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The present study began as an exploratory attempt to discover patterns and meaning in the superficially confused politics of New South Wales during the 'seventies and 'eighties of last century. This has been a neglected period; the dramatic political struggles of the decades at either end of the half century provided the first obvious focus of attention for modern Australian historical research, still largely in its infancy.

Closer examination of the subject soon made it clear that two central questions required answering. Simply stated, they were:

1. How, in the absence of an established party system, did Responsible Government function in New South Wales between 1872 and 1887?
2. What was the nature of the political parties that appeared between 1887 and 1889, and how did they emerge from the confused scene of previous years?

These problems have in a general sense determined the limits of the study. Attention is directed largely to the
formation of groups in the parliamentary struggle, and to the modes in which such groups strove for power. Hence there is no attempt to provide a connected political history of the period.

Some explanation has also to be made of the apparently extreme importance accorded to Parkes in the first part of the discussion. It is, of course, true that he was the dominant parliamentary personality of his day, and that the politics of the period could be written largely in terms of his career. His constant reappearance here, however, is due more to a methodological circumstance than to any such judgment of his role. He was the only contemporary politician to leave an important collection of private papers, and these - hitherto neglected - have proved a fruitful source of information on political machinations of the less obvious kind. It is illuminating, on the basis of this material, to view Parkes as the type of the faction leader of his day.

This study essays a number of new interpretations whose value will be open to debate. But the approach adopted has yielded at least two important discoveries: that widespread electoral manipulation took place during the 'seventies in the interests of parliamentary factions; and that, well before the formation of the Labour Party, the electorate of New South Wales had witnessed, and experienced
the operation of, two highly organised party structures. Both these conclusions suggest that accepted interpretations of the early stages of growth in the Australian party system require modification.
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PART I

FACTIONS AND PRESSURE GROUPS IN NEW SOUTH WALES
1872 - 1887.

"No one who has any knowledge of inner political life believes that the present Ministers cared what was done with Gardiner; they simply found that the cry raised could be worked effectively for their purpose, and they worked it effectively — I am by no means sure that the people of this Colony understand how Government is carried on ... The whole machinery of Government is marked by a system of direct manipulation and indirect sinister influences. I am quite sure that there are not 30 members out of the 72 who are in favour of the existing Government, and yet they obtain majorities."

(Henry Parkes to unnamed correspondent, 5 June, 1875).
CHAPTER I
-INTRODUCTION-

British observers of Australia during the second half of the nineteenth century were almost uniformly shocked by what they saw when they looked at the Colonial legislatures. Imbued with a due sense of the seriousness of the function exercised by the legislator, and accustomed to the order and stability usually associated with a well defined party system, they could not refrain from adverse comment both on the quality and activities of colonial politicians, and on the attitudes displayed towards them by those whose chosen representatives they were.

"Honour," wrote Ranken in 1874, "is hard to find in these Assemblies, and seldom has been accorded, at least by their fellow colonists, to retired politicians, however titled or decorated they may have been. There is no opening for ambition in colonial politics; there may be a job to be done, or a living to be earned, by interpreting quickly the wishes of the almighty unwashed; but the interpreter, if he is an intelligent educated man, must very often be ashamed of his own work, and his successes may lead him further from honour. Political ambition is gratified in other countries by the mere fact of standing in the places sacred to great names, in holding the positions famous men have held, and in all the historical associations in which an old state always clothes its lawmakers and chief magistrates." (1)

These were hard words, but they represented the natural reaction of a Conservative unwilling to understand, in their own

terms, the institutions of the vigorous young colonial democracies. Ranken attributed the ills he discovered to the lack of a 'leisure class' from which dignified and intelligent legislators could be drawn. He pointed, in support of this argument, to the instability that resulted from the ease with which lesser men, like the colonial politicians, allowed principle to dissolve in favour of personal spleen or limited material ambition. (1)

Trollope saw the same defects, though he more generously attributed them to the youth and smallness of the Australian communities.

"... it would be absurd to condemn the colonial parliaments for being occasionally ridiculous where we are wrongheaded, for being riotous where we are simply loud, for being foul-mouthed where we are only ill-natured, for being uneducated and illiterate where we are ill-informed and superficial, or even for being vulgar where we are severe. It is not only that our House of Lords is to the manner born, and that we choose our House of Commons from the best of thirty millions of people, while they have no statesmen to the manner born, and can choose their parliaments in each colony from but a few hundreds of thousands. Perfect as might be their excuse for inferiority founded on that allegation - that is not their only nor their chief excuse. The colonies are peopled with men who have gone out to earn their bread and who are earning it - and from these have to be chosen their members of parliament. There is as yet among them no class of men capable of devoting their time and energies to the public cause and to that only." (2)

(1) Ibid., pp. 296 et seq. Ranken considered these ills the inevitable result of mass democracy, and quoted America as another example of their manifestation.

(2) Anthony Trollope, Australia and New Zealand, (Melb., 1874), pp. 510-1
Reaction against the vulgarity of the colonial politician was only a matter of taste; of more practical importance were the loss of time, maladministration, and lack of governmental continuity which appeared to result from their personal insufficiencies. Trollope, like Ranken, commented bitingly upon these, finding his admiration of the refreshing "vigour" (1) of colonial parliamentary life insufficient to compensate for the concern he felt at the chaos that resulted from it. A similar concern was still being expressed almost twenty years later - though more calmly - by so acute an observer as Dilke. Of New South Wales, he wrote in 1890 that, "with all her splendid prospects and her magnificent wealth," she was "not coming to the front so rapidly as she should do." It was his opinion that this could be attributed largely to the Colony's unsatisfactory political life.

"It is noticeable that there is not that amount of interest in politics in New South Wales which might be expected. There are a good many wilful abstentions from the exercise of the suffrage, and there has till lately been a still more objectionable form of abstention in the refusal of many of the leading men of the colony to take part in public affairs. There are not in the colonies clearly marked party lines, and there is support and opposition to each measure under discussion as it comes up, but little permanence in party ... There is much disrespectful reference in colonial newspapers to 'the bear garden in Macquarie Street,' and New South Wales can hardly be said to be so proud of her Parliament as she is of her development in other respects." (2)

(1) ibid, p. 520.
(2) Sir Chas. Dilke, Problems of Greater Britain, (Lond: 1890), pp. 170-1.
Some Australians themselves felt the same disillusionment about their politics (1) and few tried to deny that defects existed. Even Henry Parkes, who constructed a political career largely by exploiting the passing whims both of politicians and public, once admitted that:

"In these colonies, with our infant Parliamentary systems, we very naturally look to England for guidance; and I fear we are often guilty of attempting to justify a course of action, not sound in itself, by quoting the example of English statesmen. Our legislatures are composed of men for the most part who have thought little on political questions, and have less insight into the casuistries of party disputation. Hence this majority is swayed either by the unconscious feeling of obedience to a temporary leader, or by the veriest superficial estimates of the matters under consideration, with which prejudice has much to do. No wonder, then, that we stumble into strange pitfalls." (2)

Though the criticisms of these observers were many sided, the common thread that ran through them all was the belief that, in the absence of principle as its guiding force, the political life of the colonies had lost meaning, and became detached from the needs and aspirations of the colonial communities themselves. As a modern writer has succinctly put it:

"The party system seemed a welter of personal ambition and spleen. Governments came and went, collapsing over this or that minor issue, while major matters went by default. At the same time, administrative decisions were made to suit the particular cabal of the moment, and efficiency also went by default." (3)

(2) Parkes to Frederick Harrison, 31.7.73 - in a letter expressing the writer's admiration for Harrison's book, Order and Progress. (P.C., A.915. 254).
(3) J. D. B. Miller, loc. cit.
It is noteworthy that the common explanation for this unhappy state of affairs was made in terms of the paucity of men produced by a colonial environment who were suitable — according to received canons — to become legislators, and of the alleged disgust which kept away those who were. In New South Wales, the incapacity of politicians was a recurrent theme in the press. The Sydney Morning Herald, for instance, was fond of asking — rhetorically — what had become of those "Kings of men," or "shepherds of the people" who had reigned in the days of the old Legislative Council, and answering in disgruntled vein:

"A decline in political capacity, in parliamentary knowledge and faculty, ... seems almost to be a democratic feature, particularly as democracy operates in the Australian colonies." Furthermore, to-day there is an "absence of that stimulus to intellectual vigour and emotion which arises out of the excitement of political struggle for vital and important objects. Great questions cease, and consequently party strife dies out, when the progress of organic changes has levelled all political inequalities, and admitted to equal rights all classes and conditions.... That combative force which commonly belongs to, and is often the chief element of intellectual superiority, expends itself elsewhere, and seeks some nobler and more expansive arena, than the rivalries of parochial interest, or the squabbles of constituencies over loaves and fishes." (1)

So far as New South Wales was concerned, it was significant that most of these complaints were voiced either during, or in relation to the 'seventies and 'eighties.

(1) S.M.H., 21.1.74.
These decades constituted what, on the surface, appears to have been a "doldrum" period. On the one side - in the 'fifties and 'sixties - lay the constitutional, land and education controversies; on the other - in the 'nineties - were the struggles surrounding the emergence of the Labour Party, and the movement towards Federation. In both of these periods, great questions closely affecting the welfare of large sections of the community dominated politics and gave them some semblance of order. By contrast, the middle years saw, "on the whole, a dimming of ... reforming zeal" (1); confusion, degeneration, and a divorcement from social reality appeared to be distinguishing features of the colony's political life. These things the critics saw, condemned, and attributed to a variety of causes, but chiefly to the poor quality of the men who offered themselves as legislators.

Demunciations of the kind that have been quoted were a little extreme. Whatever may be said about the apparent meaninglessness of the political struggles of the period, government had to be, and was, carried on, and this on the basis of parliamentary majorities. As the present study will show, there was more to the see-sawing changes of power between the "ins" and "outs" than met the eyes even of contemporary observers, while during the last half of the 'eighties, political issues were crystallizing and some startlingly new

forms of political organisation were coming to birth. The
generalised vision of confusion and inefficiency that has been
given to subsequent generations by the words of men like
Trollope and Ranken may thus be taken as a starting point for
an enquiry into the manner in which, under the special circum-
stances of New South Wales during the 'seventies and 'eighties,
parliamentary groups were organised, and interest groups out-
side parliament found political expression.

These things were either overlooked or disregarded
by those who created the existing picture of the politics of
the period. The real value of their contribution lay in their
perception of what Colonial politics were not, rather than of
what they were. Though the explanation they gave for it was
unsatisfactory, they were correct in observing that it was use-
less to search in colonies like New South Wales for the kind
of parliamentary division - on issues of principle - to which
they were accustomed in England. They were also correct in
attributing most of the political confusion they saw to this
fact. Their views, however, were conditioned by the faithful-
ness with which colonial constitution makers had copied the
British model: despite the alien environment the institutional
framework was identical, and they expected to be able to in-
terpret the political action which took place within that
framework in familiar terms. In the result, they were forced
back upon some unsatisfactory theory of the ineptitude of
colonial politicians, or of the evils of extreme democracy,
to account for what they saw.

The real explanations lay deeper, in the social and economic conditions of the Colony. It was easy to remain oblivious of this. The bi-cameral system of England was paralleled in New South Wales by the existence of a Lower and an Upper House, the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council, the one elected, the other appointed. Cabinet government had also been taken over, and even in minor matters, British procedure had been adopted. Trollope, for example, recorded these things faithfully.

"The scheme and manner and general intentions of our own parliaments have been carried out with great fidelity ... The government has government days — and often shows a tendency to encroach on days and hours which are not its own. Almost all effectual legislation is initiated by the Ministers. There are questions on which it is understood that a Ministry if beaten will retire, — and questions as to which it is understood that no such obligation is supposed to exist. The outgoing Ministry claims the privilege of dissolving, — which is eagerly disputed, as we have heard it disputed at home ... In all small forms and ways the imitation of our Parliamentary practice is generally exact. The Ministers sit on the right of the Speaker, with their staunch supporters behind them. The opposition occupies the opposite benches, and there are cross benches, or benches below the gangway, for those whose party obligations are less binding ... The practice of counting out is quite as rife as with us. Application to the Speaker for interference is much more common — is so common as to have become the most prevailing fault in the conduct of these Parliaments. In exciting debates gentlemen rise to order every minute." (1)

But institutions and procedure could not in themselves create more than the channel through which political life expressed itself. This was seen, during a Governmental crisis in 1878, by the *Sydney Morning Herald*, which wrote, in an extraordinarily clear-sighted editorial:

"In the present crisis, we have another illustration of the truth so often forgotten, that, in endeavouring to govern the colony upon a system intended to be a close copy of the British Constitution, we are subjecting responsible government to trial under a widely differing set of conditions. We have not an equally clear division of parties. We are almost without traditions of our own. Our public men are neither constrained nor restrained by the same pressure from without or from within. There is not with us the same combination of fidelity to party, with recognition of the need for compromise and moderation where public interests that override party considerations are at stake. In these respects the conditions are more favourable to the smooth working of responsible government in the mother country than in the colonies; and it is not surprising that the case should be so. It has taken centuries to develop the state of affairs that exists in England. It would be a marvel if the colonies could spring to the same level in a generation." (1)

The writer then proceeded to discuss in detail the points of difference that existed between the actual practice — as opposed to the letter — of British and Australian politics, making a number of very pregnant observations about the way in which most of the peculiarities (by British standards) of the politics of New South Wales, had their roots in the material and social circumstances of the colony.

Particular attention was drawn in this editorial to "the extensive field of operations" of the Government, a

---

(1) *S.M.H.*, 12.12.78. For a similar observation, see Clark, *op. cit.*, pp. 353 et seq. (Extract from H. de R. Walker; *Australasian Democracy* 1897)
feature which provided noticeable contrast with England and
which was of great importance in explaining both the muddle
into which Parliament was frequently led, and the lack of
significant political divisions. That "socialisme sans
doctrines," which, as has been frequently pointed out by
modern historians, was virtually forced by circumstances upon
the Australian colonies during the nineteenth century, was
particularly marked in New South Wales. Here distances and
rapid pastoral expansion had created problems for which the
only possible answer was government enterprise. Thus railway
and other public services were government sponsored and run.
Outside the trading and administrative centre of Sydney,
sparse settlement and a growing tendency to view the state as
"a vast public utility," (2) combined to hinder the develop-
ment of traditions of local self-help. (3) By 1881 only 98
municipalities had been incorporated; throughout the rest of
the colony the people looked to the central government to pro-
vide their roads, bridges, and public buildings. In addition,
the task of handling the sale, lease and general supervision
of a great public estate rested upon the Executive. For none
of these functions was there an independent managing corporation;
even the civil service was directly under the control of
Ministers. Politically, this situation produced a

(1) "Here the Government undertakes to do a hundred different
things for the people, which there the people are left to do
for themselves." (ibid.)
(3) Under the Local Government Acts of 1858 and 1867, there was
provision for incorporation on local initiative. But in
1881, of 310,000 square miles in the colony, only 1,665, (or
1/186 of the territory of the colony) were administered by
local government bodies. (Speech of Parkes, N.S.W. Legis-
concentration of time and energy in Parliament upon matters of an administrative nature, diverting attention from the legislative function. It was not to be expected that, in an Assembly where the salary or actions of every public servant, the construction of the most minor road or bridge, or the rights and wrongs of any land transaction were matters of incessant and legitimate debate, legislative policy should be likely to be of sufficient moment to produce consistent political division. At the same time, recurring crises produced by the struggle of faction leaders for office accentuated the pressure of administrative questions by interfering with ministerial continuity, and by periodically creating accumulations of matters awaiting attention.

Within the electorates, the range of functions exercised by the government combined with the comparatively underdeveloped nature of the colony to produce the "local" or "roads and bridges" member, who showed himself to be the poorest of all material for party action. As the Sydney Morning Herald explained during the election of 1872, the electors -

"In choosing a member ... want to have a man who will be an efficient local member, and who will be accessible at all times to communications, who will understand the wants of the district, and who will exert himself to get those wants attended to. This is a much more important matter in their eyes than merely to have an organ for the expression of political principle. Material wants, not social and political views, press with the most urgency. That which is nearest us touches us most; and the nearest want is for the expenditure of money to increase the convenience of living."
"The colony is still in the municipal state of development; it is a big parish, and the parishioners have parochial views; grand politics are only in the germ, and will not develop themselves until we disengage them from baser surroundings. Now and then some leading politician will make an eloquent speech about great principles, but it does not count for much, and a man who does not profess to understand principles but can promise a fine bridge, or a railway extension, will get the votes." (1)

The frequent collision resulting from all these implications of "ample" government - between the "material" and "political" interests of the colony, was complained about time after time by contemporaries, and a number of remedies were suggested. In their more extreme form, the problems involved often placed "the faith of many in the wisdom of our present form of government under a severe strain." (2) This was, for instance, the source of the demand made by some for elective ministries. (3) Without doubt, also, republican and other radical ideas abroad during the 'eighties were at least in part a reaction against the apparently meaningless tangle into which the existing political life of the colony often degenerated. (4)

(1) S.M.H., 14.3.72.
(2) S.M.H., 12.12.78.
(3) See J. D. B. Miller: loc. cit.
(4) This is explicitly stated by H. V. Evatt, (Australian Labor Leader, Ch. III, pp. 15 et seq.). It is also implicit in much of what R. Gollan has to say. (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Radicalism and Socialism in Eastern Australia 1850-1910, Part 2, Chapters 1 - 2, pp. 106 et seq.) See also B. E. Mansfield, "The Background to Radical Republicanism in N.S.W., in the Eighteen Eighties," (Historical Studies - Australia and New Zealand, May, 1953, Vol. 5, No. 20).
The coalition and the "gentleman's agreement" represented a practical attempt to make the existing system function more smoothly. (1) The same object lay behind another popular suggestion:

"The probability is that, if there be any way of escape from the chronic muddle and inefficiency by which the government of the colony has been distinguished for some years past, it will be found in the strengthening of the political element rather than in the weakening of it. Clearer views and stronger convictions on questions of public policy on the part of electors would lead to the formation of stronger parties in the House, and to the construction of stronger ministries. When the elections turn upon minute personal preferences and points of local interest, great results are hardly to be expected and measures that require a dead heave to get them through Parliament are almost of necessity piled up in heaps on the threshold." (2)

This was, beyond doubt, true. But to express the matter in such a way was to beg the real question. "Clearer views and stronger convictions" on questions of policy were not blessings to be produced by conscious effort, on the part either of electors or of politicians. The effect of the implications of government paternalism in reducing, in terms of practical politics, the significance of such issues has already been suggested. Further, if attention is paid to the more outstanding features of the economic and social situation of the colony during these years, it is difficult to see in what directions sufficient conflict of opinion could have arisen on policy questions to make them the sources of major political division.

(1) See below, pp. 39-40.
(2) S.M.H., 12.12.78.
The 'seventies and 'eighties were, for New South Wales, years of rapid economic expansion. Principally through the stimulus of British capital, which, especially after 1875 entered the colony in great quantities, production and trade increased, and public and private services were expanded. Incoming capital was of two kinds: that finding its way into private enterprise, and that raised by public authorities.

**TABLE I - N.S.W. CAPITAL IMPORTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>1876-80</th>
<th>1881-5</th>
<th>1886-90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870-5</td>
<td>2,861,000</td>
<td>5,458,000</td>
<td>16,066,000</td>
<td>11,571,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>6,170,000</td>
<td>11,688,000</td>
<td>15,187,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brought into Colony by Immigrants</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,719,000</td>
<td>1,387,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>4,361,000</td>
<td>13,628,000</td>
<td>30,473,000</td>
<td>28,145,000 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The former appears, through the agency of banks and financial institutions, to have been chiefly employed in residential construction in the growing urban areas, and for land purchases and improvement in the pastoral industry. (2) The latter financed that "spirited policy of public works" which became a characteristic feature of the Australian scene at this time. (3)

(1) Table constructed from data in Coghlans, The Seven Colonies of Australasia, 1895-6, pp. 329-332.
(2) N. G. Butlin and H. de Meel, Public Capital Formation in Australia, p.13.
The enormous increase in the colony's trade in these decades provides a good index of the expanding activity of the economy. From a value of £15½ millions in 1870, total trade jumped to £30 millions in 1880, and to £44½ millions in 1890. Exports climbed steadily in the 'seventies, rapidly in the 'eighties, and despite a check owing to bad seasons during the 1885-7 period, were still advancing as the decade ended. (1) Export prices held firm until 1884, when a slow decline began (2), but continuing capital imports prevented either this, or the decline that occurred at the same time in the volume of exports, having a serious effect on internal prosperity. (3)

Wool continued to be the staple product of the colony, always accounting for almost half its exports. The value of wool exports, at £2.5 millions in 1870, reached £8 millions by 1880, and though fluctuating in the succeeding ten years, was never lower than £7 millions. (4) The pastoral industry, indeed, underwent astonishing development in these years. From 16 millions in 1870, the colony's sheep increased to 50 millions in 1889. (5) Technological change improved the quality and weight of the fleece, and reduced production

---

(1) See Table II, (Appendix I. p. 299).
(2) See Table III, (Appendix I. p. 300).
(3) See Table II, loc. cit.
(4) Coghlan, The Seven Colonies of Australasia, 1895-6, p. 331.
(5) N.S.W. Statistical Register, 1890. (Statistical View of the Progress of N.S.W. - last table).
costs. Apart from wool, tallow and livestock exports also provided consistent sources of income to the industry, (1) while pastoralists were not slow to capitalise upon the possibilities of refrigerated transport, which in the 'eighties opened new vistas for the Australian meat industry.

British capital and the expansion of the pastoral industry, were the chief influences in creating and sustaining the boom of these years, from which, at least until the middle 'eighties, most sections of the community benefited. Government works programmes directly created great avenues of employment, as did capital expenditure for pastoral improvement. As a result of changed techniques, the numbers actually employed in pastoral pursuits did not increase proportionately with the growth of the industry, but the benefits of pastoral prosperity were indirectly conferred upon those employed in other occupations through the stimulation of commercial activity. Full employment, combined with wages higher than those ruling in comparable callings overseas, were the rule in the years from 1873 to 1884, with the exception of the 1879-80 period, when numbers of labourers and skilled artisans in Sydney found themselves temporarily unable to procure work. Intermittent unemployment from 1884 onwards - especially in the metropolitan area - provided early

(1) Stock exports were, in total exports, second to wool. See Coghlan, Wealth and Progress of N.S.W. (1889-90), p. 178. Table of "Value per Head of the Principal Articles of Home Produce and Manufacture Exported."
fore-warnings of the break of the boom. (1)

Under these conditions, circumstances tended to mould the form taken by economic expansion more or less independently of the shaping hands of governments. Political conflict occurred over matters of detail rather than of policy. The areas of State economic activity were, by common consent, already established, while developing needs therein were clear enough for all to see. Thus, for instance, resolutions moved in the Assembly in the early 'seventies favouring rapid extension of facilities for transport and communications were always passed unanimously, (2) and Sir John Robertson observed in 1879 that it was well proven that "any government which adopts a spirited railway policy at the present time will make themselves popular in the country." (3) The bitter conflict that took place in Parliament over railways was never concerned with principle, but with the distribution of the spoils. As the Sydney Morning Herald remarked in 1875, on the announcement by the then Works Minister, Lackey, of a vigorous railway programme:

"How many weary battles have been fought in Parliament over these trial surveys? For years past we have not had a Cabinet that did not know that its existence depended upon holding the balances even between North, South and West ..."

