, and withdrew his resignation.

Peace and goodwill came by courtesy of Glenelg that Yuletide. He overflowed with patience: he preached restraint to his under-secretaries when they itched to dip their pens in sarcasm and demolish the Archdeacon's quibbles; and when Broughton seemed on the brink of reopening the feud over his salary with a claim to have met a colonial Archdeacon at home on leave and full salary, it was Glenelg who sent officers scurrying to check the matter. Then, no sooner had Christmas passed, than Broughton returned with a round of

---


fresh demands. He wanted the question on compensation for the land
grants promised, but never made over, to the clergy settled before
he left.\(^{38}\) He wanted too, since he was to be a bishop, a domestic
chaplain.\(^{39}\) Indeed he had already selected the Reverend R.L. Tyner
for the job on the recommendation of Bourke's own relatives.\(^{40}\)
Domestic chaplains, it turned out, were like ornamental architecture
- not for Botany Bay. He was told that one of the young chaplains
in Sydney would be adequate for his needs; that gave him the choice
of Cowper, fifty-seven years old and afflicted with failing eye
sight, or Hill, four years younger, overworked, and already dying.\(^{41}\)

For Glenelg the serious business of the moment centred around
the preparation of Broughton's Letters Patent and despatching him
speedily to the demesne of his apostolic labours. This he undertook
with careless haste. A week of debate around the Colonial Office
sufficed to settle that the title of the See would be Australia rather
than New South Wales as originally decided, with James Stephen
adamantly upholding the cause of Sydney as more in keeping with the

\(^{38}\) Broughton to Sir George Grey, 28 December 1835, C.O. 201/250.
\(^{39}\) Ibid.
\(^{40}\) Sir George Grey to Tyner, 15 and 18 March 1836, C.O. 202/33;
Broughton to Bourke, 3 September 1836 (Correspondence from
W.G. Broughton, Ms.No.Ab29/6a, M.L.).
\(^{41}\) Sir George Grey to Broughton, 5 January 1836, C.O. 202/33. For
one who scorned the idea of ornamental architecture in Botany
Bay, see Sydney Smith's review of the Bigge Report in Edinburgh
Review, vol. 38, 1823, p. 85. On Cowper's health see Macquarie
Cowper, Autobiography, pp.34 and 41-3. Hill died on the eve
of Broughton's return, see K.J. Cable, 'Hill, Richard',
apostolic tradition of naming bishoprics after towns. Broughton accepted *Australia* on the understanding that it was 'not intended that its limits shall deviate from those of the existing Archdeaconry'. There the matter rested until the completed and officially sealed documents arrived in Canterbury some weeks later, and Broughton discovered himself destined to become bishop of the entire continent. 'I was altogether taken by surprise', he admitted to Glenelg, 'no such proposition having ever been made to me."

It was a question of territorial logic, Glenelg explained. The Western portion of Australia seemed better under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Australia than the Bishop of Calcutta. As one lone chaplain resided at Swan River no one expected Broughton to undertake wearisome journeys for regular visitations. He might care to go in some future year, Glenelg suggested, after the western colony had grown and the episcopal system in New South Wales had settled down.

---

42. On the title *Bishop of New South Wales* see Glenelg to Broughton, 1 December 1835, Encl. No.1 in Glenelg to Bourke, 27 December 1837, *H.R.A.* I.xviii. 698; for the change to *Bishop of Australia*, see Glenelg to Broughton, 7 December 1835, *C.O.* 202/33; for James Stephen's insistence on the title *Bishop of Sydney*, see 'Minute A' attached to a rough draft of Glenelg to Broughton, 1 December 1835, *C.O.* 325/28 (p. 123).

43. See the document entitled 'Being a draft of a reply to the Memorial of the S.P.C.K. such as Archdeacon Broughton would like to receive from the Colonial Office', Encl. in Broughton to Hay, 2 December 1835, *C.O.* 201/250 (p. 203).


The extra work involved was not his bother, Broughton complained to Glenelg; though ever since reading about Heber's journeys all over India he had condemned long tours as futile and fruitless. The real point at issue was his insurance policies. These afforded his family no protection once he ventured by sea beyond the boundaries of the late Archdeaconry. 'I shall be prepared to visit Western Australia', he felt compelled to inform Glenelg, '... only upon condition that the charge necessary to secure my Life Assurances under this contingency should be supplied on the part of the public and not from my own private resources.' Glenelg did not intend to see his arrangements disintegrate over a quibble about a few shillings, and promised to look into the matter when the time came for Broughton to visit the Western half of his diocese.

As the year 1835 gave way to 1836 and Broughton balanced his gains against his losses he could only have concluded that he had achieved less than he had hoped. Yet he was not unduly downcast. 'I am gratified by knowing that I have done some things by coming to England which I could not have done by continuing as you say "at my post"', he wrote in self-consolation to Arthur. Among his gains he counted the almost certain free and unfettered possession of as many of the existing schools as he could raise finance to support.

46. Bishop of Australia to Glenelg, 20 February 1836 op.cit.; for the point about Heber's visits see this thesis pp.54-5.
47. Sir George Grey to Bishop of Australia, 12 May 1836, op.cit., p.421.
'I am not able to speak as yet with certainty; but I have every reason to believe and hope I shall obtain the means of carrying on most of our schools', he informed Marsden. 'Keep possession therefore by all means of the school houses till I come.'

By bitter contrast Broughton lost government support for the King's School, Parramatta. This stunned him. He had believed that School secure in Bourke's affection, and earlier in the year he was not without hope of revived government interest in the King's School, Sydney. Bourke, however, had turned and damned the Parramatta School in a fit of pique in March 1834. He had learned then that its master, the Reverend Robert Forrest, had lodged an official complaint with the Bishop of London accusing the Governor of reducing the size of the school and of retarding the progress of its building, and thereby causing the master a substantial loss of income. The King's School, Parramatta, could support itself, Bourke told Stanley, and should be made to so so. So long as the government provided that School with commodious buildings the parochial schools must remain hovels, and if the well-to-do were to


50. Broughton to Marsden, 30 December 1835, op. cit.; Glenelg to Bourke, 30 November 1835, op.cit., p. 205.


52. 'Heads of Subjects for conference with Archdeacon Broughton; comments prepared by Mr. Hay', C.O. 201/250 (p. 156).

53. Forrest to Bishop of London, 11 March 1834, C.O. 201/251 (pp. 188-91).
be educated by expensively imported Oxford and Cambridge graduates then the poor must be content with convict school masters. Bourke recommended that the government subsidise instead schools like those found in Yorkshire, where boys of the middle classes are lodged, boarded, clothed and taught for a very moderate annual sum. In the opinion of the contemporary observer Mr. Charles Dickens, those schools fouled the moors of Yorkshire; but the economy, if not the excellence, of Mr. Squeers and men of his ilk, had a strange fascination for many of the age.

The loss of support for the King's School was a hard blow, but to Broughton the greatest disappointment was to return alone. Many clergymen 'who would be a blessing to any community' had offered their services to the colony. He had turned them away having not so much as passage money, let alone a stipend, to offer. Glenelg promised that he could have up to nine extra chaplains, if the Legislative Council approved, but not until after the new legislation on religious provisions had been passed. Broughton shuddered at the thought of the delay, but he decided to move rather than moan. In December 1835 he instructed Marsden to circulate petitions among the laity in nine areas needing chaplains, and to have them ready for presentation to the Legislative Council when he returned. 'The more quietly the affair can be carried on the better', he advised his deputy, 'and the great object will be to obtain as many signatures

55. Ibid., p. 394.
as possible.' He wrote by the same mail begging McLeay to be busy about his politics and prepare the Council to approve the petitions. With luck the clerical drought could break around the end of 1836. 57

Ironically the one new chaplaincy created, at Norfolk Island, remained unfilled. Broughton had found two suitable candidates, both rugged men of mature age, not in Holy Orders but ready for them, and equipped, in his opinion, to survive the ordeal of life in a receptacle of vice. 58 The Bishop of London declined to ordain either. 59 Broughton in turn refused to agree to Glenelg's seeking a substitute from the London Missionary Society. 60 Convict settlements were low in Broughton's list of priorities. He felt a certain futility in attempting to convert men who had regressed from assignment to the chain gang, and from that to Moreton Bay or Norfolk Island. 'I cannot venture to hope that the exertions of any individual, even if an angel, could effect any general reformation...in those receptacles of the worst of criminals', he told the Secretary of State. 61 He certainly did not intend to direct chaplains away from other areas for their benefit. And when, in a last minute change of heart, Glenelg offered Broughton £800 for itinerant chaplains to minister to the scattered chain gangs, Broughton accepted only on the condition that

57. Broughton to Marsden, 30 December 1835, op. cit.
60. Sir George Grey to Broughton, 7 March 1836, C.O. 202/33.
61. 'The Report of Archdeacon Broughton on the State of the Church and Schools Establishment in N.S.W., 29 September 1831' in Despatches from Governor of New South Wales. Enclosures etc. 1832-5, p. 1143 (A1267/13, M.L.).
the chaplains could minister to free and convict alike in the districts they passed through. He saw a grave risk in turning single men into the vast loneliness of the interior, and he did not believe that a ministry to convicts alone warranted it. 62

In the chilly late winter of 14 February 1836 a small but polite gathering found its way into the grey stone chapel of Lambeth Palace. Inside only the scarlet and black of doctor's gowns relieved the drabness of the heavy oak panelling. Howley of Canterbury, Blomfield of London, Summer of Winchester, and Monk of Gloucester, were there ready to perform, in subdued tones and with staid formality, the ritual for consecrating Broughton a bishop in the church of God. Beside Broughton sat the Reverend George Jehoshaphat Mountain; and he, the preacher said, would soon depart for a land where episcopacy had been well established. Broughton would not. He must return to a place peopled by men who had borne the brand of satan, and there attempt to plant and preserve sound doctrine. He must go into a tractless wilderness and raise up a refuge where the outcast, the adventurer in search of wealth and the poor in search of hope, may find far from their earthly father's home the true riches of their Heavenly Father's grace. And he must never forget, the preacher added in a timely aside, that episcopacy could vanish from England, and men would then look to the colonies for its revival. If at that moment Broughton had raised his eyes and looked to where Howley sat he would

have seen the Archbishop heavy in thought, for he had just learned that Lord Melbourne had dismissed all his nominations for the vacant Regius Chair of Divinity at Oxford, and had appointed one considered dangerously unorthodox. With such a candidate occupying the chief chair of divine studies in England there seemed no limit to the potential dangers before the church. So Broughton was charged with the double responsibility of establishing sound doctrine in a new land and of keeping episcopacy alive within the English nation.  

A week later on the 22 February, the barque Camden carried Broughton, his family, two servants, and a brand new carriage out into the Atlantic. He was content to depart. Too much had changed in church and state not to leave him with the feeling that he was forsaking one strange and uncertain land for another. He might sigh to himself 'O Sweet England', but within he knew the sweetness lay

63. J.E.N. Molesworth, The Foundations of Episcopacy. A Sermon Preached on the Consecration of the Right. Rev. William Grant Broughton, D.D., first Bishop of Australia, and the Right. Rev. George Jehoshaphat Mountain, D.D., first Bishop of Montreal, Lower Canada (London, 1836), pp.43-5. Hampden was appointed against Howley's wishes on 7 February 1836, see Chadwick, Victorian Church, pp.112-8. Broughton was aware of the affair (see Broughton to Keate, 26 July 1836, Ms. No. 1731, A.N.L.) and as it did not break on the public till March 1836, by which time Broughton was at sea, he probably learned of it through his close association with Howley and his circle of friends around the time of his consecration. That circle included the preacher at the consecration, Molesworth (see Molesworth, Foundations of Episcopacy, preface and p. 40), and Hugh Rose (Broughton to Coleridge, 26 July 1836, Ms. No.1731, A.N.L.) a good spiller of official secrets (see Chadwick, Victorian Church, p. 113 note 4) and a subsequent force behind the launching of the Tracts for the Times (see Newman, Apologia, pp. 44-7.
in the memory of past times, a few friendships, and places like Hartley Wespall, and these must ever remain adjuncts to life's main work. He was exchanging one battle ground for another. But whereas in England he would remain a spectator, his friend had convinced him that in the colony he had a unique role to fulfil. 'It was the conviction', he later recalled, 'that if I declined no one else could take up the matter in an instant so as to be prepared to carry it on as I might do, which decided me upon coming back.'

So Broughton sailed to build in the colony that 'citadel', which others would have to build in England, where the Christian faith would find its refuge when the unholy league between Rome's old superstition and modern liberalism let loose its full terror.

64. Broughton to Arthur, 13 June 1836 (Arthur Papers, vol.12, M.L.); for Broughton's review of the ecclesiastical and political state of England as he left it, see Broughton to Keate, 1 May 1837 (Ms. No. 1731, A.N.L.).
65. Broughton to Keate, 26 July 1836 (Ms. No. 1731, A.N.L.).
They who are prepared with me to encounter the rage of the adversaries, will lay the foundation here of a citadel, within the walls of which the Christian faith will find a sure refuge when all without is laid waste.

Broughton to Arthur, 21 September 1836.
Captain Valentine Ryan brought the Camden to its anchorage in Sydney Cove at 2 on the afternoon of 2 June 1836. It was Thursday and market day. Broughton had no complaints. The weather had been rough, but the sailor more experienced and the journey shorter. Some on board had had no fear of the fate of the ancient mariner before their eyes and had killed an Albatross, Broughton told the poet's nephew; 'But we escaped the penalty'. Another had almost taken its place. Just off the Cape a number of the crew had mutinied as the ship rode into a gale and Broughton had had to turn honest broker between captain and crew.

No news of Broughton's departure had preceded him, so he announced his own arrival to Bourke and created his own ceremonial landing by insisting that, as he had arrived under His Majesty's commission, a government boat should be made available to land him at his pleasure on that spot where officials of His Majesty's government were accustomed to step ashore. Bourke provided the boat, but a storm intervened to delay his landing until the Saturday. By then word of the Bishop's arrival had spread, and an impressive gathering braved brooding skies to welcome him ashore. Bourke in the meantime had fled Government House for Parramatta, leaving the Bishop

1. 'Abstract of Ship Camden's Log from Portsmouth to New South Wales' (Broughton Papers 1824-98, Ms.No.913, M.L.).
2. Broughton to Coleridge, 26 July 1836 (Ms.No.1731, A.N.L.).
3. Sydney Gazette, 7 June 1836.
5. Broughton to Bourke, 2 June 1836 (Correspondence from W.G. Broughton, Ms.No.Ab29/6a, M.L.).
to be conducted in friendly procession to temporary quarters at the Pultney Hotel. 6

Broughton returned to a lively Sydney. Good seasons had fattened men's hearts with drink and merriment, and a promise of more tomorrow. Firkins of Bristol butter appeared in the stores, and the palate that had grown stale on Coopers could be refreshed with an abundant supply of bottled beers from London. At night, for five shillings in a box or for two in the pit, the Theatre Royal played out The Merchant of Venice, with Mrs. Taylor singing the Daughter of Israel between acts; while those with a thirst for culture could remain and round off the evening viewing the one act farce, A Race For Dinner. 7 There was value in that. But even better value at Government House. From nine on the evening of Monday 30 March till 'the first blush of rosy-fingered morn' the day following, it cost nothing to dance endless quadrilles in the Governor's ballrooms, and then to stroll into gardens and wander around the brilliantly lit foliage before turning back to 'long tables groaning under every substantial good and delicacy of the season', including a fine range of superior wines. That, the social correspondent for one Sydney newspaper observed, was 'not usual at routs' and a sign of true liberality. 8

Bourke had good cause for liberality. A K.C.B. had fallen into his lap unsolicited, and some thought unmerited. 9 The thing

6. Broughton to Bourke, 3 June 1836, ibid.; Australian, 7 June 1836.
7. Based on advertisements in Sydney Gazette, May and June 1836.
8. Sydney Gazette, 2 June 1836; Sydney Herald, 2 June 1836.
itself had no great value for him, but he found the thought behind it touching. The thought, his son-in-law Mr. Percival reminded him, belonged to Spring-Rice. Few men, Bourke replied, had such friends. But the people of Sydney were mighty proud of it; and at public functions over the weekend of the King's birthday they were as happy to see that red ribbon strapping Bourke's chest as Bourke delighted in wearing it. The ball celebrated, too, the opening of the Legislative Council where the prospects were good for many a lively sitting.

Dissatisfied justices and rebellious councillors had already peppered the air. Judge Burton had declined to acquiesce in the temporary exaltation of his brother judge, Mr. James Dowling, to leadership on the bench during Forbes' leave of absence. The move surprised many including young Richard Bourke who, believing himself to be about his father's business, had notified the Colonial Office that the Governor wished Burton to succeed Forbes. Bourke did. But taking refuge in the thought that Dowling's was only a temporary appointment which left Burton's ultimate claims to succession intact, he held Burton back in 1836 in order to reduce Tory strength on a Council destined to reconsider the near ill-fated Jury Act of 1833.

15. Richard Bourke jnr. to Spring-Rice, May 1835 (Bourke Papers, vol.11, M.L.); also Bourke to Richard Bourke jnr., 30 November 1835 (Bourke Papers, vol.6, M.L.).
Burton, caring not a twig for the seat on the Council but desperately in need of an increased salary, fought to upset the appointment.  

Bourke had hit at other Tory officials. He had expelled the Colonial Treasurer, Riddell, from the Executive Council, and declared war on the Hunter River aristocracy. Riddell, the long-standing 'Frondeur of the government', had finally overstepped the limits of political propriety. He had nominated for an office Bourke ruled him ineligible to hold, and had gone on to defeat the Governor's favoured candidate, Roger Therry, in a political tussle reeking with sectarian overtones, and master-minded by an anti-catholic Hunter River faction. Broughton and Parry had raised a prejudice, Bourke told his son, which could bedevil the area for years if allowed to pass unchecked.

Behind Riddell stood the Honourable Richard Jones who, by May, had struck back. Stepping into the shoes Wentworth wore in Darling's days, he raised a petition criticising the governor's powers of control

---

17. Burton to Edmund Burton, 4 October 1832 and 29 November 1833, and Burton to Reverend R.C. Burton, 4 October 1832 (Correspondence of Sir William Westbrook Burton 4 October 1832 to 6 July 1838, Ms. No.834, M.L.).
19. See 'List of Persons whose names are proposed to be inserted in the Warrant under the King's Sign Manual as provided by Section 3 of the Draft Bill for New South Wales, any 12 of whom may be selected by the Governor', Encl. in Bourke to Glenelg, 26 December 1835, H.R.A., I.xviii.252. The list omitted the names of Richard Jones and E.C. Close two existing members of the Council and critics of Bourke, and was contrived to allow for the exclusion of Hannibal and James McArthur, Robert Campbell and the McLeays.
over legislation, expenditure, and the magistracy; and had he not chosen to add a few adverse remarks on the increase of crime and the poor performance of civil juries, the opposing faction would have been hard pressed to gainsay it. As it was, Wentworth had to preface his defence of Bourke's administration confessing a hearty concurrence with much the Honourable Mr. Jones' petition had to say. So petitions became the thing, one begetting another. Some said convicts were more mischievous than ever; others that the Legislative Council was more mischievous than everyone. Another begged His Majesty's government to allow a few popularly elected members into the Legislative Council; and to keep them out an 'Anti-House-of-Assembly Conservative Petition' went into circulation. Others, less ambitious, got up an 'Open Door Petition', so that they might have a peep at what went on inside. With most petitions went a meeting, and none more stirring than those at 12 o'clock where Jamison took the chair and Wentworth the hide off every seeker of place and wealth who loved not Bourke. Happily for Broughton the doctrine 'out of sight, out of mind' had prevailed.

Though the opening of the Legislative Council would heat up this agitation, Bourke sailed into it with merry-making and a heart lightened by the loss of a year of doubt and mistrust. At the end of 1835 he had believed Broughton the victor in the struggle over national

23. 'Petitions of the Free Inhabitants of New South Wales etc.', Encl. B, ibid., p.399; Sydney Gazette, 14 April 1836.
24. Sydney Gazette, 12, 14, 21 and 23 April, 12 and 29 May, and 11 June 1836.
schools. 'I am sorry to find that the prejudices of one Religionist should be allowed to stand in the way of general education', he had replied to his son on hearing of Glenelg's partiality to the West Indies system. 'I must only do the best I can upon the system prescribed for me.' He had talked then, crushed in spirit, of returning, like Scott, to expose the scoundrels who had control of the place. Then came 18 May, and the Henry Tanner, after a miserable one hundred and fifty-two days voyage from London, landed Glenelg's despatches. 'The church and schools matters have been settled according to my wishes', he wrote with relief to his son on whom the doors of the Colonial Office had snapped shut. He told few others preferring to ponder in his heart how to use the news to its best effect. He pondered, too, what else might follow. Should his recommendations on civil juries and an elected Assembly receive equally favourable countenance from his masters at Westminster, then the McLeays, the Riddells, the Joneses and the Broughtons would soon be his footstool! So, on the evening of 30 May, as Bourke's feet danced his heart leaped and good wine flowed freely both ends of the feast; but the best wine was still to come.

26. Bourke to Richard Bourke jnr., 4 February 1835 (ibid.).
27. Sydney Gazette, 19 May 1836 (Shipping Intelligence).
29. Bourke's brief reference to coming changes in the education system at the opening of the Legislative Council concealed more than it revealed. The Sydney Gazette ignored them, and the Sydney Herald passed them off as routine.
Broughton began his public episcopal career in this gay and lively Sydney on Sunday 5 June when Marsden installed him in Office at a ceremony in St. James' Church, King Street. His friends rallied to make the occasion as impressive as they could. Bourke declined to give it any official countenance, and stayed away. But some of the colony's leading citizens had said in an Address the day before that the Bishop was there by 'His Majesty's gracious resolution'; and it behoved His Majesty's faithful servants to honour the event. So McLeay put on his official uniform, for he was still one of the King's men and in the King's service despite rumours that Bourke had edged him into retirement, and led a contingent of Supreme Court Judges, Legislative Councillors, and the High Sheriff, into the front pews where important people sat on special occasions. Behind them the respectable inhabitants, who graced every occasion the press cared to report, took their seats and stayed there four hours.  

Among the many wearisome duties he performed in those four hours, Broughton recited the Thirty Nine Articles, reminding his congregation that God had neither body, parts, nor passions, but that they had the lot and were very far gone; so, do what they might they remained their Creator's unprofitable servants until they confessed faith in Jesus Christ. Just what that faith was he took some pains to show them. It certainly did not add up to what Rome taught; Rome

30. For Broughton's enthronement, see Sydney Herald, 9 June 1836; for rumours of McLeay's retirement, Australian, 10 June 1836; for the Address of Welcome, Sydney Gazette, 11 June 1836, and Sydney Herald, 13 June 1836.
31. Required by Canon 36 of 1604.
32. Articles of Religion in Book of Common Prayer, Nos.1, 9, 10 and 14.
like Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch had erred. It came from far back through Canterbury, the faithful guardian of doctrine approved by Scripture and the practices of the Apostolic Age.

With that said he ascended the pulpit and 'dwelt at considerable length upon the leading doctrines of the Church of England', giving great prominence to that doctrine which taught the emptiness of faith without works. As their bishop, he warned them, he would be looking for the maintenance of good works in proof of the strength of their faith and the seriousness of their repentance.

He did not add, for the moment, that one good work would be the proliferation of support for bricks and mortar. Only towards the end of the sermon did he warm to his congregation and pay an affectionate tribute to their pastor, Richard Hill, who but a week before had called many of them to prayer before the throne to which he had since been summoned.

Many an eye moistened at the mention of his name; and well it might the Australian observed, for those people had filled that church that day to pay homage to the dead, not to welcome the bishop!

The formal, stodgy structure of the sermon belied the passion of the mind which composed it. Broughton had not come all the way back from England to pound the ears of practical colonists with high and dry propositions of Christian dogma, though to many it could have

33. Ibid., No.19.
34. Broughton, Present Position and Duties of the Church of England, p.16.
35. Sydney Herald, 9 June 1836.
37. Ibid., pp. 23-4; Sydney Gazette, 2 June 1836.
38. Australian, 7 June 1836.
seemed just that. In England, the call from Oxford for a 'practical
revival of doctrine' had added a fresh dimension to Broughton's
well established concern for correct belief. True doctrine,
succinctly but accurately formulated and uncompromisingly propagated,
the Oxford dons said, would alone impart to the Church that hearty
courage to turn and build without regret on her true, apostolic
foundations as the state 'deprived it of its temporal honours and
sustenance'. It would be, too, the Church's one hope for repelling
the attractions of Rome and Methodism, whose tight systems of
discipline, while odious to the liberal spirit, attracted (as it was
the genius of the Oxford dons to see) those who wearied of vagueness
in the search for certainty and salvation. The dons spoke of the
problems a little ahead of the Church in England, but to Broughton in
the colony they spoke of a crisis in hand; the church there had already
been severed from its sustaining lands and reduced to being but one
denomination among many.

Broughton refused to have the emotional, evangelical preachers
which Arthur favoured, because they took no pains to moor their converts

39. (Members of the University of Oxford), Tracts for the Times Vol.1
(London, 1834), preface p.iii.
Tract No.1 in Tracts for the Times Vol.1.
42. Newman put the question, 'Should the Government and Country so far
forget their God as to cast off the Church, to deprive it of its
temporal honours and sustenance, on what will you rest the claim
of respect and attention which you make upon your flock?', Tract
No.1, p.1. See also British Critic, vol.27, 1840, p.441, where
it was admitted that while all eyes were turned elsewhere a 'pseudo-
liberal government had been trying their prentice hand (alas!
unnoticed)' in New South Wales stripping the Church of its
privileges and property.
to sound doctrine, and so opened the way for 'the Papists to make a
prey of those who are cast adrift to follow every impulse of their
own imagination.' He wanted men of Mr. Newman's school. For
himself he set about to repair the deficiency in his own knowledge of
the patristic writers, in whom Mr. Newman schooled his pupils, and
began with the meatiest of them all, St. Augustine. 'I had only heard
of him before', he confessed to Dr. Keate who supplied him with seven
volumes of the great doctor's work. 'I think his learning, eloquence,
and penetration are above all praise. If I were a Rector in England
with six hundred pounds a year and a small parish, I think I should
incontinently read through all seven volumes.' While he enlarged
his own understanding, he intended to strengthen the understanding of
his flock. So, when a deputation from the congregation at St. James's
asked to be allowed to publish the Bishop's sermon of 5 June as a
memorial to their deceased pastor, the Reverend Richard Hill, the first
tract for colonial times went on to the market.

The day after his episcopal installation Broughton went up to
Government House to take his seats on the colony's Councils. Bourke
barred his way. No news of Glenelg's intention to admit him to either
Council had reached the colony, and the Judges of the Supreme Court,
Burton included, ruled that the Bishop's Letters Patent afforded no

44. Broughton to Coleridge, 19 October 1837 (Broughton Papers, m/f,
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(Item 2b, Letters of W.G. Broughton to Rev. G. Gilbert,
Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
ground for such a move. A week later, on 15 June, the slow moving convict ship 'Strathfieldsaye' landed a despatch removing all doubt of Broughton's right to the seats he claimed, but carried no legal Instrument for formally installing him in either Council. Bourke took refuge in the oversight. He declined to give the Bishop a seat and he declined to rest content with the Bishop's temporary exclusion; but instead wrote to the Colonial Office begging that Glenelg, in the interest of colonial peace, renounce whatever promises he had made to Broughton and exclude the Bishop from both Councils for good. Broughton, fearful lest sometime after his departure Glenelg had retracted his bargain (which was to leave Broughton in both Councils until the New South Wales Act was renewed, and then to retire him from the Legislative Council) wrote reaffirming his need of the seats for the present.

Broughton found himself isolated in the colony. All newspapers, including the Sydney Herald (which as yet had no brief for Broughton),

47. Judges of the Supreme Court to Colonial Secretary, 6 June 1836, Encl. in Bourke to Glenelg, 11 June 1836, H.R.A., I.xviii. 440.
wished him out of the Councils. Glenelg admitted to bungling the matter but showed no signs of remorse. Judge Burton, in a fearless moment, for his appointment carried no security of tenure, labelled the error as intentional, so conveniently did it minister to the interests opposed to the Bishop. Broughton spoke more kindly; he accepted that the legal Instruments were delayed by 'a very singular but...unintentional omission' on the part of authority. Perhaps he had begun to see that the error could be to his advantage.

Press news of Broughton's tussle for seats on the Councils coincided with the publication of the first of a number of Addresses of welcome presented to the new Bishop. Considered together they showed signs, some thought, that a section of the community had taken the 'Lord Bishop of Australia' business a little too seriously. The plain, unobjectionable 'Reverend Sir' of archdeaconal days had gone, and in its place lips and pens seemed all too eager to drop a mellifluous 'My Lord', with Broughton adding whimsy to their fantasy flourishing a pretentious 'Will G. Australia' for a new signature. The very sight of it tickled some southern editors, but around Sydney it looked like the markings of a man groping for the traditional prelatical powers of old England, which a section of the community

55. Broughton to Keate, 26 July 1836 (Ms. No.1731, A.N.L.).
58. *Sydney Herald*, 15 August 1836 (quoting the *Tasmanian*).
would not be loath to deny him. 'There will be no Lords in New South Wales, either spiritual or temporal', the *Sydney Monitor* let it be known. 'They have done enough mischief in England.'\(^{59}\) Such ideas must be brought down quickly, another newspaper warned, or the colony will find itself building cathedrals and an episcopal palace; and supporting a port filled bishop too comfortable to go riding up bush, added yet another.\(^{60}\)

Fact, fiction, and abuse fell thick and fast for a time. Broughton saw his salary swelled to £3000,\(^{61}\) and his political chicanery extended till it included a conspiracy with an individual in England, named Macarthur, to rewrite the New South Wales Act.\(^{62}\) They called him 'an ecclesiastical Tory - the worst species of the worst genus of politician',\(^{63}\) and boasted of the good progress made under their own steam. 'After doing for three full years past so quietly and satisfactorily without either Bishop or Archdeacon', the *Sydney Gazette* reminded him, 'we could very well have been contented to have jogged on still to the end of the chapter, with neither one nor the other.'\(^{64}\) They had jogged quietly, perhaps, but scarcely satisfactorily; 'the Church of England is asleep',

---

60. *Sydney Gazette*, 7 June 1836; *Colonial Times*, 5 July 1836. For some strange reason the vituperance of the Hobart newspapers exceeded that of the Sydney newspapers.
61. *Colonist*, 9 June 1836; (retracted the statement, 16 June 1836); *Colonial Times*, 5 July 1836. A rumour that Broughton's salary had risen to £4,000 preceded his return, see Bourke to Arthur, 17 August 1835 (*Arthur Papers*, vol.8, M.L.).
62. *Sydney Herald*, 7 July 1836 (Broughton to Editor.)
64. *Sydney Gazette*, 7 June 1836.
Bourke had complained to Arthur a fortnight before Broughton's return. But when tempers evened and the dust settled, it remained clear that an Australian bishop 'must be a different character here from his brethren in England', nothing above a 'Mister Bishop'.

While the heavy hand of derision stripped Broughton of whatever political quackery he might feel tempted to read into his lordly title, the Colonist took out its scalpel and, with presbyterian glee, dissected the Bishop in search of his newly acquired apostolic character. It discovered none. Was there ever so unheroic a tale, its editor wrote, as that of a man who, having come from a land in vital need of moral renovation, knocked on the door of the Colonial Office to ask for chaplains and took 'No' for an answer? Had he received but the faintest infusion of apostolic zeal he would have led fifteen curates out of London itself 'on the simple assurance that they were coming to the land of plenty'. Lang reaffirmed the Westminster Confession and Broughton realized that he had indeed returned to New South Wales.

While the press turned a belated but jaundiced eye on the Bishop's arrival, Broughton, free from the obligation to attend the Legislative Council, threw himself into his ecclesiastical work. Hill's death, Marsden's old age and dawning senility, and Cowper's ill-health highlighted the predicament of his clerical establishment.

---

66. Australian, 10 June 1836; Sydney Monitor, 23 July 1836.
67. Colonist, 9 June 1836.
68. Lang's authorship of the articles on education and religion about the time of Broughton's return rests on the tone of the language involved. He was known publicly, however, to contribute regularly to the newspaper, see Sydney Monitor, 27 May 1835.
numerically the same in 1836 as in 1829, but considerably reduced in vitality. Seven of the official Anglican clergy were older than the Reverend J.J. Therry, the senior by age and service among the Roman Catholic clergy. Three of them were to follow Hill to the grave within a few years. So while a discrepancy in numbers remained between the clergy of those two denominations, a parity in stamina had been reached. In 1836 Polding was ready to start placing clergy in the neglected areas Broughton had tried unsuccessfully to fill for several years. In some efforts the Roman Catholic clergy had visibly proved themselves the peers of their Anglican counterparts. They had built fewer churches but those they had were bigger, and eye-catching to the stranger. But at last Broughton had within his grasp some means of driving his church from the stagnant inertia of his archdeaconal days and into greener pastures. To this he gave his first energies after returning.

On Monday 20 June he managed to attract sixty men to St. James' vestry to hear him report on his work in England, and outline plans

69. Fulton, aged 75; Marsden, 70; Cartwright, 65; Cowper, 58; Reddall, 56; Cross, 55; Broughton, 48; J.J. Therry, 46.
70. Marsden and Reddall died 1838; Fulton died 1840.
71. Broughton to Coleridge, 19 October 1837 (Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.); Burton, Religion and Education in N.S.W., p. 64.
73. Bourke would have said in all departments; Bourke to Arthur, 13 May 1836 (Arthur Papers, vol.8, M.L.); Bourke to Richard Bourke jnr. 21 August 1836 (Bourke Papers, vol.6, M.L.).
for a Diocesan Committee to raise subscriptions among colonists for the erection of schools and churches. The men who came did not hesitate. They voted to form themselves into a committee and to set the Bishop’s plan in motion without delay. Marsden wept; he never expected to see the day when men of opposing political creeds, McLeay, Deas Thomson, Judge Dowling, Judge Burton, and many others, would gather in one place and with one accord raise their voices for the advancement of the church at their own expense. 75

That night Broughton put down £215.5.0. James Macarthur promised £500, for a church and school at Camden, and for a chaplain whom he would select himself when he reached England later that year. Bowman gave £235; Colonel Dumaresq £52/2/-; Robert Campbell, £150; Robert Scott, £125; Philip King, £108; Judge Burton, £100; Edward Macarthur, £85; Hannibal Macarthur and McQuoid, £50 each; and McLeay £25. The Whig brothers of these 'notorious' Tory-minded enemies of the people put forward their offerings, but hardly on a scale to prove their point that voluntaryism would prosper the church better than lands. Dowling, the Acting-Chief Justice, headed their ranks with £31/10/-; Deas Thomson found £10; while the greatest liberal Anglican of them all, and the architect of colonial voluntaryism, Bourke, found his purse empty then and thereafter, whenever the Committee’s subscription day arrived. The meanness of the colonial Whigs showed Broughton that, whether he wanted closer ties with the landed Tory party or not, he needed the type

75. Sydney Monitor, 22 June 1836; Sydney Herald, 23 December 1836.
of financial support they willingly offered. 76

The gathering at St. James' vestry on 20 June elected from its number a working committee to carry the appeal to the smaller settler. Two secretaries were appointed, one a cleric and the other a layman, for it was to be a joint enterprise. Cowper filled the clerical vacancy, and McQuoid, the High Sheriff whom Broughton had probably talked into the job on the voyage out from England, took the other. This committee approached whom it could by post, soliciting first a person's consent to having his name entered as a subscriber, and, when that was forthcoming, then approached him with a second letter requesting him to name the size and object of his subscription. The subscription could be put in a general fund, or ear-marked for local use, or directed to any project, school or church, of the donor's personal liking. 77

Subscribing a name and honouring a subscription were frequently, and regrettably, independent events. Broughton had found colonists no exception to the old world vanity of flourishing away large sums

76. A Statement of the Objects of the Committee of the Societies for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, and for Promoting Christian Knowledge (Sydney, 1836), pp. 28-31. On McArthur's plans for Camden, see Broughton to Keate, 26 July 1836 (Ms. No.1731, A.N.L.). On Bourke's failure to contribute to the Church of England, see Sydney Gazette, 20 June 1837 ('A Protestant' to editor). Governor Gipps subscribed to the Society (see, Report of Diocesan Committee, 1839) as did Lieutenant-Governor Franklin (Hobart Town Courier, 1 June 1838).
against their names in print, and refusing to honour one droit of it. 78 To bring the money in Broughton formed district committees, and sent the chaplains, with any willing laymen who would accompany them, riding days on end rounding up the pledges. 79 If his own presence could extract a bigger donation he would spare no effort to get it. 80 His industry, the Reverend Richard Taylor remarked, after accompanying him on one day's duty, would be 'a lesson for our English bishops'. 81

The response Broughton met touring the countryside fortified his best hopes. He found, in almost every township he entered, a building committee with funds in hand. At Scone they had £600; at East Maitland, £420; at West Maitland, £620; at Paterson, £350; and at Wittingham on Patrick's Plain near where the Mudie felons, Hitchcock and Poole, had been strung-up like a brace of hare to scent the air with fear, £430. In other districts it was the same. Broughton met each committee, heard its plans, and departed leaving behind a sturdy gift from this privy purse. 82 The crowds which greeted him on his early tours were perhaps larger than usual because

77. 'Circular from Diocesan Committee etc.' dated 22 June 1836 and 9 July 1836 in Riley Papers Vol.1, pp. 145-7 (Ms.No.A106, M.L.).
79. A Statement of the Objects of the Committee...for Promoting Christian Knowledge, pp. 18-9; Report of the Diocesan Committee 1837 (Sydney, 1837), p.69; Taylor, Diary, 21 July 1837.
80. Taylor, Diary, 18 September 1837.
81. Ibid., 14 July 1836.
82. Report of Diocesan Committee 1837, pp.25-6; also 'Report by Bishop of Australia', Appendix in ibid., pp. 36-52.
he often coupled his first visit with the administration of the Sacrament of Confirmation. For such an occasion little Mulgoa found eighty-three candidates and a sizable gathering of relatives and friends. Whatever cause brought the people out, the result was the same. Broughton was pleased to be able to commend his scheme to good congregations, adding for their encouragement that no generation of colonists could achieve so much for a modest sacrifice. Every pound they parted with earned a bonus from abroad, and the government would double the lot again. Broughton, before launching the scheme, had checked with Bourke whether he intended to accept Glenelg's recommendation not to discriminate between private contributions raised within and without the colony, when allocating government subsidies. He accepted it. So Broughton, within a few weeks, wrung £3078.10.0 from 123 families. He added £10,000 more before the first anniversary of his return. The church Bourke found asleep in May, hummed by July, and Broughton was the busiest bee in the hive.

While Broughton organised the diocese for systematic fund raising Bourke turned his despatch of 30 September 1833 into legislation. He tested public feeling towards its religious provisions by releasing

83. Taylor, Diary, 20 December 1836.
84. Glenelg to Bourke, 12 May 1836, H.R.A., I.xviii. 419.
86. A Statement of the Objects of the Committee ... for Promoting Christian Knowledge, p.31.
87. Report of Diocesan Committee, 1837, p.34.
88. Broughton's immense energy in this period was acknowledged in Colonist, 14 December 1837.
copies of the despatch, and Glenelg's reply, a month before he had the Bill prepared. 88a The reaction seemed favourable. 'There appears to be no dissenting voice on the subject', the Sydney Herald reported. 89 Bourke passed this message on the Glenelg. The scheme's sole opponent was Broughton, so it was said, and for want of an audience, Bourke added he had confined his criticism indoors. 90

Broughton objected to the principle underlying the bill and said so, with the regularity of a signature tune, whenever he wrote to Bourke on the matter. But, like a signature tune, the comment was brief and formal. 91 He accepted the changes which were to be made, and his fear in July 1836 seemed to be that the measure might not long survive. 'The government', he warned Bourke, 'is going to involve itself in a labyrinth out of which it cannot be extricated except by removing, at no distant date, all concern about and connexion with the interests and affairs of religion.' 92

88a. Sydney Gazette, 16 June 1836; Colonist, 16 June 1836.
89. Sydney Herald, 4 July 1836.
91. Broughton to Bourke, 13 July 1836 (Correspondence from W.G. Broughton, Ms.No. Ab29/6a, M.L.). When Broughton re-entered the Legislative Council in 1837 he made his first official statement on the Church Act, and Bourke commented that 'he spoke well and with great moderation professing only to desire to record his opinions in the recollection of those who heard him'; Bourke to Richard Bourke jnr., 30 July 1837 (Bourke Papers, vol.6, M.L.).
92. Broughton to Bourke, n.d. (Correspondence from W.G. Broughton, Ms.No. Ab29/6a, M.L.). This letter is dated 'Wednesday'. It accompanied a final draft of the Church Bill and raised issues dealt with in another letter of 13 July 1836. It can therefore be dated between 13 July 1836 and 22 July 1836, the day the Bill was placed before the Legislative Council).
Broughton was more than kite-flying in reaching this conclusion; he read his newspapers better than many of his contemporaries. The *Colonist* loudly praised the measure, but chiefly for the ill it did the Church of England and its pretentions at playing the establishment. For the rest, it expressed a hope that the forthcoming aid represented but a brief pause in 'the Half-Way-House, on the high road to the Voluntary Principle'. The *Sydney Gazette* seconded that. It found the principle of aid 'dubious', but temporarily justifiable on the ground that a sudden cessation of aid would be too much of a 'wrench' for colonial religion to sustain without serious damage. Only the *Australian* commended it as a sound long-term measure. 'An established Church is absolutely necessary to our well being', its editor insisted, and praised Bourke for injecting a little colonial tone into the question by constructing a locally styled multi-denominational establishment. The *Sydney Herald* half supported that, but served Bourke notice of its intention to watch closely the progress of the matter. The provisions were 'ostensibly religious', it said, 'but we cannot shut our eyes to their political tendency'. By this it meant; should any section of the community reap a greater proportion of subsidies than its capital investment in the colony earned in taxes, it would withdraw all support. This really meant it would rock the boat the moment the poorer Roman Catholics looked like benefiting from the productivity of the richer Protestants. With warnings such as

---

93. *Colonist*, 16 June 1836.
95. *Australian*, 10 June 1836.
this in mind, Bourke played a cool hand in drafting the first Estimates of Expenditure to bear the impress of the legislation. The Church of England and Roman Catholic estimates were both increased by roughly £1,000.98

The Bill Bourke tabled on 22 July provided more liberally for churches than the despatch of 30 September 1833, and much of this added generosity arose from concessions Broughton had won in England.99 One concession was the right for all churches to claim subsidies on donations made from abroad. Another was the recognition that some form of exceptional aid had to be paid to the more scattered communities.2 Bourke had not received Glenelg's despatch recommending the appointment of itinerant clergy, but Broughton had copies of his correspondence on the issue and could point Bourke to Glenelg's likely dissatisfaction with any arrangement leaving a class of colonist beyond the reach of some form of regular ministry.3 As a

98. 'Estimates of the Probable Expenses of the Church Establishments forming a Charge on the Treasury of New South Wales, for the Year 1837', V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 1836. The Church of England grant went up £868.18.0 to £14,827.10.0 and the Roman Catholic £1,111.76 to £3,040.

99. For an expression of official surprise at some of the liberal changes, see Minutes of Sir George Grey to James Stephen and James Stephen to Sir George Grey, 17 May 1837, attached to Campbell to Sir George Grey, 15 May 1837, C.O. 201/265 (pp.252-3).


result Bourke allowed two variations in the general rule which limited clerical subsidies to areas able to build a church and gather a regular congregation of one hundred. Where local subscribers could provide a building for worship but not a congregation of one hundred, the Governor-in-Council could still grant a basic stipend of £100. In other areas where the population was so scattered or unsettled as to make the construction of a church wasteful or inexpedient, the settlers could apply for a minister and some portion of a stipend provided they first showed good faith in subscribing £50 annually towards his upkeep.4

A pleasing feature of the bill was its refusal to distinguish between free men and convicts in forming church congregations.5 The Colonist and Sydney Herald had called for such a distinction; the Colonist, because the exclusion of convicts would seriously hamper the ability of Roman Catholics to qualify for subsidies: the Sydney Herald, because it believed the British Government should meet the full cost of evangelising its exported criminals.6 Broughton despised such a distinction. The future of the colony could not afford the luxury of such quibbles. For the sake of the rising generation the problem of irreligion had to be tackled immediately. In England Broughton had appealed for a partnership between those who gave and those who received the criminals.7 In the colony he

5. Ibid., clause ii.
6. Colonist, 16 June 1836; Sydney Herald, 4 July 1836.
wanted nothing more than the means to get on with the job; and, in
his estimate the job would be well in hand when servants were able
to gather with their masters at Divine Worship. Anything which
encouraged this was good. Bourke's Bill did; the signature of an
assigned servant on a petition for a minister amounted to a pledge
that that assigned servant would regularly attend the church served
by that minister.

Broughton did lose one cherished aim with the Bill. He had
once hoped that all colonial churches would reserve half their
pews for free sittings. In 1830, when he revived the idea of building
a new church on foundations Macquarie laid in George Street, he had
insisted that the plans incorporate such a provision. A few
years later he put a new gallery into St. James' Church chiefly for
the benefit of the poor. The Bill of 1836 killed this dream. It
reduced free sittings to one in six. The fact did not escape the
eye of the editor of the Sydney Monitor, who had lost his taste for
pew doors the day he scrambled over one and landed on a magistrate's
bench. He shut out all memory of the ragging he had earlier given
Broughton for his extravagance in extending St. James's to provide

9. When some months later a dispute arose over what some assigned
convicts did at church, it was revealed that the convicts
attended but their masters did not, see Campbell (police magistrate)
to Colonial Secretary, 3 September 1836, Encl. No.1 in Bourke to
10. Sydney Gazette, 30 September 1830.
11. Ibid., 14 January 1832.
seats for the poor (who preferred to be elsewhere on the sabbath, he said) and asked what form of 'bastard Christianity' had taken hold of the minds of the rulers and clergy that they should now condemn the poor to the aisles? The colony had achieved, he said, 'An Act to teach publicly, Religion to those who can afford to pay for it'.

He might have been ruder had he overheard Bourke tell Broughton that that one-sixth was primarily for convicts, ticket-of-leave men, and the armed forces, and not the poor.

In early drafts of the Bill Bourke had reserved one seat in four as a free sitting. He intended also that pew rents should meet all the running costs of a church, from the parish clerk's wages to the cost of maintaining the belfry and graveyard. So formidable a series of charges, the Legislative Council insisted, would require a greater income than three-quarters of the pews in some churches could provide. It asked Bourke to set the figure at five-sixths. Broughton raised no objection. He was so nervous about the ability of churches to pay their way that he asked Bourke for powers to sue

13. Sydney Monitor, 3 August 1833 and 30 August 1836.
17. Bourke to Glenelg, 4 October 1837, H.R.A.,I.xix. 149.
pewholders in arrears. 18 When this proved impossible he agreed, against his better inclination, to reduce the free sittings. 19 This change of heart exposed the negative achievement of the Church Bill; it was better designed to achieve Bourke's aim of freeing the treasury of the cost of maintaining churches, than Broughton's, which was to being the Gospel to all classes of His Majesty's subjects.

The Bill went, nevertheless, some distance in discharging its object 'to keep alive a regard for the ordinances of religion' among settlers absorbed in the cares and anxieties of hewing a living from a raw and uncertain environment. 20 For Broughton it erred in keeping alive too great a variety of religions. At the same time, it broke through the impasse created by Murray's ruling in 1829 (and confirmed by Goderich) to restrict new chaplaincies to areas prepared to raise half a stipend. 21 Broughton had condemned that as a fatal bargain between the government and a community generally ignorant of religion. The church's one hope, he had ever insisted, was to send among settlers 'in the first instance at the public expense zealous and efficient ministers, by whom they may be gradually won over'. 22 Bourke's Bill made such a mission possible. And, should the laity respond

20. Minutes of His Excellency the Governor to the Legislative Council explanatory of the several heads of Expenditure and Ways and Means, as estimated for the year 1837', V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 5 July 1836.
in furnishing additions to the government stipend, as Bourke expected they would, the clergy would be no worse off, and in many cases better provided for, than under the scale of stipends Broughton had himself proposed for them at the Colonial Office in September 1834. Moreover, the Bill opened the way for an immediate increase in Broughton's ecclesiastical establishment. Unlike the despatch of September 1833, which wanted a church built before its minister was appointed, the Bill required only that a local committee have its £300 and a petition with one hundred signatures. In the Estimates for 1837 Bourke calculated that Broughton would qualify for six more clergymen. The Bishop may have been disappointed; he had asked for nine while in England, but at least the drought had broken.

The Church Bill passed on 29 July without opposition from the Legislative Council or Broughton. Bourke unkindly reported months later, and in the heat of another debate, that the Bishop would have opposed it had he found support. Broughton gave no indication of this. His negotiations in England had showed him moving in the opposite direction, and steadily accepting that 'the great contrariety

24. 'Estimates of the Probable Expenses of the Church Establishment forming a Charge on the Treasury of New South Wales, for the year 1837', V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 1836.
25. V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 29 July 1836. (An 'Act to Promote the building of Churches and Chapels, and to provide for the Maintenance of Ministers of Religion in New South Wales', 7 William IV. No.5).
of religious sentiments' among the colonial population placed serious limitations on the ability of a government, however willing, to exclusively favour the Church of England. The financial settlements he had urged upon the Colonial Office bespoke of a man preoccupied more with the idea of modest, long term grants, which could usefully serve as the basis of planned development, rather than a relentless hankering after exclusive aid. He might, on occasions, moan about the principle of a government aiding conflicting religious bodies, but in practice he had accepted it.

He had gone further; he had rationalised his acceptance. Exclusive aid was the handmaid of a church establishment. Ideally Broughton never abandoned his conviction that a nation without an established church, and a protestant reformed one at that, was but a pale and seedy affair. In England, he had recognised the impossibility of transplanting one to New South Wales given the temper of its rulers and their masters, the people. Worse still, a rot had set in at all levels of the English establishment which rendered it a doubtful objection for imitation, 'Too many of her sons have forgotten what she really is', he complained to Keate, adding with pain that even Howley seemed to be joining the ranks of the waverers. 'My own policy would never be to give up anything

27. See document entitled 'Being a draft of a reply to the Memorial of the S.P.C.K., such as Archdeacon Broughton would like to receive from the Colonial Office', Engl. in Broughton to Hay, 2 December 1835, C.O. 201/250 (p.208).
28. Ibid., pp. 203-9. See also epigram to chapter 9 of this thesis, which is from Broughton to Coleridge, 25 February 1839 (Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
that I thought right in the hope of appeasing the tumult. I would rather clear off whatever I thought was corrupt or useless; but with what remained I must take my chance to sink or swim.'\textsuperscript{29}

To swim in New South Wales Broughton decided he must turn the church into a citadel, preserve the true faith, and await the day the nation returned to its senses. It had done so before, in the age of the Stuarts, after wandering in the wilderness of the Commonwealth. In that age the promise of liberals, like Cromwell, had come to naught, and the gimmicks of well-wishers like Gauden, had served only to embarrass the cause of true religion. Truth and fidelity then, as ever, remained religion's sole and necessary ally; that lesson he drew a decade before from the \textit{EIKON BASILIKA}.\textsuperscript{30} The pattern of the past would prevail to confound the present meddling of the temporisers. 'You...prefer to swim smoothly with the stream', he sniffed at Arthur, who had spoken up in favour of a multi-church establishment. 'It only shows me how fatally the pursuit of political objects...can blind the most sagacious judgement.'\textsuperscript{31} For himself he had chosen a more excellent way; 'they who are prepared with me to encounter the rage of the adversaries, will lay the foundation here of a citadel, within the walls of which the Christian faith will find a sure refuge when all without is laid waste.' The Church Act demolished the Church of England as a privileged establishment but gave Broughton the

\textsuperscript{29} Broughton to Keate, 1 May 1837 (Ms. No.1731, A.N.L.).
\textsuperscript{30} Broughton, \textit{EIKON BASILIKA}, pp.88-92; for Broughton on Cromwell, see Broughton to Arthur, 21 September 1836 (\textit{Arthur Papers}, vol.12, M.L.).
\textsuperscript{31} Broughton to Arthur, 21 September 1836 (\textit{ibid.}).
money to build that citadel and furnish it with keepers.

For the very reason that he acquiesced in the religious settlement of July 1836 Broughton withstood the educational settlement Bourke intended coupling with it. The one gave him churches to strengthen his citadel, the other undermined it by destroying his schools. To maintain and defend his citadel Broughton needed to recruit the young and bring them under a strong religious influence in their impressionable years. He saw no future for youth brought up in a 'hesitating neutral system, which leaves their mind at liberty to halt, not between two opinions only, but between as many opinions as the will of man can conjure into existence.' Fortunately the first shots in the battle he was determined to fight had been fired months before he returned, and by churchmen of other denominations.

The moment Lang spotted Roger Therry and Ullathorne enter the vestry of the Scot's Church, Sydney, and join a group of protestants who had assembled to form a society to educate poor colonial children in the principles of the British and Foreign School Society, he guessed there was more afoot than met the eye. That was 19 January 1835. At first it seemed they had come to announce the willingness of Roman Catholics to join protestants in a school system built on principles then advocated in the colony by the presbyterian educationalist the Reverend Henry Carmichael. When the gathering repudiated

33. Colonist, 12 March 1835.
34. Ibid., 22 January 1835.
their offer, the two men behaved badly. The Reverend Mr. McEncroe behaved equally badly at subsequent meetings, to which he was never invited, and, when the protestant gathering denied him the right to disrupt their meetings completely, Ullathorne indignantly flourished a pamphlet in which he condemned the group's chief principle, which was to employ the Bible as a general teaching text. Lang decided there and then, April 1835, that 'a regularly organised plan' existed to frustrate the establishment of any system of schools not amenable to the principles of the Irish system of education. He did not suspect Bourke of any complicity in the scheme. Instead, he believed that Carmichael and his disciples, excited by the rumour that Bourke wanted a single system of schools for protestants and Roman Catholics alike, had made common cause with Roger Therry and Ullathorne for the purpose of misleading the Governor into believing that the people would welcome the Irish system as providing the solution to their education needs.

So by 1835 Lang had declared war on the Irish System, not because he believed, as Broughton did, that it would fall under the control of the Roman Catholics and serve as the tool of their revival, but from the fear that anything which had Carmichael's enthusiastic

35. Ibid., 5 February and 12 May 1835.
36. Ibid., 12 March 1835; see also J.A. Ferguson, Bibliography of Australia, vol.II. 1831-1838 (Sydney, 1945), p.163, item 1859.
37. Colonist, 30 April 1835.
38. Bourke was deeply implicated in the attempt to disrupt the meeting, see Ullathorne, Autobiography, p.109.
support must be capable of subversion to his ideas. These ideas, Lang declared to be those of an infidel; Carmichael would disjoin religious instruction from general education, put the Bible on the shelf as optional reading, confine prayer to the home, and generally expect a child to imbibe a sense of divine awe through unravelling the mystery of an air-pump. In its origin Lang's feud with the Irish system was an extension of his feud with Carmichael, and in place of Carmichael's ideas he was content to restate his preference for a denominational system. He would have the Roman Catholics free to go their way because he desired for Presbyterians complete freedom to follow theirs. 'We are inclined to be liberal' he affirmed, 'but determined not to be liberalised in the modern sense of the term.' By the end of 1835, then, little separated the practical policies of Broughton and Lang. Each was determined to fight for schools where they were free to mix confessional and general education; Lang because it was the ideal, and Broughton because it was as much as could be hoped for.