(1) A complete survey of employment and wages for the period is given in Coghlan, Labour and Industry in Australasia, Vol. III, pp. 1424, et seq.
(2) e.g., on 9.7.72, MacLeay moved a re-affirmation of the "resolutions of the Legislative Assembly of 19 December, 1871," expressing the opinion "that a very great improvement in the means of internal communication throughout the entire colony is most urgently called for," and demanding "the extension of railways with all possible celerity," (S.M.H., 10.7.72). Resolutions demanding more rapid railway development were also moved by Forster on 9.12.73. (S.M.H., 10.12.73).
"(But) with an overflowing exchequer, there is scarcely any ministerial portfolio so enviable as that of the Department of Works .... Happy Mr. Lackey the heir to a few years' accumulation of land revenue, and therefore able to gratify everybody." (1)

Sectional squabbling of the kind referred to here was another emanation of the spirit of localism, and could not be looked to as a source of consistent political division. Communications were necessary to develop the country, and with general approval, the railway lines open for operation in the colony extended from 340 miles in 1870 to 2,100 in 1890. (2)

The tariff was, until the middle 'eighties, another matter in which the majority of politicians swam gladly with the tide. There was a certain inevitability about a policy of free trade for a colony whose fortunes were chiefly dependent upon the export of a staple raw material, and which was thriving upon an influx of capital from abroad. Protection was thus for many years a lost cause. It needed a break in the general prosperity to lead to serious questioning of the efficacy of the traditional free trade dogma, and this did not come until 1885. (3)

The Custom House was never excluded, however, from the calculations of Colonial Treasurers. "Free trade" was interpreted broadly enough in these years to permit the imposition of a revenue tariff sufficiently severe to account

(1) S.M.H. 1975.
(2) Statistical View of the Progress of the State of N.S.W., 1856-1906, p.5.
(3) The question of tariff policy is discussed in detail in Ch. 7 below.
for about a third of the Colony's public needs. (1) Tariff revision in 1872, though at the time much vaunted as a vindication of the free trade feeling and tradition of the Colony, set this pattern for almost twenty years. Imposts fell chiefly upon items of general consumption which could not be produced in the colony, so that few industries were able to establish a footing under their cover. (2) Mild indirect taxation of this kind was acceptable to a series of middle-class Parliaments, which were in addition enabled, by a consistently high land revenue, to avoid the embarrassment of facing the problem of devising an equitable system of taxation.

Land Revenue commonly accounted for about half the receipts of the Treasury. It was made up in part by rents from pastoral and other lands, but principally by the proceeds of land sales. These were considerable during the period, the ordinary impulses to land purchase being added to by the pressure of British capital and the effects of the social struggle between the various types of squatters and selectors. Outright buying of the land they occupied or wished to occupy had become the pastoralists' weapon, both of offence and of defence, and, especially after the practice of permitting auction sales of public lands was adopted in 1875, this brought enormous sums of money into the coffers of the State. These funds were consistently treated as current revenue, despite the warnings of many that in so doing, the colony was squandering

(1) See Table IV, (Appendix I, p. 301).
(2) See below, p. 254.
its capital resources. It was, however, scarcely to be expected that in an atmosphere of general optimism, politicians should be prepared to face the unpopularity of prescribing the unpleasant safeguards of economy and higher taxation in order to prepare for a time of difficulty. In this matter, indeed, they did not have to rely merely upon imagination to suggest the odium likely to attend an advocacy of such policies: it was demonstrated amply enough by the violent reaction that occurred on those few occasions when, facing some short term exigency, Treasurers dared to propose new taxation. (1) Policy thus became irrelevant, and the colony drifted on in the tide of its own prosperity. The potentiality of the taxation issue as a source of political division was shown in the years after 1885, when a drying up of land revenue raised the question of finding alternative funds for State purposes, and became one of the immediate causes of the emergence of the colony's first political parties. (2) The same problem provided the chief issue around which non Labour parties crystallized in the 'nineties. (3)

Given the general prosperity of the period, there was little in the social structure of the colony to produce political parties founded upon class divisions. Social tensions there indeed were, particularly on the land, where the

---

(1) e.g. Reactions to taxation proposals of Parkes (1880) and of Stuart (1883). See below, pp. 102 (Note I), 114.
(2) See below, Ch. 8.
(3) See article by the writer - "Free Trade and Protection Parties in N.S.W." (Historical Studies, Australia and New Zealand, Vol. 6, pp. 315 et seq., Nov., 1954).
struggle between squatter and selector reached perhaps its bitterest pitch of intensity in the 'seventies. A clash of this kind, however, manifested itself at the political level in the operations of pressure groups rather than of parties. (1) As will shortly be seen, the classes locked in struggle for possession of the land constituted a relatively small proportion of the total population. From the frequent debates on land policy that took place in Parliament during the period, nothing emerges more clearly than that, whatever their idealistic protestations, those not directly engaged in primary pursuits - the great "third estate," as their representatives frequently called them - were principally dedicated to the material object of seeing that the State received the fullest possible income from the land. (2) Who possessed it thus tended to be to them a less important question than that the land should continue to provide the Treasury with funds which might otherwise have to come from general taxation. In practical terms, this situation made it impossible, at least while the land boom lasted, for either squatters or selectors to find sufficient support among, or community of interest with, any other groups to back their position with coherent political organisation.

(1) The operations of such pressure groups are discussed in detail in Ch. 4 below.
(2) See below pp. 142-144.
The labour-capital relationship might have been expected to provide an even more fertile source of tension and political division. By 1871 it was becoming clear that the ideal of economic independence - so optimistically advanced in the gold decade (1) was not to be realised. The census figures of that year show that already 56% of the colony's male breadwinners were wage earners. (2) The thirty years which followed saw an acceleration of the trend suggested by this figure: by 1891 the proportion of wage earners had advanced to 65%. (3) Politically, this great social change was a major factor in the ultimate emergence, in the early 'nineties, of a Labour party. But the class differentiation symbolised by that dramatic event scarcely ruffled the surface level of politics during the preceding few decades.

Though structural conditions for aggressive class consciousness were developing rapidly during these years, a number of influences tended to limit their immediate effects. Chief of these were the economic position of the workers, on the one hand, and the stabilising effect of urban middle class values on the other.

During the 'seventies and 'eighties, the rural and urban working classes of New South Wales remained quiescent under the soothing influences of full employment and good wages. (4) Isolated industrial disturbances did take place, but

(2) The calculations from which this figure has been arrived at are detailed in Table V and explanations. (Appendix I, pp.302-306).
(3) See Table VI and explanations. (Appendix I, p.306).
(4) Coghlan, loc. cit.
these represented minor adjustments in areas of economic activity where there was little serious questioning of the common interests of employer and employee. It was not until, at the end of the period, economic difficulty provided the impulse, and the spread of radical socialist ideals and of militant unionism the means, that the Labour movement erupted in its full power.

The social picture was not, in any case, a simple one. Especially among the urban population, the capital-labour dichotomy was modified by the existence of a large proportion of wage earners whose social aspirations in this period of prosperity tended to be towards the middle rather than the working classes. The importance of this group can be seen, for example, by glancing at the 1891 census. In that year, of male breadwinners described as being engaged in "Commercial" pursuits, 222,726 were employers or men working on their own account and 52,512 were wage earners. (1) Of the last-named, however, more than 22,000 - or almost half - were clerks and shop assistants.

(2) These men were until the

(1) Census of N.S.W., 1891, p. 585. (There were also 3,350 unemployed, 59 occupations not stated, and 1,744 whose grade of occupation was not classifiable under the adopted system. These numbers are included in Coghlan's total estimate of 81,291 ... see below, p. 26).
(2) The detailed figures are as follows: (the number in brackets denotes page of census report from which the figures concerned are taken -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clerks Insurance</th>
<th>552 (593)</th>
<th>Shop Assistants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>2499 (593)</td>
<td>Provisions 3340 (601)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping</td>
<td>3631 (607)</td>
<td>Groceries 2306 (601)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>4129 (605)</td>
<td>Ironmongery 1026 (605)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drapery 2704 (339)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General 2232 (405)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10811</strong></td>
<td><strong>11608</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
end of the century the despair of the Labour movement, for
their stubborn refusal to "recognise their own interests" and
abandon their admiration for, and political support of, the
representatives of the superior economic classes. (1)

Similar petit bourgeois tendencies were displayed by many wage
earners in the "Industrial" callings. Skilled tradesmen, for
instance, assumed a large area of common ground with employers,
and this coincidence of economic interest tended to be paralleled
by a concordance of social values, largely through the mediating
influence of a number of agencies such as the churches, the
various lodges, the educational system, and even the newspapers.

One indication of the strength of middle-class values among
tradesmen during this period was the enthusiasm with which they
undertook the (for them) difficult task of building and pur-
chasing homes of their own in the expanding residential

---

(1) L. F. Fitzhardinge, e.g., recounts the great difficulty
experienced by W. M. Hughes, as late as 1898, in per-
suading the Labour Party to take up the cause of the shop
assistants, and quotes his words at the Labour Conference
of that year: "I have been at shop assistants' meetings
and noted that they clapped the loudest when a crusted
Conservative was speaking, but that was due to their
ignorance of economics, and they would do better if they
had more time to study." ("W. M. Hughes in N.S.W.
Politics," Journal and Proceedings of the Royal
Australian Historical Society, Vol. XXXVII, Part III,
Dec., 1951).
suburbs, (1) and subsequently became deeply involved in
municipal politics and local progress movements.

The growth of a large urban middle class was, indeed,
one of the most fundamental of the social changes of the
second half of the nineteenth century in New South Wales.
In the period from 1860 to 1890, the balance of the distrib-
ution of population between urban and rural centres was
radically altered, as can be seen from the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>URBAN – RURAL DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION – NEW SOUTH WALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney and Suburbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The growth of urban population was also mirrored by
proportional changes in the occupations of the people. This
is to be observed from the figures of male breadwinners engaged
over the period in the broad categories of callings.

(1) The S.M.H., commented, e.g., on 23.12.74, on the "in-
creased wages and steady employment" currently enjoyed by
"the artisan and labouring classes," adding that "the working
classes have purchased largely of suburban lands for building
purposes, and if they require money to complete their homes,
it is readily obtained .... The desire to become freeholders
just referred to is not without importance in a national point
of view. The workman who possesses property is more conser-
vative, more interested in the future well-being of the
country than those of his class who have no permanent stake
in it." The suburbs in which working class home-owners pre-
dominated were shown to be numerous by a S.M.H. survey of
Sydney electorates, in 1894. (See unpublished thesis by the
writer: Political Developments in N.S.W., 1870–9 pp.101 et seq.
Fisher Library, University of Sydney).

(2) Statistician's Report on 1891 Census, P.127.
These figures clearly show that a considerable decline occurred in the proportion of the population engaged in pastoral and agricultural pursuits, accompanied by very marked rises, both in the numbers and in the proportion of those whose livelihoods depended upon commercial and industrial operations. (2)

(1) Table derived from Coghlan's Table I, Census of 1891, p. 579. Persons with "Indefinite occupations," and "Occupations not stated," have been omitted. In his Table II (ibid.), Coghlan has computed the percentage of the population in each class of occupation, but he has included in the calculation "Dependents" as well as "Breadwinners." It seemed more useful, for comparative purposes, to compute the percentage of breadwinners only, as has been done in the Table above.

(2) A development of this kind was to be expected in an economy wherein the staple industry, woolgrowing, itself made relatively few demands upon labour and at the same time fostered trade with the outside world through a major port. There was little 'drift' from the rural areas. The urban population appears to have been increased chiefly by the arrival from abroad of immigrants who tended to remain in the metropolis rather than seek work in the less attractive countryside. (See Coghlan, Statistician's Report (1891 Census), p. 128. Coghlan's explanation of these changes is tentative, and there has as yet been no significant study completed of internal migration in N.S.W.).
Though this change did not signify any decline in the importance of the primary producing sector of the economy - indeed, thanks to capital investment and technological change that was increased - it did have vital social and economic implications.

The 'seventies and 'eighties have been aptly described as "the Golden Age of the Australian Bourgeoisie," (1) and New South Wales offered no exception to the common pattern. Solid sandstone public buildings in the heart of Sydney, and suburb upon suburb of brick dwellings remain to-day as memorials to the way in which the urban middle classes fingered the wealth brought by wool and overseas capital. The boom in trade and commerce admittedly gave city life a brassy aspect. In 1874, Charles Campbell, the pastoralist, enjoying again the peaceful atmosphere of his estate after a visit to the metropolis, cynically applied to Sydney his own rendering of some of the words of Horace:

"O Sydney cits., be money your first thought,
   That gained, be truth and literature sought;
This cry resounds thro' Sydney's every street,
   While old and young the maxim wise repeat." (2)

It was in reaction to such materialism, and the uninspiring round of city existence, "limping in apish imitation after London ideas, habits and manners," (3) that the Bulletin writers and the other national myth-makers of the period eagerly sought

(1) A phrase used by C. M. H. Clark, (Professor of History, Canberra University College), in his Inaugural Lecture, 1954. (As yet unpublished).
(2) Campbell to Parkes, 13.7.74. (P.C. A.880. 106).
(3) J. F. Archibald, on aims of Bulletin. Quoted in Crawford, Australia, p.149.
to idealise life in the Australian bush. In tune with these
men, Vance Palmer has written: "It is hard to find among
the separate urban groups of the last years of the century a
distinct national type. It is even hard to find common
characteristics." (1)

But - as Sir Charles Dilke pointed out in the course
of his remarks on New South Wales in 1890 - city life tends to
be much the same whatever the location (2), and it was scarcely
to be expected that there should be anything unique about the
Australian urban dweller. It was the unavailing search for
typically Australian things that, as much as anything else, led
Archibald and his circle to condemn so glibly the urban life of
their time. The same thing lies behind Palmer's picture of
Sydney society in flamboyant terms of larrikin pushes, lucky
speculators, Irish lawyers, and "a more cultured group that re-
volved around the Anglican bishop's palace and had an urbans, un-
worldly air." It was only logical that to a man with Palmer's
preconceptions, these grotesque city types should stand in sharp
contrast to Francis Adams' romanticised Bushman, "the one pow-
ful and unique type yet produced in Australia." (3)

But "imitation" of British urban values had permeated
a deeper stratum of Australian society than those superficial
layers of socialites and selfish opportunists whose doings pro-
vided treasured material for the satirists of the Bulletin.

(1) V. Palmer, The Legend of the Nineties, p. 414.
(2) op. cit., p. 496.
(3) Palmer, op. cit., pp. 42, 47.
Observers unencumbered by the incipient nationalist fervour which thirsted for typicality might have found "common values," albeit dull and uninspiring, in the completeness with which the inhabitants of suburbia and of the country towns had taken over the mores of the bourgeois society of Victorian England.

This was materialism too, smug to the eyes both of the nineteenth century radical and of the twentieth century historian, but certainly not of the brassy kind. It was less obtrusive because less aggressively vocal, but it is impossible even to begin to examine the records of the time without feeling a strong sense of the pervading influence of the staid virtues of respectability, of concern for the stability of the family, and of reverence for the rights of property. These things found reflection, for instance, in the press of the period, which was both a maker and a mirror of contemporary social values. The *Sydney Morning Herald*—the newspaper with the widest circulation and the greatest influence—was noted for its enlightened conservatism, its dignity, and its strong Protestant inspiration. The *Daily Telegraph*, though more sensationalist, and from time to time more radical, aspired to a similar reputation. Both devoted large sections of their space to reports of church activities, discussions of social and religious problems, and of the financial and political issues of the day. Foreign affairs occupied less attention in their pages than sport and country news. The importance, as reflected in these newspapers, of sectarianism, the "Drink
Questions (local option and social problems surrounding the use of alcohol), municipal affairs and public health, gave but a few indications of the kind of interests that absorbed the attention of the majority of the urban population.

The echoes of broader social problems touched these people but lightly. Sydneysiders were occasionally presented with the sight of unemployed men congregating in Queen's Square to demand work, and the labour-capital relationship from time to time provided a subject for learned discussion in the press or in the debating societies. But until the activities of radical organisers in the mid-'eighties and the strikes of the 'nineties brought the reality of these things home to him, the average citizen seemed to find more of pressing concern in the questions of whether the art gallery should be open on Sundays, History be taught in the State schools, (1) or a new hotel be built in his home suburb. This was not in any sense a reflection of a lack of concern for the unfortunate, or of an ostrich-like attitude to social realities: it was an indication of the natural focal points of interest for men to whom, in a time of plenty, their immediate environment was the most real, and upon whom it was impressed by the prevailing morality of the churches that true worth lay in the exercise of responsibility within the narrow circle encompassed by their day to day living.

(1) These two issues were debated fiercely, and at great length, in Parliament.
It was not surprising that the interests and values of this urban group should have tended to dominate the politics of the period. Its size has already been indicated: it had, furthermore, together with its social counterparts in the country - the town commercial classes and the large and small landowners - a practical monopoly of parliamentary representation. Its influence on parliamentary life was accentuated by the frequency with which country constituencies, through the lack of a system of payment of members, had to elect a city man to represent them, and by the simple fact that Parliament met in Sydney and provided a focal point of interest in a city wherein the resources of commercial entertainment were still relatively limited.

In general, then, it was scarcely to be expected that the politics of New South Wales should be characterised by the existence of a strong party system. Its managerial function tended to monopolise the attention of Parliament, limiting both the time and interest that could be expended upon questions of legislation. The economic circumstances of the colony were not such as to foster conflict over developmental or tariff policies, while prosperity served to damp down potential class tensions. The all-pervading influence of the urban middle classes elevated the virtues of public and private responsibility, and promoted an acceptance of the
status quo. At the same time it combined with the material pressure of localism to riddle politics with a multitude of minor issues, from which could be distilled no common elements to become the bases for organised political parties.

In these circumstances, the political scene naturally took on a chaotic aspect. Observers seeking for the meaning which lay behind the frequent changes of government could find none, and concluded that the politicians were corrupt and vulgar. But though so often apparently unrelated to the needs of the community, their struggles were not without significance. From the vantage point of a later generation it can be seen that the real interest of the politicians' activities lay in the way in which, in the absence of clearly meaningful divisions and of great political questions, they managed to make a system of responsible government work at all. This problem, as well as a consideration of the intrusion of distinct interest groups into this peculiar political arena, form the chief concerns of the first part of the present study.
CHAPTER 2

PERSONAL FACTIONS IN THE POLITICS OF NEW SOUTH WALES
1872 - 87

In the absence of political parties, government in New South Wales was conducted, during the years under survey, on the basis of parliamentary majorities organised around personal factions. The nature and operations of these factions, however, were usually concealed by the self-conscious desire of those who belonged to them to conform to prevailing standards of political behaviour, or by confusion produced in the political picture through the stratagems of leaders, the clash of personalities, or the intrusion of pressure groups.

It is the chief purpose of the present chapter to show the existence of such factions, and to attempt to define them in terms of numbers and membership. As a necessary part of this study, some examination has to be made of the structure of the Parliaments of the period, and of the kind of political ideals activating those who belonged to them. To provide a meaningful framework for the discussion, a brief preliminary account is given of the sequence and accomplishments of the governments that held office during the period.
I. THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE PERIOD. (1)

(i) The Parkes Administration: 1872-75.

Parkes became Premier of New South Wales for the first time in May, 1872, when, following the apparently inconclusive elections of February, he succeeded in forming a government strong enough to command the confidence of the Legislative Assembly. The dissolution preceding the elections had been granted by the Governor at the request of the then Premier, Sir James Martin, who had been defeated on his policy regarding negotiations with Victoria for the renewal of an agreement suspending the collection of border customs duties. Three of Martin's Ministers lost their seats at the election, and the Government resigned.

Parkes began his premiership under favourable auspices, in a period of rising prosperity and with a large majority at his back. In an immediate attempt to prepare the way for a settlement with Victoria, he piloted through the Assembly a Border Duties Convention Bill, to permit the Government to make with the neighbouring colony any border customs agreement it considered just and practicable. The Bill was, however, rejected by the Legislative Council. A much needed measure to reform the electoral system of the Colony was subsequently treated in like manner, and the Premier angrily introduced a Bill to reform the Legislative Council by limiting its powers.

(1) The following account, being chiefly chronological in nature, is based upon Thos. Richards' Official History of N.S.W., (1883), except where specifically stated.
and making it elective. A constitutional crisis appeared imminent, but despite his impassioned rhetoric, Parkes' ardour soon cooled, and when the Council laid aside this Bill, he made surprisingly little protest.

The practical achievements of the Government were not, indeed, particularly impressive. It took advantage of the buoyant state of the Public Revenue to abolish existing ad valorem duties, an action which brought great popularity, and was hailed as a reassertion of the Colony's free trade heritage. Communication improvement was effected by a Railway Act, providing for considerable extensions to the existing railway system, and by the establishment - after long bickerings with other colonies - of a regular steam mail service to England. A Funded Stock Bill provided finance for aiding desirable immigrants to come to the Colony.

During the administration of this Government, private members successfully initiated Bills to limit the duration of Parliament to three years, (1) and to alter the law on matrimony. (2) At the same time the appointment of a Select Committee to study the working of the Crown Land Acts of 1861, (3) and lively debates on a resolution in favour of the amendment of the 1867 Public Schools Act (4) - both the results of action by private members - showed that, though temporarily quiescent, the Land

---

(1) Introduced by Terry, 2.12.74.
(2) Matrimonial Causes Bill. (Buchanan 6.11.72).
(3) On motion of Cunneen. 5.7.72.
(4) 10.12.72. Motion by Forster - demanding stricter enforcement of principle of secular education.
and Education questions were still potential sources of political conflict.

The Government unexpectedly fell victim to censure motions on its attitude towards the Governor's pardoning of Frank Gardiner, a notorious bushranger. This sudden collapse, at the height of his power, was the product of a series of skilful manoeuvres by Parkes' opponents, who used the bushranger affair to raise moral issues calculated to confuse many of those who actually supported the Government. (1) The House was dissolved, and after the elections the defeat of the Government was confirmed when Robertson successfully moved a hostile amendment to the Address in Reply. Parkes resigned and Robertson formed a new ministry.

(ii) The Robertson Administration: 1875-77.

Though he succeeded in holding office for over two years, Robertson secured the passage of only two significant pieces of legislation: a Crown Lands Act Amendment Act, and an Agreements Validating Act. The former effected a number of adjustments to the existing law, chiefly with the object of preventing the "dummying" of land by squatters. The latter was designed to facilitate selective immigration, by enabling employers to bring workmen to the Colony under contracts for service.

Of several Bills unsuccessfully introduced by the Government, the chief was a measure to amend the Public Schools.

(1) See below, p. 348, where this matter is discussed in detail.
Act by appointing a Minister for Education, and by further reducing aid to denominational schools. This was laid aside on a procedural technicality and not re-introduced. Railway extension, the establishment of telegraphic communication with New Zealand, and the promotion of sanitary reforms in Sydney completed the list of the Government's achievements. Otherwise, time was consumed in clumsy efforts to carry on the ordinary business of the Colony, and to keep in office. There was, in fact, little that was inspiring about the Ministry. They had come to power, by virtue not of their own strength, but of an indiscretion on the part of their predecessors. Once the Land question—on which he had strong convictions—had been dealt with, Robertson showed himself to be weak and fumbling, and one by one his less enthusiastic followers began to drop away.

Early in 1877, the Government tottered. Within a single week, it suffered four defeats in the Assembly. (1) Parkes delivered the coup de grace on March 6, by successfully moving censure. Robertson requested a dissolution, but since the House refused Supply, the Governor declined to accede.

(iii) The Year of Confusion: 1877.

The fall of Robertson precipitated a year of confusion, during which there were three changes of government, and little public business was transacted. Of the numerous influences

(1) On a motion condemning the action of the Colonial Treasurer in allowing a government contractor to be paid a higher price for supplies than stated in the contract.
(2) On Supply.
(3) On a demand for production of documents relating to the release of a bushranger, Cummings.
(4) On contemplated Government publication in the newspapers of maps for a projected electoral redistribution.
contributing to this situation, the chief was the even balance of the principal parliamentary factions.

A government formed by Parkes in March, 1877, survived until August. Robertson then assumed power, but succeeded in maintaining his position only until September, when, after narrowly averting defeat on a Censure motion, he requested the Governor to grant a dissolution. This was again refused unless Supply could be guaranteed, and the Government resigned. Two prominent politicians, Alexander Stuart and S. C. Brown, attempted to form ministries. When both failed, the Governor reluctantly dissolved the House on October 12.

The election did not clarify the situation greatly. In the new Assembly, the Robertson Government, which had agreed to remain in office over the election period, was immediately defeated, but on a close vote of 33-31. Parkes was sent for, but, unable to secure the adherence of a presentable body of ministers, he relinquished his commission. Eventually, on December 18, J. S. Farnell succeeded in forming an administration, whose members secured the confidence of the House and survived the ministerial re-elections.