In May 1836, just before Broughton's return, Lang, sensing that the test of strength begun the year before between the proponents

40. Lang did give vent to anti-papist and anti-Irish opinions but they were a subsidiary theme in his fight against Carmichael. For Lang's own account of how he saw his part in the opposition of 1836, see J.D. Lang, Historical and Statistical Account of New South Wales, third ed. (2 vols., London, 1852), vol.2, pp.512-4.
41. Colonist, 5 February 1835.
42. Ibid., 29 January and 5 February 1835.
43. Ibid., 5 February 1835.
and opponents of the Irish system had been suspended rather than
abandoned, reaffirmed on behalf of dissenting protestants their
implacable opposition to the scheme.\footnote{Ibid., 5 May 1836.}
Unfortunately he spoke for a group more vocal than organised, and more determined than strong.
The Australian School Society, the heartbeat of this opposition,
had remained an exclusively non-conformist body. To mend this and
bring in Church of England support, the protestant Dissenters
approached Broughton, a week or so after his return, to take over
the leadership and form a united protestant opposition to the Irish
scheme. 'This was certainly a determined step to take', he
reflected a month after the event in a letter to Keate, for he had
never hidden his disdain for the common cause English Dissenters
had made with radicals against the Established Church.\footnote{Broughton to Keate, 26 July 1836 (Ms. No.1731, A.N.L.)
for Broughton's opinion of Dissent in England, see Broughton
to Arthur, 27 July 1835 (Arthur Papers, vol.12, M.L.).}
But beside the peril from Rome all other squabbles paled. 'The danger
being I think not less close and obvious than it was in the reign
of James the Second', he continued on to Keate. 'I took, therefore,
the bold and perhaps hazardous resolution of setting myself at the
head of the "Protestant Association", as it was termed.\footnote{Broughton to Keate, 26 July 1836, and 1 May 1837
(Ms. No.1731, A.N.L.).}

This Association took on formal existence at a small meeting
of protestant leaders on 24 June in the Pultney Hotel, Sydney.
It drafted a manifesto of conscientious objection to any scheme
of education 'founded on the principle of interdicting, either wholly
or in part the use of the Holy Scriptures according to the Authorised Version, and of prayer in which the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity may be unequivocally acknowledged or implied.' The language belonged to Lang and he moulded the resolution to intercept the deism of Carmichael as much as the unbiblical tone of the Irish system. Broughton agreed with the sentiment, but made his distinctive contribution to the evening on a different level. The colony had not lacked indignation against the Irish scheme before his return, but was starved of the cunning that could tactically exploit the wealth of protestant sympathy available. With his disposition for organisation and eye for detail, Broughton stepped into the vacant niche reserved for a tactician. He proposed exploiting the existing indignation to arouse further indignation, and to overwhelm Bourke with concrete evidence of protestant disdain for his scheme in traditional colonial fashion, a petition. On the night of 24 June, when the committee dispersed, some had the task of enlisting the support of twenty leading laymen who might supply the initial funds needed to launch a campaign. Others, like Broughton,

47. 'Resolutions at a meeting of Protestants...held at Pultney Hotel, Sydney, on Friday, June 24, 1836', Additional Encl., Bourke to Glenelg, 8 August 1836, H.R.A., I.xviii. 472. The word 'interdict', which later caused a bitter debate, first appeared in a similar context in Colonist, 5 May 1836. It did not occur anywhere in Broughton's correspondence with the Colonial Office on the Irish system. Indeed Broughton tended always to argue that the villany of the Irish system was less in what it did outright from the beginning, and more in what it could be pushed to do in time.
were to apply their talent to the details of the attack. Lang in
the meantime was to return to his propaganda in the Colonist, and
soften the public with sweet suggestions that Glenelg had already
heard the cry of Protestants and had neither required nor recommended
the out-and-out establishment of the Irish system in a scheme of
National schools. 48

Three weeks later the committee, fattened with its twenty
laymen, returned and adopted a strategy. Twenty-five country sub-
committees were to be established to hawk the petition the length
and breadth of the settlement, and to gather in subscriptions at
ten shillings a head. An appeal went to all ministers of religion
to explain the meaning of the petition to their flocks, and to 'exhort
them to a hearty and prompt co-operation'. 49 As for the petition
itself, Broughton was unmistakably its author despite the novel turn
it took in attacking the mechanics rather than the principles of the
Irish scheme. The two central issues, mutilated scriptures and Roman
Catholic bias, received scant attention. Instead the petition flatly
asserted that the government's pre-occupation with economy would
frustrate its guarantee of one day's solid catechetical instruction
for every denomination each week. Broughton had raised this issue
with Glenelg the year before, but now for the first time thrust it
to the forefront in the colony. 50 Where there were thickly peopled

48. Colonist, 30 June 1836.
49. 'Resolutions of the Committee etc.', in Sydney Gazette,
19 and 28 July 1836.
50. Broughton to Glenelg, 22 May 1835, C.O. 201/250.
areas the scheme could work, the petition conceded, but even so, it would be no cheaper than a denominational scheme. In other areas it must prove equally as expensive as a denominational system, for there the government need provide not only teachers for general education but a religious instructor for every denomination in every school. 'If such religious instructors be not provided', the petition asserted, 'the system becomes not only futile but deceptive.'

To highlight this deception became the chief aim of the petition. In areas where a minister of religion did not reside in the neighbourhood of a school, the promised catechetical instruction would fall to the ordinary teacher, or languish. Who but a virtuous imbecile or a talented latitudinarian would consent to instruct a variety of denominations each in its own catechism? The scheme, if adopted, would send the government searching for a type of teacher whose 'want of fixed principles would be a chief recommendation for his appointment'. Such was the deal predicted of the Irish system. Against it the denominational schools offered a predictable and properly supervised course of general and religious education. Every signature added to its pages, the Petition concluded, would help ensure the continuation of those schools; for, as one newspaper had put it

51. Clause 3, 'To His Excellency Major-General Sir Richard Bourke etc...and the Honourable the Legislative Council assembled. The Petition of the undersigned Protestants of the Colony of New South Wales', V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.) 1836, p.535. (The page numbers used in reference to this and the other petition on education referred to in this Chapter are those of the Minutes and Papers of the Legislative Council from its inception to 1836 as reprinted in a single volume with consecutive page numbers. It is the volume most readily available at the A.N.L. and M.L.).
in those crucial days, Lord Glenelg required the Governor 'to consult and to respect the opinions of the public'.

Before the Committee dispersed it expressed its indebtedness to Broughton for his 'able and impartial' attention to the Association's business. He had transformed the protestant scene, and none realised/more bitterly than Bourke. The size of the opposition mounted so stealthily in six weeks stunned Bourke, and he found little reassurance in the lightness with which his friendly newspapers dismissed it. An 'uncalled for stir', the Sydney Gazette nonchantly remarked after the Association's second meeting, and added at modest length that the Governor's scheme was too obviously sensible to require defence. Bourke supplied the defect; 'I am writing minutes and circulars and endeavouring to remove prejudice by all possible means', he told his son. One means at his disposal was the magistracy in the pay of the Government. If Broughton could direct his clergy to disseminate the Association's propaganda, Bourke deemed it fair play for him to use the police magistrates for his.

52. Ibid., pp.534-5; see also Colonist, 30 June 1836.
55. Ibid.
56. Sydney Gazette, 19 July 1836. The Sydney Monitor, 10 August 1836 referred to Broughton's attempt 'to divide the colonists into two great parties, on a whimsical point of mere educational policy'. G. Nadel, Australia's Colonial Culture (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1957), p.194 suggests that Bourke received too little of the right type of support early in the campaign.
on 'an order issued from the Horse Guards', as the *Sydney Herald* liked to put it, the police magistrates learned that they must denounce as false that resolution of the Protestant Association which charged the Irish System with interdicting the free use of the whole Bible, and generally point out, to all who came under their sway, that the Protestant Association's general vilification of the scheme merely repeated the calumny heaped upon it earlier in Ireland, but without effect.

For a police magistrate like Major Lockyer, a member of the Association's sub-committee at Parramatta, the situation began to grow complex; as indeed it had for McLeay who was Broughton's chief spokesman within the Council Chamber but outside it found himself in the course of duty compelled to draft Bourke's denunciations of the Association's propaganda. Broughton found fresh complexities too. On the one hand, he saw Bourke suddenly manoeuvre to outflank the Association and have the Legislative Council vote on the Irish system before the petitions could be gathered. On the other, he found his and the Association's name increasingly entangled in the private politics of a party of settlers whose publicity organ was the *Sydney Herald*.

58. *Sydney Herald*, 1 September 1836.
61. Bourke to Glenelg, 8 August 1836 (separate and confidential), *H.R.A.*, I.xviii. 475. The circular referred to in footnote 60 was sent out in McLeay's name!
believing he had done nothing more than assist his church lay claim to a share in the government's subsidy for schools. The Australian School Society's petition to the Legislative Council early in June expressed that limited expectation, while those accustomed to reading a document sentence by sentence, but never as a whole, may have believed that the Protestant Association's own petition sought nothing more. Broughton aimed higher. He had left England prepared to settle for an annual grant of £1,000 for parochial schools, and if necessary was still prepared to accept that. But the agitation astir amongst protestants at the time of his return emboldened him to attempt more. If he could consolidate protestant opposition to a point where Glenelg's happy picture of a central Irish-like system with adjunct of denominational schools just did not fit the colonial scene, Bourke would be forced to abandon his scheme as the only self-respecting alternative to having the government schools in a minority and predominantly Roman Catholic. Once Bourke had abandoned his scheme fresh negotiations could begin from which Broughton could reasonably hope to reap more than a paltry £1,000 for Church of England schools. When he wrote into the petition that protestants wanted a 'proportionate share in the funds proposed to be expended on education', he meant to show, by the numbers on the petition,

62. 'To His Excellency Major-General Sir Richard Bourke etc...and the Honourable the Legislative Council. The Humble Petition of the Committee of the Australian School Society on the Principles of the British and Foreign School Society', 10 June 1836 (V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 1836, p.524.

63. W.G. Broughton, A Speech Delivered to the Committee of Protestants on Wednesday, August 3, 1836 (Sydney, 1836), p.20.
that this meant the lion's share, two-thirds.

The key to Broughton's tactic was numbers. Bourke foresaw this and for that reason decided to deprive Broughton of the opportunity of dramatically confronting the Legislative Council with his evidence. Rather than seek outright approval for a totally new system Bourke asked for only £3,000; and to get it, he put on the mask of a man wanting no more than a fair go. It was a small sum, he explained for 'exhibiting experimentally, by the establishment of one or two of these schools, the nature of the proposed system'. At the same time he allocated Broughton £3,150 for over thirty parochial schools. Either Bourke intended some heady experiment to give his schools an irresistible appeal, or he had unrevealed plans. It was the latter. With the money he ordered great quantities of text books; reckless quantities, it turned out, which the Colonial Office slashed. He began too, a recruiting drive for teachers abroad. He had no intention of merely demonstrating the system. The colony needed it for its own good, and he intended to see that it got it. The bitter divisions of Irish

64. 'Minute of His Excellency to the Legislative Council explanatory of the several heads of Expenditure, and of Ways and Means, as estimated for the year 1837', V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 5 July 1836; italics added.

65. 'Estimates of the Probable Expenses of the Schools Establishment forming a charge on the Treasury of New South Wales, for the year 1837', V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.) 1836.

66. Colonial Secretary to Barnard, 26 July 1836, and Minute of James Stephen attached, 19 December 1836, C.O. 201/256 (P.91); Sydney Gazette, 16 May 1837.

society, born in the churches, confirmed in the schools, and exposed in the administration of justice, would never be allowed to take root in New South Wales so long as he administered its affairs. Bourke's pressing need was for time to run out on the present Legislative Council. He had sounded out its members before it assembled and decided they would never agree to an out-and-out establishment of the Irish system. He even suspected the £3000 might not be approved: he knew nothing more would. Yet if it should be, he would contentedly await 'a future and better constituted Legislature' to vote the experiment into a system. That council was due the following year when another New South Wales Act would come into force. So Bourke's demure request for £3000 in 1836 formed part of a grander design which would only become apparent in 1837.

Broughton saw the danger of Bourke's tactic immediately. 'If, after a sufficient period of trial, the system should be proved to be attended with those pernicious effects which are anticipated from it', he wrote in a petition to the members of the Legislative Council, '...it will be too late for your Honourable Council to abandon the experiment.' Three days earlier on 22 July he had appealed, without

69. Blaxland to Bourke, 5 December 1835 (Bourke Papers, vol.11, M.L.).
70. Bourke to Richard Bourke jnr. 21 July 1836 (Bourke Papers, vol.6, M.L.).
success, for permission to address the Legislative Council in person before it voted on the £3,000. To acquit his conscience he turned his speech into a petition, and had it presented on the crucial day.

The petition skilfully assembled into one succinct statement the many different arguments of the scheme's opponents, and became, in effect, a charter of Protestant Rights. In it Broughton deliberately reversed the emphasis he put in the Association's petition, and unabashedly forced the sectarian issue to the forefront. He said of the scheme, that it was a raw deal for protestants, and that it contained no proposition protestants would have willingly initiated, and none, he hoped, that they would accept. But he went further. 'The direct tendency and necessary effect of that system, wheresoever introduced', he added pointing the finger for the first time in a public document, 'must be to consolidate a power, whose aim and object will be to dash the Bible out of the hands of the people, and to place it again under lock and key.' Broughton finally qualified a little for that title, 'the Cumberland of Australia', which the Sydney Monitor had been feverishly trying to bestow on him for some time.

The tag of 'Orangeism' pinned on Broughton carried overtones of political unseemliness. 'It is in the name of religion, indeed,
that Bishop Broughton erects the standard of the cross', the Sydney Monitor warned, '... but it is politics he is really engaged in.'  

The newspaper referred to the politics of a protestant ascendancy. Broughton admitted that the debate often turned sour and struck an excessively sectarian note, yet he reminded his critics that he and his companions were not discussing an abstract philosophic question in perfect security and calmness of mind, but were battling for rights where the losses would be heavy and permanent. 'If we have spoken strongly', he added absolving himself of blame, 'it is because we feel strongly.'  

And the strongest conviction in his treasury of opinions was that 'the essence of Christianity consists in its revealed doctrines'.  

To have properly equipped troops in his citadel guarding the true faith, for this and succeeding generation, he needed schools in which to train them in their duties.

In this struggle for schools there was no middle ground. Bourke had wedded the notion of uniformity to his idea of a National system. He decided it would be Irish throughout and not beholden to any of the modifications of the British and Foreign system, whose reports, contrary to Glenelg's expectation, he did

75. Sydney Monitor, 20 July 1836.  
76. Ibid.  
77. Ibid., 10 August 1836.  
79. Ibid., p.18.
not bother to table in the Legislative Council.  

He contrived to prevent the Irish System from being discussed by the Council, or by a committee of the Council, or any evidence taken or received from anyone hitherto engaged in education of any description. He revealed no syllabus. He preferred, he said, to leave that to be worked out by a Board after the scheme had received approval. He added that he would select the Board. It would contain three Anglicans, but none need be the bishop; two non-conformists, but that could be Carmichael and a deist friend, and not Lang; seven churchmen in all, and none need be a minister of religion. 'Education is the business of the State', Bourke proclaimed, and disported his dogma without compromise so as to create two camps, one for him and the other against him. Broughton pitched his tent in the latter. Beside him dwelled the Sydney Herald. It was inevitable that their fortunes should one day entangle.

82. V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 25 July 1836; 'To His Excellency Major-General Bourke etc... The Petition of the Undersigned members of the General Committee of Protestants in the Colony of New South Wales', 25 July 1836, ibid., 1836, pp.531-2; see also the third proposition of the Protest of Robert Campbell, Richard Jones, E.C. Close and H.H. Macarthur, ibid., 11 August 1836.
83. Sydney Herald, 18 August 1836.
84. Bourke to Glenelg, 8 August 1836, op.cit., p. 470.
86. Bourke to Richard Bourke jnr., 7 November 1835 (Bourke Papers, vol.6, M.L.).
The *Sydney Herald* started without a brief for Broughton. It regarded him as an unnecessary and expensive colonial functionary; and, as the paper belonged to Dissenters 'utterly opposed to any political alliance between the head of Church and the government', an intrusion into colonial administration. Its columns ignored his return and only nodded at his installation. A breakthrough for Broughton began around the end of June 1836 when the Wesleyan community addressed the Bishop as their leader in the critical struggle ahead to preserve 'the purity and undefiledness' of colonial religion. Thereafter the paper paid him increased attention, culminating in an announcement, in August 1836, that throughout the colony wealthy and intelligent laymen of all protestant denominations were turning to him 'not from blind obsequiousness, but from a conviction that his guidance is safe'. With the other major newspapers opposing him Broughton may have welcomed this support. Yet, at best, it turned out an uneasy marriage for propagating his ideas, and, at worst, a disastrous one for his reputation.

The *Sydney Herald* appeared to be a Tory paper because it was anti-Whig; in fact, it tried to be liberal in religion and *laissez-faire* in most things else. It represented a boorish class of settler preoccupied with flocks and herds, possessive of every penny it earned,

89. *Ibid.*, 1 August 1836.  
90. The *Australian* and *Sydney Monitor* remained in opposition to Broughton throughout the campaign. The *Sydney Gazette* made a *volte face* around September 1836 with a change in editors and the acquisition of shares by Richard Jones, see *Sydney Gazette*, 1 September 1836 and 23 February 1837.
and apt to believe that the entire resources of the colony arose from
the capital and intelligence of the protestant emigrant landholders. 91
Such men of substance found no difficulty educating their own children
in schools of their choice. They believed their employees received
wages adequate to enable them in turn to educate their children to an
appropriate level. Only the children of convicts, of the indolent
who would not work, or of the dissolute who wasted their earnings,
needed a gratuitous education. But by a law as old as Moses they
did not deserve it; it was then written that the sins of the fathers
were to be visited upon their children, and the Sydney Herald saw
no reason for declaring New South Wales a privileged exception. It
consigned the offspring of convicts to the mercy of the British
treasury; either the British Government educated them or they could
remain animals. The children of the free drunkard or wastrel might
receive, at the colony's expense, a charity education worth a few
mean pence, but nothing more; nothing so fantastic as an education
equal to that given a provident labourer's son, which was what Bourke's
general system seemed to aim at. The protestant emigrant landowners
who laboured to turn their capital to profit and parted with some
of the gain in wages to their employees intended to keep the rest,
and not have it go a second round patching up family budgets that
had failed to stretch to education. 92 So the Sydney Herald, speaking

91. See Sydney Herald, 4 July 1836. A slightly different appraisal
of the political colours of the Sydney Herald is found in
Michael Roe, Quest for Authority in Eastern Australia 1835-1851
92. Based on Sydney Herald, 6 June, 4 July, 1 August, and 13 October
1836. The argument in the text draws together the consistent
element in the newspaper's philosophy. The paper could, however,
in some issues relax its hard line, but usually managed to reassert
it.
for the emigrant landowning class denounced every system of general education as an 'iniquitous and impudent attempt to tax them ... for educating the children of all the profligate vagabonds, freed and fettered'.

Broughton received no comfort from the *Sydney Herald's* educational policy. He had more in common with Bourke. The Bishop and the Governor agreed on the need for a comprehensive system to educate the children of convicts and derelicts for the colony's sake. They disputed only the content and management of the schools. The *Sydney Herald's* argument, however, had many faces. Believing that Protestants dominated the emigrant land-owning class and Irish Catholics the slackers, it could swiftly transpose its economic argument into a religious one. In place of the cry that emigrant landholders were being plundered for convict purposes, it could complain that Protestants were being forced to pay for Catholic education, and of a type to which they conscientiously objected. Pressing the argument further, it could warn Protestants that having footed the bill for general education they could expect to witness the newly educated mass of Irish Catholics applying their mental skills to upsetting the 'essentially protestant' tone of the colony.

Beneath this concern for the colony's protestantism lurked an

94. *Ibid.* 4 July and 13 October 1836. In the early stages of its opposition to Bourke's policies on churches and education the *Sydney Herald* spoke of it as being opposed to the interests of the 'emigrant landholders' (e.g. *Sydney Herald*, 6 June 1836). By 1 August 1836 this had become the 'protestant emigrant landholders', and by 15 August the 'protestant emigrant colonists'.
95. *Sydney Herald*, 1 August 1836.
anxiety for the security of the social and economic ascendancy the emigrant landholders had won for themselves, and hoped to pass on to their children. So the *Sydney Herald* warned that Bourke's ideal of general education would 'give an ascendancy to the children of the present race of transported Irish papists, at the expense of the protestant landholders of this country'. A *laissez-faire* doctrine appealed to the *Sydney Herald* because it left the emigrant landowning class at the top of the ladder, and in possession of all the means for keeping itself there. Mass education was their enemy, and anyone opposed to it in its most threatening form (Bourke's Irish scheme) became their partner.

Broughton would have remained only a distant ally of the forces behind the *Sydney Herald* had their political arm, the Legislative Council, possessed the strength to defeat Bourke's proposal. Once hope had shifted to the petitions, where the free labourer's signature counted as much as his employer's, the *Sydney Herald* hid its economic and status interests under a verbiage of concern for the survival of protestantism. So the *Sydney Herald* talked of preserving the protestant ascendancy in New South Wales while Broughton spoke of building a citadel. Beside the *Sydney Herald*'s outrageous Orangeism Broughton's was mild, but because the newspaper identified itself with Broughton's cause, Broughton found himself identified with the newspaper's rhetoric. He did not attempt to dissociate himself from it. He could not lose by its tactics, though he could never embrace its

victory if that meant, as the newspaper seemed to imply, that when
the Irish system was downed the British and Foreign would replace it.98
Broughton had a goal of his own not to be identified with the policies
of either the Australian or Sydney Monitor on the one hand, or the
Sydney Herald on the other; and throughout the war of words he quietly
but persistently tried to make this clear.

The time eventually came in August 1836 for him to make this
clearer still. A section of the Protestant Association wanted to
move beyond their negative stand against the Irish system and
explore what Protestants might agree to accept as a workable alternative.99
They knew Broughton would not agree to the British and Foreign System,
but were loath to accept that his newly demonstrated capacity for
co-operation could not be pushed to some constructive end.1 On the
morning of 3 August, in the genteel environment of the Pultney Hotel's
saloon, Broughton dashed their hopes. He announced to the assembled
Protestant Committee the utter futility of his being party to any such
discussions; and instead, to the Committee's utter amazement, he issued
them each an invitation to join him in extending the parochial school
system. 'Although connected with the Church of England, they have
never been so constituted as to give well grounded umbrage to individuals
of other communions', he reminded them, adding for good measure a
promise to continue the policy of exempting non-Anglican children from
catechetical instruction.2

98. Ibid., 20 (16) June 1836.
1. Evidence of Reverend R. Mansfield, 1 July 1844, in 'Report from
   the Select Committee on Education', V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 1844,
   vol.2, pp.9-18.
2. Broughton, Speech to Committee of Protestants, pp.18 and 21.
His clergy had reported, universal satisfaction among parents who had used the schools over the years. He appealed to them to stand firm, and for others to join them on the ground that survival was to be better ensured by strengthening resistance at its strongest point. He appealed to them not as a stranger, but as the leader of that Church which had given them the Word of God in the native tongue. 'So long therefore as that Church stands', he addressed them, 'you never can want a bulwark within which all Protestant communions may find shelter when their title to enjoy the free use of the Bible is directly or indirectly threatened.'

Broughton’s bid for a super citadel fell on deaf ears. Nevertheless he leavened whatever disappointment he brought into the meeting with a lively bargain. Should any of those present wish to form a sub-committee of the Protestant Association and agree among themselves on a scheme of united education, provided they abided by the resolutions of the Association and taught no doctrine adverse to the Church of England, he would apply his influence to obtain for them a share in the public support.

The Dissenters in the Association refused Broughton leave to acquit himself so easily. The protestant position had deteriorated. A week before the Committee met on 3 August, Bourke had won his £3000 from the Legislative Council, and the Irish system was on its way.


6. V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 25 July 1836; Australia, 26 July 1836.
Outwitted in its tactic over the petition, the Association decided it must unite and compete against Bourke, or die. So on 12 August the Reverend John Saunders, a Baptist minister, replied to Broughton. Dissenters would never be gathered like chickens under the wings of the Church of England, he averred. Times had changed; though Dissenters without Anglicans had little pull in affairs, Saunders reminded Broughton that Anglicans without Dissenters had little more. The colony could have a protestant future, but never again an Anglican one. The root cause of the Bishop's exclusiveness, the Reverend Dissenter continued, was his exaggerated and false respect for the Church catechism. 'It sustains by far too exalted a position in the educational question', he lamented. 'It has been made the wicket to the school instead of the gate to the church.' He called upon the Association to affirm the unity the Bishop had repudiated, and to elect a sub-committee to draw up 'a general plan of protestant education' with reasonable concession to Anglicans. In the meantime he begged them pray that Broughton might learn that the mountains dividing him from others were molehills, and catch the spirit of unity.

With that decision the Protestant Association took a decisive turn away from Broughton. Instructing him, as did the Reverend Mr. Saunders, that error marred the catechism and little in doctrines separated Anglicans and Presbyterians, was not the way to his heart or his head. Broughton had told the Dissenters the limits of his

---

7. *Colonist*, 25 August 1836 (report of meeting of 12 August 1836.).
co-operation before forming the Association. He had seen Lang add in those same days, that it would be reasonable to expect Wesleyans to unite with the Church of England, and the others with the Presbyterians to form two sets of protestant schools. Broughton's speech on 3 August fell into line with this. The reward for this consistency was to find himself condemned as a stumbling block to a unity he had vowed never to attempt, and to discover among his companions a determination to appeal over his head to other Anglicans to join a scheme he would counsel them to oppose. Broughton did not come to the meeting of 12 August, nor to any other that followed it; and the Association's secretary, the Reverend Ralph Mansfield, was at a loss to know why.

The discord within the Protestant Association delighted Bourke. He felt only time stood between him and success once the Legislative Council had voted him the £3,000. 'The Bishop will I fear continue his hostility', he wrote to his son in the full flush of victory, 'but the plan will succeed at last.' Nothing would hasten success better than a split in the Association, and he dared to foresee it in events around 3 August. The Bishop has cast off the Dissenters, he told Glenelg, and the erstwhile champions of a denominational system, the Presbyterians, appeared interested in a general system, he confided to

13. Sydney Gazette, 16 August 1836.
his son; and to reassure himself added, that in many places petitioners were repenting of their precipitous opposition and were withdrawing their signatures from the petitions. Moreover, a breach had appeared in the phalanx of Broughton's clergy. The Church of England chaplain at Wollongong, Wilkinson, had appeared, spoken, and moved a motion in support of the Irish system.

Broughton did not feel that matters had drifted away from him. He accepted the decay of unity within the Protestant Association as an inevitable consequence of its having fulfilled the purpose for which it assembled, which was to state the grounds of protestant discontent, circulate a petition and literature on the subject, and to mobilise local committees. The success of the petition rested with these local committees and the pulpits. Broughton had firm reins on both. His clergy sat on fifteen of the twenty-five sub-committees and kept them active. There was evidence, too, of a sting in the words being dropped from pulpits. But they were not sufficient. Bourke's success with the Legislative Council had changed the nature of the contest. To Broughton, or anyone accepting Bourke's word at face value,

14. Bourke to Glenelg, 8 August 1836 (separate and confidential), H.R.A., I.xviii. 476; Bourke to Richard Bourke jnr., 21 August 1836 (Bourke Papers, vol.6, M.L.); Bourke to Glenelg, 8 August 1836, H.R.A., I.xviii. 469.
15. Australian, 9 August 1836; Sydney Gazette, 11 August 1836.
16. Broughton to Keate, 1 May 1837 (Ms. No.1731, A.N.L.).
17. 'Sub-Committees' of the Protestant Association, Additional Encl. Bourke to Glenelg, 8 August 1836, H.R.A., I.xviii. 473-4; Colonist, 22 September 1836.
18. Sydney Gazette, 2 August 1836; Sydney Monitor, 17, 21 and 28 September 1836; Bourke to Glenelg, 7 October 1836 (separate and confidential), H.R.A., I.xviii.566.
the £3,000 from the Legislative Council amounted to a publicity grant. To offset this and save the petitions, Broughton needed means for a sustained and widespread counter-propaganda. The Sydney Herald offered him this. So as Broughton's ties with the Protestant Association weakened his links with the Sydney Herald strengthened; and the tussle with Bourke, rather than being finished as some newspapers predicted, entered a second stage.19

Broughton had many arguments with which to sustain a prolonged opposition, but to be sure of upsetting Bourke's hopes he had to impugn the Reports of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland. They were Bourke's trump card, and he circulated extracts from them throughout the colony.20 They told a story of protestant-catholic concord and of a triumph over prejudice in a land torn by centuries of religious hatred. Broughton was certain from what he had heard in England, and learned through a correspondence with the Dean of Kildare, that serious strains had emerged in the scheme.21 But as the British Critic had ruefully to report, the evidence against the system was too shadowy to support a case in condemnation of it.22

19. Sydney Gazette, 28 July 1836; Sydney Herald, 1 August 1836.
Attacks continued in the House of Commons but came to naught.\(^{23}\) Broughton analysed the Irish Commissioners' report for 1835 for himself, and concluded that since twelve Roman Catholics accepted aid for every one Protestant, Roman Catholics must regard the scheme as a good deal for their religion whilst Protestants both feared and rejected it.\(^{24}\) Yet the Irish Commissioners reported the presence of a 'perfect harmony' among all who participated in the scheme from the highest to the lowest level. They could even boast of having produced an acceptable book of scripture readings painstakingly worded to avoid echoes of either the Authorised or Douay versions.\(^{25}\) It had taken ten years to compile;\(^{26}\) and to some, like Broughton, that was as much a sign that things were not going smoothly as it was to others that all was going well. Yet whenever Broughton grasped at these shadowy signs of disharmony to publicly condemn the scheme, Bourke simply stood against him the testimony of Archbishop Whately, Lord Stanley, and, to run the matter home, 'a large body of Protestant Divines, Episcopal and Presbyterian, inferior to none in piety, learning and morals'.\(^{27}\) Broughton refused to wither before such betters. He never wavered in his conviction that the scheme was running off the


\(^{24}\) Broughton to Marsden, 25 September 1835 (Marsden Papers, vol.1, M.L.).

\(^{25}\) 'Extracts from the Second Report of Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, for the year ending 31 March, 1835', V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 1836, pp. 519-21.

\(^{26}\) The drama of the struggle over the scripture readings is seen in essence in 'Ninth Report of Commissioners of Irish Education Enquiry', P.P., 1826-27, xiii, (510), 1009-26.