It was estimated at the end of 1877 that, considering the time spent over three ministerial elections and one general election, in Censure bickerings, and in preparatory work after new governments came in, "very little short of half the year
has been spent in the work of turning one set of men out of
office and putting another in." Though the Assembly sat for
134 days in the remaining time, and came to 178 divisions, the
practical result was almost nil. Of the twelve Public Bills
passed during the year, ten were monthly Supply Bills, one a
Public Works Loan Bill, and one an Appropriation Bill, the latter
two being rushed through both Houses on the day before the dis-
solution. (1)


Farnell owed his position to the fact that he had be-
come the recognised leader of what - on the assumption that the
remaining members of the Assembly were roughly divisible into
supporters of Parkes or Robertson - was known as the "Third Party!"
These members were actually Independents, whose numbers had been
increasingly swollen during 1877 by a body of men who, disgusted
at the established leaders' scramble for office in a period of
crisis, had drifted from the Government or Opposition to the
cross benches.

It soon became apparent that Farnell and his Ministers
were acceptable, as a compromise Government, to those - including
many regular supporters of Parkes and Robertson - who were res-
ponsible enough to see that factional strife must give way to a
concern for the welfare of the Colony. The early rejection of
two Censure motions by large majorities signalised the coming of
a "gentleman's agreement" among members of differing opinions;

(1) S.M.H., 21.12.77.
to aid Farnell in carrying on the business of the country. (1)

Mediocrity, however, was the distinguishing characteristic of the new Ministry. Though it succeeded in providing a stable instrument through which the ordinary transactions of government might take place, its legislative record was a barren one. The prorogation speech at the end of the first session of the 1878 Parliament claimed that "several matters of a minor character but of considerable public utility" had been passed, but admitted that these "did not demand special notice." A Bill to amend the electoral laws had been laid aside on a procedural point, and not reintroduced. The initiative of private members had been responsible for decisions to open the Public Library on Sundays, and to establish a Hansard.

A more vigorous policy was foreshadowed at the beginning of the next session, when Farnell made generous promises to construct over 1,000 miles of new railway lines, to institute much-needed public works, and to reform the electoral and land laws. But before this programme was fairly under way, the Government was defeated on the second reading of its Land Bill, a measure in which Farnell had rested great hopes. A group of actual opponents of the Bill made a vigorous but vain attempt to secure from the Assembly an expression of confidence in the Administration. The desire for stable government thus not being strong enough to overcome passions aroused in the conflict of interest groups over the land, the period of compromise was at an

(1) On this tacit understanding, see speech of Robertson, S.M.H., 14.12.78, and S.M.H., Editorial, 16.12.78.
(v) The Parkes-Robertson Coalition: 1879-82.

After an unsuccessful attempt by Robertson to construct a ministry, Farnell acceded to a request by the Governor to withdraw his resignation. Within two days, however, on the motion of Parkes, the Assembly condemned this action as unconstitutional and the Colony was again without a government. The impasse was solved when, after a series of complicated manoeuvres, Robertson joined Parkes in a coalition ministry. This alliance of old enemies created an invincible majority in the House, and thus began the strongest and most fertile Administration of the period.

The progress of the new regime began modestly with a Felons Apprehension Act, and a successful Bill to abolish the export duty on gold. The effortless passage of Appropriation and Public Works Loan Bills indicated that a return had been made to stability in the conduct of State finance, while as an outward symbol of the Colony's prosperity, arrangements were made for promoting an International Exhibition in Sydney.

A burst of legislative activity followed. In one year, three major measures were placed on the statute book: the Land, Education, and Electoral Acts. The first of these made a number of changes in the existing laws, principally with the object of benefiting selectors. The second ended State aid to denominational schools, vested the control of education in a responsible
Minister, and included a number of detailed provisions calculated to increase generally the scope and efficiency of the system of secular State education. This Act was subsequently supplemented by a Church and Schools Dedication Act, which arrogated, for the purposes of Public Education, the income from all unimproved land hitherto reserved for churches and schools. The Electoral Act effected that redistribution of seats, for which a number of governments had striven unsuccessfully, as well as altering some of the minor details of the previous Act of 1858. A general election was held under the conditions laid down in the new Act, in 1880.

With its parliamentary majority confirmed by the election, the Government proceeded, in 1881, to two further pieces of major legislation. These were an Act to restrict Chinese immigration, and a Licensing Act. The latter effected a very detailed regulation of the liquor trade, and established the principle of "local option," for which the Temperance movement had been clamouring for years. By this principle, the granting of new publicans' licences, or removal of certificates in any area, was made conditional upon the opinions of local ratepayers.

At the end of 1881, Parkes, for health reasons, took a trip to England, leaving Robertson as Premier, and Parliament in recess. The new session did not begin until Parkes returned in August, 1882. The Opposition immediately tabled a motion condemning this long recess, but it was decisively defeated on a division of 67-17. Thus encouraged, the Ministry again turned
to the land problem, and in October Robertson introduced a measure to consolidate and amend the existing land laws. The essence of this Bill was the re-assertion, with certain modifications in detail, of the system laid down in the 1861 Acts. Stuart, leader of the Opposition, condemned the measure, and presented a set of counter proposals, which embodied radical changes of principle in regard to land settlement. The tide of opinion had for some time been flowing strongly against the established system, and Robertson's Bill was defeated on the second reading. The Government immediately requested, and secured, a dissolution. Four members of the ministry were defeated at the polls, the Government resigned, and Stuart formed a new Administration.


One of Stuart's first actions was to appoint two Commissioners, Morris and Rankin, to make a thorough enquiry into the land situation. Their report, tabled in May, 1883, formed the basis for a Land Bill, introduced in October. This was the principal measure of the Government, and eventually became law during the following year. The new Act altered the 1861 system of land lease and alienation, substituting a scheme which, by designating areas for the occupation of each, sought to end the clash of interest between squatters and selectors.

A number of reforms accomplished by this Government included the amendment and consolidation of the Colony's Criminal Laws, amendment of the Licensing Act of 1881 (to reduce its
stringency so far as publicans were concerned), and the passage of a Land Boilers Inspection Bill (to protect the interests of operators of certain types of steam engines). An Inscribed Stock Act aimed at improving the Colony's position on the overseas money market, while a Rabbit Nuisance Act made arrangements for funds collected from pastoralists to be used to combat the rabbit menace. A most ambitious railway and public works programme was instituted in 1884, and a loan of over £14 million authorised for this purpose.

Stuart's health broke under the strain of his public duties, and in October, 1885, he resigned. His place as Premier was taken by George Dibbs, the Colonial Treasurer. A new period of instability now began. The Government had already suffered a depletion of its majority, chiefly through suspicions aroused by Opposition charges of corruption. Dibbs reconstructed the ministry, but was almost immediately replaced by Sir Patrick Jennings, who, finding himself with but a slender majority, secured a dissolution. After the election, a motion of Censure tabled by Robertson was defeated by only two votes, and the Government resigned.

In December, 1885, Robertson, after unsuccessfully seeking a renewal of his alliance with Parkes, formed an Administration which, however, soon fell before the combined opposition of Parkes and Jennings. He then began negotiations with Jennings for the formation of a coalition cabinet, but these broke down over the composition of the projected ministry. The
Dibbs-Jennings faction eventually undertook the construction of a government on its own. Its efforts were successful, and with certain internal reshufflings, the new cabinet managed to retain power for almost twelve months. The maturing of certain extra-parliamentary movements and the coming of financial disturbance brought new political alignments during this period. These, however, are to be discussed in detail in Part II of the present study, since they signalled the decline of the old personal factions in the face of the arrival of political parties.
2. THE POLITICIANS AND A DOMINANT POLITICAL IDEAL

The accompanying table gives a survey of the occupations of all members of the New South Wales Legislative Assembly between 1872 and 1885. Though the data used are not such as to permit fine enough distinctions for making this an accurate representation of the interests of those enumerated, the table does give a general idea of the occupational structure of the Parliaments of the period.

The most noticeable feature of the survey is the consistency with which certain occupational groupings appeared in successive Houses. Persons connected with the pastoral, mercantile and professional callings always accounted together for over seventy per cent of the membership of the Assembly. With the exception of a slight increase in the number of manufacturers during the 'eighties, the minor groups also remained at approximately the same levels during the period. The predominance of pastoral and mercantile representatives, with whom many of the large professional group had a considerable community of interest, was a significant reflection of the location of wealth and influence in the society of the Colony. There was thus some point in the complaint commonly made by the leaders of the early Protectionist movement that these were the classes who had long dominated politics and furthered their common interests by preserving the assumption that Free Trade was the inevitable tariff policy for New South Wales, by resisting direct taxation, and by encouraging immigration.
## New South Wales Legislative Assembly

### Occupations of Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>AGRICULTURAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer and selector</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchardist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>PASTORAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>MERCHANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Agent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock, Hides &amp; Wool Agt.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission agent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auctioneer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce merchant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant (City Importer)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country merchant or storekeeper</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping and/or wharf owner or manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>MANUFACTURING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawmiller</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boot Mfr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rope Mfr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweed Mfr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soap Mfr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feltmger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builder and/or contractor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>MINING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mine Owner or Manager:</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERVICE:</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publican</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Soc Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROFESSIONAL:</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Practitioner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveyor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer (other than mining)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergyman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Servant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRADES:</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER:</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Means Professional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politician</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Table compiled from data presented in Appendices I and II. Figures opposite principal headings show number of members in each category, and percentage of total membership of the Parliament.
Beyond these general observations, however, it is true to say that, with one important exception, economic interest as represented in occupational groupings was rarely a source of political division. The exception was provided by the pastoralists who acted in concert on a number of occasions as a strong pressure group to advance their own interests. (1) Otherwise, the loyalties governing the actions of parliamentarians were generally of a different order, and related to more ephemeral matters. These circumstances resulted largely from the prosperity enjoyed by the Colony during these years when, at least among the men who found their way into Parliament, there was little objective reason for looking at politics in terms of a clash of broad material interests.

Of greater importance than their potential divisions was the social unity of the parliamentarians of the period. Small and large traders, professional men, pastoralists, a few selectors and manufacturers, they appeared a motley collection. They numbered among their ranks men with many shades of opinion on many political issues. Their deliberations were frequently spiced with bitter wrangling which sprang from temporary clashes of interest or principle as well as from personal animosities. But they were almost all members of the Colony's middle classes, most of them with property or good incomes, and many of them self-made men.

A number of circumstances combined to bring about this

(1) See below, Ch. 4.
middle-class monopoly of political representation. Payment of members, though frequently mooted, was not achieved until 1889. Except in unusual circumstances, it was thus necessary for a man to possess an independent income before contemplating an entry into the political sphere. Evening sittings of Parliament made it possible for Sydney men actively engaged in business or the professions to become members. Financial means were a still greater necessity to country representatives, and it was one of the standing arguments in favour of payment of members that non-metropolitan constituencies were limited in their choice of a member either to a wealthy local man, or to some city dweller largely ignorant of the real needs of those whom he represented. (1)

The financial obstacle was not, however, always insurmountable. In the early days of his political career, James Hoskins was sponsored and supported by his fellow diggers on the Northern Goldfields. (2) Angus Cameron, a carpenter, entered Parliament in 1874 under the auspices and with the financial assistance of the Sydney Trades and Labour Council. (3) The experience of other working class representatives, like Jacob Garrard, an engineer, and E. W. O'Sullivan, President of the Trades and Labour Council, (1882), both of whom managed to hold seats in Parliament during the 'eighties, also showed that the political arena need not be necessarily closed to determined men

(1) See, e.g., debate on motion by Terry for payment of members. (S.M.H., 18.3.74).
(2) Illustrated Sydney News, 2.5.74.
(3) S.M.H., 5.12.74.
of limited means. The incentive for the working classes to overcome the difficulties of securing parliamentary representation was not, however, strong during these years. Though their share of the general prosperity may have been disproportionately small, the majority of them appear to have enjoyed standards of living that were higher than in most other countries. (1) For the rectification of particular grievances they tended to look to direct rather than parliamentary action, and in the 'seventies and 'eighties the attention of workers was concentrated in laying the foundations of the Trades Union movement. In comparison to this task, the politics of the day appeared to them petty and unreal, and the most significant working class attempts at intrusion took place in the extra-parliamentary field. At the election of 1877 a Workingmen's Defence Association attempted unsuccessfully to organise the metropolitan electorates in favour of protection and the cessation of immigration, while Unionists were prominent in the activities of those bodies which in the early 'eighties sponsored the Protectionist movement proper. Otherwise, the working classes took no important part in politics until payment of members provided the means, and the failure of the Great Strikes of 1890 and 1891 the incentive, for the organisation of a Labor Party.

The solidly middle-class composition of the New South Wales Parliament during this period was undoubtedly the chief influence in fostering a general acceptance by politicians, and

(1) R. Gollan, op. cit., p. 110.
by a large section of the public, of an ethos which had important implications for the question of political organisation. The central notion of this ethos was well summarised in the received view of the priority of "Good Government" as an objective both for ministers and for the Assembly generally. This concept had two aspects: the first practical and administrative; the second theoretical and legislative.

It was a matter of importance to the community generally, and to those with "a stake in the country" in particular, that the many-sided business and service functions that fell to the lot of the Government should be exercised with speed and efficiency. The periodical muddles into which the Lands Department alone fell, either through ministerial incompetence or through successions of political crises, provided apt illustrations of the material losses that threatened the public unless active pressure was maintained to guarantee energetic acceptance by the government of its responsibilities. Similarly, the great backlog of administrative tasks which often had to be faced by Parliament engendered a contempt in the more responsible members for those of their brethren who for "party" or personal reasons adopted "stonewalling" tactics in the House, or raised upon motions for adjournment, petty issues which opened long, inconclusive, and time consuming debates. The charge of such irresponsibility was always accepted by the accused as a serious one, and the bitter personal exchanges that it sometimes evoked were testimony to the commonness of the belief that to secure efficient administration for the people was one of the principal
concerns of their parliamentary representatives. Another aspect of the same thing was the frequency with which members declared their support for a government, even at the risk of the charge of betraying declared political tenets, not because they necessarily favoured either the men in power or the principles they stood for, but because they were not prepared to help in creating administrative chaos through frequent cabinet changes.

"Good Government" in this sense was an objective which sprang naturally out of colonial conditions wherein a large measure of government activity in the economic life of the community was accepted as right and necessary. But, — almost paradoxically — on the legislative side, the same term was taken to stand for a political ideal clearly related to mid-century British Liberalism.

The epithet 'Liberal' was, indeed, frequently used in New South Wales during these years, though rarely with precise meaning. The politicians of the 'seventies and 'eighties, looking back to the days of constitution making and land reform, spoke nostagically of the time when a 'Liberal' (sometimes 'Popular') party existed in the Assembly. As they themselves

(1) e.g., Speech of W. H. Cooper in Legislative Assembly, 12.2.74, (S.M.H. 18.2.74).
(2) "We had a division of parties when responsible government first began. There was a sort of Conservative party, which was associated with the old officialism of the colony ... (this) old party was put out by the popular party. After that the land question came forward and a violent public excitement arose in favour of that Bill ... ever since that period we have had no parties in the Colony. — We have had nothing but personal followings." W. Forster, 4.10.81. (N.S.W.P.D., Vol. IV., P.1596).
understood, however, the name was in these cases little more than a convenient tag for the more progressive of contending sections of Parliament on specific questions. It was common in ordinary day to day political affairs to use it in this way as a complimentary reference to politicians of whom one approved. John Stewart, for example, who was elected as member for Kiama in 1872: in a speech explaining his parliamentary course to his constituents, spoke of the existing (Parkes) government in the following terms:

"I do not wish to be captious, but I do think the members of the government do not represent so large a mixture of the Liberal element as I would desire. The Premier, Mr. Parkes, is a Liberal-minded statesman - a man devoted to doing good for the country. Mr. Farnell and Mr. Sutherland are liberals, but Mr. Butler and Mr. Innes, men of ability, are conservatives... as for Mr. Lloyd, I do not believe that he knows himself what his principles are." (1)

At the time when his government was being formed, L. F. De Salis, an old political confrere, replied to a request from Parkes for his opinion on the wisdom of including Butler -

"I do not know whether he is really bigoted or of the same practical Catholicism which now best goes down even in Ireland - and with which you need not for a moment scruple to join without prejudice to your true liberalism." (2)

In these and the many similar instances that may be adduced of the use of the term "Liberalism," it is noteworthy that the political principle in question was always conceived to be a matter of personal attitudes. Hence it was possible for these men to think of the existence of a "Liberal Party," which

(1) S.M.H., 1.10.72.
(2) L. F. De Salis to Parkes, 19.3.72. (P.C., A.881.395a).
transcended the normal political divisions upon which government were based. In 1882, for instance, a member of the Assembly felt himself able to state — amid general approval — of the then principal opponents in the House, Parkes and Robertson, that:

"The hon. gentlemen, though personally opposed, have voted for almost all the great measures which have been passed in this country. They have voted for a Lands Act, a Public Instruction Act, an Influx of Chinese Restriction Act, and all the great measures which have distinguished the Liberal Party. They have voted together, although they have sat on opposite sides of the House." (1)

The great looseness with which the names "Liberal" and "Liberalism" were used in the Colony is well enough indicated in these examples. But although preciseness of definition could not be looked for, there was at least a common thread to be discerned. To call a man a Liberal implied that he made it his object to secure legislation of general benefit to the community or, in the more naive words of Stewart, to devote himself to "doing good for the country." This appears at first sight a sentimental notion open to many interpretations according to individual conceptions of values such as "good," or "benefit." But it was nevertheless significant for two reasons: on the one hand it bore — for all its vagueness — a suggestive similarity to the political creed of the English middle classes; and on the other, it had some implications which were of importance for the question of political organisation.

Halevy recounts how, in 1847, Palmerston attempted to define for his constituents the essence of "good government," by saying that it consisted in the adoption of that course, arrived at by rational discussion and conflict of opinion, which "is most advantageous to the interests of the whole community." (1) This feeling was, as Halevy shows, an essential ingredient in the Liberal political philosophy developed from 1832 onwards by the English bourgeoisie. An emanation of the compounding of elements such as Laisser Faire, Protestantism and Utilitarianism, it was a declaration of faith in the possibility of achieving social justice and political stability through the rule of wisdom among legislators, and the responsible exercise of individual energy on the part of all members of society. As Gladstone saw it:

"methodically to enlist the members of a community, with due regard to their several capacities, in the performance of its public duties, is the way to make that community powerful and healthful, to give a firm seat to its rulers and to engender a warm and intelligent devotion to those beneath its sway." (2)

Although their lack of sophistication and the facts both of their structure and their environment made it impossible for the middle classes of the colonial society of New South Wales to accept in every detail the political creed of their English counterparts, they did take over at least the attitude of mind which has just been outlined. Palmerston's words provide a more

exact description of the "Liberalism" of the colonial politicians than they themselves were capable of making. Further, the implicit assumption upon which so much of the Liberal view rested - that society was best considered an agglomeration of individuals found freer play in the colony, where middle-class hegemony of political representation was combined with a less rigid class structure than that of England. The result was that New South Wales provided a better example even than England of the working of the Liberal paradox of a theory which played down the significance of social class, being used to guarantee the interest of a particular group of classes. The Liberal ideal interpenetrated politics, becoming - as it was soon to be in England - a "respectable justification of the status quo." (1)

Elaborate lip-service was paid to the belief that there was a way of dealing with almost any given issue that was objectively good or right from the viewpoint of society as a collectivity. Hence those who, on any matter, regarded as being of prime importance the interest of a section of the community were to be condemned. To invoke the bogies of "class legislation" or "class representation" against measures or men to whom one was opposed, became a common - and generally effective - weapon for attacking an enemy. These politicians lightly assumed their own capacity to act as the arbiters of the general good, unwilling or unable to see the implications of the fact that politics were in practice the preserve of but a section of the community.

As a spokesman of one of the excluded groups put it in a hustings speech in 1877:

"Instead of working men being returned from their own ranks, the representation had been conveyed to the hands of a class of men occupying higher social positions, but who were either ignorant of the wants of the working class or careless about them, and in their legislative capacity, instead of legislating for the great mass of the people, almost exclusively legislated for themselves. At present the majority of the House were squatters, lawyers, merchants and bankers, and the interests of those four classes ran more or less in the same groove." (1)

The conventional view was put from the same platform by an opponent, who warned the electors against the temptation,

"to elect a man of some class interests or for some particular object. When a man was so elected to the Legislative Assembly, he was sent there as a mere delegate, and that was one of the most objectionable forms of representation. Any man going into that Assembly did not go there simply to represent a constituency, but to represent the colony at large, and it was the bounden duty of every constituency to return a candidate who would represent the whole colony." (2)

"Independence" of control, both by their constituents and by parliamentary "parties," was an ideal superficially revered by politicians who subscribed to the theory of "total" representation. They never wearied of pointing out that no man trammelled by obligations to others could hope to exercise that objective judgment conventionally demanded of the wise legislator. When the occasion arose, great play was made of this

(1) W. Turner—successful candidate for Northumberland in 1877. Turner was a reporter on the Newcastle Herald and Miners' Advocate, and claimed to be a miners' representative. He was sponsored by the N.S.W. Reform League, which guaranteed him £300 per annum for his political services. (S.M.H., 20.7.77, 25.7.77).
(2) Speech of Wallace, Northumberland nomination. S.M.H., 20.7.77.
point, and the debates of the House were liberally sprinkled with ostentatious declarations of independence made in similar strain to the following:

"I am returned to this House in an independent position. I received to-day a letter from some of my constituents asking me to vote against the second reading of the bill. A meeting had been held at Manilla, an important part of my constituency. The meeting was largely attended, and it condemned this bill; I do not think that more than three of those who were present supported it. A motion was carried in which I and my colleague, Mr. Gill, were asked to record our votes against the bill. It is not my intention to do so. I am independent enough to say—and I hope it will reach the ears of my friends and supporters, as well as those who are opposed to me—that I will not be dictated to as to how I shall vote. I sit here as the representative, not the delegate of my constituents, and I hope that I shall continue to occupy that position with honour and credit to myself and to those who sent me here. I cannot forget, moreover, that I have a duty to discharge to my country." (1)

Constant warnings were given to Governments by members that, on principle, they were unprepared to extend to them more than "conditional" support. Even the staunchest followers of an administration felt constrained to voice this sentiment from time to time. It was usually formulated in words like those of H. L. Nelson, who, at the end of a parliamentary session in which he had been an unwavering supporter of the existing government, declared to his constituents at Orange:

"It was well-known that he had been a pretty general supporter of the present Administration. He did so because he believed in their policy and measures—he supported them when he considered their acts were for the benefit of the colony, but when he thought the interests of the colony were endangered, he would oppose them."

(2) S.M.H., 13.1.74.
The beau ideal of independence was the man prepared to support every government so long as its actions squared with the dictates of his conscience. The formulation of their position by those who professed to follow this course was always the occasion for adopting a high moral tone. The words of G. E. Cass, representative for the Bogan, on the occasion of his desertion of the Stuart Government in 1883 because he disagreed with their Land Bill, may be taken as a typical example.

"I am perfectly free to act as my conscience dictates; no one can be less influenced than I by personal considerations in dealing with this question. Since I have been in the House I have identified myself with no particular party. I have given the present Government that consistent support which I gave to their predecessors. When I first went before my constituents I stated most emphatically that I would not accept a seat in this House if I were to be bound by party ties. My motto was "Measures, not Men." I said that so long as the government of the day brought down measures conducive to the welfare of the country I would give them my cordial support, but that if they introduced measures which were inimical to the best interests of the community I should be uncompromising in my opposition as I had been cordial in my support." (1)

Striking examples of the deference paid to the ideal of independence were given in the extraordinary scenes that sometimes took place when the actions of individuals during parliamentary divisions came under discussion. One such case occurred in 1882, during the committee stages of a Criminal Law Amendment Bill, when attention was drawn by one member to the fact that some of his opponents, on a division being called for, had entered the Chamber, asked the question "where is the Government," voted accordingly, and then had left. This he denounced as

"a discredit to the House," adding that when he questioned one
of the culprits, the latter had agreed that he had had little
idea of what he had voted for, remarking: "but I do not care
about the Bill - all I know is that I saw the Government sitting
there and I will vote whichever way they go." (1). So seriously
did he regard this denunciation, that the accused man iden-
tified himself, and made an elaborate explanation to the House.
His chief argument was that:

"In regard to subjects in reference to which he did
not feel much confidence in his own judgment he
thought it better to defer to those who were
better able to form an opinion. The Criminal Law
Amendment Bill was a measure which had been drafted
by a commission, and which had received the support
of the House, and this was an additional reason for
the course which he adopted... He had confidence
in the Government; but at the same time he claimed
that he gave his vote ... independently, ... in-
telligently ... and honestly." (2)

This was specious reasoning: it was significant,
however, that he not only felt it necessary to explain his
action, but also, even in the circumstances, argued that he had
asserted a form of independence.