\(^{27}\) 'A Minute explanatory of the System of the proposed National Schools', V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 22 July 1836, and document, ibid., 1836, p. 531.
rails, and in 1836 lived in hope of events which would prove him right. 28

They came. The British Critic in April 1836 could finally report that the Irish Catholic clergy had the National schools 'nearly under their exclusive management', 29 and the proof had been assembled in a speech the Bishop of Exeter, Dr. Philpotts, delivered to the House of Lords in March. 30 Philpotts had set his 'desperate and dreadful countenance' against the Irish system from the beginning, and took hold of the Commissioners Report for 1835, checked its statistics, and denounced it as a 'very disgusting fraud'. Of the 140 protestant clergy who had reputedly requested aid in 1834 only 40 were bona fide clergy of the Church of Ireland he said. Some had been dead many years, others had been defrocked, and a few were visitors enjoying a quiet holiday. There were twenty-four officially listed monastery schools, and they received more aid than all the Episcopal Schools together, Philpotts added. For good measure he named nine others the Commissioners had overlooked. He knew of National schools, he said, with an altar in the classroom and a Mass in the curriculum; he knew of others with scripture books so clean as never to have been opened, and of others still with a text for general reading stating that 'the worship of God in the Protestant Church is rejected by Him as impious and sacreligious'. 31 After Philpotts had put all this before the

House of Lords, he put it in a pamphlet which, in turn, provided copy for many issues of the *Sydney Herald*.\(^{32}\)

This anti-Catholic trend in the campaign both disgusted and vexed Bourke. It gave Broughton a staying power the Governor had not anticipated, and 'the good sense of the community' rather than snuffing out the Bishop's bigotry seemed to be basking in his intolerance.\(^{33}\) In his anger Bourke turned on Glenelg. Either the Secretary of State had irresponsibly approved at one and the same time a scheme of education and a bishop to upset it, or Broughton had exceeded the permissible limits of dissent.\(^{34}\) The Governor suspected the latter; and for good measure told Glenelg how the Bishop had winked at his clergy inviting convicts to sign a petition of no confidence in the Legislative Council.\(^{35}\) Bourke, of course, had none either, but that was beside the point. In October 1836 Bourke clutched at any straw to pin political sins on Broughton. He wanted the Bishop off the Legislative Council, off the Executive Council, and if possible, out of the country. 'It is peculiarly unfortunate for the cause of education', Bourke bluntly told Glenelg, 'that a prelate of Dr. Broughton's exclusive principles should hold a distinguished and

\(^{32}\) *Sydney Herald*, 25 August 1836, and *Sydney Herald Supplement*, 19 September and 20 October 1836. The *Sydney Herald* also published in regular instalments from 25 August to the end of the year, excerpts from W.D. Killen, *The Bible, versus the Board - the Priest - and the Court of Chancery; or, the Working of the New System of National Education as exemplified in the History of Ballyholey School, in the Parish of Raphoe, County of Donegal* (Belfast, 1835).


\(^{34}\) Bourke to Glenelg, 8 August 1836 (separate and confidential), *H.R.A.*, I.xviii. 474-6.

\(^{35}\) Broughton to Bourke, 4 October 1836, Encl. No. 3, in Bourke to Glenelg, 7 October 1836, *H.R.A.*, I.xviii. 569-70.
influential place in the colony.\(^{36}\) The *Sydney Monitor* supported this and called for Broughton's immediate removal from the colony.\(^{37}\) 'A dumb dolly of a trader, like Archdeacon Scott', it confessed with a lump in its throat, 'would have been a far safer shepherd.'\(^{38}\)

The *Sydney Herald* denied that Broughton's removal would make any difference. 'We think we have quite as much influence in this matter as the Right Reverend Prelate', the paper's editor insisted.\(^{39}\) Bourke differed. He blamed Broughton for arousing the madness in the land.\(^{40}\) 'If so', Broughton replied, 'I possess an influence much more powerful than I was ever conscious of, or ever aspired to.'\(^{41}\) Non-conformity had for some time abandoned the habit of acting at a Bishop's bidding unless it was equally determined to act without it. They had joined him in shouting down the Irish system, Broughton said, because they had already decided to shout it down whether he shouted or not.\(^{42}\) And the pages of the *Colonist* for May 1836 bore this out, for they contained almost every argument produced in the debate whilst Broughton was still on the high seas. The Bishop's character and rank assisted the cause, the *Sydney Herald* admitted, but 'though he may be looked upon as the leader of the oppositionists, the latter would have deputed some other to that post, even had his lordship joined the ranks of the liberals.'\(^{43}\)

42. *Ibid.*
43. *Sydney Herald*, 20 October 1836; also *Colonist*, 11 August 1836.
To some the contest was a question of creed, to some a question of power; others joined to protect the rights of protestants, others the rights of emigrants, others still the privileges of landowners. A medley of concerns for acres, pounds, and Bibles, converged to raise up the opposition of 1836 which some directed against education, some against taxes, and some against the Governor. Broughton represented one stream of this, no more. The campaign which singled him out for extreme culpability smacked of the tactic of 'low political faction'. Yet Bourke could not rest while he remained a potential member of the Legislative Council. He still hoped to commit his scheme to the Council in 1837. He had won eight to four in July on the vote for £3,000, but one Tory opponent had not voted, so the balance of strength was eight to five. If Broughton joined the Council he would make it eight to six and that was too narrow a margin to entrust to the Bishop's rhetoric. He was 'a dangerous man to be allowed to retain political power', and the Governor and the Governor's newspapers were determined to strip him of it whatever Glenelg's earlier promises.

Broughton could draw greater comfort from the trends of late 1836 than the Governor. The disintegration of protestant opposition, which Bourke had confidently forecast in July and August 1836, did

44. *Sydney Herald*, 6 October 1836; also *Colonist*, 11 August 1836 ('A Protestant' to editor).
45. E.C. Close, who had earlier protested against the appropriation of £3,000 for National schools, was absent when the vote took place; *V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.)*, 11 August 1836.
46. *Sydney Monitor*, 17 September 1836; see also *Colonist*, 29 September 1836.
not eventuate. 47 Broughton artfully concealed his variances with the non-conformity to prevent their being exploited. Mansfield, the Protestant Association's secretary, confessed to not quite knowing where the Bishop stood throughout this period, 48 while the Sydney Monitor actually credited him with the authorship of the plan for general protestant education from which he had expressly disassociated himself. 49 The Dissenters, contrary to Bourke's expectation, reaffirmed their opposition to the Irish system whether Broughton joined them in the search for an alternative or not. 50 The expected Presbyterian capitulation was arrested, if indeed it was ever likely, by the Scottish and Ulster's Synod's ultimate condemnation of it. 51 No breach appeared among Broughton's clergy. Wilkinson acted alone; out of character for he held highchurch principles, and out of spite towards a Bishop who had restored him to his chaplaincy without ever offering him friendship or hospitality. 52 The religious bodies remained firm, being united less to one another than individually devoted to the principle of preserving the Scripture intact as the foundation of education.

47. Bourke to Richard Bourke jnr., 28 July and 21 August 1836 (Bourke Papers, vol.6, M.L.).
49. Sydney Monitor, 28 September 1836. This edition of the newspaper shows the editor as ignorant of the differing aims of the National Society and the British and Foreign School Society, and highlights the claim that the struggle over national schools was, for many, a political struggle quite divorced from the debate on the principles of education.
50. Colonist, 25 August 1836 (Saunders's speech); Australian, 17 January 1837 (Wesleyan meeting).
The passage of time, which Bourke believed would expose the misrepresentations of his enemies and undo their cause, served instead to exhibit the imprudence of his own campaign. Why, it began to be asked, did Bourke exclude Broughton from the Legislative Council? Dismiss the petitions? Decline the Council all opportunity to discuss the scheme? It did not escape note either that on the day the Governor dismissed a request for a committee of enquiry into education he approved another to investigate designs for a new Government House. Did the arrangement of drains and windows in the official residence deserve more loving attention than the system that was to nurture countless young for years to come? Had not Glenelg advised the Governor to consult the Council? Did not he expect the system to have popular support? Why such indecent haste, and so arbitrary and narrow an interpretation of Glenelg's despatch? it was asked. Why did the papists applaud? asked a more sinister voice. Was the Governor a secret papist? Indeed he was, replied Marsden. He had openly avowed that faith, added the

55. *Sydney Herald*, 12 September and 10 October 1836.
59. *Ibid.*, 10 October 1836 ('Ideal Minute').
62. Marsden to Coates, 18 February and 26 April 1838 (*Bonwick Transcripts*, Missionary, Box.54, vol. 6, M.L.).
Sydney Gazette, until it impeded his promotion. Whether he was or not the fact seemed to emerge that Bourke feared to consult the people lest he should learn that they despised his scheme. On that the Sydney Herald rested its case at the close of 1836.

As suspicion encrusted his motives, Bourke witnessed the failure of 'the people' to come to his rescue. He had intended to ride out the storm calmly planting an experimental school here and there whenever the local residents voted for it. Wollongong asked first, early in August, but blotted its record. The tale spread that it was requested by a picked meeting of childless couples. Two months passed before a second request came from Yass. No others followed. 'We gave the said "system" such a decisive blow', Broughton boasted, '...it was evident it could not be carried into effect'. Bourke certainly found little opportunity to demonstrate the style of the system.

The truly decisive blow, however, came from Bourke himself. On 29 August Glenelg advised the Governor that, in view of the wealth of suggestions he, as Governor, had put forward for a new New South Wales Act, the Colonial Office had decided to withdraw the Bill prepared for the current sitting of Parliament and to extend the present Act another year to allow time for a full consideration of the

63. Sydney Gazette, 31 January 1837; see also Sydney Monitor, 25 January 1837.
64. Sydney Herald Supplement, 26 December 1836.
65. Sydney Herald, 11 and 15 August 1836; Colonist, 18 August 1836.
66. Sydney Gazette, 29 September 1836; Bourke to Glenelg, 7 October 1836, H.R.A., I.xviii. 5666.
67. Broughton to Keate, 1 May 1837 (Ms. No.1731, A.N.L.).
matters raised. In 1837 Bourke would have the same Legislative Council as at present, and little prospect of passing an education Bill.68

The campaign took its toll of Broughton's strength. He found the constant opposition, he told Keate, 'harassing and painful to me whose genius and inclination certainly do not point that way'. An acute housing shortage in Sydney added other strains. Broughton had found himself condemned to the Pultney Hotel for three months after his return, and he chafed at the confinement and expense. He had contemplated moving to Parramatta when A.B. Spark, a Sydney merchant, fell into financial difficulties over a house he was building on a high rise between Woolloomooloo and Rushcutters Bay, and offered it to the Bishop as it was, builders' rubbish and all, for £250 a year with the first two years' rent going into improvements. Broughton accepted. The rent outraged him, and the unfinished state of the building left it without pantry, cellar, or water pump; besides, he said, every chimney smoked. It was no Fulham, Auckland or Farnham, and more like a huge stone workhouse than a cockney's suburban villa, he noted for his English friends. So long as he looked out to sea everything was fine, but once he lowered his eyes to the shoreline, he saw only a dotting of snug white villas in 'marvellous bad taste', monotonous bush, and the Right Reverend J.B. Polding, Bishop of Hiero-Caesarea in partibus infidelium, holding court in his predecessor's residence. Broughton had rested there seven years before after

69. Broughton to Keate, 1 May 1837, op.cit.
completing his first journey from England; and he remembered it as a more spacious, more comfortable, and more fitting residence for a bishop than the one he had just occupied. 70

70. Based on Broughton to Coleridge, 26 July 1836 (Ms. No.1731, A.N.L.); Broughton to Coleridge, 19 October 1837 (Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.); Whittington, Broughton, p.82; A.B.Sparke, Diary Vol.I.1836-1843, 17 August 1836 (Ms. No.A4869, M.L.); T.L. Suttor, Hierarchy and Democracy in Australia 1788-1870 (Melbourne, 1965), p.30.
In the present temper of the world I cannot hope to roll the stone uphill again so far as to recover possession of all that we were unjustly deprived of, and therefore as an act of prudence I confined myself to petitioning for an equitable measure of support.

Broughton to Coleridge, 25 February 1839.
The onward march of Roman Catholicism robbed Broughton of any peace. The defeat of the Irish system checked papist advances in one direction, and Broughton entered 1837 determined to carry that advantage on other fronts. From early in November 1836 to mid-February 1837 he toured most of the settled counties around Sydney assessing the state of his diocese. He decided it had turned the corner to prosperity. The people had changed remarkably: their stinginess had vanished; brick and mortar had caught their imagination; and forty projects were about to go on the map. Most were churches and chapels, a few parsonages, and three modest new boarding schools. Bourke's decision to retain the old system of paying for the upkeep of the parochial schools relieved Broughton of any immediate need to divert funds to education, and he consequently threw everything into a drive for churches aware that every new building earned him the right to claim another government paid minister. In a second round of building he hoped to give every priest his parish school. Then the Church of England would be armed to defend the truth with a self-contained citadel in every district.¹ Many shared his vision and effort. 'This colony', he proudly reported to England, '...is not inferior to any British settlement in sincerity of attachment to the Church of England, or in active effort or liberal contribution, for its maintenance and extension.'²


2. Broughton to Campbell, 21 July 1837 (S.P.G. Papers, op.cit.).
England's job was to supply him with men. He believed that under existing provisions he qualified for fifteen; and he wanted university men, he said, sharp in wit and 'sufficiently masters of the subject of controversy' to turn to naught the doubts and difficulties raised by papal intrigue. They must also be able to remain obliging under criticism, accept self-denial, withstand bodily fatigue, and manage on £150 a year with only uncertain extras. A prudent man with a prudent wife can do a lot on £150 in the colony, he assured the S.P.G.; a bewildering confession from the lips of one accustomed to complaining that £2,000 a year forced him into economies unbefitting his office. But he agreed that a truly ample reward must await the return of the Chief Shepherd.

These new chaplains would be a race of novices, for Broughton could not expect beneficed clergy in England to surrender their security for what the colony offered. Simeon had found the spirit of sacrifice dead at Cambridge, but at Oxford Broughton saw a brighter light. Newman and his companions were nurturing the art of controversy he needed in New South Wales, and dealing in those principles of

3. Broughton to Sir George Grey, 18 June 1836, C.O. 201/257; Broughton to Bourke, 26 November 1836, Encl. in Bourke to Glenelg, 29 November 1836, H.R.A., I.xviii. 603-4; Broughton to Bourke, 1 June 1837 (Correspondence from W.G. Broughton, Ms. No. Ab 29/6a, M.L.); Broughton to Campbell, 21 July 1837 (S.P.G. Papers, op. cit.).
4. Broughton to Coleridge, 19 October 1837 (Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.); Broughton to Campbell, 17 June 1836 (S.P.G. Papers, op. cit.).
5. Ibid.; Broughton to Campbell, 18 June 1836 (private), (S.P.G. Papers, op.cit.); Broughton to Coleridge, 8 September 1837 (Broughton Papers, m/f., A.N.L.).
ecclesiastical authority and doctrine which touched at the heart of his contest with the Papists and with those who would sink all differences with other Protestants. 'It is among the young men brought up in their principles', he told Coleridge, whose brother-in-law the Reverend J. Chapman was in the thick of it at Balliol College, 'that I should expect to find the temperate ardour which appears to me the first requisite for a man's doing his duty well, and finding his chief support and reward in doing it.'

Late in 1836 and unbeknown to him, Coleridge, honouring a pledge not to see the Bishop go needy, had launched an appeal for the new diocese among his and the Bishop's friends. By march 1837 he looked like raising £3,000. Broughton was overwhelmed; and flatteringly accepted each contribution as a measure of the donor's esteem for him personally. For that reason Darling's £10 struck him as mean. The General alone among the contributors owed him a personal debt for the consistent and disinterested support he had received in the colony, Broughton told Coleridge. But there was a heartening surprise recorded in the gifts from Oxford. Young men from Balliol, Christchurch, Exeter, Merton, Oriel, Trinity and other colleges had all chipped in. And there, too, was the name of Dr. Pusey, Newman's collaborator. Surely Broughton could snare some of their students.

7. Broughton to Coleridge, 19 October 1837 (Broughton Papers, A.N.L.).
8. Broughton to Coleridge, 26 July 1836 (Ms. No. 1731, A.N.L.); Broughton to Coleridge, 19 October 1837, op. cit.; 'An Appeal to the Friends of the Church of England in Behalf of their Brethren in Australia', in Report of Diocesan Committee 1837, pp. 80-93.
The money from Coleridge came over and above the gifts of the S.P.G. and the S.P.C.K., and went unfettered into the Bishop's hands. Being extra money Broughton believed it could be best used by being preserved. If he invested the £3,000 in land and cattle and carefully reinvested the profits for a decade, the current boom conditions could almost create a miniature Queen Anne's Bounty 'to serve as a foundation of a secure and independent provision for the clergy for ever'. This would release the diocese from the insecurity of a voluntary system and the stultifying effect of the Church Act which, Broughton maintained, condemned him to building a diocese out of low paid parochial clergy. 'A mere parochial clergy', he protested 'will not suffice'. He would have no priest anxious for his bread; on the other hand he wanted to create zeal through the expectation of rewards, and to attract a few men of exceptional talent he needed funds to create for them the leisure profitable for scholarship. 'I am not so unworldly in my views as to assume that the cause of Christian truth cannot be supported without endowments', he apologised lest his enthusiasm for real estate should seem misplaced, 'but neither am I on the other hand so visionary as to expect that if we neglect all measures of worldly prudence and foresight, miracles will be wrought.'

9. Broughton to Campbell, 8 September 1837 (S.P.G. Papers, op.cit.); see also Broughton to Campbell, 22 February 1837, ibid.
10. Broughton to Coleridge, 19 October 1837 (Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
12. Broughton to Coleridge, 8 September 1837, ibid.
Providence seemed to support this. Broughton had often rested overnight at Moore-Bank, a lush 4,000 acre property near Liverpool with a beautiful serpentine view of the river meandering towards the town. The owner, Mr. Thomas Moore, had an humble origin, and his wife, once a prisoner of the crown, a fairly disreputable one. People whispered about her, but Broughton ever found her kind and inoffensive. 'I never thought it necessary to go back into former histories', he explained, 'not always a pleasant enquiry even in the best of places; and here peculiarly ticklish and dangerous.' The Moores were citizens who had overcome their beginnings and Broughton counted them his friends. One day early in 1837, feeling the call of his three score years and ten, Moore spoke to Broughton of the manna from heaven which had enriched his pocket and of a desire to render a portion back to the Almighty source of it all.14

Encouraged by what he had received and what he might expect, Broughton pushed forward plans to build a new church in Sydney sufficiently pretentious in its architectural dimensions to rival the Roman Catholic structure by Hyde Park. 'Without such a stronghold of faith we cannot keep our position', he told Coleridge.15 The edifice was to seat 1800, have a nave like St. Mary's, Oxford, and a tower like the one he had seen at Magdalen College.16 The S.P.G. agreed to aid the project, and Broughton was prepared to make one exception and

15. Broughton to Coleridge, 26 July 1836 and 19 October 1837 (Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
take £500 from Coleridge's funds for it.¹⁷ The local people showed considerable interest, and the government added its maximum £1,000 subsidy.¹⁸ To place the new church in a more advantageous setting Broughton offered £800 from his own salary to have Macquarie's foundations shifted. Bourke saved him the expense for he, too, wanted the foundations moved.¹⁹ This was done by April 1837, and all was set to re-lay a foundation stone on 'the sixteenth day of May in the year of human redemption 1837'; and around it would arise the Cathedral Church of St. Andrew's.²⁰

Broughton intended the day to be a grand protestant festival. Bourke agreed to perform the ceremony at the George Street site after Broughton, and those inclined that way, had been to church further up the hill at St. James.²¹ In a last minute switch of plans Bourke joined the 'numerous and highly respectable congregation' for Divine Service at 11 a.m., and endured the sound of Broughton extolling Macquarie as a builder of churches. Then came the protestant parade. Bourke's carriage led it off, Broughton's followed, and after that rode the officials of the land; then came the gentry, and then the others, some riding, some walking, and at the rear six hundred parish school children marched along with bright banners flapping against a

¹⁷. Broughton to Campbell, 2 June 1835 ('Bishop Broughton's Letters 1834-1843', 'C' Mss. Aust. Papers, Box 12, S.P.G. Papers, m/f, A.N.L.); Broughton to Coleridge, 19 October 1837, op.cit.
¹⁸. Sydney Herald, 18 May 1837.
¹⁹. Broughton to Bourke, 13 February 1837 (Correspondence from W.G. Broughton Ms. No. Ab 29/6a, M.L.).
threatening grey sky. The exhibition would long remain a memorable sight, the *Sydney Gazette* reported. Then after Bourke had placed the foundation stone in the right spot, Broughton ordered the children back to St. James' school room, where with squirarchical magnanimity he had them filled with roast beef and plum pudding. The Governor looked in on the scene and smiled; Broughton did the same and received three gravy filled cheers, which convinced him that he had that day glimpsed the true order of things. 22

Broughton staged this display against a background of seasoned anti-catholic hostility. For a year the *Sydney Herald* had sustained a propaganda against all things Irish and popish, demonstrating in extracts from American and English sources that the strife of Ireland had been transplanted to American soil, and would come with increased Irish immigration to New South Wales unless deliberately checked. 23 Occasionally it stooped lower, 24 but rarely as low as the *Sydney Gazette* which, being in need of some ruse to help shore up sagging sales, threatened the exposure of debauched priests in and around Sydney. Broughton disavowed these excesses. 25 'Our present discussions bring us unavoidably much into contest with the religious principles of the Roman Catholics', he reminded his fellow Protestants, and begged them 'be careful not to extend it to them as persons or individuals.' 26

Broughton restrained the language of his contest with Rome, but not his determination to proceed with it. He had aired his doctrinal quarrel with popery in the pamphlet of 1833, and the procession of May 1837 was another gesture in that direction. But it was more. In 1837 Broughton's greater preoccupation was with Rome's political pretensions. He believed that by the very tenets of its faith popery must seek domination. In England he convinced himself that the formidable but 'inherently wicked and mischievous' order of Jesuits had set its sight on the recovery of the English race. So the parade of May 1837 became a demonstration of protestant determination to resist Rome's designs on New South Wales. And for Broughton there was no more satisfying adjunct to the day's proceedings than an announcement in the press that His Majesty's Government had restored him his seat in the Legislative Council. That forum had lost most of its usefulness to him as a Church of England leader, but as a protestant and a citizen it remained a useful means for monitoring and checking the growth of undesirable political influences in the colony.

Polding bided his time before striking back at the growing pretensions of protestantism. Broughton might parade up and down King Street in lawn sleeves and appropriate the Governor's services for ecclesiastical ceremonies, but as Polding understood matters, His Majesty by allowing the Church Act had put all religious denominations

---

in New South Wales on a 'footing of perfect equality'.

31. Bourke to Broughton, 3 June 1837 (private), (Correspondence from W.G. Broughton, Ms. No. Ab 29/6b, M.L.); Sydney Herald, 1 June 1837; Sydney Gazette, 29 April 1837.
32. Broughton to Bourke, 30 May 1837, Sub-encl in Gipps to Normanby, 29 July 1839, op.cit., pp.266-7; Broughton to Bourke, 1 June 1837 (Correspondence from W.G. Broughton, Ms. No. Ab 29/6a, M.L.).
protocol at Dublin and London remained unaltered.\textsuperscript{33} When Polding heard of this he lectured Bourke on the varieties of episcopal dress, and declined to concede that a purple soutane could be designated as in any way the distinctive dress of a Bishop of Rome. He wore episcopal vestments only in church.\textsuperscript{34} Nevertheless a purple soutane was not the dress of an ordinary citizen, and Broughton's point was that officially Polding was no more. He was an officer of a foreign potentate with jurisdiction in the Turkish Kingdom happily filling in time in New South Wales while he awaited the liberation of his Diocese of Hiero-Caesarea. It was the fiction by which Roman Catholic prelates had crept into the King's dominions, and Broughton was determined to do his part to make them live by that fiction.

The secret of Rome's re-entry into British public life had been her successful exploitation of mild concessions. Only in retrospect, Broughton maintained, could it be observed how one seemingly inoffensive concession had been piled on to another to release in time a viper in the very heart of protestant England.\textsuperscript{35} Polding had come to care for the convicts and their descendants, and subdue the rancour among the papist clergy. No more innocent and laudable a task could have befallen anyone, and he prospered in both. He prospered so well as to be ready on the 29 May to push his commission a little further. He chose a most innocent guise, an hour or two abroad in public in unaccustomed attire. What man could make a public issue of that and

\textsuperscript{33} Bourke to Broughton, 3 June 1837 (private), \textit{op.cit.}

\textsuperscript{34} Polding to Gipps, 2 July 1839, \textit{op.cit.}, p.268.

escape ridicule? On the other hand, if it did misfire it could be passed off as a sartorial slip. 36 Broughton had no doubt that Polding intended giving the constitutional restrictions on papal prelates a nudge to see how far they could be defied thousands of miles from London. He did not doubt that if it was passed over another would follow. 37 So Broughton, braving the ridicule of those who would see it only as a puerile quibble over clothes, told Bourke to nudge Polding back into his place or be prepared to have the matter raised in the House of Commons by his good friend Sir Robert Inglis. 38

Bourke thought Broughton's threat impertinent. 39 Broughton offered no apology. 40 Indeed Broughton had grown a little tired of Bourke's touchiness. 'Like all Whigs he is pertinacious and vengeful when thwarted', the Bishop told Keate. 'His object has been to take opportunity of behaving to me in a way which is certainly not usual towards a bishop of any church.' 41 On one occasion Broughton had found himself invited to rest overnight, after an official function, at Government House Parramatta, and then of being forced to spend the evening talking to Sir John Jamison, the Governor's most recent nominee

36. This, of course, was Polding's retreat; see Polding to Gipps, 2 July 1839, op.cit., p.268.
37. Broughton to Coleridge, 13 September 1839 (Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.); see also, Broughton to Coleridge, 25 February 1839, ibid.
38. Broughton to Bourke, 5 June 1837 (Correspondence from W.G. Broughton, Ms. No. Ab 29/6a, M.L.).
39. Bourke to Broughton, 3 June 1837 (private), (Correspondence from W.G. Broughton, Ms. No. Ab 29/6b, M.L.).
40. Broughton to Bourke, 5 June 1837, op.cit.
41. Broughton to Keate, 1 May 1837, (Ms. No. 1731, A.N.L.). Many believed Bourke was conducting a vendetta against Mansfield for his part in the Protestant Association, see Colonist, 13 October 1836, and Bourke to Glenelg, 8 August 1836 (private), H.R.A., I.xviii. 475.
to the Legislative Council. Doing official business with Sir John was one thing, drinking port with an unrepentant womaniser was another. The Governor had every right to expect the first, Broughton admitted, and no right to trap the Bishop into the other. Yet the Governor could do much worse, and was working underhand to pluck the brightest jewel from the Bishop's crown, the King's School, Parramatta, and have it placed in the hands of independent trustees.

Despite some ups and downs like these, Broughton felt he had good reason to celebrate the achievements of his first year in episcopal office; and he gave a dinner for the Diocesan Committee at the Pultney Hotel. There on 20 June 1837 toasts were raised to £13,000 in cash, to a crop of new churches, chapels, and parsonages, to the preservation of the parish school system, to the return of their reverend chairman to the Legislative Council, and to the pleasure of having organised the largest outdoor gathering many could ever recall. Even the *Sydney Monitor* conceded with a bitter grudge that the 'Pultney Hotel Conspiracy' had triumphed. But Broughton rode the crest of his success that evening, and it was to be short lived; for while the warm glow of achievement lingered Broughton received a chilling message from London that chaplains were not to be found for

---

42. Broughton to Bourke, 24 September 1837 (*Correspondence from W.G. Broughton*, Ms. No. Ab 29/6a). Others found Jamison's presence at Government House socially objectionable, see Bourke to Jamison, 19 July 1834, and Jamison to Bourke, 19 and 20 July 1834 (*Bourke Papers*, vol.11, M.L.).
43. Broughton to Coleridge, 26 July 1836 (Ms. No. 1731, A.N.L.).
£150 a year. Without them he realised his affectionately toasted buildings would remain useless shells.

The Bishop panicked. He understood the trouble was as much with the insecurity of the £150 stipend as its smallness. No Englishman who had lived for any time within earshot of the wagging tongues of the Whigs and Radicals would, in his right frame of mind, entrust his future to a stipend dependent on government goodwill. And yet that was asked of all who came to serve in New South Wales. The Bishop of London believed he could recruit men if they were ordained to a title worth a minimum of £150, but Glenelg declared that out of the question. The initiative in paying salaries must remain exclusively with the local government. So Broughton tasted the firstfruit of the drift towards the voluntary principle. He cursed it; and yet it was as he had anticipated.

Broughton rallied the Diocesan Committee and they undertook to guarantee the £150 and no one asked how they would do it. He begged the S.P.G. to put a little icing on the cake. He said he was desperate. He said he had sixteen clergy, four worn out and four others as capable of as much harm as good. His situation in Sydney had

47. Minute attached to Bishop of London to Sir George Grey, 12 December 1836, op.cit.
48. Broughton to Campbell, 1 August 1837 (S.P.G. Papers, op.cit.).
50. Broughton to Coleridge, 19 October 1837 (Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
become so desperate that he was taking weekly Sunday services, and faced the prospect of doing some of the regular parish visiting.\textsuperscript{51} He had no secretarial help.\textsuperscript{52} The two C.M.S. missionaries detained on their way to New Zealand had not brought the relief expected. One, the Reverend William Yate a young blade who had cut a dashing figure in and out of the pulpit at St. James, had to be spirited away under clouds of suspicion, leaving Broughton a legacy of public criticism for refusing to divulge the young man's misdemeanours.\textsuperscript{53} Marsden had to go off to New Zealand to repair the damage the young Yate had done there, and left Broughton with the task of supplying the services at Parramatta.\textsuperscript{54} The other missionary, the Reverend Richard Taylor, a quite solid scholar with whom Broughton delighted to converse was willing to help out here and there and now and then, but had a compulsion to wander off and explore the colony.\textsuperscript{55}

Under these pressures Broughton often wondered which would expire first, his frame from overwork or his job for want of clergy to govern.\textsuperscript{56} But deep down the burden of work did not oppress him unduly,
so long as he could entertain a hope of relief. He had struck an impediment, and without underestimating its stubbornness, he refused to believe that a cause as good as his would not succeed. In his troubled moments he could always return to Canterbury Cathedral and to what he had said there about the church being 'most properly represented by images and comparisons which depict a struggle'. So he decided in the midst of his disappointment to adopt as the motto of his episcopate, 'perplexed but not in despair'.

The one venture Broughton despaired of accomplishing was a promised early visitation to Van Diemen's Land. Affairs had not gone well there. Polding had paid a triumphant visit and scored £1,500 from the government for a church at Hobart, and was arousing the inhabitants to ask for another £700 for Richmond. Roman Catholics who used to attend the Established Church, Arthur reported, had begun at last to return to their old religion. And Polding had transferred Ullathorne south to hasten their return, and to make inroads on protestant complacency.

Broughton felt, too, that Arthur had sold him out on the Grammar School project. At the end of the visitation in 1833 he understood Arthur to have agreed to assist in the establishment of a classical school, on the model of a King's School, at Hobart. On

57. Broughton, Present Position and Duties of the Church of England, p.3.
58. Broughton to Coleridge, 19 October 1837 (op.cit.).
the basis of that understanding the S.P.C.K. had contributed £500 to
the project while Broughton was in England; a sum sufficient with
Arthur's aid to launch the venture. 62 Also while in England Broughton
had nominated the Chief Justice, Pedder, the Surveyor General, George
Frankland, and Bedford, as the School's trustees, and authorised them
to issue a prospectus and advertise for pupils. The pupils came but
not Arthur's assistance. 63 The Governor found the thorough highchurch
tone of the board of trustees offensive, and condemned one regulation,
requiring the scholars to attend worship at St. David's Church, as
'exclusive in the extreme'. 64 Bourke told Arthur there was nothing
like it in New South Wales; 65 so Arthur told Pedder, the chairman of
the trustees, to broaden the religious appeal of the School and
enlarge the board of trustees, or forfeit aid. 66 Pedder and Broughton
agreed to forfeit the aid; a proposition made somewhat easier by
Arthur offering only £400. For Broughton the School existed to
strengthen the Church of England and to instil in the young those
principles of learning which he believed had led England to her
eminence, and which, when other methods had been tried and found
wanting, would be ready and waiting in his citadel to serve the future
British nation. 67

62. Broughton to Barnard, 7 July 1835, C.O. 201/249 (p.45).
64. Arthur to Bourke, 2 February 1836 (private), (Letters of Sir
65. Bourke to Arthur, 12 and 15 March 1836 (Arthur Papers, vol.8,
M.L.).
66. Pedder to Arthur, 3 August 1836 (op.cit.).
67. Broughton to Arthur, 21 September 1836 (Arthur Papers, vol.12,
M.L.).
Broughton had every confidence that the new Archdeacon, Hutchins, would guide the southern archdeaconry into prosperity. The Archdeacon's fellow Councillors condemned him as a highchurch bigot, and that pleased Broughton. It meant Hutchins had firm principles in theology and a good sense of what was proper and fitting in politics. Broughton nevertheless wanted to go to Van Diemen's Land to settle a dispute which had arisen there over his right to discipline his clergy without interference from the Executive Council. The dispute centred once more on Bedford. Broughton had cleared Bedford of the allegations laid earlier against him during his visit to England, and though Arthur rejected the verdict he agreed to forgive and forget the matter. It was he who should seek the forgiveness, Broughton replied; and that remark ended a friendship. Palmer, however, was not for forgiving and he struck again. He accused Bedford of altering his school returns to conceal his negligence in not regularly attending and examining the pupils of St. David's parish school. Palmer recommended that the Executive Council investigate the matter.

Bedford immediately fled to Broughton for protection. Before a Council of men like Arthur, Palmer, and Montague who had abused him

68. Jane Franklin to Mary Simpkinson, 6 January 1841 ('23 Letters to Mary Simpkinson', Franklin Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
70. Broughton to Arthur, 21 September 1836 (op.cit.).
in the street, and Forster, Arthur's nephew by marriage who had
once walked out of St. David's in the middle of a service, Bedford
felt he could not expect an impartial hearing.\textsuperscript{73} Whether the hearing
would be impartial or not was beside the point, Broughton replied.
As a cleric accused of a misdemeanour in the course of his duties the
matter belonged to the Bishop's jurisdiction alone; and Broughton
advised Bedford that he was under no obligation to appear before
Arthur or any Council.\textsuperscript{74} Moreover, Broughton added, a tribunal sitting
under an oath of secrecy and passing sentence without the power to
receive evidence under oath, was 'unknown to law or custom'.\textsuperscript{75} As a
cleric Bedford need not attend such a tribunal, and as a citizen he
ought not.\textsuperscript{76} The Executive Council nevertheless pressed on, and duly
recorded in its Minutes a series of damaging observations on Bedford.\textsuperscript{77}

Bedford, realising that these Minutes would in due course
reach London, wrote to Glenelg explaining that he had not attended
the Executive Council, to hear and refute the charges, on Broughton's
recommendation.\textsuperscript{78} Glenelg decided that between them, Broughton and
Bedford had conspired to re-establish on protestant soil a form of
'benefit of clergy', and to exempt persons of clerical character from

\textsuperscript{73} Bedford to Arthur, 9 September 1836, \textit{C.O.} 280/71 (pp.167-70).
\textsuperscript{74} Bedford to Glenelg, 29 October 1836, \textit{C.O.} 280/71 (p.163).
\textsuperscript{75} Broughton to Glenelg, 12 December 1837, in 'Copies or Extracts
of Correspondence and other Papers relating to cases in which
the Bishop of any Diocese in the Australian Colonies has
attempted to exercise Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction over any of
his clergy', \textit{P.P.}, 1850, xxxvii, (175,ii), 687-91.
\textsuperscript{76} Broughton to Arthur, 15 September 1836, and Broughton to
\textsuperscript{77} Minutes of 29 July and 24 August 1836, \textit{Proc. Ex.C. (V.D.L.)},
\textit{C.O.} 282/10.
\textsuperscript{78} Bedford to Glenelg, 29 October 1836, \textit{C.O.} 280/71 (p.162).
ordered Bedford to appear before the Executive Council and, exceeding anything Arthur had dreamed of, directed the Council to apply a fitting penalty up to and including dismissal.\(^79\)

The move stunned Broughton. For the first time in its history the colony had a duly authorised procedure for administering ecclesiastical discipline, and Glenelg had flung it all aside in favour of a procedure hardly to be distinguished from the Star Chamber. So Broughton struck back with every weapon in his armory, condemning the Secretary of State's ruling as unconstitutional, partial, and absurd. It was unconstitutional because it conflicted with the provision in his Letters Patent reserving to him as bishop of the diocese, full powers of spiritual and ecclesiastical jurisdiction in matters concerning the morals and behaviour of the clergy in their 'offices and stations'. It was partial because the peccant deeds of the clergy of other denominations, and Broughton had a tasty list to offer the Secretary of State, had been left to their superiors for action. As for the absurdity of the action, he asked Glenelg to consider the predicament of the Archdeacon. If he takes his seat on the Council, as he has a right to, he will be bound by an oath of secrecy from communicating with the Bishop on the matter, and that is a clear breach of his obligation to keep the Bishop informed on all matters touching the conduct and efficiency of the clergy. If he declines to

\(^79\). Glenelg to Franklin, 17 June 1837, in 'Copies of Extracts of Correspondence... relating to cases in which the Bishop of any Diocese in the Australian Colonies etc....', \textit{op. cit.}, p.687.
sit, the Council's oath of secrecy will preclude him from knowing the substance of a serious charge brought against one of the clergy, and so prevent him exercising that discipline his office was created to dispense. Glenelg's action, Broughton concluded after all this, was so amateurish that, at the risk of losing his office for his audacity, he ordered Bedford to stay away from the Council chamber no matter who ordered him to attend.  

This prepared the ground for a possible head on clash between Broughton and Glenelg over the respective rights of civil and ecclesiastical authorities in matters where the clergy served as agents of government as well as servants of the church. In earlier days the office of King's Visitor to schools, with its clear line of command, had been created to avoid this problem; and the clash Broughton found himself embroiled in in 1836 and 1837 arose directly from the Government's decision to abolish that office while retaining government subsidised church schools. It was the fruit of a system only half altered. It had continued to work in New South Wales because of the good sense of those involved. Bourke, for all his desires to reduce Broughton's influence, had to accept him as an intermediary in all matters affecting the schools, even after he was convinced that he was not legally required to. The anticipated clash between Broughton and Glenelg never eventuated because good sense also returned to Van Diemen's Land. When Franklin replaced Arthur and Hutchins took over from Palmer, the two strongest links in the chain

of hate against Bedford were broken, and neither of the new incumbents had any heart to pursue the matter. 81

The central issue, however, remained unsolved, and Broughton wanted to say more on the matter. Before doing so he needed to see the evidence recorded in the Minutes of the Executive Council, which he was told he might read in Hobart but which could not be extracted for forwarding to Sydney. 82 An attempt to reach Hobart in 1836 came to nothing, and 1837 proved equally as busy in New South Wales. When Wood's *Almanack* went to press for 1838 its editor recorded that the Island of Van Diemen's Land formed part of the Diocese of Calcutta. 'We might as well for all we see of our Bishop', Pedder remarked. 83

While the government of Van Diemen's Land frustrated Broughton's disciplinary powers by its excess activity, the government of New South Wales accomplished the same through calculated inactivity. Broughton had tried to set up a Consistorial Court in 1836 to deal with the case of the Reverend William Yate, and failed. 84 The thought of examining Yate in a corner of a vestry, about accusations no one would swear to on oath, offended his sense of justice. But the government refused the Bishop legislation compelling witnesses to attend such a court or to give evidence under oath. 85 To Broughton it was clear that his Letters Patent required the government to do just this, but Plunkett,

81. Franklin to Glenelg, 23 December 1837 in 'Copies or Extracts of Correspondence... relating to cases in which the Bishop of any Diocese in the Australian Colonies etc....', op.cit., pp.691-2.
84. *Colonist*, 10 November 1836.
the Attorney General advised it to steer clear of involvement in ecclesiastical law. Complexities apart, the sight of a bishop sitting like an ancient feudal baron in his splendid cathedral, and presiding over a court armed to the teeth with the power of the state, drew terse warnings in the press that a new intolerance was abroad in the colony which had to be watched and squashed.

Before this offending spectre of a baronial Broughton had faded, another of Broughton the inquisitor arose. On Christmas Day 1836 and again on Easter Day 1837, Stiles, the chaplain at Windsor, excommunicated one of his flock, G.M.C. Bowen formerly of the 39th Regiment, for heresy. Broughton intervened and withdrew Stiles's interdiction, but never rebuked the earnest chaplain. Instead he disclosed, in the course of a correspondence the press got hold of, that he would examine Bowen's alleged book of heresies himself. Bowen forced the Bishop into this by disclosing in the book's preface that Broughton had offered him ordination without being aware of his un-orthodox opinions. The book's purpose was to make his position clear, and so avoid any subsequent charge of deceit. The colony's religious press leaped to Bowen's defence and scolded Broughton for interfering with a laudable venture in intellectual honesty. The Bishop, it said, appeared more determined to be master of his own house

86. Minute of Plunkett attached to Broughton to Bourke, October 1836, C.S.I.L., 36/8578, Box 4/2266.1 (N.S.W. S.A.).
87. Colonist, 7 April 1838.
88. Sydney Herald, 12 December 1836; Colonist, 8 and 12 December 1836, and 25 May 1837.
89. G.M.C. Bowen, The Language of Theology Interpreted, in a Series of Short and Easy Lectures (Sydney, 1836).
than a servant in His Master's house. 90

Broughton need only look at the scandalous sight of the open warfare afflicting colonial Presbyterianism to see the penalty of not being master of his own house. 91 The cloven foot of intolerance, which the Colonist said was to be found in Broughton's recent activities (with respect to Bowen and his ambition for a Consistorial Court), was not the manifestations of a cholic highchurchman, as some began to name Broughton, but the result of the Bishop's efforts to govern and protect his citadel. 92

The move most likely to strengthen Broughton's citadel was Bourke's departure from the colony. It came suddenly. Rumour of the Governor's resignation had been rife since January, but Bourke gave only twelve days' notice of his intention to sail off on 5 December 1837; too short a warning to afford his enemies time to transform their orgy of verbal abuse into a harbourside festivity in imitation of Darling's farewell. 93 Still, some hounded him to the water's edge, 94 while others burned incense wherever his shadow fell. 95 Bourke farewelled them all with a cold stare. 96

But there remained a group determined to plant a warmer memory

90. Colonist, 25 May 1837.
91. A summary of the situation appears in Colonist, 7 December 1837 (Lang to editor).
92. Colonist, 29 June 1837.
93. Sydney Gazette, 26 and 28 January 1837; Colonist, 23 November 1837.
94. Sydney Gazette, 2 and 7 December 1837; Sydney Herald, 2 and 25 December 1837; Colonist, 28 December 1837.
95. Sydney Monitor, 11 December 1837; Australian, 28 November 1837.
96. Sydney Gazette, 7 December 1837; Sydney Monitor, 11 December 1837.
of the great General for the generations to come, and raise in iron
and stone an indestructible tale of the day a noble and wise man
visited their shores and turned the tide against a class of narrow and
rapacious barons who had held the liberties of the people captive. 97
Their tale would need to be engraven in an enduring substance for the
Tory spirit wore the triumphant grin in those days. One proof was the
ever increasing circulation of the Sydney Herald which, if it did not
espouse every Tory opinion, despised every Whig notion. There was,
too, the memory of a day not long past when, at one of those public
meetings where Wentworth delighted to play the lion, the crowd hissed
the demagogue and mortified his spirit by putting McLeay in the chief
chair and him a little lower. He spoke later that night, it was said,
with a modesty and decorum never before witnessed in public. A few
days later when Wentworth again took to the stage to head a public
meeting, called this time to address Bourke on his departure, the lion
was determined not to be frustrated by the same decorum and the word
was put round that only friends of the Governor need attend. One by
one the events of those weeks showed, a middle of the way newspaper
noted, 'a miserable defeat of colonial whiggery, and a proud triumph
for colonial toryism'. 98

A proud triumph for some, but not for Broughton. Only an
emasculated Toryism remained; a Toryism without an established church.

97. Sydney Monitor, 4 December 1837. The Colonist called on
Protestants not to sign the farewell Address as it would imply
approval of the Irish system, and at the time of Bourke's
departure no non-conformist minister's signature had appeared on
it; see Colonist, 7 December 1837.
98. Colonist, 30 November and 7 December 1837 ('Some Recent Events');
see also Sydney Monitor, 26 July 1837.
No Governor, he wrote to Coleridge after Bourke had embarked, had done him or his cause greater harm; and in the Governor's last days he had allowed a little of the bitterness to emerge. Though he accompanied Bourke to the water's edge, he snubbed the Address signed and presented to him by the Civil Officers. Vainly did the *Sydney Herald* comfort him with a reminder that the Church of England would enjoy a primacy of honour wherever the laws of Britain were established. An honorary position was a useless position. The *Colonist* saw the true position of the Church of England and rejoiced. 'Her bishop', it wrote, 'is only the head pastor of his own voluntary flock'. Broughton knew that, and accepted that; and when the Colonial Office occasionally tried to interfere in the day to day affairs of the colonial church Broughton was quick to rebuke it with a reminder that, having once reduced the Church of England to the level of other denominations, it should have the decency to grant it the same independence.

In the isthmus of time between Bourke's departure and the advent of his successor, known early in December to be Sir George Gipps and 'a Whig of the first water', the colony's fiftieth

1. *Colonist*, 14 December 1837; also *Sydney Gazette*, 12 and 26 December 1837.
4. Broughton to Glenelg, 12 December 1837, 'Copies or Extracts of Correspondence ... relating to cases in which the Bishop of any Diocese in the Australian Colonies has attempted to exercise Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction over any of his Clergy', *P.P.*, 1850, xxxvii, (175,ii), 690-1.
anniversary cropped up. Was it to be thanklessly dismissed with the standard skyward discharge from Dawes Point, or decently marked as a national jubilee? The question stirred men differently. Some saw nothing to celebrate. Others planned a programme of Divine Services, a procession, a picnic, and fireworks; a day outdoors under the colony's Italian skies where every citizen would survey the gay metropolis and with a just boast say, 'These are the works of only fifty years'.

The next fifty would witness unbounded progress, the *Sydney Gazette* prophesied, and hailed the fiftieth anniversary 'as the commencement of a new era in the annals of our progress'. To assist progress in the right direction Broughton called the Diocesan Committee to St. James' Church, and on that fiftieth anniversary exhorted them to that effort which would see the next half century conclude with a truly Christian jubilee.

Shortly after all this fun-making Gipps slipped into the colony wearing civilian dress. The next day, 24 February 1838, he put on a dashing blue uniform to receive Broughton and the other Officials. No one in the colony knew at that stage that Broughton and Gipps had been to school together, but the sharp eye of the *Colonist* did pick out the Governor's name on the list of English donors to the Bishop's building appeal. It served notice against any pranks in aid of the

10. *Colonist*, 28 December 1837; Gipps gave £7 to Coleridge's appeal, see *Report of Diocesan Committee 1837*, p.90.
Church of England that the two might try to hatch. Broughton laughed: 'My old school fellow, but a radical I fear for all that'. 11 Broughton and Gipps had been placed together in the Reverend John Francis' House at the King's School, Canterbury, during much the same period, but the years since had trained each differently. The one had come from an ecclesiastical background, chosen a military career, and excelled in civil administration in a way that pleased the Whig minds. 12 The other had chosen civil administration as his career, changed to scholarship and the church and won approval from Tory masters. Their one common attribute in 1838 was a fierce independence of judgment. Broughton respected it in Gipps, 13 but knew that between servants of two different visions of the future it foreshadowed strife. 'For my part', he confessed to Coleridge, 'I am prepared to try to walk in harmony with him.' 14

While Gipps received many a caution and much advice, 15 Broughton,

11. Broughton to Coleridge, 6 February 1838 (Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.); see also Broughton to Coleridge, 14 October 1839 (ibid.).
12. S.C. McCulloch, 'Gipps, Sir George', in Australian Dictionary of Biography, vol.1, pp.446-53. It is difficult to see Gipps as a dedicated Whig in such documents as his dissenting opinion dated 15 December 1836 in 'Report of Commissioners Appointed to Enquire into the Grievances Complained of in the Lower House', P.P., 1837, vol.xxiv, (50), 249-53. Indeed Gipps was surprised to find himself so easily able to work with Broughton; see Gipps to Glenelg, 1 May 1839, H.R.A., I.xix. 402. Does this point to Gipps being more conservative, or to Broughton being more liberal, than many have allowed?
14. Broughton to Coleridge, 6 February, 1838 (Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
15. Sydney Gazette, 27 February 1838; Sydney Herald, 1 March 1838; Colonist, 16 May 1838.
confident that the Governor would not attempt to settle the great outstanding issues in the coming sitting of the Legislative Council, decided to visit the southern archdeaconry. Captain Drinkwater Bethune offered him the hospitality of Her Majesty's Ship *Conway*, and the Bishop set sail on 7 April 1838. The vessel called *en route* at Port Philip where, in a wooden hut close to the centre of the settlement, Broughton celebrated the first Eucharist in the settlement. It was Easter. After the service the inhabitants presented him an Address professing zealous loyalty to the Church of England and the need of a clergyman. He decided to send one immediately, convinced that the settlement would become 'very speedily an opulent and important scene of business'. He stayed seven days and then sailed south.  

Three days later he arrived at Hobart and fell into the welcoming arms of Bedford. The Governor spirited him away from the wharf, and Lady Franklin squeezed him into an overcrowded Government House.  

For the next seven weeks she both delighted and taunted him with her urbane chatter; and a hostess who delighted to sit Hutchins on her right, Ullathorne on her left, both opposite Sir John, and then orchestrate an argument on education taking the side of each in turn, was well endowed to cope with Broughton. She found him


interesting, intellectual and benign. She scolded him for sending the riff-raff among the clergy to Van Diemen's Land, and expounded the virtues of Dr. Arnold. She expressed the hope that the great Doctor would come to the colony as a bishop; if not he would leave his mark in another way, for Sir John Franklin had asked him to draft a charter for a new school in Hobart and select a possible headmaster. If that school conformed to Arnold's latest ideas it would not be officially connected with the Church of England, Broughton warned; for Arnold was then advocating the erection of classrooms around a row of chapels and suggesting that each denomination should supply a headmaster in turn.

Broughton visited every establishment in the colony, consecrating churches, confirming the young and old, presiding over meetings to establish new churches and new schools, and indeed doing everything with that useless rapidity he had condemned in Bishop Heber's tours. But what he found pleased him, with one exception; Palmer had failed to get the Holy Trinity project off the ground. Broughton had raised £600 for it in 1833 and sent another £500 from the S.P.G., and Palmer

20. Arnold to Sir John Franklin, 20 July 1836, in James Aitken (ed.), English Letters of XIX Century (Middlesex, 1946), pp.162-3; Franklin to Glenelg, 26 June 1838, C.O. 280/95 (pp.232-4, and 231); Jane Franklin to Mary Simpkinson, 6 January 1841 ('23 Letters to Mary Simpkinson', Franklin Papers, m/f, A.N.L.); Jane Franklin to Captain Ross, 16 September 1841 ('Various Papers of Sir John and Lady Franklin 1837-53', Franklin Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
22. Ibid.
had not so much as set a foundation stone. His parishioners came from the poorer classes, Palmer said, and could not raise sufficient money to qualify for a government subsidy. But the thought remained that he had wasted his time hounding Bedford. Broughton took the opportunity, too, of looking over the evidence taken before the Executive Council on Bedford's case. He submitted so scathing a condemnation of it that his report had to be edited before being published at the request of the House of Commons.

Only once did Broughton stir the wrath of his southern critics. Under his influence the trustees of the Hobart Grammar School agreed to strictly enforce a religious rule requiring all scholars to assemble at the School on Sundays for catechism at 9 a.m. and worship at 11 a.m., unless collected and taken elsewhere by their parents. The cry of 'bigot' rent the air. But the trustees stood their ground. 'Our school is professedly a Church of England school...and not a public school', they replied, '(and) is not indebted to the Government itself for one farthing.' Franklin's new school would cater for those who liked their religion weak; Broughton purged his to preserve it as a strong pillar in his citadel. He set a similar venture on the way in Launceston, and founded a local committee of the S.P.G. and

25. Broughton to Franklin, 5 June 1838, C.O. 280/95 (pp.123-6). The edited version is in *P.P.*, 1850, xxxvii, (175,ii), 693-4.
27. Broughton to Campbell, 22 May 1838 (*op.cit.*).
S.P.C.K. to raise funds for the parish schools system which Franklin intended to ask the Legislative Council to subsidise. Broughton left the colony content that its future was in good hands. Hutchins was sound, and Sir John a better churchman than Arthur.

When Broughton returned to Sydney he declared himself ready for business by entering the Legislative Council and demanding that he be immediately elevated in rank above the Officer second in command of Her Majesty's forces. The Attorney-General supported him. Someone had blundered. Gipps' Commission had returned Broughton to the status he enjoyed before Bourke's arrival. Broughton, however, was not in an obstructive mood, and quite delighted Gipps by throwing his full support behind a new proposal to double the size of the Legislative Council and turn half its membership over to elected representation on the basis of a high property qualification alone. All others consulted, Dowling, Burton, Deas Thomson, and Plunkett thought it would either acerbate conservative fears or aggravate emancipist frustrations, and so

28. Hobart Town Courier, 3 June 1838. Barrett's argument that Franklin favoured a semi-denominational scheme is not inconsistent with Broughton's expectation that he would support a denominational one, see Barrett, Better Country, pp.115-8. Franklin would seem to have made a sudden change and even to have caught his Council on the hop, hence the strange sight of his proposal being defeated one day and accepted the next. The Executive Council Minutes do not foreshadow Franklin's eventual proposal, see Minute of 26 July 1837, Proc. Ex.C. (V.D.L.), C.O. 282/11, pp.282-5; Minutes of 17 May and 25 June 1838, ibid., C.O. 282/13, pp.461-70 and 743-70.

29. V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 26 June 1838.

30. Ibid., 3 July 1838.

31. Colonist, 10 March 1838; a draft of Gipps' Commission shows that the reversal of precedence had been detected and corrected in the margin, but the correction was not incorporated in the official document; see 'Draft of Commission and Instructions for the Appointment of Sir George Gipps Kt. to be Governor of New South Wales and its dependencies', C.O. 380/104, pp.65 and 112.
please none. Broughton did not anticipate its ready acceptance, but the principle of cautious progress without distinction between free and freed accorded with what he had advocated since his arrival. By a strange turn of the wheel Broughton found himself, as he had nine years before on the matter of trial by jury, closer to Forbes than most other colonial officials. There was no suggestion that he and Forbes were in agreement for the same reason; Broughton undoubtedly believed the measure fundamentally sound, while Forbes regarded it as the strongest dose of liberalism the blind conservative colony could swallow and the lethargic English reformers would prescribe. The agreement nevertheless showed that Broughton in 1838, on the eve of possibly having to step down from the Legislative Council, supported the admission of emancipists to government, and was more disposed to assist than to hinder the evolution of liberal government.

Broughton showed himself surprisingly flexible in other matters. When news crept into Sydney that the colony had been mocked before a Committee of Enquiry in London as a sink of iniquity, Broughton declared on the floor of the Council chamber that 'he, for one, was

33. Forbes to Bourke, 28 October 1836 and 25 February 1837 (Bourke Papers, vol.11, M.L.). Close observers of Forbes seem to suggest that he was more conservative than he often made out; see Currey, Forbes, ch.53, and Melbourne, Constitutional Development, pp.198-9 and 232-6.
34. Colonist, 10, 13, 17 and 20 January 1838; 'Petition to His Excellency...complaining of the Partial Statements in the evidence given before a Committee of the House of Commons, on the System of Transportation to these Colonies etc.', V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 1838, p.229.
not at all inclined to sit down quietly under the aspersions which had been thrown upon the colonists'. No district in the colony, he added, was without a supply of men as correct in their principles and as high in their honour as the counties of England. These men had responded magnificently to his diocesan appeals. Moreover, and he reminded his audience that he was not given to flattery, he felt he could justly add 'that there is a deep feeling of religion among the settlers of the colony, which only requires to be drawn forth, and it will form a fortress of good feeling, which in a few years will alter the face of the country'. He supported the move for counter-action against what had been said in London.  

The counter-action came in the form of a series of resolutions. One stated that the virtues of free immigrants had elevated the colony more than the presence of convicts had degraded it, and Broughton agreed with that. But when it was added, that recent religious developments in the colony had made it a better receptacle than ever for the reception and reformation of convicts, and invited the British government to use the improved facilities, Broughton objected. He was not prepared to make any such pledge as to the goodness of the system of transportation, he said, and was of the opinion that it should be done away with as soon as possible.

Broughton's fellow Councillors may have been pardoned an expression of surprise. The Bishop had made a volte face on his

written opinion of 1833,\textsuperscript{38} and in coming out publicly against the party actively at work to counteract the growing sentiment in England for ending transportation, he placed himself in opposition to landholders like J.E. Manning, the Macarths, and Jones, who were the staunch supporters of his Diocesan Committee.\textsuperscript{39} But he had never believed the colony as much their inheritance as they would wish it to be. Superior talent and good business acumen would inevitably make some men wealthier than others, and a few very wealthy; but the settler he wanted to encourage was the small farmer of the type he knew around Hartley Wespall.\textsuperscript{40} To make land available for these he had recommended a strict application of the new land regulations in 1831, and he still hoped to see them come to the colony in increasing numbers.

Broughton's performance impressed Gipps and the Governor appointed him chairman of a new committee on immigration. A curly petition had come in from the landowners arguing that if transportation were to cease and the development of the colony made to depend exclusively on free immigrants, the pattern of immigration would need to be altered to reduce expenditure on the importation of unprofitable wives and children, who had to be fed but could return no work. The colony needed single men who were too poor to be tempted to set up on

\textsuperscript{38} G. Arthur, \textit{Observations upon Secondary Punishment...to which is added a letter upon the same Subject, by the Archdeacon of New South Wales} (Hobart Town, 1833), pp.88,92,104-7. It was perhaps even a \textit{volte face} on a statement made the week before, see \textit{Sydney Gazette}, 14 July 1838.