These theories of the special nature of "representation"
and of the primacy of "independence" were, as has been seen,
natural corollaries of the dominant Liberal ethos of the period.
From another point of view, they may be considered as a theoret-
cal justification for the inevitable political individualism
displayed during a time of prosperity in a series of Houses whose

(1) Speech of Pigott (Canterbury), 26.9.32. (N.S.W.P.D., Vol.
VII, p.349, et seq).
(2) ibid., (Cooke, Forbes).
members were of a fairly homogeneous social composition. Their appeal was also bolstered by the material pressure of influences such as localism, which demanded of its parliamentary agents sufficient mobility of political allegiance for them to transfer their support as occasion offered itself to the quarters from which concessions were most likely to be gained.

In practice, however, individualism was tempered both by the requirements imposed by the colony's system of government, and by the fact that, for all their declarations of independence, parliamentarians were men who lived among other men, and were thus inevitably attached, on a number of levels—religious, economic and intellectual—to others of the same mind as themselves. Responsible government could only function through majorities organised around some principle or person. In the circumstances of the colony—for various reasons which have already been discussed—principle could form no basis for enduring political alignments, and government came to depend upon the operations of factions held together by the bond of personal admiration for a leader. Allegiance of this kind was accepted as being compatible with the exercise of "independence," provided that it was not expressed too crudely, and that an acceptable escape route was always left open against the day when a leader could no longer be followed with integrity. These factions, indeed, imposed greater order upon politics than might at first glance be suspected, and their functioning is worthy of close study.
3. THE PARLIAMENTARY FACTIONS

(1) The Concept and Role of the Faction

"Ours is a system of government by majorities, but not a system of government by parties, in the sense of party being based on definite political principles. As party divisions do not represent, as they have done in England, distinctly marked differences of political principle and tendency, it is utterly impossible that honest and independent men can be expected to give to any government more than steady support which may, when the occasion requires it, be withdrawn without violation of party fidelity." (1)

These were the words in which the Sydney Morning Herald attempted in 1874 to sum up, on the one hand, the nature of "party divisions" in New South Wales, and, on the other, the implications, so far as discipline within contemporary political groups was concerned, of that theory of the primacy of "independence" which has just been outlined. The criterion assumed here as the test of the "true" party, the combination which could justifiably demand absolute fidelity from its members, was virtually the definition of Burke:

"A body of men united for promoting by their joint endeavours the national interest upon some particular principle in which they are all agreed." (2)

As long as so called "parties" owed their existence to other influences, especial responsibility was theoretically placed upon the moral judgment of the individual member. Thus the virtue of "independence," though an ideal springing from deeper sources, was confirmed by the nature of contemporary political divisions.

So far as these divisions themselves were concerned,

(1) S.M.H., 7.12.74.
(2) Quoted in S.M.H., 19.10.77.
it was further to be observed that "faction" was the best word to describe the party-like combinations to which they gave rise, and which formed the real basis for the "system of government by majorities" that had developed in New South Wales. Logical extension of the Burkian concept of party provided an apparently pleasing definition of such factions:

"The absence of ... principles is the mark that distinguishes a faction from a party - a combination that exists for the purpose of mere personal aggrandisement from one that exists for the purpose of the public good." (1)

But the nice balance of this definition, though perhaps satisfying in its epigrammatic terseness, was misleading if applied to the actual factions operating in the New South Wales Parliament. It was certainly true that they were composed of politicians grouped together for the service not of a principle, but of a man. The accepted method of distinguishing them was by the names of their chiefs, while the unimportance of doctrine was emphasised by the fact that, so far as policy was concerned, there was generally little to choose between rival leaders. Public apathy in the face of the so-called "battle of the 'ins' and 'outs'" sprang usually from an awareness of this lack of clearly definable division: as it was once rather whimsically put, the Colonists did not "very much care which days, like the ancient Spartan kings, they alternately reigned." (2)

The role of these factions was essentially the same as

(1) S.M.H.* 19.10.77.
(2) S.M.H.* 11.10.72.
that which always characterises political parties; to "win political power and exercise it." (1) Since, unlike parties, they could not justify this end by proclaiming a desire to use power, if achieved, to put certain accepted principles into operation, it was logical enough to conclude that they existed "for the purpose of personal aggrandisement." Nor can there be doubt that, though it had always to be concealed, desire for the privileges and emoluments of office was frequently a powerful motive underlying the allegiance of individuals to the leader of their faction. There were, however, other aspects to this question. A hint of them was given in 1877, in the course of a newspaper discussion of the decline of "party spirit" during periods when few important matters of legislation require settlement:

"... during intervals between the very serious acts of legislation, it is natural and not unbecoming that more preference should be given to men than measures, that special regard should be paid to the vigour of administration, and to the purity with which the patronage of the State is exercised." (2)

In such circumstances, supporters of personal factions could often be thought of as acting through a concept of the public good, and not from a desire for personal gain, simply because they believed that particular men could serve the State better than others. The varying degrees of such admiration to be witnessed in practice will receive more careful discussion.

(1) M. Duverger, Political Parties, Introduction, p.xxiii.
(2) S.M.H., 19.12.77.
shortly: here it is important to notice that, despite the con-
temporary fashion of regarding with scorn the factional squabble
for office, there was, from the point of view of those who par-
ticipated in it, no necessary reason why they should consider
such a course as being inconsistent with the keeping of their
personal integrity. Though, for appearance sake, they may
have felt obliged to place little public emphasis on it, even
the most prominent and the worthiest of politicians became in-
volved - if only through the necessity of playing a part in the
choice of Executives - in the clash of factions.

But if the existence and importance of these personal
factions are readily recognisable, it is a difficult matter to
discover in terms of numbers, or of the particular men involved,
a great deal about them. The convention which imposed upon
parliamentarians a reticence, or even a frank evasiveness, about
their political sympathies, made it impolitic for leaders to
leave records of the names of their followers, and virtually im-
possible for even contemporary observers to make detailed assess-
ments of the compositions of individual factions. Numerical
estimates of their size were occasionally to be found in the
newspapers of the period, but never with names annexed.

Some indication of the allegiances of members was,
however, given from time to time by the divisions that took
place in the course of parliamentary business. It is true that
most politicians maintained their right to vote on any issue
according to their conception of its merits, and frequently
acted with this principle in mind. But there were always occasions when the fate of a ministry was at stake, or at least when the votes given by members were specifically recognised, or recognisable, as involving a direct expression of opinion in favour of, or against, the Administration of the day. It is reasonable to expect that from a survey of those divisions of this kind which took place within the life of any government, it should be possible to distinguish its regular supporters and opponents. Although there may be some doubt as to the significance to be attached to the latter group, the former could be said to have constituted, at least during his period of office, the "faction" led by the Premier of the day.

A survey of the kind just mentioned is presented in detail in Appendix II (p.307). As is pointed out in the explanatory note which prefaces these summaries, there are certain reservations which must be held about them. These, however, do not seriously prejudice the general conclusions, concerning the size, nature, and consistency of the factions of the period, which are to be drawn from them.

(ii) Voting Patterns within Individual Parliaments:

In the survey of voting patterns, attention has been paid to the reactions of politicians to the principal government which held power in each of six consecutive Parliaments, the Seventh to the Twelfth (1872-87). These governments were:
Three types of relationship between member and government have been distinguished in each case: Supporter, Opponent, and Independent member. In terms of numbers, the general results of the survey may be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporter</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opponent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though, as is explained elsewhere, the absolute precision of these figures is to some extent vitiated by difficulties involved in the original classifications, the margin of error is not large, and they may be taken as representing the best available estimates of the relative strengths of the governments of the period.

Two significant facts emerge from this table. The first is that, despite the implications of contemporary theories of "independence," there were always clearly
distinguishable groups of men who in each case consistently supported or opposed the government. This is decisive evidence for the existence within each Parliament of predictable faction divisions, whereby the uncertainty arising from a lack of regular political parties was in practice considerably modified.

The second observation to be made is that in only two of the cases examined (the Parkes–Robertson Coalition and the Dibbs–Jennings Ministries) could a government be said to have had a decisive majority. In the other instances, independent members held the balance of power. It is therefore not surprising that political instability was a recurring feature of the period. From the point of view of the leader of a ministry, this disposition of numbers meant that his policy and tactics had to be shaped with an eye to the crossbenchers, since it was in their hands that his fate so often lay. Regular supporters thus formed on occasion but a basis for the construction of a parliamentary majority, while the problems posed by the incubus of the independent member taxed the ingenuity and skill of those whose task it was to secure his allegiance.

It is to be noted, in passing, that classification of the kind used here makes it possible for the actual composition of the factions to be examined. This provides interesting evidence to support the contention that it is useless to seek in these groups any more meaningful principle of combination than
a preparedness to support a common leader and his colleagues.

Robertson's 1875 supporters may be taken as examples.

The names and occupations of these men were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Booth</td>
<td>Timber Merchant.</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Farmer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>Barrister.</td>
<td>Lord</td>
<td>Pastoralist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrnes</td>
<td>Tweed Manufac-turer.</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>Builder and Contractor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>Carpenter.</td>
<td>Macintosh</td>
<td>Ironmonger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Pastoralist.</td>
<td>Montague</td>
<td>Pastoralist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke</td>
<td>Produce</td>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangar</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>Onslow</td>
<td>Pastoralist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>Ironmonger.</td>
<td>Teaee</td>
<td>Merchant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forster R.</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>Farmer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forster W.</td>
<td>Pastoralist.</td>
<td>Watson</td>
<td>Merchant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>Land Agent.</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>Barrister.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goold</td>
<td>Solicitor.</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>Storekeeper;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>Pastoralist.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Queanbeyan).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occupations admittedly provide but a rough index of economic interest and of social status. But at least it is clear that this was a very mixed collection of men, among whom no common interest or characteristic is readily discernable. From this point of view, they were, in their heterogeneity, undistinguished from their regular opponents, most of whom were recognised followers of Parkes. In detail, these men were:

(1) Appendix II, pp.315-318.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Solicitor.</td>
<td>Lloyd</td>
<td>Merchant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bawden</td>
<td>Farmer.</td>
<td>McElhone</td>
<td>Hide and Tallow Merchant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>Auctioneer.</td>
<td>Meyer</td>
<td>Grocer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne W.</td>
<td>Pastoralist.</td>
<td>Piddington</td>
<td>Bookseller and Publisher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td>Barrister.</td>
<td>Scholey</td>
<td>Stock Agent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>Solicitor.</td>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>Seed and Plant Merchant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnell</td>
<td>Ex Land Agent.</td>
<td>Smith, R. B.</td>
<td>Solicitor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzpatrick</td>
<td>Ex Civil Servant.</td>
<td>Sutherland</td>
<td>Builder and Contractor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Under-Sec. for Lands)</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>Pastoralist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurley</td>
<td>Pastoralist.</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Butcher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examination of all the Government and Opposition factions of the period yields the same general result: there is in no case any indication of common - or even of near-common - characteristics of social class, or economic interest, either to suggest a reason for unity, or to distinguish the members of these political combinations from their opponents.

(iii) **Sequences of Loyalty from Parliament to Parliament:**

As has been suggested, the motives leading politicians to provide, within the life of a single parliament, consistent support for a government, could be numerous. Such constancy did not always spring from personal attachment to a leader: the type of member who was prepared to support any government, so long as its actions did not offend him, has already been mentioned, and there were naturally many variants of this form of allegiance. Similarly, it was an open secret that local favours and other material compensations were frequently the price paid for the adherence of some members. It is thus not surprising that, in many cases, a man who had been a strong adherent of one
government was to be found lending equal support to its successor, even when - as usually happened - the new administration drew its strength from the opponents of the old.

Politicians of the kind just described were, during their period of support of a given leader, members of his faction, at least for all practical purposes. There were others, however, whose loyalty held good in times of difficulty as well as of success. Consistent and close personal supporters of their chief, they could always be relied upon to form a nucleus around which, when the occasion presented itself, a government could be constructed, and a parliamentary majority organised.

An indication of the importance of these faction nuclei, or "cores," is to be gained by considering the governments supported by individual politicians from Parliament to Parliament. These are summarised in the list appearing in Appendix III, (p. 338), which is constructed from the preceding analyses of voting. A close inspection of this list reveals the recurrence of four significant patterns of loyalty. A tabular arrangement, in accordance with these sequences of those members who held seats in two or more Parliaments during the period, and whose political allegiances were deduced from the voting analyses, is shown in Appendix IV, (p. 346). The importance of the patterns mentioned is indicated by the fact that of 147 members surveyed, 87, or more than 59%, adhered, throughout their parliamentary careers, to one of them. The remaining 54 were either consistent Independents, or changed their loyalties in a manner individual to themselves.
The patterns discerned, and the numbers involved, are summarised in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATTERN</th>
<th>PARLIAMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB.</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The symbols used here represent attitudes to the principal government of each Parliament. 0 = Oppositionist, while support of particular governments is shown in the following manner: P = Parkes, R = Robertson, PR = Parkes-Robertson Coalition, 3rd = "Third Party" (Farnell) Administration, S = Stuart, DJ = Dibbs-Jennings Governments. Taking the attitudes adopted by the designated leaders as criteria, it will be seen that, with the possible exception of C, each of these patterns indicates a consistent sequence of loyalties. During the Seventh and Eighth Parliaments, for instance, when the rival leaders were Parkes and Robertson, Robertson’s established supporters followed him into opposition when Parkes formed a government, and vice versa. In subsequent Parliaments, these factions were united, first in opposing the Farnell Administration, then in sustaining the Parkes-Robertson Coalition, and finally in opposition to the Stuart and Dibbs-Jennings Governments.
Pattern AB represents the course taken by those entering Parliament after the period of rivalry between Parkes and Robertson, but who joined the combination which was instituted by the rapprochement of 1879. Pattern C was followed by those who, by their defection from Parkes or Robertson during 1877-8 provided part of the nucleus for the "Third Party," which in turn, as the very existence of this and the subsequent sequence shows, was to be the parent of the Stuart and Dibbs-Jennings factions.

Few members held seats throughout the whole of the period, so that numbers of those designated in the above table fitted into a segment of one of the total patterns. But though the numbers involved may have varied, it is clear from these calculations that at any given point of time, each of the current leaders could depend upon a hard core of consistent followers who would support him whatever his political fortunes. In periods of success, these men became potential recruits for ministerial posts, and enthusiastic abettors of all tactics designed to increase or maintain a Government majority; in bad times, they joined their leader on the Opposition benches and became implacable harassers of his enemies.
4. **THE CONCEPT OF LOYALTY**

There were, undoubtedly, cases where that personal devotion which held faction cores together could be explained by the selfish hope of riding to power through consistent support of a likely leader. More commonly, however, it was motivated by a genuine feeling that the good of the colony would be best served by the exercise in office of an admired leader's talents. This attitude was typified in the words of an obscure backbencher, who wrote to Parkes, on the eve of the General Election of 1887:

> "Whatever I do during the coming contest will be done out of a sincere personal regard for you, and from a firm conviction that your return to power at the present moment is necessary for the well being of the country." (1)

The same sentiment lay behind the readiness of some men to give up their own seats to their chosen leader should political misfortune overtake him in his home electorate. Both Parkes and Robertson received many offers of this kind after their respective defeats in the metropolitan elections of 1877. Indeed, long before that election took place, the unlettered - but powerful - Stephen Scholey had informed Parkes from Maitland that:

> "It is reported hear (sic) and many people believe it that Mr. Dalley will beat you in East Sydney this I do not believe but if so I will make way by resigning at once the representing of East Maitland for the country wants you and your best services." (2)

(1) Francis Tait to Parkes. 22.1.87. (P.C., A.929.116).
(2) Scholey to Parkes. 26.3.77. (P.C., A.909.179).
For all his weaknesses, Parkes appears to have had a gift for gaining the affection and admiration of those who believed in his political capacity and earned his friendship. (1) The deep regard held for him by G. A. Lloyd, for instance, shines through in the genuineness of a fragment that remains to record his feelings at the news of Parkes' 1877 defeat. Word came to him in the midst of an election meeting at Newcastle -

"Poor miserable deluded Sydney," he wrote later, "to prefer Macintosh to Parkes. All the gas is taken out of me. I had arranged for a telegram to be sent to my meeting and it came while I was speaking, but when I opened it I would not announce it as I had intended. I was congratulating myself on the show of hands and the prospect of success here, but I do not care a fig to go in now and for two pins I would retire at once." (2)

Even more touching were the letters to Parkes of politicians like L. F. De Salis and J. G. L. Innes, both of whom as ageing men still looked back with warm feelings of pleasure to their days of service under his direction. Innes, though having retired from the Assembly some years earlier to the comparative restfulness of the Legislative Council, was recalled to office by Parkes in 1880. A year later, on the eve of a dinner he had planned to celebrate the event, he learnt that Parkes was ill and at his Faulconbridge home. Full of concern, he wrote:

"I do hope you will be able to come and dine with me on Monday next or shall I put it off till the Monday following? Without you, a Ministerial Anniversary dinner with me for a host would be a fiasco. For are you not my one chief? I am

(1) The same was true of Robertson. See e.g., affectionate remarks of E. W. O'Sullivan, concerning his period of support of Robertson, *From-Colony to Commonwealth*. pp. 173-181, 183-5. (Manuscript Memoirs, Mitchell Library).
(2) Lloyd to Parkes. 2.10.77. (P.C., A.891. 413).
(3) See e.g., De Salis to Parkes. 7.1.75. (P.C., A.882. 166).
"the only one of the present team who was with you in '72 when you for the first time took your proper place as Prime Minister - first and foremost - facile princeps - and unless you sit on my right hand on Monday I shall be miserable." (1)

The same affectionate tone had for a number of years marked Innes' correspondence with Parkes, whom he addressed invariably as "my Dear old Chief." (2) These were private expressions of attachment, of a kind doubtless received by all the leaders of the period. Few politicians, however, made public declarations of such loyalties, which expressed themselves externally in deed and not in word. Occasional spectacular exploiting of faction core solidarity evoked protests in the name of "independence," (3) but in the normal conduct of parliamentary business, unostentatious personal devotion within small groups was accepted as a normal part of the political process.

Indeed, even within the larger parliamentary combinations which crystallised around faction nuclei, honour, and a sense of responsibility to the group, in practice demanded from the individual a degree of consistency in his political relationships. This became evident on those occasions when notable changes of allegiance took place. Eyebrows were raised in 1874 when Parkes attracted R. P. Abbott from the Opposition to the

(1) Innes to Parkes. 10.8.81. (P.C., A.889. 208).
(2) See e.g., Innes to Parkes, 30.9.74, also undated letter welcoming Parkes back to the Colony after his trip to England in 1882. (P.C., A.889. 148. 214).
(3) See e.g., speech of Abbott (1882) on Robertson's clever rallying of personal supporters to save Garrett from expulsion from the Assembly on a corruption charge arising out of the Millburn Creek Copper Mining Co., scandal. (N.S.W.P.D., Vol. VI., p.118).
(4) S.M.H., 28.8.74.
office of Minister for Mines, and the appointment soon became "a matter of gossip." Even more unexpected was the Parkes-Robertson Government's choice of W. J. Foster as Minister for Justice. Foster had been Attorney-General in the preceding Farnell Government, and was in 1881 (at the time of his elevation, regarded as a distinct Opposition member. (1) His junction with Parkes became the subject of an acrimonious debate in the Assembly, in which a number of members endorsed the opinion that:

"... we ought to labour to preserve as much as possible the purity of public life ... The gentleman who has now accepted office has ... now deserted and left in the lurch his late colleagues... Such a course of action is not creditable or honourable to public life, and it behoves us to stamp it with our strongest condemnation. If there is to be no adherence or fidelity to party, where will it all end?" (2)

The strength of this sentiment was also demonstrated by the explanations frequently made, on the floor of the House, by lesser members transferring their allegiance from one side to the other. They rarely found difficulty in justifying their action as a vindication of their integrity and "independence," but the fact that they felt an apology to be necessary was itself testimony to an unwillingness to be charged with treachery, or "rattling." (3)

---

(1) To Parkes himself Foster admitted, on the eve of accepting office: "Nor did I ever regard myself in the light of a supporter of the Government." (W. J. Foster to Parkes, 14.10.81 P.C., A.883, 398).

(2) Speech of Buchanan, 14.10.81. (N.S.W.P.D., Vol. V., p. 1594). See also remarks of A. Cameron and J. S. Farnell. (ibid., pp.1603 et seq.).

(3) Among numerous examples of such explanations, the following are of particular interest: J. P. Abbott, (24.8.82, N.S.W.P.D., Vol. VII., p.117); N. Melville (ibid., p.169); L. F. Heydon, (22.7.84, ibid., Vol. XIV., p.1464).

(4) See attack by Parkes on W. Clark, "the renegade member for Orange, who came into the House to support the late Governor nt and speedily ratted to another." (1885. N.S.W.P.D., Vol. XVII., pp. 128-9).
Commission of this political sin in a few instances actually occasioned the demise of the culprit from public life, in a wave of general condemnation. (1)

Hence, both through the close personal bonds uniting faction cores, and an instinctive sense of mutual dependence within larger combinations, the ideal of loyalty tended to modify the dessicating influence of political independence. Its effectiveness was, however, limited by the fact that it could rarely be invoked in the service of parliamentary constellations held together by permanent political principles. The reaction against Parkes' frequent and arrogant attempts to use the notion of "party fidelity" to constrain a motley following, (2) exemplified the insufficiency to promote tight discipline outside the faction nucleus, of a mere appeal to the service of a set of men. In the circumstances of the

(1) F. B. Suttor provided the most outstanding case of this, when he deserted Parkes in 1886 to join Jennings. Condemned both by friends and enemies, he lost his seat in the subsequent elections. (See N.S.W.P.D., Vol. XXIII, pp. 6034, et seq., and S.M.H., comment of 10.2.87: "Mr. Suttor has been flattened out, first by the steamroller of the Premier's unsparing invective, and then by that of the popular disapprobation.")

(2) "See, e.g., Parkes' attack on S. C. Brown, and his belief that "an independent member is a member who can never be depended upon." (9.3.81, N.S.W.P.D., Vol. IV, pp. 842-3) Similar statements had in 1874 earned Parkes the title of "Dictator." (See election advertisement, S.M.H., 8.12.74), and a scathing S.M.H., editorial which declared: "... to appeal to the electors here in the name of party government ... which, in the English sense of it, has no existence, and certainly no influence on the public mind, seems to show that Mr. Parkes has lost his head in the clouds, to which he has lately elevated it." (7.12.74).
Colony, it was more profitable for the individual politician to cultivate the impression that he was more concerned for the interest of the constituencies than for the fortunes of political leaders, and these did not always coincide. Fidelity to "party" thus operated best when least talked about; in the absence of the deeper sanctions arising from common aims and ideals, it was difficult to justify in the face of the strong appeal of the notion of independence.
CHAPTER 3.

THE MAKING AND BREAKING OF PARLIAMENTARY MAJORITIES

There were two general phases in the process of expanding faction cores into parliamentary majorities. The first took place at the point of contact between political leaders and the electorates, and will be examined in a later chapter. The second focussed around warfare within Parliament itself.

Such warfare often tended to be a determinant, rather than a product of the nature of the larger political combinations in the House. This may be seen by an examination of certain incidents that occurred during the period, and which exemplify the following aspects of the struggle for parliamentary power:

1. Personal intrigue and cabinet formation.
2. Parliamentary manoeuvre.
3. Patronage and log-rolling.
4. The early "party" Caucus.
1. PERSONAL INTRIGUE AND CABINET FORMATION:

The collapse of the Martin Ministry in January, 1872, after the passage in the Assembly of a motion condemning its Border Duties policy, produced a complex political situation. The Premier requested, and secured, a dissolution. Severe criticism was at the time levelled against the Governor, Lord Belmore, for acceding to Martin's wishes in this matter: Opposition members in particular felt that some "mystery" surrounded this action, since the issue upon which the Government had been condemned was clear-cut, and its defeat decisive.

(1) Belmore himself was disturbed by the vehemence of this criticism, and in reporting it to his superiors in London, appended a long explanation which revealed that his attitude had been shaped by the disposition of "parties" in the Legislative Assembly.

"By dismissing ministers, I should have virtually said 'I am satisfied that your policy on this question is so contrary to the general opinion of the country that I will take upon myself to decide upon its merits, and will not let you appeal to the constituencies'... Had there been an evidently strong and united party in opposition, one with a fair chance of carrying on the Government for a considerable time if called on to take office, I might perhaps be justified in taking such a responsibility upon myself. But such did not appear to be the case.

"The Opposition consisted of two parties - one Mr. Cowper's old party, minus Mr. Robertson, and I think some three or more other members. Of this I believe Mr. Forster is the recognised leader; the other of Mr. Parkes and a few other members.

Neither of these parties fulfilled singly the conditions I have mentioned, nor was I to assume the probability of a coalition between gentlemen who had been so long opposed to each other as Mr. Forster and Mr. Parkes. (1)

The "parties" referred to here are recognisable as faction cores surrounding the specified leaders. The principal factions of the preceding decade had been those led by Martin and Cowper, between whom power alternately passed. Forster and Parkes had each played something of a lone hand during this period, gathering supporters around themselves, and aiding or standing aloof from governments according to the whim of the moment. Between 1868 and 1870, however, Forster held portfolios in ministries formed by Robertson and Cowper, and had become practically identified with the Cowper faction. After Cowper's appointment as Agent General for the Colony in London (1870), his followers split into two groups. The first joined Robertson in the coalition which underlay the Martin Ministry of 1870-72; the second accompanied Forster into opposition. Thus, on the eve of the election of 1872, three factions appeared likely to emerge in the new House, led respectively by Martin (and Robertson), Forster, and Parkes.

The election itself, though ostensibly fought over the Border Customs issue, was a tangle of disconnected struggles, and on the eve of reassembly, the Parliamentary situation had not been clarified. This was clearly shown in an amusing set of

(1) 12.2.72, Belmore to Kimberly. (Despatches from the Governor of N.S.W., to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Jan., - Dec., 1872. No. 18. Typescript copy, Mitchell Library).
letters published in the Herald during the last stages of the conflict. (1) Under the pseudonym of "An Elector," Parkes made, on March 9, an elaborate classification of the members thus far elected, (2) and came to the conclusion that, in a House of 72, at least 48 would oppose the Government. Several days later, "Another Elector" (who was subsequently revealed to be Martin), produced a counter-classification which purported to show that the Government would, in fact, have a strong majority.

These sets of calculations each rested on an examination of the supposed factional attachments of those elected, as revealed by past votes or hustings declarations. They immediately aroused the ire of a new correspondent, "Third Party," who bitterly assailed the idea "that parties should be formed arbitrarily, or ... factiously in anticipation of events and circumstances yet to come," and maintained:

"that no political promise whatsoever is binding upon any public man to whom it is ascribed, against, or otherwise than is consistent with, the public interest... Still less can it reasonably be held, that a political promise, upon a specific subject, binds a candidate to any party associated for various and uncertain and often concealed purposes."

"Third Party," identified as Forster, was next rebuked by Parkes for having become a "self-constituted teacher" of political

(1) The letters are collected in General Election, January-March, 1872. (Newspaper clippings and Manuscript Notes. Mitchell Library).

(2) Parkes' classification gives an excellent indication of the uncertain nature of contemporary political groupings. He divided members into the following categories:

(i) Oppositionists as declared on the hustings, or known by past votes,
(ii) Supporters of Mr. Robertson, as known by past votes,
(iii) Friends of Sir James Martin, as known by past votes,
(iv) Supporters of Government on Border Duties Convention only,
(v) Uncertain, but more with the Government than with the Opposition."
morality, advancing a theory of faithlessness which would "shock the perceptions of English statesmen of all parties." This letter introduced a note of personal asperity into the correspondence; and when W. B. Dalley intervened with a whimsical but biting attack on Parkes, the controversy degenerated into a three-cornered, and somewhat disreputable personal wrangle.

The incident was, however, significant in reflecting the melange of indecisiveness that factional politics involved. Parkes' attempt to idealise the moral duty of adhesion to "party was as unrealistic as Forster's extreme denunciation of all but a position of strict "independence." In practice, the leaders each commanded the loyalty of a coterie of followers, and principle gave place to personal negotiation and tactical manoeuvre in the task of expanding this minority into a majority. The correspondence itself was a bizarre episode in the latter process. As Dalley put it:

"To the outside public the correspondence between 'An Elector,' 'Another Elector,' and 'Third Party,' must appear to be a lively commencement of the Parliamentary masquerade which, as a matter of course, (like a carnival before Lent), precedes the dreary austerities, late vigils, general penitential exercises, and the very Lenten fare of the Parliamentary session. Enter three dominoes - they circulate among all the characters who have been bidden to this legislative Ballo in Maschera - whispering 'Martin is stronger than he looks.' 'Parkes' phalanx is unbroken,' 'public good before hustings promises.' 'Disraeli is twice as honest as Forster;' and just as the music breaks into a pathetic tarantella, the clandestine prompters come forward, and tearing the hoods and satin noses off..."

(1) After an oblique reference to Parkes' somewhat loose attitude to his private creditors, Dalley observed that for him to try to teach morality to Forster, "represented the whimsical incongruity so happily expressed in the Japanese proverb of 'The anchor teaching the dolphin how to swim.'" (loc. cit.)
"each other, reveal the three contending chiefs in the battle of portfolios." (1)

In the event, Parkes' predictions proved more accurate than those of his opponent, and Martin was immediately defeated in the new House. Forster, who had moved the resolutions which had originally led to the dissolution, was commissioned to form a government. He failed, and the Acting Governor (2) sent for Parkes.

Parkes' negotiations in forming his Ministry are worthy of some consideration, both for the light that is thus thrown on the character of the principal faction leader of the time, and as a sample of the political considerations and tactics usually involved in contemporary cabinet construction.

He himself committed to paper two ostensibly complete accounts of these negotiations: in a long letter to Joseph Wearne, an old political conferee, and in a detailed entry in his own "Diary." (3) These narratives agree in all details, and are both marked by a carefully assumed tone of high moral dignity. In outlining for Wearne's information "the principles on which I have acted in trying honestly and wisely to discharge this responsible trust," Parkes wrote:

(1) Loc. cit.
(2) Sir Alfred Stephen. (This was just prior to the arrival of Sir Hercules Robinson to take over the Governorship).
(3) This book (in Mitchell Library's Parkes Papers) contains nothing other than what purports to be an accurate account of the formation of the Ministry. Its tone, and its omissions, suggest that it was designed for reading by posterity.
"It seemed to me that it was my duty to the country to construct a ministry which would fairly embody the principles that had been in controversy and had triumphed in the late elections and in the conflicts in Parliament. With this general aim I had to consider a number of points in the character and position of individuals; such as, length of public service, special claims, political associations, personal fitness, and party fidelity, and to consider these things in relation to the state of the House and the tendency of public feeling outside." (1)

This was a fair statement of the complex task faced by a faction leader in composing a ministry likely to satisfy his personal followers and command the support of Parliament.

Parkes' first move was to offer a portfolio to Forster, "on public grounds, and from a sense of duty, and a recognition of his political standing and ability." (2) This was on the day he received the Acting Governor's Commission, (May 10). Forster curtly refused, and on the following morning Parkes called at the office of W. H. Piddington, a leading member of the late Opposition. Piddington reported that he, Saul Samuel, and J. S. Farnell had each been offered ministerial posts by Forster, but had declined to join him unless he sought the cooperation of Parkes. These rebuffs were understood to have been the chief explanation of Forster's inability to form an Administration. (3) Parkes commented to Wearne:

(1) Parkes to Wearne, 11.5.72. (P.C., A.932).
(2) Diary, p.25.
(3) Diary, p.26. It is important to note that Parkes claimed to have been unaware of this until the morning of May 11. To Wearne he wrote: "It became known to me on Friday morning (i.e., May 11) that Mr. Piddington and Mr. Samuel were twice pressed to take office, and twice refused." (loc. cit).
"This strong instance of political fidelity to me behind my back and in the face of my personal opponents imposed upon me an obligation which no right-minded man could disregard. It became one of my first duties to seek the co-operation of these gentlemen who had thus made my co-operation, or at least a fair attempt to obtain it, an absolute condition of their joining others. Mr. Farnell was also pressed to take office by Mr. Forster and refused on my account but perhaps I might have expected this from a gentleman who for many years had steadily supported me in public life." (1)

Of the other members selected for the team, Innes, Sutherland and Lloyd were old supporters whose expectations could not be disregarded. (2) For his choice of Edward Butler as Attorney General, Parkes claimed the credit of having yielded — almost reluctantly — to a high sense of public duty.

"In filling the office of Attorney General it seemed to me that my choice was limited to three gentlemen, Sir William Manning, Mr. Darley and Mr. Butler, and it seemed very clear to me that in concurrence of political opinions, Parliamentary standing and popular sympathies, there was no comparison between Mr. Butler and the other two . . . The question then arose, was the man best qualified for the office to be excluded because he was a Roman Catholic? In accordance with the principles of my whole public life that could not possibly be a question with me . . . Rumours for months has (sic) made free with Mr. Butler's name simply because his name was pointed out to rumours by his undoubtedly eligibility. But I give you my assurance that I never spoke to Mr. Butler on this subject until one o'clock yesterday." (3)

This, briefly, was the story of the formation of the ministry, as presented by Parkes to Wearne, to the Assembly, (4)

(1) loc. cit.
(3) Parkes to Wearne, loc. cit.
and in his "Diary." It will be observed that emphasis was placed throughout upon the importance of a supposed sense of public responsibility, and of obligation to faithful followers, as motives for every phase of the negotiations. The ambitions of the Premier-elect himself received no mention, while it was implied that the understandings reached during the critical few days when ministers were actually named were simple, open, and devoid of any previous background of intrigue.

On two vital points, however, other evidence shows that the accuracy of these accounts is open to question. Parkes alleged that he was unaware, until May 11, (the day after he had been "sent for" by the Acting Governor) of the efforts of Samuel and Piddington to induce Forster to join forces with him. But, before Forster had even returned his Commission, Butler had informed Parkes that:

"It has reached me confidentially (but not so that I may not write to you) from a person not a member of the House that Forster is so beset with recommendations to offer office to you that he is likely to do it. But some of those who so recommend him expect that you will refuse and so afford an opportunity for shifting the blame to you of not representing the present opposition in the formation of a ministry. Piddington said to me today that he agreed with what I said last night that he would have nothing to do with the ministry if he refused. So that you may infer that the thing is likely to be done... At all events - and this is the object of my writing to you - do not reject so as to give them the advantage that some of them would seek... I feel you will be damaged with many people if you take such a stand as to make it appear that you would not act with Forster on any terms or take office simply because he has the formation of a ministry - not you, I write in court to give you notice of what is afoot, which you may know already." (1)

(1) Butler to Parkes, undated. (P.C., A.372. 193)
From this it is clear that, well before he offered Forster a position in his cabinet, Parkes was aware of a strong feeling among members of the late Opposition that every effort should be made to unite its hostile factions, and that Forster had refused to attempt to do this. It was thus both safe, and a clever tactical stroke, for him to approach Forster. No honourable man could accept an offer such as Parkes' after what had occurred. Yet to make that offer would be to bid strongly for the favour of those who desired unification, and to enable its author to appear as a generous and public spirited man. Parkes, in fact, made a significant - if guarded - admission of this stratagem in his letter to Wearne, despite his anxiety to impress upon that gentleman that Forster had been approached through a determination "as far as possible to subordinate my own personal feeling to a correct sense of public duty."

"Of course," he added, "this step on my part has placed me in a favourable light with all those members who desired our union, but I cannot say that I am sorry that Mr. Forster refused." (1)

The second matter upon which Parkes' narrative was misleading was his relationship with Butler. "Misleading" is perhaps a generous term: his "assurance" to Wearne that he had not mentioned the subject of participating in a ministry to Butler "until one o'clock yesterday" (March 10) was a distinct falsehood. For as far back as January 27, he had written to Butler:

"For the sake of information in the same sense as you sought information from me yesterday I put the following question.

(1) loc. cit.
"Supposing I accept office ... would you be disposed to accept the leadership of the Legislative Council with the office of Attorney-General?

I can foresee that such an arrangement would enable the other offices to be filled so as to secure a larger support in the Assembly, while it would give the Government a more influential position in the Upper House.

To yourself, considering the demands of your profession upon your time I should think the arrangement would be a good one as it would relieve you materially from Parliamentary duty." (1)

Parkes was thus speculating upon the composition of a projected ministry more than two months before receiving his commission to form one. He already had plans for devising a combination of ministers, with an eye less to "public duty," or even to "strong instances of political fidelity," than to the filling of offices "so as to secure a larger support in the Assembly." And the position of Attorney General had already been reserved for Butler!

Parkes' position and strategy in relation both to Butler and to Wearne are understandable when the importance of sectarian animosity in the Colony at this time is recalled. Bitterness between Roman Catholics and Protestants had become strong at the time of the Educational controversy of the mid-sixties, and had been fanned by the O'Farrell incident of 1868. (2) It found its chief political expression in the electoral struggle, where powerful sectarian organisations wielded an

---

(1) Parkes to Butler. 27.1.72. (P.C. A.915.220)
(2) Attempted assassination of Duke of Edinburgh at Clontarf. (12.3.68). O'Farrell, the would-be murderer, claimed at his trial to have been the instrument of a Fenian conspiracy. Though O'Farrell was clearly insane, those hostile to Roman Catholics made great capital out of the incident.
influence which few politicians could disregard. (1) Parkes, through his association with the cause of secular education in 1866, and his 'anti-Fenian' crusade at the time of the O'Farrell incident, was identified in the popular mind with the Protestant cause. Though on occasion he vigorously denounced sectarianism in politics, he was always, in fact, at pains to preserve this impression. This was undoubtedly the real reason for the tone of his letter to Wearne, who held a high position in the Loyal Orange movement. (2) Butler's influence with the Roman Catholics of the Colony was legendary. It had been once said of him that "if he held up an umbrella, his people would vote for it," (3) and he was indeed one of an important group of Catholic electoral wirepullers. (4) It was thus not surprising that Parkes should seek to spread among Orangemen the belief that his alliance with Butler was reluctantly made on public grounds alone.

This was, as has been seen, untrue. Parkes' friendship with Butler was, indeed, of long standing. The Irish lawyer had been an early contributor to the Empire, (5) and an enthusiastic admirer of its politician editor. (6) Parkes, for his part, had observed Butler's political promise as far back as 1858. (7) It was not until 1869, however, that he was induced

(1) See Lyne, Op. cit., pp. 296-7. Sectarian pressure in electoral contests is discussed in Ch. 5 below.
(2) W. H. Cooper to Parkes, 21, 28.11.73. (P.C., A.878,4,42).
(3) Statement by C. J. Byrne, recounted at nomination of Butler for Argyle election. (Excerpt from Goulburn Herald, 6.3.72, in General Election, 1872, Op. cit.
(4) See above, pp. 179-187.
(6) In 1872 Butler recalled how, in congratulation for Parkes' first election to East Sydney (1859), "I shook your hand in the Empire office." (Butler to Parkes, P.C., A.919.651).
(7) Parkes to Windeyer, 1.12.58, (Windeyer Papers). "I should like to see Butler in Parliament." (Butler had only arrived in the Colony in 1853).
to enter Parliament. The two were then kept apart by sectarian issues arising from the O'Farrell incident. Butler was for a time a member of "a separate Catholic party in the House," but he "abandoned" it "as soon as the good reason for it was past," (1) and impelled both by personal friendship and by a fear of the influence of squatters in Parliament (2) he drifted into personal alliance with Parkes. His activity on Parkes' behalf during the election of 1872 (3) showed that - despite that politician's protestations to his anti-Catholic friends - this alliance had been sealed long before the negotiations for cabinet formation began.

It is clear then, that behind Parkes' construction of his 1872 ministry, there lay a tangle of personal intrigue. Given the membership of the new House, which had already been carefully studied, his hope of securing and consolidating power rested in choosing ministers who through personal merit, political opinion, or sectarian attachments, would in combination appeal to as wide a range of politicians, and as large a section of the outside public, as possible. His freedom of choice was admitted­ly subject to obligations contracted through the past fidelity of prominent followers. Within these limits, however, a perception for the tactical implications of knowledge gained through keen

---

(1) Butler to Parkes, undated. (P.C., A.872.288).
(2) Butler considered that the Martin-Robertson Coalition con­tained a dangerously large number of squatters. His detest­ation of men of this class was reflected again and again in his letters to Parkes. In 1871, after referring to "my dread of the power of the Squatters in the House," he suggested to Parkes that he should "seek a junction with Robertson and form a new Liberal and Land Party." (Butler to Parkes, 5.9.71. P.C., A.872.288).
(3) See below, Ch. 6.
observation and the confidential reports of friends, combined with unscrupulousness and a readiness to invest the search for personal power with the dignity of a "public trust," served to open the way for propitiating antagonistic groups, and promoting an acceptance of the "inevitability" of a Parkesian tenure of office.

Though infinite variation naturally occurred in detail personnel, and circumstance, this pattern seems to provide a typical sample of the process of cabinet formation during the period. On several occasions, after the decisive defeat of a government by a united opposition, new ministries almost automatically formed themselves from the enemies of the old. But more generally, faction divisions within a preceding opposition, and uncertainties created by the existence of independent members, made it necessary for potential premiers to consolidate their position through personal intrigue. The absence of principle as a basis for political division, and the faithfulness of faction cores, permitted great mobility in such operations. Lacking the restraints of a rigid party system, and limited only by the extent of his own resourcefulness, a leader could include the most unexpected men in his cabinet, or coalesce with those whom he had but recently denounced as his bitterest political enemies.

The Parkes-Forster entanglement of 1872 was paralleled on all those occasions when there were three major factions in the Assembly. Alliance in opposition to a common enemy imposed few strains on the relationship of rival leaders.
manoeuvres – such as Parkes' attempt to wrest the leadership of the Opposition from Robertson in 1883 – (1) occasionally took place. But the inducement to struggle for position of this kind was not great; prominence in the Opposition involved hard work without material reward, with but a dubious prospect of gaining in prestige. It was easier to play a lone hand, and await an issue upon which a sudden burst of activity might rock a government and promote a wave of public approbation in one stroke. (2) The case was different, however, when the power and emoluments of office were at stake. These acted as potent incentives to a struggle for control of the elements which had opposed the vanquished government. The chance of co-operation depended upon the personal relations of "ministrables," and their assessments of existing, and future balances of strength, in terms of prestige, numbers of personal supporters, and exploitation potential of current political questions. On the basis of such calculations, for example, Farnell was able, in 1877, to pave the way for his own advent to power by refusing to ally himself with Parkes and thus permit the elder politician to form a ministry, even though the two had been closely associated in opposing the previous (Robertson) Government. On the other hand, when Parkes turned his back on approaches from Robertson in

(1) Parkes tried to "jump" the Opposition leadership by planning to occupy the front benches with his followers on the opening of Parliament. Robertson heard of the plan and arrived there first. (See E. W. O'Sullivan, From Colony to Commonwealth. Manuscript Memoirs. Mitchell Library. p.183).

(2) This was achieved, e.g., by Parkes in 1886-7, when he fiercely championed Free Trade. (See below, ch. 8).
1885, he gained nothing other than the satisfaction of having frustrated a rival for office. Disagreement on the allotting of portfolios was another rock on which negotiations often split; (1) reconciling the urgent claims of personal supporters always proved difficult. Even when an alliance was successfully concluded, a leader was often left with the unpleasant task of conciliating those of his followers who had been overlooked to make room for others who, though perhaps of no greater personal capacity, commanded badly needed influence in desirable quarters. (2).

Whatever the means adopted in these personal struggles for power, most of the men involved took great pains to camouflage such of their stratagems as could not otherwise be hidden, and wherever possible, to appear to the outside gaze as unselfish guardians of the public interest. The 1872 efforts of Parkes in this direction have already been noted. In 1877, Farnell justified his refusal to act with Parkes by picturing himself as the instrument of those who, disillusioned at the failures of established leaders to provide stable government, saw the interests of the Colony as being best served by at least a temporary rejection of their dominance. (3) Parkes'
supporters, in reply, spread the rumour that Farnell had cynically broken a promise, made at an Opposition meeting held on the eve of the fall of Robertson's Government, to take office under Parkes if the latter were commissioned to form a ministry. This allegation found its way into the Echo, and in indignantly repudiating it, Farnell frankly stated his belief that:

"it had been inspired by some one who thinks it will serve his purpose to convey a false impression in some quarter or other." (1)

But the most ingeniously contrived facade of the time was presented as a cover for the astounding volte face represented by the Parkes-Robertson Coalition of 1879. After Farnell's defeat on the Land Bill of 1878, Robertson made a half-hearted attempt to form a new ministry, and then resigned his seat in the Assembly. In a long speech of explanation, he declared that the existence of "three parties in the Chamber has made it utterly impossible for business to be conducted" and that therefore in the "hope that the Assembly will naturally arrange itself in two parties" and thus permit the development of stable government, he was voluntarily withdrawing. (2) This apparently magnanimous gesture was greeted with astonishment. In a brilliant editorial, the Sydney Morning Herald analysed recent parliamentary events and showed clearly that the conduct of public business had in no way been obstructed by the existence

---

(1) Letter to S.M.H., 12.12.77.
(2) S.M.H., 14.12.78.
of three "parties." (1) Until he raised the land issue, on which there were many individual, but no distinctly "party" positions, Farnell's Government had been a perfectly stable one. "The facts, therefore," concluded the Herald, "seem to us not to sustain the argument that the triple division of the Assembly makes the retirement of Sir John a matter of patriotism and public expediency." But Robertson's perturbation was for the future, not the past, even though he had shrewdly laid his emphasis upon the latter. A number of members who had voted against the Land Bill had made it clear that their hostility was confined to that measure, and not directed against the Government. One of them (Bawden) actually attempted to move a resolution of confidence in the Government after the fatal division had taken place. (2) This indication of Farnell's continuing strength was confirmed by the refusal of the House to grant Supply to Robertson's embryonic ministry. So far as mere stability was concerned, therefore, there was every reason to believe that a reconstructed Farnell ministry would hold its majority. The "three party" position was an obstacle, not to the conduct of public business, but to the kind of consolidation of its opponents which might overthrow the Government.

From the point of view of Parkes and Robertson, a union of forces was most desirable - alone, neither could hope to achieve success - but the shock of a sudden alliance needed some

(1) A majority of members, it was shown, had adhered honourably to the "gentleman's agreement" to assist Farnell, while Parkes had remained quiescent on the Opposition benches, content to accept Robertson's leadership and not fairly chargeable "with having distracted the Assembly." S.M.H., 16.12.78.