\textsuperscript{39} \textit{Colonist}, 26 May 1838; \textit{Sydney Gazette}, 29 May 1838.

\textsuperscript{40} Broughton to Keate, 26 July 1836 (Ms. No. 1731, A.N.L.).
their own, and sufficiently ignorant to be content as shepherds and agricultural labourers. Give us this class of labourer, the petitioners concluded, and the wilderness will blossom into the 'Wool Mart of the world', and the colony turn into a rich, virtuous, powerful, and splendid nation possessing the language, religion, laws, and customs of England. ⁴¹

Broughton was the right man to examine this claim. He more than anyone longed for the birth of that virtuous English-speaking, protestant, reformed nation modelled in the image of Canterbury. He too knew the problems of the immigrants; his house being the depot for goods to relieve their needs on arrival and his family constant visitors to the canvas township at Spring Cove which housed them after landing. ⁴² Moreover, he was not an interested party. After nine years in the colony he had acquired not so much as one acre, one sheep, or one ox, and had had only four convicts assigned to him, two of whom had promptly absconded and never since been seen. The welfare of the colony at large remained his single interest. ⁴³

The committee which sat under his guidance recommended a goal of 3,000 adult male immigrants a year, and wasted no time on wings about unprofitable wives and children. Single males might benefit the landed class; they did not necessarily suit the colony. Shiploads of

⁴¹ V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 7 August 1838; 'Petition Addressed to His Excellency by certain Members of Council etc...adopted at a Public meeting held on the 25th of May last...', V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 1838, pp.583-6; Colonist, 26 and 30 May 1838.
⁴² Mary Phoebe Broughton, Diary Kept at Sydney, 1 January 1837-13 December 1838, pp.13,20-1 (Ms. No. 756, M.L.).
⁴³ Sydney Gazette, 14 July 1838.
single females had proved a constant headache, while the excessive importation of unmarried males, because it violated the Almighty's declared appointment 'that it is not good for man to be alone', could only add to the moral turpitude free immigration was designed to remove. If it proved possible to reduce the intake of large families of young children well and good, but they ought not to be passed over at the expense of reducing the flow of settlers. In short, Broughton advised the Governor, contrary to the plea of the landowners, to be prepared to pay out bounties on 12,500 persons in order to achieve a quota of 3,000 adult male workers. 44

Broughton showed surprisingly little concern for the point of origin of the new settlers. In 1832 he had seemed desperately anxious to secure money exclusively for English migrants, but that was to offset Lang's shiploads of Scottish settlers. 45 His report in 1838, despite the anti-Irish propaganda of the Sydney Herald, made no recommendations in this direction. On the other hand, Broughton showed himself desperately concerned with their destination. To uproot 12,500 men, women, and children from villages and townships where they had lived within easy reach of a church and parish school and to plant them in a 'wilderness without any means of religious worship or education being provided for them, and to trust to their voluntary

44. 'Report from the Committee in Emigration', V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 1838, pp.758-62; on female immigration see Broughton to Hay, 28 January 1835, C.O. 323/174 (pp.36-7), and Clark, Australia II, pp.193,214,267-8; on the evil effect of the imbalance of the sexes, 'The Report of Archdeacon Broughton on the State of the Church and Schools Establishment in N.S.W., 29 September 1831' in Despatches from Governor of New South Wales. Enclosures etc. 1832-5, p.1147 (A1267/13, M.L.).

45. V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 20 February 1832.
effort for supplying themselves with those blessings, would be tantamount to dooming them to the worst of evils'. Broughton's was a well founded fear. To each prospective employer who gave evidence before the committee Broughton had put questions about the religious provision on their estates. Some like John Bowman, the Macarthurs, and the Campbells promised to provide to the limit of their ability as their estates expanded, but all too many adopted the pose of the Duttons who considered it every man's individual responsibility to provide for himself. So the committee concluded that while the colony needed a vigorous immigration policy, that in turn required sanctification from an equally vigorous programme of religious development. The matter, Broughton dared to point out, was so obvious as to require no labouring.

Broughton presided over another committee which found its task less easy to resolve. A Committee of the House of Commons reported in 1837 that the native peoples of His Majesty's colonies were in a parlous state, and required attention of a different type from that being currently afforded them. In 1835 Broughton had submitted evidence to that Committee and his evidence had considerably influenced its findings. He was, therefore, a logical choice as chairman of a

46. 'Report from the Committee on Emigration', op.cit., p.763.
47. 'Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee on Emigration', V. & P. (LC. N.S.W.), 1838, pp.815,833,840,857-8.
48. 'Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements); with Minutes of Evidence', P.P., 1837, vii, (425), 11.
49. Compare the above Report, p.11, with Evidence of W.G. Broughton in 'Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines (British Settlements), together with Minutes of Evidence', P.P., 1836, vii, (538), 23.
local committee to enquire into what might be done in the colony to
preserve and civilize the native.\footnote{50}

The committee was chosen in August 1838, and sat in September
under the shadow of a dark deed. On the Liverpool Plains, 350 miles
north of Sydney where the Myall Creek joined the Big River, twenty-
eight aboriginals, adults and children, had been butchered in a
libation to fear and revenge for fifteen white stockmen fatally speared
in the district in as many years. The \textit{Sydney Gazette} screamed that it
was a foul deed, and yet an understandable one. The government had
consistently failed to protect white settlers from increased black
aggression.\footnote{51} The witnesses Broughton called before the Committee told
a different tale. The aboriginal, they said, needed the protection,
and especially that of a legal officer who would investigate and
revenge at law the scores of isolated murders and mutilations inflicted
by white settlers.\footnote{52}

Glenelg had already decided that something like that should be
done, and had ordered the colonial treasury to provide £1,500 annually,
by way of contrition, for the support of five wanderers who would
follow tribes, befriend and protect them, and perhaps happily induce
them to settle down and farm, build houses, and so generally lay the
foundation for a comprehensive programme of Christian education in the

\footnote{50. \textit{V. \& P. (L.C. N.S.W.)}, 14 July 1838.}
\footnote{51. \textit{Sydney Gazette}, 20 September and 20 November 1838; 4 December
1835; \textit{Sydney Monitor}, 12 December 1838; Gipps to Glenelg,
19 December 1838, \textit{H.R.A.}, I.xix. 700-4.}
\footnote{52. Evidence of G.A. Robinson, L. Threlkeld and Lieut. R. Salier in
'Report of the Committee on the Aboriginal Question with Minutes
of Evidence', \textit{V. \& P. (L.C. N.S.W.)}, 1838, pp.1055-8,1070-4,
1078-9.
future. Lang had supported this idea in 1835. Broughton thought the sentiment fine but futile. But as the government had decided already to appoint George Robinson, the protector from Flinders Island, chief wanderer in New South Wales, Broughton accepted the proposal, but warned against allowing Robinson to bring any so-called civilized aboriginals from Flinders Island as his off-siders. They were the descendants of countless generations of warriors and only a fool would believe that six or seven years residence at Flinders Island had driven that spirit out of them. No such miracles had occurred at Wellington Valley; and Broughton did not believe that a fundamental change could occur anywhere in so short a time.

For all his enquiries in 1838 Broughton had an aching fear that he had learned nothing new to dispel his pessimism of 1835. The committee did not submit a report worthy of the name. It simply asked permission to sit again in 1839. Broughton wanted to do better, but the news from Wellington Valley afforded no comfort. 'We have little hope of effecting any good amongst the aboriginal natives', the once optimistic C.M.S. missionaries had reported. In the meantime the melancholy tale of murder and mass cremation near Myall Creek unfolded.

54. 'Report from the Select Committee on Aborigines etc...', P.P., 1836, vii. (538), 688-90.
55. Ibid., p.25.
57. Cowper to Coates, 4 August 1838 ('Letters of Corresponding Committee Secretary to Home Secretary', C.N./02, C.M.S. Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
with little doubt as to the guilt of those involved. Still, the Chief Justice felt it incumbent upon him to remind the jury before it retired that 'the life of a blackman is as precious and valuable in the eyes of the law, as the highest noble in the land'. Not so, said one of the jurymen, 'I look upon the blacks as a set of monkeys'. His counsel prevailed; and in fifteen minutes the civil jury returned to hail the defendants 'Not Guilty'. A week before Christmas seven of them died on the gallows at Liverpool after a retrial. This may not have been the atonement Mr. Buxton and his parliamentary committee had hoped for, but as Broughton's committee went into recess it was the best the colony could offer.  58

Broughton clearly enjoyed being back in harness on the Councils, flexing his talent with the freedom and prestige he had enjoyed in Darling's day. Some thought he enjoyed himself too much; and the sight of him rolling along in his chariot from Council meeting to Council meeting wearing the air of a prelate mocked, some said, the principle of religious equality Bourke's Church Act had supposedly bequeathed to the colony. The *Colonist*, the voice of Presbyterianism in schism, revolted. It called for Broughton's removal from the Councils and his expulsion from ecclesiastical office. This member of the Oxford Tract Society who venerates Rome and believes 'the sublime and papistical nonsense of apostolical succession', it warned Anglicans little by little week after week, can no longer supply the colony with a vital alternative to the driving ambitions of Rome.

58. Based on *Sydney Gazette*, 20 and 22 November, and 11 and 20 December 1838.
Anglicans must unite and cast down their bishop. His despotism, reinforced by a cohort of hand-picked highchurch curates, has had them cowered like a mob of horned cattle too long, it said. The people must elect their own bishops and choose their own ministers; and if that should drive them into schism, they can be comforted with the knowledge that schism is but the outward and visible result of purity freeing itself from corruption.  

To Broughton's surprise the Australian leaped to his rescue and, dismissing the Colonist's cry as nonsense, testified its opinion that the Bishop had not appeared inimical to liberal causes in the year past. But to the schismatic forces behind the Colonist he had. The men of the Synod of New South Wales, Lang's breakaway Presbyterian church, did not relish liquor as did their brothers in the Presbytery of New South Wales, but they needed bread. The Executive Council early in 1838 ruled that they would not have that bread from the government. That meant the government viewed McGarvie and his drunken crew as the true Presbyterians, and for all it cared Lang's men could eat stones.

The Colonist unhesitatingly blamed this decision on Broughton. The Bishop's cunning plot, the newspaper alleged, was to feed the corrupt Presbyterians and starve the pure in the hope of snuffing out Presbyterianism as a force to be reckoned with in the years ahead. Moreover, it was a vindictive reprisal for Lang's role in collapsing

59. Colonist, 7 April, 30 June, 14, 21 and 28 July, 15 and 18 August, 29 September, 3 October 1838.
60. Australian, 20 December 1838.
61. Colonist, 9 June 1838.
the Church and Schools Corporation. Broughton, however, had not
attended the Executive Council in February or May when the decision
was hammered out. The presence of Colonel Snodgrass and Riddell,
two staunch members of the Presbytery of New South Wales, sufficiently
explained its ruling. But in July 1838 when Lang petitioned the
Legislative Council against the Executive Council's decision, Broughton
spoke with the minority against any concession to Lang. He feared
that subsidising each denomination could in time tax the patience of
the government. Any attempt to go beyond that and to accommodate the
rival factions within denominations, seemed to him openly to court
that complexity which could compel the government to cast off the
entire scheme.

While some Presbyterians hailed Broughton as a prelate about
to fall mightily, the Bishop turned up at the Pultney Hotel full of
glee and heartiness to celebrate the second anniversary of the Diocesan
Committee. The church had never looked better. So much had changed
so suddenly. Buildings had been opened and put to use; clergy had at
last arrived and the S.P.G. promised more were to come; a permanent
lobby was forming itself at the S.P.C.K. to plead his needs; and
letters from abroad hinted that a considerable benefaction could soon

62. Ibid., 30 June and 8 August 1838.
63. Sydney Gazette, 4 August 1838; 'Extract from Minute No.27, 28 May
1838, Executive Council of New South Wales', Encl. in Gipps to
Glenelg, 12 June 1838 C.O. 201/273 (p.290).
64. 'Memorial from the Synod of New South Wales...praying for allowances
of Salaries', V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.) 1838, pp.265-8; Sydney Gazette,
4 August and 13 September 1838; Colonist, 15 August 1838.
65. Sydney Gazette, 21 July 1838.
That morning, too, the Reverend W.M. Cowper had preached before the Committee in a style which proved to Broughton that currency lads could be safely entrusted with the traditions and institutions of the Church of England. It was a ripe moment for celebrating. But some believed it improper to celebrate with wine, and had condemned the previous year's dinner as an ungodly affair. So when Broughton stood up to respond to a toast on behalf of the church he prayed that the spirit of puritanism would never get a footing in the colony. Now McLeay, for one, was a puritan and in the chair; but Broughton was not to be put down. When the gathering toasted the ladies present Broughton again leaped to his feet and raising his glass high encouraged the bachelors present to abandon their present state. Newspapers reported these proceedings; and a few days later the drawn countenance of one settler blushed to read of another anti-puritanical dinner disgracing the colony.

While one blushed with shame another reddened with anger.

66. Report of the Diocesan Committee 1838 (Sydney, 1838), pp.21-32; Colonist, 28 July 1838; Broughton to Bourke, 2 December 1837 Encl. in Snodgrass to Glenelg, 13 January 1838, H.R.A., I.xix. 244-5; Glenelg to Gipps, 31 March 1838, ibid., p.348; Sir George Grey to Campbell, 19 June 1838, Encl. No.1 in Glenelg to Gipps, 30 July 1838, ibid., p.514; Norris to Broughton, 21 March 1838 Broughton Papers 1824-98, Ms.No.913, M.L.; Broughton to Dr. Wameford, 12 November 1838 (Bishop Broughton's Letters 1834-1843, 'C' Miss. Aust. Papers, Box 12, S.P.G. Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).

67. W.M. Cowper, A Sermon Preached before the Lord Bishop of Australian and the Diocesan Committee (Sydney, 1838).

68. Sydney Gazette, 21 July 1838.

69. Ibid.

70. Colonist, 25 July 1838.
Polding had no quarrel with Broughton's claret and turkey. He knew that a man was defiled by what came out of his mouth, and for that reason a fury gripped him when he read, in reports of the dinner, that out of the mouth of a newly arrived but rather cantankerous judge, Mr. Justice Willis, had proceeded statements about the Mass of Roman Catholics being idolatrous. So on Saturday 28 July the community of Sydney awoke to find the town plastered with signs summoning Roman Catholics of all classes to meet their bishop on the Sabbath, and condemn the Judge's wanton and unprovoked remarks as 'calculated to enkindle the flames of religious discord in the colony'.

Polding did his best to start the fire. He called not one but eight meetings; and was not put off when he learned from an interested press that Her Majesty Queen Victoria had dropped a similar remark at her recent coronation.

Broughton resolved to waste no time on Polding's antics. He did not relish the revival of the fracas over idolatry and was content to leave Judge Willis's defence to the crusading spirit of an eager young Presbyterian, the Reverend William McIntyre. Another Scot, William Duncan, a catholic lay teacher from Maitland, chimed in on the debate and the colony was soon off again. The dispute for all

---

72. *Sydney Gazette*, 31 July 1838; 'The Pastoral Address of John Bede etc.', in *Sydney Gazette*, 2 August 1838.
73. *Colonist*, 8 August 1838.
74. W. McIntyre, *Is the Service of the Mass Idolatrous? Being a candid Inquiry into the doctrine maintained on that Subject by Bishop Poldings in his Pastoral Address* (Sydney, 1838).
its sterility never reached a stalemate. After McIntyre and Duncan had fired their volleys, the newspapers took up positions for an extended season of sniping which would ensure that the issue grew into a worthwhile crisis.  

Broughton intended taking issue with Polding in another matter. He had detected a scoffing tone in the many Roman Catholic references to him as merely 'the protestant bishop' in contrast to 'John Bede by the grace of God and the appointment of the Holy See, Bishop, and Vicar Apostolic of New Holland', and the undoubted servant of the Sacred Occupant of a crystal throne whose kingdom was from everlasting to everlasting. And yet, as Broughton examined his Letters Patent the jibe seemed uncomfortably justified. William Grant Broughton, His Majesty King William IV had announced in the Writ issued under the Great Seal of the United Kingdom on 18 January 1836, shall have 'full power and authority to confirm those that are baptised, and come to the years of discretion, and to perform all other functions peculiar and appropriate to the office of bishop within the limits of the said See of Australia, but not elsewhere'. He clearly seemed destined to move only at the behest of the voice which issued forth from the throne at Westminster.

In 1837 Broughton asked himself, may he go as a bishop to New Zealand? The plain answer was, 'No'. But no sooner had he admitted

---

75. *Colonist*, 8 August 1838; *Sydney Gazette*, 3 November 1838 (Letters to editors).
76. See Broughton to Coleridge, 13 September 1839 (*Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.*).
77. Clark, *Constitutional Church Government*, p.36, italics added.
the point than his head rang with the indictment of the Oxford
Tract writers who had condemned Anglicans for resting their authority
on too low a ground; a Commission under the Great Seal, for instance,
rather than the Apostolical succession. The matter became urgent
for him late in 1838. By then Marsden had been sealed in a tomb of
colonial earth, and news flooded in of papal inroads into the
New Zealand mission. Broughton studied his Letters Patent and
decided that though they made him Bishop of Australia, they no more made
him a bishop of the Church of God than a copy of The Times. They
were a legal instrument only, defining the range within which he
might exercise his spiritual powers for the sake of good order within
the Queen's Dominions. Beyond those bounds, Broughton maintained to
puzzled observers in England, 'I contend that every bishop has an
inherent right, in virtue of his consecration, to officiate episcopally
whenever the good of the church may be promoted by his so doing'.
With that settled he planned to set off to New Zealand. There he
would ordain, confirm, and consecrate churches and burial grounds
in a land not mentioned in his Letters Patent; and so 'give a flat
contradiction' to the false pretence of the papists that he served
only at the bidding of an earthly monarch.

78. 'Adherence to the Apostolic Succession the Safest Course',
pp.1-2, being Tract No.4 in Tracts for the Times Vol.I.
79. Colonist, 16 May 1838; Cowper to Coates, 11 October 1838
('Letters of Corresponding Committee Secretary to Home
Secretary', C.N./02, C.M.S. Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
80. Broughton to (Norris) March 1841 (Broughton Papers 1824-98,
Ms. No.913 M.L.); Broughton to Jowett, 11 August 1837 ('N.Z.
Mission. Bishop Broughton's Letters 1830-44', C.N./03,
C.M.S. Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
The Church Missionary Society urged the Bishop on.\textsuperscript{81} His friendship with Sir Robert Inglis, a vice-patron of the London parent committee, had helped soften his estrangement from the Society, and in 1837 in a magnanimous gesture of reconciliation Broughton re-joined the Sydney Corresponding Committee.\textsuperscript{82} On 13 December 1838 he sailed from Port Jackson aboard Her Majesty's ship 'Pelorus' taking with him the Reverend Octavius Hadfield, whom he had just ordained deacon in Sydney for the Mission in defiance of His Majesty's King William IV's Writ restricting the Bishop of Australia to ordaining men 'for the cure of souls within the limit of the said Diocese of Australia only'.\textsuperscript{83} He landed at the Bay of Islands on 21 December. The missionaries came and hailed him their protector in succession to their beloved founder Samuel Marsden. Broughton thanked them, and prayed for a measure of the unconquerable perseverance which had filled that 'justly venerated man'. He came only with the authority imparted him at his consecration, he added, and they were only bound to accept his direction as far as they recognised his Apostolical succession.\textsuperscript{84}

\textsuperscript{81} Minute of 28 November 1838 ('Minutes of Corresponding Committee, Sydney, 1821-41', C.N./01, C.M.S. Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).

\textsuperscript{82} Cowper to Coates, 7 October 1837 ('Letters of Corresponding Committee Secretary to Home Secretary', C.N./02, C.M.S. Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).

\textsuperscript{83} Cowper to Coates, 29 September 1838 (\textit{ibid.}); Broughton to Jowett, 29 November 1838 ('N.Z. Mission. Bishop Broughton's Letters 1830-44', C.N./03, C.M.S. Papers, m/f, A.N.L.); Clark, \textit{Constitutional Church Government}, p.36.

\textsuperscript{84} Broughton to Jowett, 28 March 1839 ('N.Z. Mission, Bishop Broughton's Letters 1830-44', C.N./03, C.M.S. Papers, m/f, A.N.L.); 'Address of the Missionaries to the Bishop of Australia', Paihia, 5 January 1839, and 'The Bishop's Address to the Missionaries', Paihia, 5 January 1839, \textit{ibid.}. 
Broughton tarried three weeks performing apostolic tasks and examining a translation of the Liturgy into a native dialect. The natives disappointed him. A joyous but rather dirty and indolent people, he commented, but not without the capacity for a real spiritual awakening. The mission had certainly not failed. Unlike the Australian aboriginal the New Zealand native lived a settled life, and appeared both anxious to imitate and apt at learning. Yet it was distressingly clear that, like the Australian aboriginal, the New Zealand native had lost his vitality from contact with the white settler; and the paradox began to form in Broughton's mind that some peoples thrived in barbarism and withered in peace. Puzzled and mystified he sailed off on 11 January 1839 to pay his first visit to Norfolk Island before returning to New South Wales. 85

Back in Sydney Broughton was among the people with whom he had come increasingly to identify his life's mission. By going to New Zealand in defiance of the most obvious interpretation of his Letters Patent, he showed that the King's Commission was shrinking in its significance and his mind was being filled with a deeper realisation that his vocation was to serve a people, their land and its future, in direct response to the Apostolic command to go into all lands. 'My own opportunities of observation have been very numerous and I do not hesitate to say', he wrote to the S.P.G.,

85. Broughton to Jowett, 28 March 1839, op.cit.; Cowper to Coates, 28 February 1839 ('Letters of Corresponding Committee Secretary to Home Secretary', C.N./02, C.M.S. Papers, m/f, A.N.L.); Sydney Gazette, 31 January 1839.
...surrounded it cannot be dissembled by much that is base and disgusting, there is nevertheless an extensive, and in point of actual influence a preponderable proportion of integrity and worth; from which if suitably encouraged and supported now, there may hereafter spring forth a wise and understanding people to occupy this land. It is on behalf of these truly exemplary and deserving people that I am anxious to make every exertion. 86

CHAPTER TEN

PREPARING TO ENTER HIS SECOND DECADE

My hope and trust is that I may lay a foundation upon which hereafter our Jerusalem may stand as it ought 'a unity in itself'.

Broughton to Coleridge,
October 1839.
Broughton faced 1839 with an optimism seasoned by a little apprehension. Shadows had appeared in the wings of the colonial stage which could disrupt the drama he had plotted for the year ahead. Having established his citadel he needed time to consolidate on the foundation already laid in churches and schools, and to add to them other departments, particularly a library and a college to train clergy, which would strengthen his citadel and add to its independence. A decade would be all too short to accomplish sound beginnings in these fields, but Broughton knew it would be a boon if he could have that long. So Broughton laid his tactics for 1839; he would expand quickly, perhaps a little recklessly, into new works, and take sharp and desperate action against any move to rob him of the gains he had already made.

Broughton expected to face a crisis in education. Gipps had warned religious leaders in August 1838 that government support for denominational schools had one year to run. 'There should be comprehensive schools or none', he had then remarked; and had drawn from Broughton the equally ridiculous retort that 'he would rather see no schools than comprehensive ones'. In 1837 Glenelg, convinced that Bourke had erred by insisting on the best comprehensive system rather than the most acceptable one, had instructed the Governor to explore again the way to a National scheme. Gipps took over that brief. He did not conduct an enquiry, neither did he once consult Broughton nor any other member of the Councils, but he read the 1836

3. Jane Franklin to Sir John Franklin, 20 June 1839, in Mackaness (ed.), *Some Private Correspondence Part I*, p.92; see also *Sydney Gazette*, 27 August 1839.
debates on education and concluded that most protestant leaders, clerical and lay, would then have settled for, and would still accept, the British and Foreign system. The evidence of the sub-committee of the Protestant Association, a body Broughton had declined to work with, had weighed heavily in Gipps's decision. But other evidence underpinned his conviction. James Macarthur in his recent book on New South Wales said plainly that colonists would co-operate in the British and Foreign system where denominational schools were uneconomic. While the Sydney Herald hinted that, despite its dislike of all general systems, it could accept the British and Foreign schools.

In June and July 1839 Gipps revealed his plan. The government would offer every child in the colony an education in the British and Foreign system at 3d. a day. Roman Catholics would receive substantial relief to support an independent system, and other separatists could apply for a fifty percent subsidy on such schools as maintained an average daily attendance of thirty. So a Bible education became cheap; the Roman Catholics catechism added a little to its price, and the protestant catechism a good deal more. Gipps made no apology for this. He had a duty to God and Queen to nurture the youth in feelings

5. (Macarthur), New South Wales Prospects, pp.230-7. This is a more qualified statement than Gipps's report of Macarthur's testimony before the Transportation Committee, see Gipps to Normanby, 9 December 1839, op. cit.
6. Sydney Herald, 30 June 1836, and 1 March 1838. The Colonist had moved a little further forward and advocated Brougham's system. This did not use the Bible as a general text, but put in its place a special text of religious lessons, given like any other subject, and from which Roman Catholics could seek exemption, see Colonist, 16 May 1838.
of love and charity towards each other irrespective of religious creeds.\(^7\) One way to stamp out bigotry (which some misnamed fervour) was to tax the catechism; 'People who indulge in such exclusiveness must pay for it', Gipps said.\(^8\)

The Bishop's schools would close, Gipps pointed out, only if the people preferred comprehensive ones.\(^9\) So Broughton faced the challenge to hold Anglicans to their existing schools, and to stop them, at the first pinch of a sacrifice, from throwing their lot in with Gipps. The *Colonist*’s oft repeated hint of a rift between Broughton and his people may have encouraged Gipps to hope for a sizeable defection.\(^10\) On the other hand Broughton was said to rule with a rod of iron.\(^11\) The fateful month of August stood to decide the pattern of future education, and to exhibit the Bishop's standing as the religious leader of colonial Anglicans.

Broughton set cunningly to work. He had petitions gathered in areas with an established parish school. Here he could expect the people to sign in convincing numbers as they had a material interest in saving their annual grants. To keep their numbers high, and not to offend the perplexed or those who saw a little good in everything, Broughton refrained from commenting on the evil or folly of the comprehensive system. He left the petitioners to

---

7. 'Address of Governor to Legislative Council', *V. & P.* (L.C. N.S.W.), 11 June 1839; 'Minute of His Excellency the Governor to the Legislative Council, explanatory of a System of Education proposed in the Council by His Excellency's Financial Minute of 1840, *V. & P.* (L.C. N.S.W.), 1839, pp.451-6.
11. *Colonist*, 30 June 1838 (Fullerton to editor).
plead simply for no diminution in grants to the Church of England schools. Petitions forwarded from areas without schools were not presented to the Legislative Council. Broughton intended revealing only his strength.\textsuperscript{12}

The plan prospered. On three occasions in August Broughton presented petitions of between seven hundred and a thousand signatures. Others came in unexpectedly. One from Kurryjong and another from River Macdonald organised solely by laymen, and another unsolicited from the employees of the Australian Agricultural Company. In all Broughton placed 3,000 signatures before the Council; most came from Anglicans but a few from Roman Catholics and Presbyterians who supported their cause. More were on the way; but even without them, the Bishop reminded the Governor, the Church of England had exceeded the tally produced by the combined protestant churches in 1836.\textsuperscript{13}

At the sight of this, and in an unguarded moment, Gipps let it slip that he feared his plan lost.\textsuperscript{14}

At the eleventh hour Gipps rallied with a new idea. Rather than present the Legislative Council with a detailed scheme and risk its rejection, he asked it to vote on four resolutions which, if acceptable, would provide the framework for further discussion.\textsuperscript{15} The resolutions simply stated that New South Wales should have a major system of unrepentantly protestant schools, and that Roman Catholics should be

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{12} V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 1839, pp.521-48; Sydney Herald, 28 August 1839.
\item \textsuperscript{13} V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 21, 22 and 27 August 1839, and documents pp.541-2, 546-7; Sydney Herald Supplement, 26 August 1839.
\item \textsuperscript{14} Sydney Herald, 28 August 1839.
\item \textsuperscript{15} V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 23 August 1839; Sydney Gazette, 27 August 1839 (Gipps's speech of 23 August).
\end{itemize}
compensated for their exclusion from it. Gipps rested the appeal of the resolutions on an assumption that the bigger system would be the better one, and that the strongest denomination within that system would naturally draw matters in its direction. 'If no advantage is given to the protestants, if no advantage is given to the Church of England', Gipps told the Council, '...then I say put an extinguisher on the whole plan.'