(2) S.M.H., 6.12.78.
cushioning after the bitter animosity that had for many years marked their relationship. Parkes made the first move to prepare the public for a rapprochement by rising as soon as Robertson had announced his resignation to the House, and declaring, under cover of a formal expression of regret:

"From one cause or another Sir John Robertson and I have sat for many years on seats in this Chamber opposite to one another. Whatever those causes were it would be a work of difficulty for us to trace them to their true source. It has not been in a conspicuous sense our political disagreement, for on many grounds - broad grounds - singularly enough the hon. gentleman and I have been in accord with each other ... I desire to express my extreme regret that the hon. gentleman should have thought it necessary to take this step." (1)

Farnell now, at the Governor's request, withdrew his resignation. Parkes moved resolutions condemning this action as unconstitutional. Robertson's faction rallied round him, the Government fell, and Parkes was commissioned to form a new ministry. His first move was sensational: to Robertson he offered a seat in the Legislative Council, and a ministerial position second only to his own. "As his friends in Parliament had joined me," he briefly explained, "I felt it would be nothing more than a graceful act to offer him a place in the Administration." (2)

Though each did his best to imply that such was not the case, neither Parkes nor Robertson ever actually denied that these events followed a pre-determined pattern. (3)

(1) S.M.H., 14.12.78.
(2) Parkes, Fifty Years in the Making of Australian History, p.353.
(3) See e.g., remarks of Lyne on this. (op. cit., p.377).
That they were fortuitous is scarcely credible. Rather is it clear that by a single manoeuvre, the two politicians sought to disarm criticism — especially from their supporters — avoid unseemly jockeying for position in the Assembly, and present themselves to the public as paragons of political virtue, the one for his unselfishness on behalf of the public good, the other for his magnanimity in desiring to share the spoils of office.
2. PARLIAMENTARY MANOEUVRES

An example of the effectiveness of strategy as a means of modifying parliamentary groups was provided by the sudden fall of the Parkes Ministry in 1874. Though apparently of formidable strength, this government succumbed to assault on an unforeseen issue which bore no relation to its declared policy. The occasion for such an attack was furnished when an outcry arose against a decision by the Governor to reprieve an ex-bushranger, Frank Gardiner. Protests were made in Parliament first against the release itself, and then over the Governor's tactless handling of petitions expressing the public alarm. Under cover of an ostensible desire to preserve "constitutional rights," Parkes' opponents manoeuvred him into the position of defending the Governor, and exploited the prejudices and moral sensibilities of a number of his regular supporters to induce them to desert the Government in vindication of their sense of public duty. (1)

Less successful was Parkes' attempt to unseat the succeeding Robertson administration by means of a similar stratagem. This was a corruption charge levelled against the Colonial Treasurer, Forster, who had transferred £250,000 of public money from the Bank of New South Wales to the City Bank,

(1) The real subtlety and opportunism of strategy of this kind can only be appreciated through very detailed examination of each detectable case. This is clearly impossible here, but as a sample, a close account of the various phases of the Gardiner issue, as they affected the fate of the Parkes Administration, is given in Appendix V, pp. 348-353.
in violation of an existing agreement with the former, and without notice to Parliament. Parkes insisted that a Select Committee enquire into the transaction, since Forster was known to be a large shareholder in the City Bank. The Government barely survived a long and heated debate on the report of this Committee, which exonerated Forster of the charge of personal corruption, but censured the transfer of funds. (1) In reporting the incident, the Sydney Morning Herald made the significant comment:

"The removal of £250,000 from the Bank of N.S.W. will be regarded by no one as the most important question of the present session. Yet an Assembly which could scarcely furnish a quorum to debate the great questions of Land Reform, Immigration, and Education, has already spent several nights in debating this little banking transaction, and each night a motion for adjournment is argued with as much warmth and earnestness as if the safety of the British Constitution depended upon each division. During the whole progress of the Land Bill through the House, Mr. Parkes never once spoke at length upon any of its provisions. He is the leader of the Opposition, and yet one of the most important measures which has been passed for years does not contain a single trace of his influence. What is the reason for his sudden animation now? Is it the hope of damaging the Government, or does he see an opening for a return to the Treasury benches?"

Assailing those in power by raising "diversionary"

(1) The Committee was appointed on 11.5.75, and reported on 22.6.75. Its report was rejected on 2.7.75, amid cheers and counter-cheers, by a division of 25-30. (S.M.H., 3.7.75).

(2) 3.7.75.
questions of these kinds became a standard practice in the period. (1) Its aim was to break up a parliamentary majority by drawing attention away from ordinary matters of policy - upon which the strength of governments frequently rested - and confusing members by arousing feeling on moral issues.

This stratagem was least effective in the face of a ministry which drew its strength chiefly from the expectations of a variety of followers. Implied promises of concessions - which might vary from the meanest of local and personal favours to the most important forms of general legislation - were always strong incentives to loyalty. It was part of the parliamentary game to secure as much support on this basis as possible, and to hold it by skilful arrangement of the order of public business. Discipline by exploiting anticipations was feasible in such circumstances, (2) and this took its boldest form when a Premier contrived to short circuit dangerous debate by declaring a

(1) The "diversionary" issue was also commonly used to bolster a majority. Parkes, e.g., was adept in promoting "constitutional crises," on the assumption, as one opponent put it, that "it is an exceedingly popular thing ... to blackguard the Upper Chamber." (Fitzpatrick, N.S.W.P.D., Vol. II., p. 1496). On two occasions (1872, 1880), he produced, and then permitted to lapse - once his tactical aims were achieved - Bills to reform the Legislative Council. On the first occasion, he was playing for time before attacking the difficult land and tariff questions: on the second he was seeking a potent election cry. (See debates: S.M.H., 24.7.72, 6.12.72, 13.1.73; N.S.W.P.D., Vol. II., pp. 1492, 1496, 1701, 1857). (2) A simple case of this was seen in the tactics of the Stuart Government (1883) which dominated its followers for over twelve months by withholding - on ingenious pretexts - the land legislation and railway grants for which many of them were waiting.
matter at issue to be one of confidence. (1) His followers were thereby confronted with a plain choice between obeying, or overthrowing the ministry; in the event, the material aims of the individual member frequently triumphed over his moral sensibilities. (2)

Correct timing was a condition of success in using these methods of attack and of defence; both prestige and energy could easily be dissipated through ill judgment of the changing temper and condition of the House. The same factor was involved in that opportunism with which leaders frequently

(1) Parkes was the recognised master of this tactic, and his successes prompted many to fear "the risk of getting into a condition in which free discussion is at an end." (Stuart, 25.8.81. N.S.W.P.D., Vol. V., p. 777). Some interesting instances of his disciplining followers by resignation threats were on motions referring to cattle saleyards in Parramatta, (Nov., 1879. N.S.W.P.D., Vol. I., pp. 235, et seq.); a clause in the Education Bill, (Feb., 1880. N.S.W.P.D., Vol. VI., pp. 1061-4); the voting of compensation to the Milburn Creek Copper Co., (Aug., 1881. N.S.W.P.D., Vol. V., p. 783). The device was most effective when a ludicrous disparity existed between the seriousness of the threatened penalty, and the insignificance of the disputed issue. It could easily misfire if incautiously used, as was shown by its failure in the Gardiner Case (see below, p.348), and in the abortive attempt to impose export taxes on wool and livestock. (June, 1880. N.S.W.P.D., Vol. III., pp. 3026, 3059, 3255).

(2) The fear of disruption to administrative continuity was often an incentive even to those not seeking particular favours. Some members usually felt like the man who declared in 1879: "He was one of those who had no very great love for the occupants of the Treasury benches; but he could not see that they were to obtain any good by refusing to pass this motion, which the Premier said would be the means of ousting him from office. He came representing a large constituency, to try and get some work done; but if the Government were turned out, the affairs of the country would be thrown back." (Coonan, 19.11.79. See N.S.W.P.D., Vol. I., pp. 235 et seq.).
approached public controversies, anxious to consolidate their own power by taking the side most likely to win. A diverting instance of this was to be seen in Parkes' and Robertson's handling of the question of educational reform, which became a major political issue in the 'seventies.

Between 1874 and 1876, wide interest arose in the education issue through the propagandist efforts of a powerful Public School League, which agitated in favour of a "National, Free, Secular and Compulsory" (1) system to replace the "Compromise" of 1867. (2) Controversy was fanned by the development of a counter movement, directed by the Roman Catholic Church, and by a Church of England Defence Association. (3) Sectarian animosities inevitably intruded, to enliven and embitter the struggle between the rival organisations.

A number of attempts by private members to force education debates upon the Assembly, (4) and the intense electoral activities of the external bodies, (5) made it clear that the issue could not be avoided indefinitely by political leaders. Parkes and Robertson both maintained a semblance of neutrality.

---

(1) Manifesto of Public School League. (S.M.H., 8.12.74).
(2) The Public Schools Act of 1867 had established an Education Council to supervise a system wherein the presence of State schools, and of Denominational Schools receiving limited State assistance, represented a compromise solution to the bitter educational controversy of the 'sixties.
(3) See S.M.H., 23.10.74. ("Monthly Summary").
(4) Chief of these were the strong resolutions of Forster, (10.12.72) and of Dibbs, (8.6.75) in favour of increased secularisation of Education.
(5) Particularly in elections of 1874 and 1877. (See below, Ch. 5).
for as long as possible. (1) Early in 1876, however, a sudden - though fortuitous - disintegration of the Education Council forced Robertson, as Premier, to announce a readiness to bring in a Bill to amend the Public Schools Act of 1866. The Public School League and the Church of England Defence Association each immediately planned a monster meeting, to test public feeling, and to urge their respective views upon the Government. Robertson, pressed to produce his Bill, hesitated, and admitted, in an unguarded moment, that he was awaiting the outcome of the impending demonstrations. This frank opportunism aroused bitter criticism in the House, and called forth a most shrewd newspaper comment upon the tactics of faction leaders on the education issue:

"... it naturally fell to the Opposition to express becoming indignation at what seemed like pandering to sectional influence. If the gentlemen who played this role with their usual skill had never been on the other side of the House, they would probably have secured to themselves a great deal of applause for their fine sympathy with political virtue, and their scorn for all truckling. But the public having now seen them in both parts, cannot rid itself of the impression which a dramatic performance induces. It is, of course, a matter of regret that a subject of such importance as the education of the people, should be the sport of party or the tool of personal ambition. But those who have deep convictions on the subject as well as those who care little about

(1) Parkes in particular refused to commit himself beyond an equivocal support of the 1867 settlement. His purpose was clear enough. See, e.g., S.M.H. article on Parkes' 'new orthodoxy': "Mr. Parkes, when he is continually genuflecting, has his attention perhaps more fixed upon place than prayer, and upon pay than piety." (22.6.75).

(2) Two members resigned, and the President "indicated his anxiety - through overwork - to be relieved of his duties, recommending at the same time that in his opinion a responsible minister should be put in charge of Educational administration. (S.M.H., 11.2.76)."
anything but themselves, alike look upon the manoeuvres of party leaders as a game in politics. They attribute both to Mr. Robertson and to Mr. Parkes the same fundamental convictions and principles. Both men are believed really to prefer a National to a Sectarian system of education. Neither of them is credited with any passion for martyrdom. Either will forward the work of National education if it can be done consistently with the retention of office, but neither will fly in the face of the powerful Denominational vote... At the same time neither is willing to offend hopelessly the growing power of the League, and each tries to excite hopes and allay fears so as to balance the conflicting forces as well as may be... Each politician has his following more or less attached and faithful, but outside these purely political circles lies the larger general public, not devoted to either man, but prepared to support or abandon either. It is in the deliberate conviction of the great mass of the people that the ultimate solution of the question is to be found, and the trading politicians will jump with the utmost nimblesness to whichever side they see is becoming the more powerful.

Having observed the results of the two meetings, Robertson introduced his Public Schools Amendment Bill on March 3. It was a timid attempt at compromise, providing for the discontinuing of State aid to existing denominational schools with regular attendances of less than forty, and no subsidisation of any new denominational schools established after the passing of the Bill. Parkes announced his opposition, on the ground that the time for compromise had passed. His speech was, however, enigmatic: while declaring himself in favour of the status quo, he emphasised that if change were to take place, it could only be in the direction of increased secularisation of schools.

(1) S.M.H., 25.2.76
(2) Church of England Defence Association, 28.2.76; Public School League, 14.3.76.
(3) S.M.H., 9.3.76.
(4) Ibid.
This ingenious fence-sitting position enabled him to remain uncommitted while he observed the course of the debate, and to take advantage of the fact that, according to the most convenient point of view, the Bill could be regarded as an attack on denominational schools, or a last ditch stand to save them. (1) The strength of the secularists was clearly revealed in the debate, and after the second reading had been narrowly carried, Parkes delivered a fiery and speciously argued speech announcing a change of heart. Referring to the support given to the Bill by Stuart (2) and a group of denominationalists, he cried:

"For ten years I have incurred a large amount of contempt and met with any amount of opposition in maintaining the present settlement of the question of education, but I have now seen gentlemen who came into this House as the avowed friends of Denominational Schools (great cheering) turn traitor (continued cheering) - and strike the first fatal blow at the existing schools. I am now relieved from any obligation to maintain the cause they have betrayed, and so far as I am concerned, I shall hold to myself the right of taking that course which the extraordinary circumstances of tonight's division may seem to direct." (3)

This was still equivocal, but it opened the way for future reconciliation with the secularists. Robertson's Bill was shelved on a point of order, and the Government dropped it, with obvious

(1) e.g., Alexander Cameron, who voted against the Bill on the ground that its secularisation clauses were not strong enough, was assailed at fiery meetings in his electorate for betraying the cause of secular education by condoning the status quo. (S.M.H., 18.3.76, 3.4.76). On the other hand, important denominationalists (like Stuart) supported the Bill as the last chance of saving denominational schools.

(2) Sir Alexander Stuart, President of the Church of England Defence Association, and Colonial Treasurer. He had only just joined Robertson. (See S.M.H., Editorial, 10.2.76, for interesting speculations on his influence on Government policy).

(3) S.M.H., 16.3.76.
relief. (1) The ground was thus cleared for a new approach whenever the time appeared propitious.

The political confusion of 1877-8 choked out further parliamentary consideration of the education question, though the outside organisations remained most active. As a result, sectarian feeling continued to run high. It reached fever pitch in June, 1879, when Archbishop Vaughan issued a pastoral condemning the Public Schools of New South Wales as "seed-plots of future immorality, infidelity and lawlessness." (2) A wave of public revulsion followed this illiberal pronouncement, and Parkes, now in power, seized the opportunity to reopen the education issue in Parliament. On November 20 he introduced a Public Instruction Bill, to establish a completely secular system, justifying his abandonment of the 1867 settlement on the ground that it had been assailed by "the very men for whom the compromise was made." (3) This was the volte face for which he had prepared in 1876; skilful timing now completed his strategy, and, with his integrity scarcely

---

(1) Defeat on the second reading had been narrowly averted, and it was clear that Committee consideration of the Bill would prove dangerous to the Government. (S.M.H., 17.3.76). Moreover, Parkes' tactics had tended to make Robertson appear the champion of the unpopular denominational cause.

(2) The bitterest portions of this celebrated pastoral are given in full by C. M. H. Clark: op. cit., pp. 720-1.

(3) Speech in Legislative Assembly, 20.11.79. (N.S.W.P.D., Vol. I., p.264). The Bill abolished aid to denominational schools, vested the control of Education in a responsible minister, and made school attendance compulsory. Comprehensive provisions regulated the status of teachers and the curricula taught, provided for inspection of schools, and established new types of schools. (ibid., pp. 269 et seq.).
challenged, Parkes carried the new measure with sweeping majorities. And Robertson, in alliance, was on this occasion able to give expression to clear anti-denominational views.

There was naturally much more to the education controversy of these years than the mere machinations of faction leaders. Many members of Parliament held sincere and decided views on the subject, while the controversy was initiated and directed by powerful public bodies. But its political treatment showed the unimportance, in the minds of men like Parkes and Robertson, either of fixed opinion, or of a genuine concern for the public good. Specious reasoning, clever strategy, and a consummate sense of timing enabled Parkes to exploit the strongest trends of public opinion in a search for political prestige. And so skilfully did he cover his opportunism, that even to-day he is popularly regarded as the "statesman father" of the Education system of New South Wales.
Until the 'nineties, ministers of the Crown exercised in New South Wales effective control over civil service appointments and public works allocations. Contemporary critics frequently urged that this power of patronage was commonly used to "strengthen the political faith of the weak-kneed," (1) and though they probably exaggerated the extent of such corruption, (2) it was undoubtedly a factor in the strength of many ministries.

Minor public appointments were often to be had through politicians ready to exploit a minister's anxiety for their parliamentary support. As one applicant put it:

"The Civil Servant is commonly the mere hanger on of some member of parliament, who is in turn the mere hanger on of some influential public man. He is as it were the jackal of a jackal!" (3)

It was also an open secret that governments were not, on occasion, above rewarding supporters - or even ridding themselves of troublesome opponents - by granting them public posts once their parliamentary terms were over. (4) Some politicians regarded ministerial positions themselves as lucrative rewards for

(1) *Daily Telegraph*. Editorial on Ministerial Patronage, 15.1.89.
(2) Trollope's view was that it formed "a recognised part of the concrete-institution which we welcome under the name of Constitutional Government." (Quoted by J. D. B. Miller, *op. cit.* p. 7, who seems to accept Trollope's judgment as evidence for speaking of 'pork barrel' politics as being typical of the Australian colonies at this time).
(3) W. H. Cooper to Parkes, 13.5.72. (P.C. A.920.183).
(4) See, e.g., *S.M.H.* Editorial on magisterial appointments (21.9.75), and debate of 24.4.83 in N.S.W. Legislative Assembly on "Spoils of Office," (*N.S.W.P.D.*, Vol. IX, pp. 1702 et seq.).
faithful service, (1) while at an even higher level, govern-
mental control of judicial appointments could provide a means of
enticing the support of men of prestige. On two occasions,
influential barristers were lured into cabinets on implied
promises of ultimate elevation, the one to the Chief Justiceship,
and the other to a judgeship, and when disappointed, both made
public issues of the "treachery" of their anticipated benefactor.

Similarly, the wooing of "roads and bridges" members
involved a form of patronage whose exercise no government could
neglect. This matter was well put by L. F. De Salis in dis-
cussing, in 1875, the "enormous national wealth" of the colony.
He observed that:

..."the colonists as a body do not understand (its) manage-
ment. It is the recognised custom to gamble or
scramble away this public superfluity. The whole
procedure is as absurd and defiling - and how can
each defiled electorate resist a wish to be
represented by a very sharp 'agent' - as each of us
in any lawsuit would insist upon retaining some very
sharp lawyer... Government can ... be efficiently
supervised least of all by the transitory puppets of
a faction - and where no supervision is, dishonesty
must ensue - honesty becomes folly." (3)

The pressure of opinion within constituencies forced even those
politicians who took an enlightened view of their function to

---

(1) D.T., ibid.
(2) E. Butler, (1873), W. J. Foster, (1887). Both promises
were made by Parkes. On the Butler case see cypher telegrams
between Parkes and Sir Hercules Robinson, 7-10.11.73, (P.C.,
A.904, 63-67); Legislative Assembly debate of 25.11.73,
(S.M.H., 26.11.73). The Parkes-Butler correspondence was
pubhs hed by Butler in S.M.H., 12.11.73. On Foster, see
N.S.W.P.D., Vol. XXVI., pp. 1625 et seq.
(3) L. F. De Salis, (Pastoralist, Cuppacumbalong - an old
political ally of Parkes'), to Parkes. 7.1.75. (P.C.,
A.882, 166).
seek a share in the spoils. (1) Railway extensions and public works allocations were a recognised price for political support. Though the understandings between ministry and private members were normally well shielded from the public gaze, the vigilant search of opponents for "diversionary" issues occasionally laid bare a large scale ministerial plot to base power on such corruption. Two important examples were the "Tammany Hall business" (2) which was shown to lie behind Robertson's 1875 Illawarra and City railway projects, and the huge public works concessions - chiefly railways - with which the Stuart Government rewarded the supporters of its 1883 Land Bill. (3)

(1) See, as example of numerous letters on this subject, Lloyd to Parkes, 2.9.73 (P.C., A.924.4/17): "I came down in the train with Combes, who was wonderfully kind and attentive. He is very pleased with what you have offered Bathurst, and says if they are not satisfied with that, nothing will satisfy them."

(2) G. A. Lloyd; Speech in Ways and Means debate, 16.12.75 (S.M.H., 17.12.75), which see for evidence of corruption.

(3) See Address by Parkes to electors of Tenterfield, (S.M.H., 4.11.84), and Privilege debate in Legislative Assembly, (N.S.W.P.D., Vol. XVII., pp. 10 et seq.). For evidence of logrolling in railway allocations by Stuart, see e.g., debate on Supply, 22.10.84, (N.S.W.P.D., Vol. XV., pp. 5974 et seq.), and especially statements on the Goulburn-Crookwell extension, (pp. 6010-3).
THE EARLY "PARTY" CAUCUS

Faction cores, which functioned through a personal relationship, required no formal organisation. But the larger parliamentary groups distinguishable by the simple tests of animosity or friendliness to the current ministry found it in their interest - however varied and uncertain their composition - to foster unity through the external "party" meeting.

This device reached its most highly developed form as an instrumentality of Opposition, a political position which at once encouraged temporary neglect of individual differences, and allowed for collective determination of future action. Thus leadership was never a "natural" prerogative: formal election at a meeting held outside the Chamber was necessary to convert even the most obvious Opposition spokesman into a "properly constituted leader." (1) Similarly, direct attacks upon the ministry in power were rarely unplanned, or carried out simply upon the initiative of a leader. The Opposition "caucus" more commonly met to discuss possible

---

(1) For an interesting series of such elections, see Lyne's account of events following Parkes' resignation from Opposition leadership. (op. cit., pp. 345-6). At the beginning of the administration of the Parkes-Robinson Coalition, the Opposition was small and unorganised, and Forster acted instinctively as its leader. When, however, Parkes referred to him by this title, Forster warmly denied that he was "aware in what way I have been constituted leader of the Opposition," adding satirically that "it is the first time in constitutional history that I have heard that it is one of the functions of a Government to elect the leader of the Opposition." (25.9.81. N.S.W.P.D., Vol. V., p. 755). When Stuart was eventually elected to the position, many Government and Independent members expressed their "pleasure at seeing the coming of a properly organised Opposition," "required in every deliberative Assembly on every ground of public interest." (22.9.82. N.S.W.P.D., Vol. VII., pp. 31, 130).
tactics whenever a weakness appeared in the defences of their enemies. (1) The terms of Censure motions were generally drafted at such meetings, which also chose movers, seconders, and chief speakers. (2)

The official ministerial caucus, on the other hand, though a recognised institution, (3) met less frequently, and with a different object. Through it, a government sought not the formulation of policy, but approval for an already planned course of action. (4) Like the dinners and picnics with which ministries sought to consolidate their followings, (5)

---

(1) See, e.g., speech of Fitzpatrick, 28.4.80, on a division of opinion that had occurred in a "caucus" (the word was actually used by Fitzpatrick) summoned to discuss tactics against the Parkes-Robertson Coalition. (N.S.W.P.D., Vol. II., pp. 2078 et seq.).

(2) For examples of this, see (i) Parkes' Diary, 1872, p.2; (P.C.). (Entry for 30 April, detailing Opposition meeting prior to fall of the Martin Government. This meeting appointed a Sub-committee to draft an Amendment to the Address in Reply, the Sub-committee reported back to the meeting, which then approved the terms of the Amendment and formally appointed Parkes to move it).

(ii) Letter of J. S. Farnell, (S.M.H., 11.12.77), relating Opposition arrangements prior to the attack that overthrew the Robertson Government of 1877.

(3) J. D. B. Miller, ("Party Discipline in Australia," Political Science, Vol. 5, No. 1), seems to date the beginning of the Ministerial caucus in N.S.W., from the mid-'eighties. But it was in evidence before this. (See note 4).

(4) See, e.g., S.M.H., report of ministerial caucus, 26.2.74. "The meeting was unanimous in concurring in the course that the Government proposed to take ... We understand that the state of public business was discussed, and an understanding arrived at ... to support the Government in getting the estimates, the Electoral Act Amendment Bill ... and some other measures passed as early as practicable." See also, on ministerial caucuses, S.M.H., 2.3.77.

(5) See Miller, ibid., also S.M.H., 30.9.73; 28.11.74; 23.3.75. For an interesting account of a picnic, see O'Sullivan, op. cit., p. 175.
the "party" meeting was in this case a mild form of persuasion which, at its most effective, produced formal "pledges" of support. (1) Coercion was out of the question; power, in fact, ultimately lay with the caucus and not with the ministry. Stuart found this in 1883, when an unofficial meeting of followers, by threatening to withdraw their support, forced him to abandon a plan to impose direct taxation. (2) The incident was the only notable one of its kind to occur in the period, but it brought into clear relief the fact that ministers, in framing policy, needed to anticipate carefully the likely wishes of their supporters. To this extent, the ministerial caucus exercised in effect a negative influence in the formulation of government proposals.

It is important to notice that these caucus meetings were but tactical instruments devised to bring efficiency into the manoeuvring of parliamentary groups. Those who participated could be very mixed in their political complexion, being unified chiefly by a desire to sustain, or break the power of a given set of men. Their meetings were ad hoc affairs, determined both in timing and in composition by the changing position in Parliament. Not being gatherings of men united in their devotion to common political principles, they exercised few disciplinary powers over their members. They were thus by no

(1) The "pledge" was also used in election campaigns. (See below, p. 184). (2) Feb., 1884. (See N.S.W.P.D., Vol. XI., pp. 1777, 2040-1, 2080-1).
means an external manifestation of rudimentary political parties, though their existence and operations provided early experience in a form of organisation later to prove admirable for the purposes of such parties.
CHAPTER 4

THE LAND QUESTION, AND SOME PRESSURE GROUPS

Of the few weighty matters which agitated politics during the 'seventies and 'eighties, the most important were the problems associated with land settlement. These gave rise to powerful pressure groups, which modified the pattern of factional politics. The methods, aims and effectiveness of these groups require examination, as also does the question of why the land issue, serious as it was, did not provide a basis for the growth of political parties.

1. THE LAND "PROBLEM"

Until 1884, land settlement in New South Wales took place under the system established by the Robertson Acts of 1861. (1) Though designed to promote small settlement by men of limited means, this "selection legislation" fostered a

(1) The major principles of Robertson's two Acts were succinctly expressed by Farnell in 1878 as follows: Crown Lands Alienation Act; selection before survey, deferred payments, and improvements. Crown Lands Occupation Act: annual and five year leases, rent to be appraised, with fixed minimum. (S.M.H., 22.11.78). The individual provisions of these Acts, and the conflict between squatters and selectors, that arose from them, are so well known that knowledge of them has been assumed in this chapter. For the most accessible summary of the Acts themselves, see C. M. H. Clarke, Select Documents in Australian History, Vol. II, pp. 117 et seq. Of the numerous general accounts of the results of this legislation, the best are: S. H. Roberts, History of Australian Land Settlement, pp. 222 et seq.; T. A. Coghlan, Labour and Industry in Australia, Vol. III, pp. 1346 et seq.; R. M. Crawford, Australia, pp. 117 et seq.
bitter struggle for possession of the land, and in practice opened the way for aggregation of large freehold estates. The methods adopted by the squatters to defend their runs against inroads by selectors and blackmailers are well enough known to require little elaboration here. But "dummying," or conditional purchase in the names of bogus selectors, was their chief weapon until the 'seventies, when the readiness of banks to lend capital on pastoral security made it possible for them to take advantage of that section of the law which permitted sales of Crown Land by auction. (1)

By the late 'seventies, land policy had become an issue which excited vigorous political discussion and controversy. The great tracts of land being sold at auction created something of a public scandal, (2) while it was clear that insofar as its aim had been to plant smallholders on the soil, existing legislation was already a failure. (3)

(1) T. A. Coghlan, ibid., points out that following the recovery from the depression of 1866, the banks adopted a policy of extending liberal concessions to squatters.

(2) The amending Act of 1875 permitted auction sales of land after one month's notice in the Government Gazette (previously three month's notice had been required). The immediate result was an enormous increase in such sales.

Of greater immediate importance was the fact that the social struggle on the land had reached such a bitter pitch that both sides looked with the eagerness of despair for some alleviation. If many selectors were frustrated in their apparently simple aim of finding a block of ground upon which to settle, numbers of squatters fell into financial difficulties through having to purchase land which, under other circumstances, might have been theirs for a nominal rental. Both classes frequently faced expensive litigation in pursuit of what they considered to be their rights.

So far as general policy was concerned, there were by this time two schools of thought. The first favoured revising the details, but retaining the principles of Robertsonian legislation. The second saw no satisfactory solution except by abandoning the old laws in favour of a system of land alienation founded upon such novel arrangements as a prior division of the lands of the Colony into agricultural and pastoral areas, or an adoption of survey before selection. All the attempts made up to 1883 to reform the land system were expressions of the first of these attitudes. Thus Farnell's 1875 Bill, Robertson's 1880
Bill, as well as the numerous abortive measures proposed in the intervening years, sought to rectify the most glaring defects, while yet retaining the basic features of existing laws. Stuart's 1884 Bill, on the other hand, forsook Robertsonian principles for a new approach, which aimed, by restricting the absolute freedom of squatters and of selectors, at serving the interests of both. (1)

It is to be emphasised that, at so general a policy level as this, the opposing attitudes did represent genuine "schools of thought." Men of all classes and degrees were to be found supporting each, constrained either by their own objective judgment of what constituted the best solution, or by the skill with which propagandists assailed them. In this sense, the broadest issues of land policy were matters of opinion which transcended interest divisions. The pull of interest groups only became apparent once detailed matters came under discussion, and these were mostly independent of policy, in the sense that, under any general scheme for land settlement, they were bound to arise in set forms. This was seen very clearly, for instance, in the parliamentary conflict that took place over Stuart's Land Bill in 1883-4. Squatter support for that measure was won not as a result of the principles it represented - so long as these alone were at issue, squatters were ranged both for and against - but chiefly through the small

(1) This Bill, and the changes in basic policy that it represented, are discussed below. (p.137).
minums it set for rentals of pastoral lands. (1)

The truth was that the real battle of interest over the land - to establish the principle of open access - had been fought and won in the 'sixties. The task now was to give full practical expression to that principle, and to devise a modus vivendi for the conflicting interests that its operation had so far created. Squatters and selectors seemed to be as confused about this problem as the rest of the community. Neither, as a group, was particularly hostile to the existing law, which at least provided a framework within which each might attempt to realise its ambitions. (2)

It was scarcely surprising, under these circumstances, that, although it was the most frequent single topic discussed in the House, and the one issue upon which a number of governments rose and fell during the period, land legislation never provided the basis for consistent party divisions. Every man was, in a sense, his own land expert, as schemes for reform according to one or the other of the two major patterns came and went, often propounded by politicians who had little personal experience of or interest in the land. On the fringes of this general argument, squatters and selectors carried on a kind of political guerilla warfare, striking fiercely when the opportunity of gaining a minor point presented itself.

(1) See below, pp. 138 et seq.
(2) For a reasoned assessment of the satisfaction of both classes with the Robertson Acts, see T. A. Coghlan, op. cit., p. 1351.
2. **THE POLITICAL ASPIRATIONS AND METHODS OF SQUATTERS AND SELECTORS:**

Selectors and their sympathisers often complained with bitterness that the squatters, through their superior wealth and influence, wielded in the land struggle an unobtrusive power which could not be countered. It is impossible to assess accurately the truth of wilder charges of corruption against ministers and Lands Department officers, but without doubt, land administration often favoured the pastoralist. (1) Of greater importance, however, was the superior financial position of men of this class, which enabled them to resort freely to the courts for confirmation of their claims, and to enter, without fear of the consequences to their personal affairs, into the field of active politics. Squatters always accounted for a sizeable proportion of the Legislative Assembly's membership, and, as will be seen, could act as a close-knit group, with great effectiveness.

---

(1) *e.g.*, By the 'eighties, it was a notorious fact that many government inspectors of selections and rent appraisers, (some of the latter being actual ex-squatters), were liberally entertained, when on their round, by squatters, and acted with this in mind when performing their duties. See, *e.g.*, speeches of Spring - himself an ex-inspector of conditional purchases - 15.11.83, (N.S.W.P.D., Vol. X., pp.451 et seq), Brodribb, 1.3.80, (op. cit., Vol. IV., p.682), Day, (S.M.H., 6.12.78), and McElhone, (S.M.H., 21.12.75). The facility with which squatters seemed to be able to have desirable land put up to auction, or to secure proclamation of reserves to baulk selection, were also matters of frequent complaint. An extremely interesting case of the latter is reported in J. F. Mayger, for Murray District Selectors' Association, to Parkes, 10.1.74, (P.C., A.897.135).
The selectors, by contrast, commanding less direct influence, had to resort to organisation as a means of strengthening their position. The first Selectors' Association was established at Yass, and was rapidly followed, in the early 'seventies, by the founding of similar bodies throughout the north, west, and south-west of the Colony. (1) Occasional country conferences of representatives from these Associations were an early feature of the movement. One of the first of these conferences, held in 1873, passed strong resolutions in favour of the cessation of auction sales of Crown Lands, and of crediting interest payments to balances owing on conditional purchases. (2) Both these demands were to become basic planks in all programmes devised by the growing free selector movement.

While the Land Bill of 1875 was under consideration, selectors' organisations inundated Parliament with petitions setting out their claims, (3) and late in the same year delegates from country Associations joined with sympathetic members of Parliament to establish a Land Law Reformation League in Sydney, (4) to stir up public support for land law reform in conformity with the wishes of free selectors. Beyond organising a few public meetings, its influence was small and short lived, but its coming caused a stir. The Sydney Morning Herald took umbrage at the prediction of one of its members that "the

---

(1) Golden Fleece. (Special issue of The Farmer and Settler, 31.8.1907, p.77.)
(2) S.M.H., 9.8.73. ("Monthly Summary").
(3) N.S.W., Legislative Assembly, Votes and Proceedings, 1875, Vol. III., pp. 347 et seq.
(4) S.M.H., 30.11.75.
selectors would soon become a political power which would be able to put any party in or turn any party out." Besides expressing horror that such a blatant statement in favour of the exertion of "class interests" in politics should have been made, the Herald scornfully rejected the idea that power of this kind was likely to fall into the selectors' hands. (1)

But scarcely two years later, the same journal was remarking:

"An eager, clamorous, and organised minority will always overpower an inert and unorganised majority. Squatters have always had an influence out of all proportion to their numbers, and free selectors are now enjoying the same privilege." (2)

This was a comment made in reference to the first central Conference of Free Selectors' Associations, held in Sydney in October, 1877. Such meetings were subsequently held annually until 1883. In this year the Conference founded a Land Law Reform Alliance, which was intended to be a continuing organisation for promoting the interests of selectors. It had, however, but a short separate existence, merging with the Protectionist movement once the Act of 1884 brought a temporary settlement of the dispute over land legislation as such. (3)

(1) S.M.H., 2.12.75.
(2) S.M.H., 13.10.77.
(3) S.M.H., 16.10.77. Associations represented were those of Albury, Jerilderie, Yanko, Ten Mile Creek, Wagga, Argyle, Armidale, Dubbo, Coolac, Quinden, Mudgee, Deniliquin, Darlington, Urana, Braidwood, Grenfell, Cootamundra, Walcha, Molong, Murrumburrah, Cobargo, Yass, Gunnedah, Marengo.
(4) *Golden Fleece*, ibid.
The 1877 Conference had issued a long list of demands for land reform, accompanied by the resolution that:

"This conference of delegates pledges itself not to support any candidate at the forthcoming election, unless promising to carry out the above programme."

This signalised the formal acceptance of a method of political warfare which, if not actually practised before, had from the beginning been at least implicit in the form of organisation adopted. The selectors thus entered the political struggle at the electoral level, becoming one of the many pressure groups operating in this manner. (2)

It is difficult to assess the extent of the electoral influence wielded by these organised bodies of selectors. Since they represented an important segment of the known vote - in some areas, indeed, the decisive one - they became one of the more important factors to be reckoned with in elections by individual candidates, and by parliamentary factions, and hence enjoyed corresponding advantages. In this manner they undoubtedly contributed to the creation of that strong pro-selector tone which seems to have marked most of the Assemblies of the period, especially after 1875. Selectors had, in addition, particular champions in Parliament, some no doubt owing their positions to the electoral work of the Associations, others being men of means who, though not ostensibly of the selector class, stood to gain

(1) Selectors' Manifesto, 11.11.77.
(2) The operations of such pressure groups are discussed in Ch. 5 below.
from any measure calculated to ease the difficulties of selectors.

Chief of these were the men who in Victoria would have been known as "boss cockies." (1) Successful selectors or country business men who, by various means, had built up large estates, which were either cultivated by share-farmers or, more frequently, used for grazing sheep. Two such men were Robert Barbour and George Day, who for a number of years were leading advocates, both in and out of Parliament, of selectors' rights. Barbour, a Moama sawmiller, was known to have taken in selections almost 4,000 acres, with 8 miles of river frontage, out of one squatter's run alone, and was credited with being the owner of some 20,000 acres in all. (2) Day, after a period on the Bendigo diggings in the 'fifties, came to New South Wales, where he became a successful storekeeper and flour miller at Albury, and subsequently selected or purchased outright a number of large stations in the district. (3) The term "selector," indeed, encompassed numerous individuals of this kind, all of whom stood to benefit from the claims put forward in the name of the struggling and poverty-stricken smallholder. In 1881 Wilson, a Riverina squatter, stated in Parliament that in his own electorate the selectors:

(1) For an excellent discussion of the "boss cocky" in Victoria, see J. E. Parnaby, Economic and Political Development of Victoria, 1877-81, (Unpublished thesis in Melbourne University Library), pp. 75 et seq. The term was uncommon, but not unknown in N.S.W. It was used, e.g., during the debates on the 1884 Land Bill. (See speeches of Combes and Cameron, N.S.W.P.D., Vol. XIV., pp. 4539, 4767).
(3) See Appendix IX, p. 374.
"consist of many men who have come there with their families, friends, and dependents, and who have been able to acquire estates of from two to seven thousand acres," while "the president of one of the local associations ... is a J.P. sits on the bench, and drives his own buggy." (1)

There was some point in Wilson's protest against the "ad misericordiam appeal" so often made in the interests of such men.

Selectors were thus a mixed class: indeed, no simple categorisation of men on the land was possible, and in practice, even squatters stood to benefit from some sections of selector programmes. (2) This tendency towards overlapping of interest was undoubtedly one of the confusing elements in the land situation, which helped to keep the demands of conflicting groups limited to matters of detail rather than of broad policy. Selectors' inability to find expression for their aspirations at the policy level was, for example, epitomised by the situation that arose at their 1883 Conference, when delegates were evenly divided over the Stuart Government's Bill, which represented a radical change in approach to the land question. (3). Similarly, a glance at the demands which repeatedly featured in their programmes illustrates clearly the tendency of selectors' Associations to confine their attention to seeking detailed adjustments of, rather than basic alterations in, the existing

---

(2) This was true, e.g., of the demand for remission of interest on conditional purchases. Wilson, (ibid.), claimed in 1881 that he knew a squatter who held about 30,000 acres on conditional purchase, and who would benefit to the tune of £1000 a year from interest remission. Similarly, the S.M.E., pointed out in 1878 that "it is notorious that the free selections of the past are largely in squatting hands, or on squatting account, and therefore the surrender of interest on selectors' balances would be, in the main, a gift to the pastoral class." (16.11.78).
(3) On a division of 14 to 14, by the casting vote of the Chairman, the Conference approved of the Bill. (Golden Fleece ibid).
These demands (1) were of two kinds: those intended to restrict the effectiveness of the manoeuvres of squatters, and those designed to improve materially the situation of selectors themselves. The most important of the desired anti-squatter measures was the abolition of auction sales of country lands. By 1875 such sales had become the chief means of barring selection, and the agitation against them was particularly fierce. Selectors also felt that squatters should be prevented from using Volunteer Land Orders (2) and Mineral Conditional Purchases (3) to "peacock" their runs, and that they should be deprived of the right to purchase sections of their runs by virtue of improvements. To counteract dummying, the time within which transfers of selections could legally be made should be extended.

To improve their own conditions, the selectors sought reduction in the value of improvements required upon their blocks, extensions in the time allowed for making them, and minor

---

(1) The following summary is based on a survey of selectors' petitions to Parliament and the manifestoes of Selectors' Associations over the period from 1875 to 1883.

(2) The Volunteer Force Regulation Act of 1867 provided that land grants of 50 acres could be made to members of the defence forces in return for certain services. Orders for such grants were transferable, and they fetched prices as high as £200 among squatters, since a judicious purchase of 50 acres could render a large area of surrounding Crown Lands valueless to selectors. (S.M.H., 9.7.77. Also speech of Day, 12.12.83, N.S.W.P.D., Vol. V., p. 989).

(3) Conditional purchases of small areas suspected of containing minerals were permitted by the 1861 Act. Squatters used such purchases indiscriminately - whether minerals were thought to exist was irrelevant - in the same manner as Volunteer Land Orders, to hamper selection.
adjustments such as the recognition of fencing as an improvement. Their most radical demand was for changes in purchase terms. Under the 1861 Act, selectors took up land at a price of 20/- an acre. They were required to pay a deposit of 5/- an acre, and, after three years' occupation, to begin payment of 5% interest on the outstanding balance, though there was no stipulation as to how or when the principal should be paid off. Selectors' Associations almost uniformly demanded the abolition, in future conditional purchases, of interest charges, with simple instalment payments of 1/- an acre per annum, while in the case of purchases already made, they desired that all past payments of interest be credited as instalments of balances owing. As will be readily seen, the practical effect of such an alteration in the law would have been to cheapen the land considerably for the purchaser.

Of a number of recurring subsidiary claims, the chief were for clearly defined grass rights and pre-emptive leases on land adjoining the area selected, and for a sanctioning of "family selection." This meant that "residence" conditions would be eased to permit the heads of families to select blocks adjacent to their own in the names of their children, who might still reside in the home on the original selection. Finally, a general tightening up of administration was sought, to facilitate rapid surveying of new selections, and to expedite departmental decisions on disputes and other matters referred to Sydney.
Though these claims were by no means completely fulfilled, the treatment of the land question in Parliament showed the effectiveness of selector agitation. The Amending Act of 1875 eased the payment terms for conditional purchases by reducing interest to 4% and establishing a system of annual payment of 1/- an acre. Some attempt was made to counter dummying by instituting public courts of inquiry at which evidence could be taken on oath before grants were issued, and by prohibiting selection in the names of children under 16 years of age. The Act of 1880 conceded a major selector claim by reducing the value of improvements required of conditional purchasers from £1 to 10/-. The same measure was to grant liberal pre-leases to selectors, but the clause embodying this concession was severely mutilated by the Legislative Council, whose squatter members bitterly denounced the Bill as "class legislation in its worst form." (1) Auction sales were at first stopped, then permitted on a strictly regulated scale, by the Stuart Government, while the same Government's Act of 1884 conferred a number of minor

(1) See speeches of Cox, and Ogilvie. 22.1.30. Another squatter, A. Campbell, declared in the same debate that "the class, (i.e., the free selectors), which the hon. member, (Sir John Robertson), had raised up would remain an incubus on the community until it could be stamped out." (N.S.W.P.D., Vol. I., pp. 86 et seq.).
benefits on selectors. (1)

The full measure of the political influence of selectors was not best revealed, however, in the legislation approved during these years, but in the abortive Land Bill brought forward by Farnell in 1878. It was at this time that selector agitation had reached its peak, and the Assembly contained a number of members pledged to support the claims of selector associations. This fact had been clear enough after the election of 1877 for the exponents of the theory of the primacy of "independence" to protest strongly against the growing tendency of selectors to secure "class representation" in Parliament. (2) During the debates on Farnell's Bill, a number of members frankly admitted their position as the political servants of Selectors' Associations, (3) and when Barbour, ex-chairman of the Free Selectors' Conference declared - amid uproar - his doubts about the wisdom of continuing the existing system of free selection, the Sydney Morning Herald remarked ironically that it was "refreshing to

(1) The Act reduced the deposit required of conditional purchasers to 2/- per acre, and established a compulsory five year residence period, with fencing of the selection within two years stipulated as the only necessary improvement. Conditional leaseholds equivalent to three times the area selected were permitted, with the selector being guaranteed preferential rights of purchase, or compensation for improvements if he subsequently allowed the lease to lapse. The permitted area for a conditional purchase was retained at 40-640 acres in the Eastern Division, but increased to 2560 in the Central, while additional selections could be made at the end of the five year residence period.

(2) e.g., S.M.H. Editorial on Selectors' Associations and "delegation." (7.11.77).

(3) e.g., see speeches of Fitzpatrick, (S.M.H., 29.11.78), Leary, (S.M.H., 5.12.78), Day and Shepherd, (S.M.H., 6.12.78).
hear in the House an expression of opinion that is adverse to the manifestoes of organisations outside." (1)

Farnell's Bill was generally recognised to be a response to the political strength of the selector interest. It sought to remit interest on conditional purchases, reduce the value of required improvements from £1 to 10/- per acre, and force selectors to reside for five years on their land before transferring it. In an attempt to establish the principle of "family selection," the Bill provided that fathers should be permitted to appropriate land contiguous to their own in the names of their children, of whom residence on the land thus secured would not be demanded. It was also proposed - in opposition to the interests of the squatters - to raise the upset price of land sold at auction to 25/-, to increase pastoral rents, and to deny lessees the right to purchase more than 1/48 of their runs by virtue of improvements. The Bill failed in the face of bitter resistance from the pastoral interest, and of the misgivings of those who felt that the measure smacked too strongly of class bias and paid too little attention to the fact that, as one of them put it, "selectors and squatters were but a handful of the people of the country, and Parliament had no right for their sakes to throw away the public inheritance." (2)

(1) 5.12.78.
(2) Speech of Wisdom, against interest remission clauses. 4.12.78. (S.M.H., 5.12.78).
But though this bill was defeated, its very formulation, and the fight to defend it, were tributes to the effective pressure exerted by selector organisations.

The squatters, like the selectors, usually showed their hand in relation to limited and concrete issues: indeed, the tendency was more marked in their case, partly because they were more frequently on the defensive than aggressively seeking concessions, and partly through the different modes of action forced upon them by circumstances. It was clear that their cause could never be made the basis for a popular movement operating through public organisations of the kind used by free selectors. Even without the popular view of the squatters as "enemies of the people," it would have taken consummate ingenuity to invest the attempt at preserving the interests of so limited a class with the sentimental appeal of a "democratic struggle."

The squatters thus remained to a large extent a closed fraternity, depending for defence upon unostentatious mutual support, and their comparatively large representation in Parliament. Where they resorted to organisation, it was of a limited and semi-confidential nature; if they saw fit to call an occasional public meeting, it was understood that those present would consist almost exclusively of persons directly concerned in promoting the welfare of the pastoral interest.

Defensive political action by the squatters was clearly seen during the consideration of the 1878 and 1883 Land Bills.
It was natural that the squatters should be hostile to Farnell's 1878 Bill: as has already been seen, it was a pro-selector measure, and Farnell had announced, in his financial statement, his intention to recoup losses of revenue due to remission of selectors' interest by increasing pastoral rents. (1) The rent question had been, for a number of years, a source of general antipathy towards squatters. It was well known that large sums frequently passed between lessees when runs were transferred — virtually representing a purchase of the right to pay rent — (2) and many felt that if squattages were lucrative enough to justify such transactions, the State, as the owner of the land, ought to receive greater benefit from its lease. Since 1861 there had been no general re-appraisal of pastoral rents, which were, by contrast with those imposed in other colonies, extremely low. (3) Squatters considered that until they had been granted some security of tenure, it was inequitable to expect them to submit to rental increases. (4) They had thus always exerted their political influence to prevent the passage of any measure involving rent re-appraisal, and with

(1) S.M.H., 16.11.78.
(2) Farnell claimed in 1879 to know of instances where the "goodwill" of runs, "that is to say, after the cattle and sheep had been cleared off the ground — the mere right to pay rent," had been sold for as much as £30,000 to £50,000. (5.11.79. N.S.W.P.D., Vol. I, p. 113).
(3) In 1877, for instance, while the average rent received in Victoria per square mile for Crown land was £4.9.2, that received in N.S.W. was 18/12d. (S.M.H., 29.10.77).
singular success. Even the Sydney Morning Herald, which could scarcely be said to favour the selector interest, deplored in 1878, the fact that "squatters have uniformly resisted the attempt to increase the rental of land," adding, in threatening vein:\n\n"They have defeated Land Bills, and upset ministries, simply because their class interest was threatened. But they have not gained anything permanent by such a course ... By opposing what is equitable, they are, in the long run, much more heavily taxed than by conceding it ... It is a very short sighted policy to resist an increased rental because it comes in the form of an increased tax. If they do not take good terms when offered, they will have to accept worse terms when forced upon them. They are a political minority and at the ballot box are nowhere ... Whatever Government may be in power, the policy of the pastoral party should be to promote an equitable settlement of the rental valuation. Their class has been blind in the past - it will be a fatal mistake if they are blind in the present." (1)\n
But such warnings were unheeded in 1878, and the pastoralists showed that, if only a "political minority," they were nevertheless powerful. In October, a body calling itself the "Freehold and Pastoral Association of New South Wales" circulated among pastoralists a confidential letter explaining that:\n\n"Most of the squatters and landowners have become members (i.e. of the Association) and as their large interests are likely to be injuriously affected by the new Land Bill lately introduced into the House of Assembly by the New South Wales Government, it therefore has become necessary to take immediate and combined action to counteract the proposals that are now being submitted by the Government." (2)
Anticipating a general election after the hoped for defeat of these proposals, the circular requested local pastoralists to suggest men for appointment as local "correspondents" of the Association to organise electoral committees in each district. The expenses both of correspondents and of committees were guaranteed by the central body.