Broughton leaped to his feet in the Council to do just that. He did not consider the four resolutions mere 'abstract propositions' as the Governor suggested, but a cloak for the type of programme foreshadowed in the Governor's earlier Minutes to the Council. Approve them, Broughton told the Council, and you write a Bill of Attainder against the Church of England. Those despised Creeds and Articles of Religion, which it was the object of the British and Foreign system to put to one side, has been framed to save the church from ignorance and heresy, the Bishop insisted. What advantage then could the Church of England gain from their prohibition? He would show them the advantage, the Bishop went on; and picking up a House of Commons Report he read the Council tales of teachers in British and Foreign schools in England who admitted that the Society's principles had forced them to dismiss the great truth of the Atonement as a 'nice point' to be picked up after school years, and of others who defined their understanding of the Society's rule of impartiality.

16. Sydney Herald Supplement, 2 September 1839 (Gipps's speech of 27 August). Broughton's speech in reply to Gipps has often been considered the finest of his career. In the estimate of some contemporaries Gipps made the finest speech in the debate; Sydney Gazette, 29 August 1838.
as amounting to a constant 'guard to see that neither Master or
boys introduced Trinitarianism or Calvinism into the school'. So
much then for the advantages of the system the Governor promised
would prosper the Church of England!  

But the Bishop had somewhat to add to this. Men had
sacrificed their lives to preserve the distinctive doctrines of
the Church of England, he reminded Gipps. Was not Cramner one, and
Ridley another? Would the Governor, Broughton asked, having been
born and bred in the Church of England and nurtured and trained in
a school founded by Cramner and presided over by Ridley, snuff out
the Church of England as a distinctive body? He sought no special
advantage for that church, the Bishop said; he pleaded only that it
be accorded an equal right with the Roman Catholic church to maintain
itself as a separate organisation, distinctive in its doctrine and
discipline. He asked on behalf of himself as a lover of that church,
he said; he asked also in the name of 3,000 others whose signatures
were before the Council. He had met a woman, the Bishop said by way
of a conclusion, who had learned her catechism in a parish school hut
by the banks of the Hawkesbury, and who could be found that day
living in a region almost beyond the limits of civilization and rear-
ing up her eleven children in the godly and orthodox truths of her
faith. Dare anyone repeat that those schools had failed.

17. Broughton, Speech in Legislative Council on Education, pp.5,
16-23.
18. Ibid., pp.9, 15, 26-8, 31-2.
As the Bishop sat down Plunkett looked on dazed; an effort, he muttered, worthy of His Holiness the Pope. But Lady Franklin thought it so marvellously eloquent that she bought copies of the speech to send to her friends in England.

Judge Dowling, who had ranted against the intolerance of the Protestant Association in 1836, had no debt of patronage to repay Gipps, and crossed the floor to support Broughton. That shocked Gipps. But, said Dowling, looking at the petitions on the Council table, 'We have opposers but no supporters'. Those who are not against me are with me, Gipps replied demonstrating that he knew his Bible if not his catechism. Yet they were hardly with him. The Council chamber was a Laodicea. The members of Council would have voted eight to six in favour of the resolutions, with two abstentions; but the best of his supporters were only luke warm. They preferred the Irish system. So did Gipps; and as the odds were so weakly in his favour the struggle necessary to establish the British and Foreign system might be better directed towards campaigning for the Irish system. Gipps decided to withdraw the resolutions without putting them to the vote.

22. Sydney Herald Supplement, 2 September 1839. The Sydney Gazette, 29 August 1839 reported incorrectly that Berry had presented a petition from Goulburn supporting the scheme. The petition asked for either denominational schools or the Irish system; V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 1839, pp.559-61.
The Governor would not allow that Broughton's emotion packed appeal had had any effect upon his decision. The Wesleyans, he insisted, had administered the coup de grace.  

25 He had anticipated their full co-operation, and when he learned from Mr. Jones in the Council Chamber that they would press instead for denominational subsidies he realised, as Mr. Jones observed, that the scheme would not be very comprehensive.  

26 Roman Catholic coolness also disappointed him. Yet Roman Catholics had every right to suspect the Governor of hollow promises. The fourth resolution before the Council promised them 'advantages'. The Governor's Minute on finance allocated them £1,000 for schools in 1840, an advance of £104 on the year before.  

27 The advantages showed every prospect of being fairly thin. No wonder the Sydney Herald singled out confusion as the only consistent ingredient in the episode.  

28 Though Gipps did not publicly blame Broughton for the collapse of the scheme, Broughton felt that privately he did. As the debate in the Council closed Gipps had turned to the Bishop and snapped 'that Rome had become more tolerant than Lambeth'. 'The fact is', Broughton admitted to Coleridge, 'he was in a desperate ill humour at the time, and could not help showing it; his purpose being frustrated and that

25. Gipps to Franklin, 8 September 1839, op. cit.  
27. 'Minute of His Excellency the Governor to the Legislative Council, explanatory of a System of Education proposed to the Council by His Excellency's Finance Minute for 1840', V. & P. (L.C. N.S.W.), 1839, pp. 454-5; 'Abstract of the Revenue of the Colony of New South Wales and its Appropriation for the Year 1838', ibid., p. 347; 'Statement of Sums Disbursed from the Colonial Treasury of New South Wales, in aid of private contributions for the building and support of churches, schools, and charitable and Useful Institutions for the Year 1838', ibid., p. 355.  
For Broughton the victory was only a respite. 'For the present we have repelled the attack', he reported to the S.P.G., 'but power is in the hands of those who have a grudge against the church; and I am sure no effort will be spared to deprive us of our schools.' It could be repeated the following year, and perhaps staved off again. But for how long he would not venture a guess, as he had only the flimiest of alliances. 'There is little sense or comprehension of what it is to oppose a government measure upon principle,' he confided to Coleridge. 'Some who are politically opposed to Sir George Gipps might be disposed to side with me if I would with them: but I am particularly careful not to give encouragement to such alliances.'

He must work as a man who would one day lose his battle and 'endeavour to get them (schools) in the interim firmly established, so as to last as long as this country'. For that reason he had abandoned the idea of investing the Coleridge funds in land and cattle, and earmarked them instead for education. But the month of August 1839 did yield Broughton a personal victory. It showed convincingly, he told Gipps and Plunkett and Jamison and all who had ears to hear, 'the attachment

29. Broughton to Coleridge, 14 October 1839 (Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
31. Broughton to Coleridge, 14 October 1839 (Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
32. Broughton to Coleridge, 13 September 1839 (ibid.).
of the people in this colony, I say the people in the strict and proper sense, to the Church of England'. 34 And he might/wished to have added, their attachment to him as their Bishop.

While the education question remained dangerously undecided Broughton saw other forces gathering which, if allowed to go unchecked, could undo what little good there was in the Church Act within a very short time. Gipps had refused to subsidise S.P.G. grants, but that did not seem a staggering blow in 1839 as the S.P.G. had allocated only £500 in 1837 and 1838 for building; and the windfalls about to come were hidden in the womb of the future. 35 But Gipps had also asked the Colonial Office not to approve any further chaplaincies for the time being. 36 The seasons had deteriorated, the cost of police and prisons had quadrupled and ecclesiastical expenditure had trebled, and the treasury was embarrassed. 37 The recommendation struck a chord in London, and it was left to the S.P.G. to inform Broughton in mid-1839 that not only had he exhausted his quota of chaplains and could not be granted more, but vacancies created by

34. Broughton, Speech in Legislative Council on Education, p.27.
37. On police expenditure (up from £15,000 to £68,000) see Gipps to Glenelg, 12 October 1838, H.R.A., I.xix. 610; on ecclesiastical expenditure (up from £13,000 to £34,000) see Gipps to Normanby, 3 December 1839, op.cit., p.409.
deaths or departures probably would not be refilled. 38 Lord Normanby, Secretary of State for Colonies since February 1839, confessed that the parlous state of colonial finances had triggered the decision, but Gipps had made it easy by certifying that there was 'no want in the colony of clergymen of any denomination'. 39

Broughton reeled before the news. Seven counties had no chaplains; one, Roxburgh, carried 2,000 settlers including 800 convicts. 40 Need he spell out the dark deeds of the Liverpool Plains to show the effect of men without religion? This ignorant assessment of clerical strength, he observed in a letter that went to the highest circles, had dropped from the pen of a Governor after only eight months in the colony and without his having ever quitted Sydney. 41 Gipps pleaded that Normanby had misconstrued his remarks, but there was no time for repentance. 42 Normanby went out of the Colonial Office in September 1839 and Lord John Russell moved in with a renovating mind which revealed in a stroke the galloping pace of liberalism. The present colonial administration might be happy to dispense the provisions of the Church Act, but, Russell warned, should a future colonial government wish to depart from its provisions, the British Government would neither impede its determination nor make

40. Burton, Religion and Education in N.S.W., pp.276-9; Report of the Diocesan Committee, 1840, pp.43-4.
good the loss in salary to any officer of the churches. Russell advised the S.P.G. to caution its recruits with a timely warning that they must 'look for future support to the community among whom they are preparing to spread their inestimable advantages'. The unexpected leap in the ecclesiastical vote had burdened an economy which could not bear any increases in taxation, Russell pointed out, so the government must seek a solution in other directions. Russell did not spell these out; but it was just as Broughton had prophesied in 1836. He had then given the Act a generation of life. In 1839 that appeared an over estimate.

While Gipps sought to stabilise the ecclesiastical vote and Russell hoped to see it wither, Broughton pressed on relentlessly asking for more chaplains on the ground that no man in his position could conscientiously recommend the continued importation of settlers without insisting that the government supply their religious needs. For good measure he added one of his legal arguments, and demonstrated to his and Russell's satisfaction that so long as the Church Act remained a statute of the colony no Secretary of State or Governor could withhold clergy where settlers had complied with the regulations

44. Broughton to Bourke, n.d. (Correspondence from W.G. Broughton, Ms. No. Ab29/6a, M.L.). Approximate date for this letter is 13-22 July 1836, see chapter 8, footnote 92.
45. Broughton to Campbell, 3 September 1840 ('Bishop Broughton's Letters, 1834-1843', 'C' Mss. Aust. Papers, Box 12, S.P.G. Papers, m/f, A.N.L.); Broughton to Gipps, 4 May 1840, enclosed with Broughton to Hawkins (S.P.G.), 25 April 1840 (ibid.).
of the Act.\footnote{Broughton to Russell, 5 April 1840, Encl. in Russell to Gipps, 11 September 1840, \textit{H.R.A.}, I.xx. 813-4.} Russell realised this; and for that reason Broughton faced the immediate future confident that the matter would be settled in the church's favour.\footnote{See Russell to Gipps, 20 June 1840, \textit{H.R.A.}, I.xx.673.} 'The people at large are decidedly with us', he reported to the S.P.G. \footnote{Broughton to Campbell, 29 November 1838, and Broughton to Dr. Warneford, 12 November 1838 (\textit{S.P.G. Papers, op.cit.}).} The Church Act would not be easily upset. If the people had a complaint it was not against the money expended on churches and clergy, but the gross tax they paid to maintain jails for British criminals.\footnote{Barrett, \textit{Better Country}, pp.61-4 argues that the Church Act was popular. See also \textit{Colonist}, 23 June 1838 ("A Parishioner to editor) which condemns pew-rents but not a tax, payable via the Church Act, to support churches.} By a strange twist in affairs Broughton was beginning to find the Church Act an important bulwark of his citadel.

From among the first wave of immigrant priests who arrived to relieve the Church of England Broughton had singled out the youthful and enthusiastic William Stack for West Maitland.\footnote{50} He would need all his brash energies to cope with the crusty Rusden and a faction torn Maitland. Stack soon made his mark. Rusden did not worry him, but the Pope did; and on Wednesday nights early in 1838, he took to ranting from his pulpit against the 'Man of Sin' and all his detestable enormities. This ruffled the local Roman Catholic school master, W.A. Duncan. He had not lived long in Maitland, but in the months before Stack's ravings he had treasured the rare peace of being able to pray to his God 'in his own way,
without being exposed to insult and calumny. Then that vanished. Duncan resolved that Stack would never remake quiet Maitland in the image of the faction torn Scotland which had abused and ridiculed his own youthful pilgrimage from protestant darkness to Roman Catholic light. He knew from recollections of his own upbringing 'in the pride and folly of protestantism', that protestant polemics sprang from a parody of Roman Catholic doctrine. Expose that parody, he reasoned, and their arguments will fall flat. Duncan regretted that Stack's integrity might collapse along with his arguments, but every man must pay the price of his stupidity, he said. So with a simple remedy and an itching pen, Duncan set forth to publicly purge Maitland, and happily the colony, of the infection of three centuries of Anglican calumny.

To Broughton's protestant eye of 1839, Rome's servants had a new and dangerous confidence. Six years ago three clergy had administered her rites. Then came Ullathorne and organised popery. Six years later Ullathorne came back from a tour of Europe, and looking on catholic New South Wales exclaimed, 'I have seen strange invisible things as though they were visible'. They were very strange and all too visible to Broughton; twenty priests and Scott's

51. W.A. Duncan, Correspondence between the Rev. Mr. Stack, Protestant Minister, and W.A. Duncan, Schoolmaster, Maitland (Sydney, 1839), p.iii.
52. Suttor, Hierarchy and Democracy, p.50.
53. Duncan, Correspondence Between Stack and Duncan, pp.2-4,7.
54. W.A. Duncan, A Reply to the Reverend W. Stack's Attempted Defence of His Lectures on the Man of Sin (Sydney, 1839), passim.
residence converted into a seminary for eight students, and news circulating that three more were in the Jesuit nursery at Douay waiting for passages out and Maynooth was willing to send as many as Polding requested. Twice within twelve months the domestic affairs of the Church of England had been seized upon as an excuse for public at a private dinner, and then Stack's semi-private remarks demonstrations, first it was Judge Willis's remarks/from a pulpit encased in four walls of stone. Did Duncan pretend that Roman Catholic pulpits never rang with anti-Protestant polemics? Why did Anglican polemics excite Roman Catholic retaliation when the polemics of others were ignored? No one had raised a voice against McIntyre's published attack on the idolatry of the Mass, and yet it was a more public and sustained attack on the Roman Catholic faith than Stack's mutterings at Maitland. Why was Rome selective in her retaliation, if it was not directed to some end other than the defence of her teachings?

Broughton blessed Stack and invited him to preach before the clergy assembled at the coming visitation in June. By the time Stack arrived in Sydney Broughton was convinced that Rome had planned some fresh advancement in the colony, and warned his assembled clergy 'to be on their guard and oppose her'. On the 24 May just past Polding had for the second time turned up at a government house levee in dress and appendages which, to Broughton's eye, distinguished him as a bishop of Rome. How brazen could a Roman Catholic be in Her

56. Ibid., pp. 392-3; Broughton to Coleridge, 6 February 1838 and 3 April 1840 (Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
57. Sydney Herald, 7 June 1839.
Majesty's colonies? As brazen as he liked, the *Sydney Herald* had said that very morning, re-echoing a recent article in *Blackwood's Magazine*. The Whigs will concede Roman Catholics their hearts desire in the colonies, the newspaper maintained, to compensate for the scant patronage they could return them in England and Ireland as recompense for Irish support in the House of Commons.° Polding had tested Bourke in 1837 and failed. When Broughton saw him try out Gipps in 1839 he realised in a flash that the dismissal of the 1837 episode as a sartorial error had been a mistake. So the Bishop protested again, and insisted this time that Polding could offer no explanation which would stop his complaint short of the Colonial Office.

Broughton asked whether it was now legal for civil officers of Her Majesty's government, duly sworn by the Oath of Supremacy, to receive in public on behalf of Her Majesty, Roman Catholic Bishops dressed in such a manner as to identify them as servants of the Pope.° Ever since his sojourn in England Broughton had longed to corner the British government and have it declare where it stood in respect of the Acts of the Reformation Settlement. Too many oaths seemed to him to be foresworn in deeds. Yet Broughton half expected Gipps to shelve the matter,° so he sent copies of his official complaint to

60. Broughton to Gipps, 25 May 1839, *op.cit.*
61. It was, but by Russell acting on Gipps's recommendation; see Russell to Gipps, 17 December 1839, *H.R.A.*, I.xx. 435; see also Birt, *Benedictine Pioneers*, vol.1, p.413, 420-1, and Chadwick, *Victorian Church*, I, p.24, both of which show that in England Roman Catholic prelates did go abroad in episcopal ecclesiastical dress.
Lord Lyndhurst, whom he had met at the King's School Feast Society and some thought might become a future Tory Prime Minister, and to Sir Robert Inglis. The matter was not to be easily killed this time.

Scarcely had Polding disrobed from the levee than he put on other garments to go up before the altar of God, and in the face of the blessed Sacrament denounced protestants. We came in peace, he said, and they have taken away our tranquility; we asked their co-operation in renovating the face of this land and in encouraging the arts and sciences which improve and adorn social life, but we have been condemned as itching after superiority; we have been promised religious equality, yet we smart under the inquisitorial control of the Bishop of Australia who, because he sits on a secret Council, can pry into the affairs of Roman Catholics as they submit their claims to the Council for subsidies under the Church Act. He is privy to our affairs but not we to his, Polding cried; and the people became indignant. No one suggested that the Bishop of Australia had misused his position to prejudice Roman Catholic claims, but the measured phrases in which he had recently pointed his clergy to a zealous opposition against them, augured ill for the future. So for their peace of mind and for the better implementation of the Church Act, the Roman Catholics of Sydney and the surrounding districts raised a Memorial praying Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State to remove the Right Rev. the Protestant Bishop from the Councils of the Colony. Being demoted one rank in the Councils by Her Majesty's

62. Broughton to Coleridge, 13 September 1839 (Broughton Correspondence, m/f, A.N.L.); on Lyndhurst, see R. Blake, Disraeli (London, 1966), pp.121-8.
government had had its humiliations, Broughton admitted, 'but I don't know what to say about being expelled by a posse of Romanists'. Yet he remained firm in his determination to quit the Councils when the proper time came according to his agreement with Glenelg.

A month later, in August 1839, Roman Catholic boldness came to a climax. The attack on Willis might be explained away and the attack on the Bishop had the appearance of a grievance, but the publication of the *Australian Chronicle* as a regular Roman Catholic newspaper 'to explain and uphold the civil and religious principles of Catholics, and to maintain their rights', could only be construed as a deliberately planned advance in formal propaganda.

The editors promised to avoid religious controversy and to concentrate on securing Catholic political rights, but that comforted few and least of all Broughton. Popery, the *Sydney Herald* had just warned its readers, was 'a system in which politics and religion are blended'. A Roman Catholic who wanted only to live in peace and to co-operate with protestants in teaching the arts and sciences and the duties of a common Christianity, was a phenomenon unknown in the histories Broughton had read. Wherever the system had flourished, the Bishop believed a spiritual and political despotism had followed in its train. Whatever the *Australian Chronicle* avowed to the contrary would be of no avail; no newspaper, however well intentioned, could

64. Broughton to Coleridge, 13 September 1839 (*op.cit.*).
65. Ibid.
68. Broughton to Coleridge, 6 February 1838 (*Broughton Correspondence, m/f, A.N.L.*).
prove itself superior to the system. So Broughton, satisfied that
popery had entered 'the business of agitation' on an unprecedented
scale, had no compunction in alerting his clergy 'to be on their
guard and oppose her; not to act on the aggressive, but on the
defensive'.

Throughout the 1830's Broughton had opposed the meddlings of
liberal churchmen and statesmen who bought peace by auctioning off
the privileges of the Church of England. He warned that popery and
not peace would reap the gain; that popery would wait, like a carrion
crow, until the church weakened by assault began to falter and then
she would swoop. By 1839 the abolition of the Church and School
Corporation, the passing of the Church Act which had raised Rome to
an equality with the Church of England, the frustration of the
parish schools system, and the alliances Rome seemed willing to make
with those of a liberal and often of an irreligious frame of mind,
encouraged Broughton to believe that Rome knew her hour had come to
swoop.

There would be no tranquility in New South Wales. New Zealand
had shown that. No friendly papist had there stretched out a hand
to seek protestant co-operation in spreading the arts and sciences
which adorn social life. Instead, Bishop Pompalier boasted that
God had given him 'the souls and hearts of New Zealanders', and

69. Broughton to Coleridge, 13 September 1839 (ibid.).
70. Sydney Herald, 7 June 1839.
71. On this theme see, Broughton to Arthur, 21 September 1836
(Arthur Papers, vol.12, M.L.); Broughton to Dr. Warneford,
12 November 1838 ('Bishop Broughton's Letters 1834-1843',
marched his troops into protestant missions. The non-conformists, who had howled against the inequity of England's religious laws, now pleaded for injunctions banning papists from even setting a foot on their missions. "That we must grant is not so liberal", Broughton wryly commented; but it told the story of the desperate and aggressive face of New Zealand's papists.

Events in New Zealand proved to Broughton's satisfaction that Rome's grand design had hit the Pacific. The papal mission there thrived on French money, and as Bishop Pompalier detached the minds of the natives from protestant truth to papist error, Broughton believed he would also strive to replace their respect for things British with an affection for things French. 'There is an intimate and well understood union between the civil and ecclesiastical powers in this establishment of a Roman Catholic Mission under a French Bishop', Broughton warned the C.M.S. And when his friend Norris rummaged through reports in the British Museum and discovered that Polding, as well as Pompalier, was receiving funds from the 

Propagation de la Foi at Lyons, the grand design grew more sinister. Broughton tried to warn statesmen of the danger; but he found liberal churchmen blind and liberal statesmen fools. All Broughton could do, as the first decade of his administration gave way to the second,

---


73. Broughton to Coleridge, 3 April 1840 (Broughton Correspondence, m/f, A.N.L.).
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75. Norris to Broughton, 3 July 1841 (Broughton Papers 1824-98, Ms. No.913, M.L.).

76. Broughton to Coleridge, 13 September 1839 (Broughton Correspondence, m/f, A.N.L.).
was curse their folly. He no longer feared the threat of Rome; he faced it.

Broughton had built his citadel to defend the Church of England from the latitudinarianism of liberal churchmen and their allies in government, and by that means he hoped to save the church from debased views of ecclesiastical authority and doctrine. The price he paid was a retreat from civil prominence as a religious leader. He hoped that his successors might one day be invited to return and enter again into government as in times past. But that could never be if Rome edged her way into the gap left by his retreat. And as Broughton and his descendents would occupy a place in this new land for many generations, for his daughter Phoebe had turned her tender eye towards the son of a settler from the Hunter River whom she had met on board the ship 'Camden', Broughton was determined, as a settler and citizen as much as a religious leader, to reduce Rome's influence. It was as much for the sake of the colony at large as for the Church of England that he threw himself into a struggle to keep Rome from winning a wider influence. 'My mind is full of the subject', he confided to Coleridge as he gazed into the year 1840. 'Indeed it departs not from me day nor night'.

Broughton's personal burden was increased in 1839 by the departure of his ablest lieutenant, Judge Burton, for England. 'He

77. Broughton to Coleridge, 3 April 1840 (ibid.). On Phoebe Broughton and Charles Boydel see, Sydney Herald, 6 June 1836 (Shipping Intelligence) and Phoebe Broughton, Diary, p.27 (Ms.No.756, M.L.). The Boydel family was prominent in Hunter River agitations, see Sydney Gazette 12 May 1836,
has allowed himself to be soured and annoyed by the ribaldry of the newspapers', Broughton noted with regret. But the Judge took his bountiful care for the colonial church to England with him. Before leaving Sydney Burton had toured the countryside inspecting churches and schools, and the information he gathered he turned into a book in the quiet of the ocean journey home. He offered the result to England at a time the Transportation enquiry had turned a public eye on New South Wales and was earning for it comment in the press, in the prestigious journals, and in the pulpit. To the Transportation Committee's claim that transportation had depraved the colony, Burton added the remark that it need not have done so if there had been sufficient schools and churches. Burton knocked on the door of the S.P.G. and was admitted as one speaking with authority. In this way Broughton's loss was turned into gain.

The S.P.G. decided to do more for New South Wales than it had done in times past. Instead of the usual £500 for development it voted £1000; it found extra money for parsonages in the Hunter River

78. Broughton to Coleridge, 25 February 1839 (Broughton Correspondence, m/f, A.N.L.).
81. Burton, Religion and Education in N.S.W., pp.v-vii.
area, and pledged to help re-establish the King's School in Sydney; it voted Broughton £500 to set up an establishment in opposition to Polding's seminary; it sent him £300 for two missionaries to work the bounds of the remoter settlements, and another £250 for a secretary and domestic chaplain to relieve him of the burden of his correspondence; and there came too a loan of £3,000 at 5% for St. Andrew's Church. And yet as much as came Broughton spent, and asked for more. 'The Society will find me a bold beggar', he said. They did; and had finally to pull him into line for over-spending.

Other sources boosted his funds. Coleridge kept money coming in in small sums of between £250 and £500, and Dr. Warneford's promised bequest turned out to be £2,000 for schools in Canada and New South Wales. But the greatest gift of all came from home territory. Thomas Moore of Liverpool, who had often spoken to Broughton of giving up some of his gain to the Almighty, finally died and left his entire estate to the Bishop of Australia in trust for the Church of England;


84. Broughton to Campbell, 30 October 1839 ('Bishop Broughton's Letters 1834-1843', 'C' Mss. Aust. Papers, Box 12, S.P.G. Papers, m/f, A.N.L.);
S.P.G. to Broughton, 30 July 1842 ('Letters sent to Australia', 'F' Mss. vol.1, S.P.G. Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).


that meant, £20,000 in cash and 6,000 acres. A number of legal uncertainties hung over the will, and hitherto unknown relatives in England began to show an interest in their deceased relative. Broughton sought the best legal opinion in England, for he meant to keep the bequest if he was legally entitled to do so.

This extraordinary spate of sustenance to some extent offset Rome's new boldness and the Governor's threat of leaner subsidies for religion and uncertain grants for education, and strengthened Broughton's conviction that 'the effectual maintenance of the Church of England here is a part of God's providential purpose for his truth'. It also afforded him a means for sustaining ecclesiastical expansion while the rest of the colony staggered for a moment in the grip of another bout of poor seasons. It afforded him also the means of nourishing a hopeful disposition in the young clergy whom he found all too apt to weaken in their resolve. He told them that they had thirty-seven churches at their disposal either completed or in building, whereas their predecessors in 1836 had had only nine. Twenty-three of them now could live in parsonages, compared with only five of their predecessors.

Whenever he overheard a voice despairing of ultimate success he felt

88. Broughton to Coleridge, 15 July 1841 (Broughton Correspondencee, m/f, A.N.L.).
89. Broughton to Coleridge, 27 December 1841, and 14 February 1842 (ibid.).
90. Broughton to Coleridge, 3 April 1840 (ibid.).
91. Broughton to Coleridge, 14 February 1842 (ibid.).
92. Broughton to Coleridge, 15 February 1841 (ibid.); W.G. Broughton, A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of New South Wales of the Diocese of Australia, At the Visitation held in the Church of St. James, Sydney, on Wednesday, October the 6th 1841 (Sydney, 1841), pp.35-6.
pangs of indignation, he said. A colony of 130,000 free Englishmen could not fail. Should matters turn difficult are we to sit down and repine? 'He hoped', he added 'that there was a better spirit abroad than to allow any such feeling.'

Putting a heart into his clergy was one duty his episcopal office obliged him to attempt; superintending his scattered diocese was another, and less easily accomplished. Roman Catholics pointed a finger at Van Diemen's Land and asked the whereabouts of its apostolic leader; and turning the same finger on Port Philip, South Australia, and New Zealand, laughed that the Church of England should pretend to be an apostolic church. Broughton needed no reminder of the absurdity of his position as the only bishop in so vast a region. He had seen it all before in India, and had condemned it as roundly as any papist. He had declared in 1829 that he would never try to patch up, by ineffectual wanderings, the lack of a proper ecclesiastical organisation. Yet, as his diocese grew, he did just what Heber had done. He wandered. He went to Port Philip, he tried to reach South Australia, and he agreed to return to New Zealand. At the same time he began to urge the creation of new bishoprics.

93. Sydney Herald, 22 December 1841 (speech in Legislative Council).
94. Broughton to Coleridge, 4 December 1841 (Broughton Correspondence, m/f, A.N.L.); Broughton to Norris, March 1841 (Broughton Papers, 1824-98, Ms.No.913, M.L.).
95. Broughton, 'John' Diary, 26 June 1829
97. Broughton to Jowett, 17 July 1830 (sic.), (ibid.). The letter is post-marked 1840.
difficulty was to make his voice heard in the right places outside the colony. The colonial laity would do little to help. They saw a ready benefit in contributing to buildings and Broughton hoped to teach them one day to contribute to the upkeep of the clergy, but he knew that the spread of liberal religious sentiments had destroyed, for the moment, any feeling of a need for a widespread episcopate. His cry, to be effective, must be heard in England and by men who hitherto had shown no interest in erecting a college for training colonial clergy, let alone raising the immense endowments necessary for new bishoprics. Broughton set his hopes once more on Oxford. The men there had shown some interest in the colony by sending him money, and even more by gathering together a library to save the place becoming a 'Colonia indocta'. So he put his case to Dr. Pusey, believing him a man of considerable influence. In 1840 he waited for a response.

Alongside of Broughton's anxiety for proper and efficient episcopal supervision was another equally burdensome anxiety for the preservation of the new works recently begun. The S.P.G. had enabled him to launch many new projects, but the Society's grants were for strictly limited periods; some would last five years, most for three, and after that the colony must sustain them alone. At a Diocesan

98. Broughton to Coleridge, 19 October 1837 (Broughton Correspondence, m/f, A.N.L.).
99. Broughton to Coleridge, 3 April 1840 (ibid.).
1. Ibid.
Committee dinner in 1839, David Campbell declared that the burden of Church finance had fallen on too few, and that colonists at large had behaved meanly towards their church. Broughton rebuked him. Campbell was right; but Broughton would not have it said publicly. 'There is not a district where the settlers have not subscribed to the Society', he said.³

The Church's troubles were rooted in the narrowness of its organisation, and the Bishop decided that the time had come to rectify the matter. The Diocesan Committee, for instance, consisted of civil officials, merchants and landed gentry, and raised its money from those same classes. That was good as far as it went, but it left untapped the affluence of an ever increasing class of successful artisans and tradesmen. Broughton wanted their co-operation and their contribution, so he decided to open the doors of the Diocesan Committee to their representative. He would admit two for a start, and then others when the idea had won acceptance. It was a 'hazardous experiment', Broughton admitted, and one bound to ruffle the well-bred gentlemen who sat at present on the Committee. But as free immigration increased those artisans and tradesmen would be representative of an increasing class of settler, and Broughton believed it right that they should share in the workings of the Church. So once more he showed that the colony was not to be the preserve of a privileged class.⁴

4. Broughton to Coleridge, 14 October 1839 (Broughton Correspondence, m/f, A.N.L.).
The colony was poised in those days for a considerable change in its population. The last shipment of convicts to the mainland was due to leave England before 1 August 1840. Broughton hailed the passing of the transportation era, and on the day the Governor officially announced the decision Broughton stood up in the Council chamber to salute the native born. Though not himself native born, he said, 'he had been so long resident that he was not without a share of patriotic feeling on the occasion'. He had never regarded transportation as a benefit absolutely, or a good thing in itself, he told the Council. Indeed, to the onlooker it might have seemed that Broughton had never known what to do with the convict. He had been the free man's pastor, and he rejoiced to be the bishop of a free colony. When twelve months later James Macarthur hinted that the colony could do with a drop of transportation to fill in the labour gap Broughton remarked that it was not what an 'Australian' would wish.

Broughton was strategically placed, as chairman of the Immigration Committees of the Legislative Council, to direct the early stages of the new growth towards a free Australia. For that reason some of the older settlers appealed to him to deploy his influence in limiting the intake of Irish and Roman Catholic settlers, and to expand the flow of protestant immigrants. Broughton admitted in October 1840 that a bias in favour of Irish and Roman Catholic settlers had begun

5. Russell to Gipps, 6 July 1840, H.R.A., I.xx 700-3; Sydney Herald, 21 October 1840.
6. Sydney Herald, 26 October 1840.
7. Broughton to Coleridge, 27 December 1841 (Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.); Sydney Herald, 22 December 1841.
to appear. He had nothing against the Irish personally, he said, and had employed them in his own household, but like many others he did tremble at the thought of a colony flooded with Irish Catholics. Yet he envisaged no remedy. 'If this arose only from the greater willingness of the Irish to leave their country', he told the anxious party, '...there might be no grounds for just complaint.' Should he uncover evidence of a deliberate attempt to manipulate the supply of immigrants in favour of people of Irish and Roman Catholic origin he would act; otherwise the colony must grow as the natural course of immigration moved it.  

Broughton's task was no longer to manipulate the growth of the colony, but to fit into it. His contemplated retirement from the Legislative Council symbolised his determination to disentangle himself from the government and the church from the state. The state had made the change necessary. Earlier in his career Broughton had instructed the clergy to go about their vocation silently, and never to impede the measures of government by captious objections nor to exhibit themselves in opposition to its authority.  

The recent actions of the state had ended that harmonious relationship, and the day could well come when, for the sake of the church, Broughton might have to call the clergy out into a vigorous and outspoken opposition against some measures of government.  

---

8. *Sydney Herald*, 31 August, 6 and 26 October 1840.
In such times of increased tension between church and state, it greatly surprised Broughton to find Coleridge mounting a great enthusiasm for a new work on church and state by the young Tory politician, W.E. Gladstone. Broughton had encountered Gladstone as one of Aberdeen's undersecretaries at the Colonial Office. The young man had then come close to resigning his office in protest at Aberdeen's liberal views on education in the West Indies. Like Broughton he held a high view on the relation between church and state and regarded the matter as the key problem of the age. Hoping one day to direct the ship of state himself, Gladstone directed his talent to exploring the principles which should guide a statesman who was also a churchman. He began by attributing to the nation a personality and a paternal obligation towards its people in both the things of man and of God, and ended by maintaining that right national acts, like proper personal deeds, could only proceed from a good conscience sharpened by a true religion. The soul of a nation was inseparable from its religion.

Around 1830 such ideas and their supporting arguments would have been grist to Broughton's mill, but by 1840 he had no enthusiasm for the exercise. Like Thomas Macaulay he thought the book a wasted effort,

not because the principles were wrong, as the Whig historian maintained, but simply anachronistic.14 The principles and the intentions of the theory were excellent, but in Broughton's opinion they could no longer bear the 'wear and tear of active service'.15 Gladstone exhorted statesmen to disregard the din of political contention and to maintain the union between state and church where happily it existed. But where did it still exist? Broughton asked.

Once England repealed the Test and Corporation Acts and approved Catholic Emancipation, it changed utterly the foundation of the nation. In Hooker's day an obvious and outward unity between church and state gave the nation a distinct personality. 'How is it today when the state has twenty consciences?' the Bishop asked. 'I think Mr. Gladstone being a politician...is not quite willing to look the truth steadfastly in the face, but expects an established Church to be maintained when the support which it naturally rests upon are all, or next to all, removed.' A still vast inheritance in endowments and institutions clouded from the eyes of Englishmen their true and rapidly deteriorating condition. Gladstone would have better spent his talent preparing the church for the defence it must make against the state.16

Preparing that local defence became Broughton's great task of the 1840's; and he moved forward rapidly on a broad front building churches, parsonages, schools, a cathedral, a college, and a library.

15. Broughton to Coleridge, 14 October 1839 (Broughton Correspondence, m/f, A.N.L.).
16. Ibid.
'I sometimes fear lest I am trying too much in desiring to see the foundation laid of every institution essential to the maintenance of pure religion', he confided tired and worn to Coleridge. 'But by the blessing of God all are in progress or in promise.' Some onlookers, however, saw little that God could bless. They distorted the Bishop's motives, and condemned his effort to establish a citadel as a cunning manoeuvre calculated to restore the Church of England as 'sole ruler and Lord over God's heritage'. They promised to one day reveal the full extent of his intrigue. In the meantime they exposed it as opportunity provided.

When the Bishop protested against the sale of the clergy and school estates, they said he would not stop till he regained one-seventh of the land of the colony. When he chaired a meeting to raise relief for those left unemployed by the drought, they said he was buying popularity in support of some more sinister design. They called him an enemy of religious liberty; and yet, in the recent contest over education he had said that the English Constitution might be construed to show that the Church of England had a place of primacy in British colonies, but he would be content with the same independence as Rome and liberty to follow the doctrines of the English Reformers as distinct from Geneva. They called him an 'intriguing prelate'; and

17. Broughton to Coleridge, 25 February 1839 (Broughton Correspondence, m/f, A.N.L.).
18. Australian Chronicle, 6 August 1839.
19. Ibid., 16 August 1839.
20. Ibid., 6 August 1839.
while those words were still hot on their lips Broughton wrote to his friends in England to say that future colonial bishops must be content to take 'a lower room in civil life'. Broughton had plans for the future, but they were not of the order his enemies feared. 'My hope and trust is', he said in the first weeks of his second decade in the colony, 'that I may lay a foundation upon which hereafter our Jerusalem may stand as it ought "a unity in itself".' Beyond that he had only dreams.

The decade of the 1830's had witnessed a revolution in Broughton's thought, and one he would more readily admit in private than in public. But for those in the crowd with ears to hear it was evident. The *Sydney Herald*, reporting on the Bishop's Visitation Charge in 1839, captured his mood with commendable precision; 'He then explained the provision of the Church Act which he considers is likely to have very ill effects upon the religious welfare of the community, but still as it is the law of the land it must be treated with respect'. For Broughton the law of the land had become a crown of thorns, and he resolved to carry it patiently. His enemies still waxed virulent in their abuse against him and his office, but they admitted to more heat than anguish. 'That the friends of religious Liberty have anything serious to apprehend from the manoeuvres of the

22. *Australian Chronicle*, 9 and 13 August 1839; Broughton to Coleridge, 3 April 1840 (*Broughton Correspondence*, m/f, A.N.L.).
Right Reverend Dr. Broughton', the Australian Chronicle reported in its second issue, 'we do not think'. But it spared the Bishop little, delivering wave upon wave of attacks to ensure that the dying notions of a church establishment could never be revived by a change to a Tory administration in England. Broughton had no illusions of what to expect from Tory masters. It was they in 1835 who had convinced him of the need for his fresh approach to religious survival in New South Wales.

When on occasions Broughton uttered his thoughts about a future restoration to the tried and traditional order of the past, it was to a time two hundred years hence that he looked. That was his dream. But the vision of a divine plan for the redemption of the great southern regions never left him. In 1829 he had looked on the English nation and seen in its exaltation and the extent of its power an unmistakable signal of God's having chosen it as his mediator in that redemption. In 1840 he no longer spoke of the role of the English nation in the southern hemisphere. He spoke instead of the role of the Church of England:

We have a wonderful and mysterious scene unfolding in this hemisphere; in which I am anxiously looking for the Church of England to appear dispensing the elements of primitive truth and establishing those principles of primitive order which, through the peculiar blessing of her Divine Founder and Head, are so providentially blended and incorporated in her system.

He came to serve an establishment: he remained to serve a church.

25. Australian Chronicle, 6 August 1839.
26. Broughton to Coleridge, 15 February 1841 (Broughton Correspondence, m/f, A.N.L.).
APPENDIX A

THE EARLY LIFE OF WILLIAM GRANT BROUGHTON

The two principal sources of information on the early life of Broughton are a short biography by the Reverend George Gilbert¹ and a memoir by the Reverend Benjamin Harrison.² Neither afford a satisfactory explanation of those early years. Other sketches add nothing. The article on the Bishop in the Dictionary of National Biography acknowledges dependence on Gilbert and Harrison.³ The lengthy obituary in the Annual Register is almost certainly Harrison's work,⁴ for it reads like a precis of his memoir. Moreover, a correspondence between Gilbert and the Bishop's brother, James Broughton, shows that Harrison had prepared an account of the Bishop's death for publication in 1853.⁵

It is not easy to pinpoint the capacity in which each knew Broughton. Gilbert was Broughton's contemporary at the King's School, Canterbury, and possibly a close friend as they attended extra mathematical lessons together outside the school.⁶ Later in life they

5. Gilbert to James Broughton, 14 and 17 March 1853 (Item 2d, Correspondence of Reverend George Gilbert, Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
corresponded, but no letters survive before 27 March 1843. Gilbert seems to have handled the distribution of Broughton's pamphlets in England, and to have been in contact with the Archbishop of Canterbury and the S.P.C.K. on matters of concern to the Bishop.

Harrison was twenty years Broughton's junior. The origin of their association is more obscure, and no evidence of a correspondence between them has survived. But their paths could have crossed in three ways. Harrison wrote four *Tracts for the Times*, taking as the topic of his special interest the scriptural authority for episcopal organisation. Few topics interested Broughton more, and he may have written to the author in the same way as his admiration for Pusey's *Tracts* moved him to write to the embattled professor. Harrison was also Archbishop Howley's chaplain from 1843 to 1848 and would have handled much of the correspondence passing between Bishop and Archbishop during the creation of new colonial bishoprics, and the

7. The correspondence is found in Item 2b and Item 2d, *Broughton Papers*, m/f, A.N.L. Item 2b consists of Broughton's letters to Gilbert, and Item 2d of Gilbert's letters to the Bishop, to James Broughton, and to the Bishop's daughter, Mrs. Crawley. These latter few letters belong to the 1870's and suggest that Mrs. Crawley sent the Bishop's papers to Gilbert who sorted them and deposited what he thought was significant in St. Augustine's College, Canterbury.


Bishop's subsequent concern to turn these bishoprics into something more than a loose scattering of missionary dioceses. Then as Archdeacon of Maidstone, Kent, from 1845 to 1887 Harrison would have had contact with the Reverend Mr. Francis, Broughton's brother-in-law, whose incumbency at St. Peters, Canterbury, fell within Harrison's archdeaconry. These and other less obvious connections, such as Harrison's close friendship with Sir Robert Inglis (who handled Broughton's business in the House of Commons), would have permitted Harrison to learn a good deal of Broughton without there being a deeply personal friendship.

The work of both Gilbert and Harrison reflects their contact with Broughton in his latter years, and is correspondingly weak on his earlier years. Harrison hoped in time to collect sufficient material for a substantial biography, and Gilbert saw the need to be busy about establishing an accurate chronology of the Bishop's early life. 'The part which most troubles me is the interim between 1804 and 1814', he wrote calling apologetically on the Bishop's brother, James Broughton, for aid. 'It is important that we who are his friends and contemporaries should supply for the use of his biographers accurate statements and insert them in a work from which information is usually sought.'

14. Gilbert to James Broughton, 5 March 1853 (*ibid.*).
young to remember the details of his brother's youth. There is no indication that he supplied Gilbert the information he sought.

One question which remains clouded in obscurity concerns Broughton's failure to proceed from the King's School to Cambridge. Whitington speculated that Broughton's father was dead by 1804, and the family in need of a breadwinner. This is irreconcilable with Professor Cable's discovery of the signature of his father on the bond put up in 1807 to get Broughton into the treasury of the East India Company. It does not rule out the possibility that his father was ill in 1804, and though he lingered on till 1807 or later he could not support the family. On the other hand, his father's capacity to put up a £500 bond suggests the family means were not all that straitened. Broughton proved later that he could win scholarships, and had he entered Cambridge a sizar in 1805, he might have worked his way through the University without burdening his family. It is possible, however, that relatives supplied most of the bond. One likely candidate would have been his uncle, William Broughton, who willed him the legacy in 1813.

Harrison leaves no doubt that in his opinion Broughton never deviated from his desire to enter the church. Circumstances, he said, 'stood in the way'. Gilbert is more reticent. He consulted the bishop's brother and was content to record that Broughton left the King's School in 1804 and entered the East India Company in 1807. He offers no explanation of Broughton's activities in 1805 and 1806.

16. See this thesis, chapter 1, footnote 15.
Broughton's own correspondence leaves little doubt that a family financial crisis occurred in his youth and this left a deep scar on his memory. He lived in terror of his family and children being left with inadequate support. His first reaction on learning that no pension accompanied the office of Archdeacon of New South Wales was to inform the Duke of Wellington that he should decline it for his children's sake. 17 Thereafter he bitterly resented every expense of public office which drew on his personal savings, and frequently complained that his children bore the penalty of his doing his duty well. 18 He carried £3,000 of life assurance policies at heavy premiums, owing to his having to travel by sea in the course of his duties, and he constantly found himself being burdened with extra levies as his work took him across new waters. 19

This preoccupation, however, must be balanced against a consideration of what financial hardship might have meant to Broughton. He thought his mother lived in poor circumstances, but she kept rooms in the fairly fashionable Fitzroy Square of London. 20 If he sent her only £30 for three months he felt he was leaving her in hardship. 21 He complained of the smallness of the allowance given him to outfit

17. Broughton to Mother, 4 November 1829 (Item 2a, Early Correspondence of W.G. Broughton, Broughton Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
19. Cowper to Coates (C.M.S.), 28 December 1838 ('Letters of Corresponding Committee Secretary to Home Secretary', C.N./02, C.M.S. Papers, m/f, A.N.L.).
21. Ibid.
himself for the voyage to the colony, but it was double that normally allowed. He ate his way through his annual salary of £2,000 and moaned of its inadequacies, and at a time he confessed that a chaplain with a frugal wife could rear a family on £250 a year. He spoke of his home 'Tusculum' as if it was a mere cottage and not a prestigious two-storey stone building with nine rooms and doric pillars adorning its entrance. Its annual rent exceeded the yearly stipend of most chaplains. He complained of the cost of his return voyage to England in 1834, but the Colonial Office found on investigation that he had travelled expensively and extremely comfortably. He complained of the cost involved in becoming a bishop, and when the Colonial Office asked him to itemise his anticipated expenses they found his fears were quite exaggerated.

Broughton did fear that he would never have sufficient money to get by. The causes for that lay deep inside him. But he seemed to fear a peculiar type of poverty, and one that had more in common with falling below a certain style of living than the actual want of the necessities of life. It may have been this that afflicted his youth; and when in December 1804 he faced the crucial decision on his own

---

23. See this thesis, chapter 9, footnote 5.
24. Broughton to Keate, 1 May 1837 (Ms. No. 1731, A.N.L.); Broughton to Coleridge, 8 September 1837, and 4 December 1841 (Broughton Correspondence, m/f, A.N.L.).
future, he may have chosen the East India Company, where his uncle had done so well, as best able to supply the comforts and security that preoccupied him most of his life.
An early historian, G.W. Rusden, has stated that both Broughton and Campbell were absent from the Council the day the vote was taken on the Jury Bill and that both Blaxland and Bell voted against it. In this way he has accounted for the even vote which only Bourke's casting vote broke. Broughton, however, was present and voted against the Bill; therefore either Blaxland or Bell voted with the Governor. The manner of Bell's appointment to the Legislative Council suggests that he was less likely than Blaxland to oppose Bourke. Bourke had nominated Bell to the Council in 1833, and openly admitted that it was his policy to fill all vacancies with men who would support his policies. Bell's appointment was the more extraordinary in that he, a pastoralist and free-settler, was selected to fill the vacancy created by the departure of the Lieutenant-Governor, thus upsetting the balance between official and un-official members. Bourke showed a similar overriding concern for political considerations when he

4. The move was the more extraordinary as Bourke proposed not seating the Lieutenant-Governor's successor on the Council. Yet the very reason for Broughton's demotion one rank was the allegedly high importance of that officer of state in the administration. The Secretary of State expressed amazement at Bourke's recommendation. See, Bourke to Goderich, 24 September 1832, H.R.A., I.xvi.760; Goderich to Bourke, 27 March 1833, H.R.A., I.xvii.60.
passed over Captain King in favour of Sir John Jamison in filling a second vacancy, King being considered by most parties the more eligible candidate. Bell, having been so carefully chosen, would scarcely have offended his patron on the occasion of his first crucial vote in Council. Bell, however, did not much like his place on the Legislative Council and wanted to retire.

Blaxland's appointment to the Legislative Council dated from Darling's administration. With Bourke's arrival he did emerge as one of the progressive members and became the spokesman within the Council for those who wanted cheaper government. His ideals were decidedly Whiggish; and he has been preserved in this mould. Yet he was a cautious progressive who believed that the Legislative Council ought to be in step with the people, not, as Bourke would have it, one step ahead of them. For this reason he praised Bourke's proposals for national schools but regretfully declined to support any measure to introduce them in 1835 or 1836. It would not have been out of character, therefore, for Blaxland to have favoured a general policy of extending trial by jury but, given the evidence of the outcry against it in the press and petitions of 1833, to have declined supporting it at that point in time.

6. Bourke did not nominate Bell as a member of his proposed new Legislative Council in 1836; see Bourke to Glenelg, 26 December 1835, H.R.A., I.xviii.252.
APPENDIX C

GLENELG'S CHANGE IN ATTITUDE TOWARDS BODIES
DISSenting FROM NATIONAL SCHOOLS IN 1835

From the original draft of Glenelg's despatch on colonial education, n.d., found in C.O. 325/28, pp. 181-2.

Should it however, appear either in the preparation of such a general and comprehensive plan in the Council, or in its actual adoption that any large class of the community entertains such an objection to it as must practically exclude them from a participation in its benefits it will be for you to consider whether some supplemental plan ought not to be adopted to meet the particular case. I am of opinion that the only schools to be wholly supported The same passage in the final despatch, Glenelg to Bourke, 30 November, H.R.A., I.xviii.206. These amendments are found on Minute BB, in Glenelg's handwriting, C.O. 325/28, pp. 185-6.

I have hitherto had in view those Schools, which are to be supported wholly at the Public expense; and I am of opinion that Schools so supported ought to be invariably of the general nature just adverted to. But the system of Public Education would, I think, be incomplete, if it did not leave an opening for the admission on certain terms, of private contributions in aid of the Public. There may be persons and even Classes of persons, who may entertain such objections to the general plan as must practically
by the public funds are those of the general nature which I have averted to but in the event which I have supposed possible it might be expedient to consider whether some pecuniary assistance might not be afforded from the public funds to schools in connection with the particular denomination comprising those who object to the new comprehensive system. The terms and conditions on which such assistance should be offered I leave to the consideration of yourself and of the Council and I merely throw out this suggestion from an anxiety that no large class of His Majesty's subjects in the colony should be excluded from the benefit of education on principles connected with the opinions which they conscientiously entertain. exclude them from a participation in its benefits, and who may yet be unable to supply a proper Education for their Children from their own funds exclusively. It would be hard that any large Class of His Majesty's Subjects should be debarred from the advantage of Education on principles, which they conscientiously approve. I submit it to you and your Council as a just object for your consideration, whether, in such cases, some pecuniary assistance might not be afforded from the Public funds in aid of Contributions from parties dissatisfied with the more comprehensive system. The terms and conditions on which such assistance may be tendered, I leave to the deliberate judgment of yourself and your Council, persuaded that you will arrange a system, which, excluding no large Class of conscientious Religionists from its benefits, shall be in a true sense National.
APPENDIX D

BROUGHTON. A LIAR?

Dr. Barrett's study of the education crisis of 1836 led him to conclude that 'the bishop was subtil to the point of lying in this campaign'.¹ This charge rests on a conflict between Broughton's account of the formation of the Protestant Association, as put before the Legislative Council in 1839,² and that of the Reverend R. Mansfield and the Reverend J. Saunders given to the Select Committee on Education in 1844.³ Dr. Barrett preferred the evidence of 1844 to that of 1839 on the ground that having caught Broughton out in one matter his whole account is open to suspicion. Broughton's alleged error was to state that Anglican clerical opposition to systems of education had formed before his return in 1836 and independently of his urging. Dr. Barrett found evidence to the contrary in letters the Bishop wrote from England to Cowper and Hill on 26 June 1835,⁴ and to Marsden on 25 September 1835.⁵ These, he has alleged, show Broughton giving a 'strong lead' from abroad to all opposition against systems of education, whether beholden to Irish or British and Foreign ideas. The shade of difference between actually organising opposition

---

² Broughton, Speech in Legislative Council on Education, pp.3-5.
⁵ Broughton to Marsden, 25 September 1835 (Marsden Papers, vol.1, M.L.).
and giving it a strong lead might be sufficient to leave Broughton technically correct, but it is misleading in the terms of his effect. Finding Broughton subtle in this one matter Dr. Barrett has suspected Broughton of it in others, especially where the Bishop's evidence is in conflict with that of an astute Baptist and an intelligent Wesleyan.  

Dr. Barrett's argument is open to examination from two directions; firstly, it may be asked whether the Bishop's letters to Marsden, Cowper and Hill bear only the interpretation he has placed on them, and secondly, whether evidence available in 1836 better supports the Bishop's account of his activities or that given by the two dissenting ministers whose testimony Barrett prefers. Broughton's letter to Cowper and Hill on 26 June 1835 expressed the Bishop's delight in finding that Cowper and Hill had decided independently of him not to support any move which would weaken the parish school system of the Church of England. The initiative in expressing this dissent, which was from the new school society being formed on British and Foreign Principles in 1835, came from Cowper and Hill, and not from Broughton. The Bishop wrote his letter to Marsden, 25 September 1835, at the peak of his indecisions about returning to the colony. The letter was a depressed and almost despairing soliloquy on the popularity of compromise in England and its ill-effect on Ireland. He bemoaned the absence of men of principle in Church and State, but declared he shall ever remain one. This stand had delayed his return and could finally prevent it, he told Marsden, but he believed Marsden,  

being also a man of principle, would support him in his stand. The letter was an apology for inaction rather than the call for a united colonial effort in some direction.

The evidence of the Reverend R. Mansfield and the Reverend J. Saunders given before the Select Committee on Education in 1844, coincided in the suggestion that Broughton had frustrated, at some stage, a widespread expectation among protestants that their churches would unite in a general scheme of education. It is difficult to decide from the evidence whether Saunders believed Broughton fostered this expectation until his purpose had been served and then cut loose from it, or whether he was its enemy from the start. The latter is the easier construction of the crucial Question forty-one in Saundes's evidence;

*Lang.* Are you aware that when it was found that a large proportion of the Protestant community generally would not coincide with such a scheme, that there was much disappointment felt on the part of the Protestant community?

*Saunders.* More than that; when it was found that the Bishop, who had lately arrived, had influenced the minds of the clergy contrary to our view, there was great disappointment felt, even by many of his own denomination.7

Saunders' own address to the Protestant Association on 12 August 1836 does not make the position any clearer. The annoyance he expressed then at Broughton's stand-offish attitude could have arisen either from a disappointed expectation that the Bishop would unite with Dissenters in education, or from an annoyance at the Bishop's persistent belief that he could afford not to.8

7. 'Report from the Select Committee on Education', *op.cit.*, p.97.
The evidence of the Reverend R. Mansfield was clearer, and more interesting, being that of a friend and one of the Bishop's closest associates on the Protestant Association and one who was doubtless a party to the original discussions on the Bishop's return. He believed, well into 1837, that Broughton might co-operate with other Protestants in education, and not until 1839 did he realise the Bishop never intended to do so from the beginning. From Question fifteen in his evidence it would seem that Mansfield based his optimism on Broughton's failure to formally repudiate the plan for a general scheme of protestant education put forward on 9 September 1836;

Charles Cowper. Did the Bishop of Australia approve it?
Mansfield. I do not remember that he ever gave us his opinion.10

Mansfield maintained this in the face of Broughton's statement to the General Committee of Protestants on 3 August. He said on that occasion:

I turn my attention now to the express object for which this meeting is convened; namely to consider the practicability of establishing a system of general education.... I owe it to the candour and plain dealing, which it is my anxious wish on all occasions to use...to say that the longer I have considered it the less reason have I seen to believe that the proposed design is practicable.11

Mansfield's optimism is both undeniable and extraordinary, and may be partly explained by the adulatory posture he adopted towards Broughton from the time he arrived as Archdeacon in the colony. In 1830 he had hailed Broughton as the harbinger of a grand protestant unity which he believed already on the move abroad.12

9. 'Report from the Select Committee on Education', op.cit., pp.11-12.
10. Ibid., p.11.
the *Sydney Gazette* he had fought Broughton's case against his critics, and continued this goodwill into 1836 and 1837 by subscribing to the appeals of the Diocesan Committee.\(^\text{13}\) He, too, probably organised the Wesleyan address of welcome on the Bishop's return from England in 1836. It can only be concluded that this friendship, which brought him so close to Broughton, blinded him at the same time to the logic of the Bishop's belief that even among protestant friends there were divisions of principles that must never be weakened out of respect for any friendship.

Barrett believed Mansfield too intelligent a person to be deceived without deliberate cunning on the part of the deceiver. Yet it cannot be denied that it took him three years to learn what others understood in an instant. The editor of the *Colonist* wrote in the issue of 11 August 1836:

...the bishop did not go to the Dissenters, but the Dissenters to the bishop; that the interview which they sought with His Lordship had for its primary object a 'union' against the Irish System; and that to this 'union' His Lordship gave a cordial and unhesitating 'pledge'. As to the extension of this 'union' to a system of education common to the Protestant body at large, the Dissenters thought of it as a matter of secondary importance, nor did they at any time entertain a sanguine hope of its practicability.

To deny that some Dissenters suffered confusion of mind would be to fly in the face of the evidence taken by the Select Committee on Education in 1844. Whether that confusion is to be readily pardoned is a different and more difficult question. But to deduce

\(^{13}\) For a discussion of the relationship between Mansfield and Broughton see pp. 95-7 of this thesis; for Mansfield's support of the Diocesan Committee's appeal, *Statement of the Objects of the Committee of the Societies for the Propagation of the Gospel etc. 1836*, pp.28-31.
from it that 'Broughton gave, and obviously intended to give, every
opportunity for various interpretations of his position', is too
harsh and narrow a conclusion. It requires exalting the 1844
evidence of two dissenting ministers, seasoned in their disappointment
by Broughton's successful opposition to a British and Foreign system
in 1839, against Broughton's own account of events and that of a
professional protestant observer of the scene in 1836.
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