Before the election took place, however, the battle against the Land Bill had to be waged. The only overt sign of squatter activity was a meeting at Wentworth, which prepared a pamphlet protesting against rental increases. (1) But in Parliament, the squatters argued fiercely against the measure, and voted almost as a body against the second reading. Some idea of the effect can be gained from a glance at the division which took place in the Assembly at the end of the debate. As accurately as is possible to assess it, the classification of those who voted was as follows: (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOVERNMENT SUPPORTERS</th>
<th>OPPOSITION MEMBERS</th>
<th>INDEPENDENTS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOR</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGAINST</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The principal factors in bringing about the defeat of the Government were thus the defection of almost a half of its regular supporters, and its failure to win the approval of a majority of

---

(1) Reported by Farmell, in Legislative Assembly, 21.11.78. (S.M.R. 22.11.78).
(2) For explanation and details of this classification, see Appendix VI, p. 354.
independent members. At least fourteen of those voting against the Bill can be identified as squatters, and may be classified as follows: Government supporters, 5; Opposition members, 7; Independents, 2. Only four squatters, staunch Government supporters, voted for the Bill. During the debate, and after the division had been taken, numerous allegations of lobbying among independent members, and even of virtual bribery, were made against squatters by their enemies, (1) and although these claims must be discounted as coming from a partisan source, it is not unlikely that they contained some truth. In any case, the solid swing against the Bill of pastoralist members themselves was clearly a major factor in its defeat.

The Bill of 1883 represented, in general policy, an expression of the view that the only hope of solving the land problem lay in abandoning the system established in 1861. This opinion had gained ground rapidly from the mid-'seventies onward. At first voiced by only a few, it was expressed more and more strongly during the debates on the Bills of 1878 and 1880. (2) Finally, when Sir John Robertson, as Lands Minister, brought forward in 1882 a measure to consolidate the existing laws, with but few alterations in matters of detail, full battle was joined

(2) In 1878, e.g., the S.M.H., remarked with satisfaction on the number of men who had expressed in Parliament the opinion that "so long as free selection before survey is maintained, the tinkering up of one hole in the land law will only bring about a leak in another place." (5.12.78). There were numerous attacks on the principles of the existing law during the debates on the 1880 Bill, as also occurred in 1881 when Reid moved for the appointment of a Commission to inquire into the whole land situation. (11.10.81, N.S.W.P.D., Vol. VI., pp. 1495 et seq.).
by the adherents of the new view. In the Assembly, Sir Alexander Stuart, from the Opposition benches, produced a set of counter proposals on which he declared his willingness to go to the country, Robertson's Bill was lost on the second reading, and the House was dissolved. The Government's defeat was confirmed in the ensuing elections, and in January, 1883, Stuart formed an administration. One of his first acts was to appoint two experts, Morris and Rankin, to conduct an inquiry into the situation on the land, and to recommend a scheme for completely reforming land legislation. Farnell, the Minister for Lands, on November 7th brought down a new Land Bill based on Morris and Rankin's Report.

The Bill proposed to separate the lands of the colony into three Divisions: the Eastern, or coastal, region; the Western pastoral districts; and the Central area between. Since conditions differed in each of these Divisions, it was argued that they required separate treatment. Each Division was to be sub-divided into a number of Land Districts, with local land boards to decentralise administration. Pastoral runs were to be divided into two parts, one to be retained by the squatter on a fixed lease, the other to be reserved for selection. Responsibility for appraising pastoral rents rested with the local land boards, though in no case was the rate to be less than 2d. per acre. Homestead leases were to be permitted in the Western Division, in which selection was barred
altogether. The Bill also included detailed revision of the conditions required of selectors, the abolition of certain types of leases, and close regulation of auction sales of land. (1)

When the Bill appeared, no body of squatters issued any expression of opinion upon the policy changes it represented. In this matter, indeed, it is clear that pastoral opinion, like that of the selectors, was divided. (2) A deputation of influential squatters from the Western districts visited Sydney, interviewed Farnell, and issued a manifesto setting out certain complaints about the Bill, (3) while in some areas local committees were formed to collect squatters' objections for compiling into petitions to Parliament. (4) But in neither case was there any comment on the general scheme represented by the Bill. Complaints were confined to matters of a different order: rental proposals, improvement compensation clauses, and periods of tenure.

Squatter opinion was thus unknown when the Bill was first introduced. In the light of the apparent disposition of

(1) This is but the barest outline of the provisions of a very complicated Bill. Its treatment of Selectors is summarised below. For fuller details, see speech of Farnell on moving second reading, N.S.W.P.D., Vol. X., pp. 327 et seq. There is an excellent summary of the details of the final Act in T. A. Coghlan, Labour and Industry in Australia, Vol. III., pp. 1356 et seq.

(2) This was indicated to some extent in the voting on Robertson's Bill, which was an avowed attempt to retain the old system. Of squatter members of the Assembly who voted, 8 were in favour of the Bill, and 11 against. (See Appendix VIII, p. 358.)

(3) This deputation was appointed by meetings held at Wentworth Pooncarie, Wilcannia, and Wanaarung. For details of its manifesto, see S.M.H., 22.11.83.

(4) See e.g., account of activities of Grafton Pastoralists' Committee, S.M.H., 4.12.83.
factions within the Assembly at the time, there was however reason to believe that the pastoral group could hold the key to the success of the Bill, and with it, of the Government. On the basis of those divisions which, before November 1883, had involved a direct expression of favour towards the Government, there were 44 Government supporters, 39 Oppositionists, and 23 Independents. Squatters were distributed among these groups, taken in the above order, as follows: 9, 7, 5. (1)

Assuming that, as on previous occasions, these members could be expected to vote on a land issue en bloc, in a narrow division they could hold the fate of the Government in their hands. An addition of the 12 Opposition and Independent squatters to its own ranks would create for the Government an invincible majority; on the other hand, the loss of its own 9 squatter supporters could be disastrous.

The printed copy of the Bill which was placed in the hands of members carried in italics the Government's proposals for minimum pastoral rents, (2d., per acre in the Western and 3d., in the Central Divisions). This was the formal method of indicating that it was not necessarily intended to insist on the amount set down, but to accept modification if the House saw fit to make it. Garrett, a leading Opposition member, attacked this procedure as a sacrifice of integrity, (2) and when, during the second reading debate, squatters who had previously opposed the

---

(1) For details of this classification, see Appendix VII, p. 355.
(2) S.M.H. 19.11.83.
Government moved across the Chamber and sat behind the Treasury benches, it became an open secret that rent reduction had been promised in return for their support. (1) Rumours to this effect were confirmed months later when the Bill was in Committee, and Farnell himself proposed, as an official Government amendment, the halving of the suggested minimum pastoral rents. (2)

The second reading of the Bill passed with an unexpectedly large majority (76-16), so that the Government's stratagem to lure squatter support proved, in fact, to have been unnecessary. As the long months of Committee discussion proceeded, however, the squatters demonstrated anew their anxiety to mould the details of the measure to suit their own interests, and the Government raised little objection. A peculiar bargaining atmosphere surrounded many of these debates, with selector and squatter representatives demanding equivalent treatment each time one group or the other gained a concession. (3) Bitter exchanges took place from time to time over the right of squatters to vote on matters directly affecting their own interests, (4) and in the smaller attendances while the

(1) See speeches of Burns, 28.11.83. (N.S.W.P.D., Vol. X., pp. 706-7), Combes, 6.12.83, (ibid., p. 1036), and Sullott, 17.6.84, (ibid., Vol. XII., p. 3905). Burns strongly objected, as well, to the Government's failure - as would have been otherwise natural - to bring forward its financial statement before the Land Bill, and thus commit itself on pastoral rents.

(2) N.S.W.P.D., Vol. XIII., p. 4128, (17.6.84).

(3) See, e.g., speeches of Jennings and Sullott, demanding pastoral rent reductions following the lowering of rents on selectors' leases, on the ground that "the same principle of justice should guide us in dealing with every class of Crown tenants." 17.6.84. (N.S.W.P.D., Vol. XII, pp. 3904-5).

(4) E.g., 26.6.84. Challenge by Fletcher of right of squatters to vote on extension of tenure of Western leases. (N.S.W.P.D., Vol. XIII., p. 4077).
House was in Committee, squatters used their concerted strength to great advantage. (1) By the time the third reading stage had been reached, wild charges were being made that the measure had been carried through by a Government whose members were "the puppets ... (of a) compact body of squatters whose gold had been all-powerful in the discussion of this Bill." (2) This was the statement of an extremist who believed that there had been a "conspiracy" between the squatters and the Government. The more general opinion was expressed by Spring, member for Young, who declared:

"I am not prepared to believe the cry which has been raised that a compact has been made between the squatters in the House and the Government, for I do not believe that either the squatters or the Government would descend to such a course. There was, moreover, no necessity for any such compact, because the gentlemen who represent the great pastoral industry here were bound by the strong cement of mutual interest to take the course they have taken with regard to the Bill. And there can be no doubt that as far as that is concerned they have moulded it to their own uses." (3)

The Bill was read a third time, by another large majority (60-30), and immediately a prominent Opposition member, Wisdom, challenged the votes of twenty of its supporters on the ground that as actual pastoral lessees, or "squatters' agents,"

(1) Typical of the large number of gains made in this way were the decision that the squatter should choose which half of his run he would retain, (N.S.W.P.D., Vol. XIII., p. 4055), extension of Western Leases, (ibid., p. 4077), establishment of the right of appeal against land board rental assessments, (ibid., Vol. XIV., p. 4303).
(2) A. G. Taylor, 30.7.84. (N.S.W.P.D., Vol. XIV., p. 4696).
(3) 7.8.84. ibid., p. 4767.
they had a direct pecuniary interest in the measure. Subsequently McLaughlin, a solicitor and avowed selector champion, moved as a formal matter of privilege that the votes of these members be disallowed. The House refused to sustain this proposal, but only after a very bitter debate. (1)

Events of this kind lent colour and a dramatic intensity to the parliamentary struggle between the different types of land occupiers. It would be easy, as a result, to misunderstand the directions in which squatters influenced the legislation of 1884. They had no hand in altering the broad lines of policy. These they accepted, in the expectation of securing, within the changed framework, concessions of detail which would make their position as tolerable as possible. Such limited aims were well within their grasp, thanks both to their strong cohesion as a parliamentary group, and to the commanding position they occupied as a body holding the balance between the major parliamentary factions.

Those standing by while squatters and selectors scrambled for concessions frequently remarked that since the land was, in the first instance, the property of the Crown, and one of the chief sources of public revenue, the rest of the community had a material interest in it too. This interest, indeed, provided a standard argument against movements in support of interest remission, low pastoral or pre-lease rentals.

(1) 7.8.84. N.S.W.P.D., Vol. XIV., pp. 4805 et seq.
and the abolition of auction land sales. During the debates on the 1884 Bill, the position of what one member called the "Great Third Party," or "the great body of taxpayers who derived no direct benefit from the alienation of the land," (1) was constantly referred to. Many members who could be taken to represent this "party" held the view expressed by Oliffe, a Sydney publican, who declared that, as "a city dweller, unconnected with any interest on the land," he regarded himself as "one of the trustees of the public estate." (2) While all of them did not perhaps take the extreme stand of Griffiths, who denounced the Bill as a "class measure," in that it "recognises two classes of the community, the squatters and selectors, but it does not recognise the general public," (3) most felt that the concessions granted to land lessees and purchasers represented a "reckless abandonment of revenue," (4) at a time when the Colony could ill afford it. They observed that the consequence would inevitably be the imposition of "additional taxation to make good the loss," (5) a procedure which could even endanger the free trade tradition of the Colony. The position was plainly put by Cameron, one of the few working class representatives of the period, who, in complaining of the effect on what he called the "third interest," of lowering interest and rental rates, and limiting auction sales, declared:

(1) Young. 22.7.84. N.S.W.P.D. Vol. XIV, p. 1472.
(3) 5.8.84. ibid. Vol. XIV, p. 4749.
(4) Garrett. 17.5.84. N.S.W.P.D. Vol. XIII, p. 4128.
"I am a free trader. I wish to see free trade obtain in this country; but we shall not have free trade if this Bill passes; we shall be placed in such a dilemma that the Government will have no other alternative but to resort to customs duties; the public who do not live on the land will be taxed to make up the deficiency which you are virtually presenting to the squatter and free selector." (1)

This was, in fact, an accurate forecast of what was shortly to happen. Of more immediate importance, however, was the implied hostility of the townsmen to both classes on the land - a hostility which had a very material basis. If even the recognised spokesman of the urban "democracy" of the Colony could not agree to risking an enlarged taxation burden for the sake of those struggling to establish themselves on the land, it is not surprising that the conventional adulation of the free selector produced little in the way of political alliances.

CONCLUSION:

Although both squatters and selectors were minorities in the colonial community, they succeeded, in the 'seventies and early 'eighties, in giving political expression to their needs through strong pressure groups. Unanimity and limited ends combined with opportunism to make this possible, as each class sought for itself the best possible terms under whatever

(1) 7.3.84. ibid., Vol. XIV., pp. 4786-7.
scheme of land settlement happened to arise through the normal legislative process.

On the basic principles of land policy, however, neither group possessed that agreement which would have been a primary condition for developing more potent instruments of political action, such as permanent parties. Past struggles on the land had brought division of opinion on the principles embodied in the laws of 1861: some of each class had prospered under the existing system; others had suffered. Moreover, neither class could hope for alliance with other sections of the community to counteract its minority status. The importance of land revenue in keeping taxation low and sustaining prosperity meant that the urban population tended to see its own interest (to ensure a high State income from the land) as being in conflict with that of the land occupiers (to secure the use of land as cheaply as possible).

These material considerations meant that parliamentary treatment of the land problem tended throughout the period to consist of debate among "independent" men genuinely anxious to find a just solution, complicated by the manoeuvres of parliamentary factions, and punctuated by the periodical but fierce clash of minority interest groups.
1. **THE ELECTORAL FRAMEWORK:**

Elections in New South Wales were, until 1880, conducted under conditions laid down in the Electoral Act of 1858. (1) This measure dealt comprehensively with electoral divisions, the franchise and electoral rolls, electoral procedure, and petitions and disputes. The chief features of the system thus established merit brief attention as an introduction to a consideration of the electoral struggles of the period.

By the 'seventies the Colony was divided into 60 electorates, returning 75 members to the Legislative Assembly. (2) There were thus a number of multiple constituencies, though no provision was made for automatically increasing representation as population grew. An unusual feature of the system was its inclusion of "Goldfields electorates," based partly on geographic limits and partly on a special franchise. In three areas which covered the principal gold mining districts of the north, west and south, these "electorates" were super-imposed upon a number of others, and represented an attempt to extend political rights to an important class of people who might

---

(1) 22 Vict. No. 20. (Public General Statutes of N.S.W.).
(2) The Act originally established 64 electorates, returning 80 members. On the separation of Queensland from N.S.W., five electorates, (Brisbane, the Burnett, Darling Downs, East Moreton and West Moreton), were abolished, and the number of representatives reduced to 74. Subsequently, under terms laid down in the Act, the University of Sydney qualified to become a separate "electorate," returning one member.
otherwise have failed to qualify for the vote. Only those possessing a miner's right or business licence, or who had held a mining lease for six months, had a voice in the election of the Goldfields members. Elsewhere the franchise was a mixed residential and property one. Males over the age of 21 were entitled to vote in electoral districts where they had lived for six months, or where they held a freehold or leasehold estate producing rents or profits of the clear value of $100 or of the annual value of $10 respectively. Occupation of offices, warehouses, or shops of an annual value of $10 also carried with it the right to vote in the electorate wherein the building was situated. Although no person was entitled to vote more than once in any given electorate, these provisions did make it possible for one person to vote in a number of electorates according to the property he owned, or occupied in a business capacity, and to this extent the franchise favoured the interests of the well-to-do.

Under the Act of 1858, Electoral Rolls were collected and prepared by the appointees of Courts of Petty Sessions in each police district, the remuneration for such men being fixed by the local justices. In 1866, at the instance of Parkes, an Electoral Rolls Act was passed to authorise the employment of the police in place of the old collectors. Considerations of economy were partly responsible for this move, since it made possible a saving of £5,000 per annum in Government expenditure.
Experience had also shown, however, that the collection of rolls represented one point in the electoral process where abuses could easily occur, and it was hoped that the employment of police would assure impartiality. (1)

The process of actually electing an Assembly copied, in its main features, the established British practice. Upon the dissolution of Parliament, election writs were issued to the Returning Officers for each Electoral District, naming the day and place of the nomination and the poll for the area concerned. The Returning Officer, having given public notice of this information, presided at a meeting "to be holden at noon at the place named for that purpose in the writ" (2) at which candidates for the seat were publicly nominated and seconded on the hustings. After they had had a chance to address the electors, the Returning Officer called for a show of hands and declared the name of the candidate elected. A poll could, however, be demanded by any candidate, or any six electors, who felt dissatisfied with the results of the show of hands. This, in practice, always occurred, except where a candidate was unopposed, so that the whole nomination procedure was generally a mere formality.

Where a poll was to take place, the responsibility for having booths erected, and arranging for the supply of sufficient ballot papers and rolls, rested with the Returning Officers. Voting was secret, and by a system of absolute

(1) S. M. H. 10.1.74.
(2) 21 Vict. No. 20, Cl. 37.
preference. Ballot papers carried a list of candidates from which the elector simply struck out the names of those for whom he did not wish to vote. (1)

A number of attempts were made between 1858 and 1880 to amend the Electoral Act. The chief stimulus was usually a sense of the insufficiency of the existing law to cope with a rapidly expanding population. In 1866 a Select Committee appointed to investigate electoral anomalies pointed out that, owing to regional population changes, disproportionate representation was virtually depriving a section of the community of political rights. The first determined attempt to achieve reform was made in 1873, when Parkes successfully piloted an Electoral Bill through the Assembly, only to lose it on a technicality in the Council. Though re-introduced, the same Bill lapsed through a change of government, and it was not until 1880 that Parkes succeeded in amending the old Act. In the meantime, abortive attempts had been made by Robertson and Farnell to achieve the same object. (2) These failures were all the result of unfortunate circumstances rather than of lethargy on the part of those anxious for reform, though it must be added that the electoral question never became a major issue during the period. There was considerable justice in the frequently made observation that few people felt sufficient interest in politics to be much concerned about anomalies in the electoral system. In 1877, for instance, it was shown by the Herald that

(1) 21 Vict., No. 20, Cl. 43.
even in metropolitan constituencies it was usual for scarcely 60% of electors to record a vote, so that:

"To talk about the country being in an agony of excitement in favour of electoral reform, in the face of such proof of indifference, is sheerest nonsense or else the veriest humbug." (1)

But this did not prevent warm feeling being aroused once the electoral system came under specific consideration, and it was only after long, and at times acrimonious debates in the House, that the Electoral Bill of 1880 became law. The new Act (2) completely revised the existing distribution of seats, increased the number of members, and instituted an automatic increase in representation to cope with population growth. (3) The only other significant changes were increases in penalties for certain electoral abuses, and requirement that candidates should lodge a £40 deposit before nomination, to be confiscated by the State unless the person concerned polled at least 1/5th of the number of votes received by the winning candidate.

No further reform of the electoral system took place until the passing of the comprehensive measure of 1893. (4) So far as electoral procedure was concerned, the pattern established in the Acts of 1858 and 1866 remained consistent throughout the 'seventies and 'eighties. During this period, certain

(1) S.M.H., 7, 12, 77.
(2) 44 Vict., No. 13.
(3) Clauses 6 - 7. For each additional 2,000 voters, a constituency was entitled to return an extra member, up to four.
(4) This Act abolished multiple constituencies, put into effect the principle of "one man, one vote," and instituted sweeping reforms in electoral procedure.
peculiarities of this pattern led to the development by candidates and their supporters of a number of practices which had as their object a manipulation of the poll to suit their interests. These practices were few and simple, but they require brief discussion, since their appearance was an important aspect of the growth of political organisation.

2. ELECTORAL ABUSES AND MANIPULATION

(1) Double Voting and Personation.

Double voting and Personation were the twin abuses most frequently deplored by contemporary political observers, and they appear to have been rife throughout the whole of the period under consideration.

There was little to prevent electors moving from booth to booth in the constituency in which they were registered and recording a vote in each. The fear of detection was slight enough to be useless as a deterrent: returning officers were required to accept a verbal assurance from voters of their identity, and even if comparison of rolls after the event indicated that more than one vote had been polled in any name, there was little chance of discovering who had been responsible for the offence. It was, indeed, common for "personators" to claim a spurious identity and vote in place even of bona fide electors on the roll. This practice was made easier by the large proportion of electors who commonly neglected to record a vote.
Many instances of these abuses were recalled and vouched for by speakers during parliamentary debates on electoral reform. Typical of such statements was that made by Lucas, in 1880:

"In Canterbury there are 18 or 19 polling booths, and any elector, if he chooses, can record a vote at all of them, so that it can readily be understood that 30 or 40 men banded together can return any man they like. For instance, some years ago 13 men voted at Wynyard Square, and then chartered an omnibus and proceeded to Waverley, Randwick, Botany Bay and so on, voting at each place." (1)

Blatant cases of a similar kind were also claimed by the Sydney Morning Herald to have occurred during the 1877 election, (2) while in 1872 Butler wrote to Parkes warning him against vicarious and double voting, and adding that it was "openly boasted by some of the P.P.A., people after one election that they polled in this way nearly 700 votes." (3)

Personation could also be carried out by creating or taking advantage of defects in the electoral rolls themselves. The Sydney Morning Herald, for example, observed in 1877 that:

"Under the most careful system of registration, there will necessarily be at every election a large allowance to be made for deaths, invalids, and absentees. But it is evident that where every allowance is made for them, no inconsiderable number will be left on the electoral rolls who never were bona fide electors at all, and who ought never to have been recorded as such. In all large cities like Sydney, there is a floating population ... the temporary boarders at our lodging houses and visitors at our hotels would at any time amount to a respectable list on any electoral roll." (4)

(2) S.M.H., 30.10.77.
It is not to be supposed that the names of anything like the whole of these are given to the collectors, but it is certain that a great many of them are given, and that in this way we get no end of fictitious electors. Persons having no idea of becoming residents in the Colony, but who happen to be here when the lists are renewed, take their place on the rolls in common with the real citizens, and thus serve the purposes of those who, when election times come round, are not accustomed to scruple at anything that will keep one man out of Parliament and put another in. There need hardly be any limit to tactics of this kind, if there are those who are clever and unscrupulous enough to practice them, and unless those who have the fullest means of knowing are mistaken, the supply of dummy voters is becoming fully equal to the demand."

The compilation of electoral rolls was clearly such an onerous business that the police were usually either unable or disinclined to verify information given them by householders. This left the way open for manipulation. McElhone drew Parkes' attention in 1877 to "the careless way the Electoral Rolls are taken," and transmitted to him a letter from one Henry Norris, an elector of Home Rule, near Mudgee, who complained of having been left off the roll altogether. He pointed out that:

"Mr. Norris thinks that the reason they were left of (sic) is that he and his mates Jas. McGee and E. W. Norris were on Mr. Piggott's (1) Committee at the late election. It is quite possible this is the case in other electorates ... In the Upper Hunter I know of one case where a Father and 3 sons resided together the Father and his two eldest sons were left of (sic) the Rolls and the Young son a minor was put on. (2)

It was even alleged on occasion that the rolls were systematically

---

(2) J. McElhone to Parkes, 12.5.77. (P.C. A.925. 888).
tampered with over a period, before elections, to make personation possible. This was, for instance, the explanation Parkes had to offer for the setbacks he and his followers suffered in the metropolitan electorates in 1883. (1) In similar vein James Torpy - a Parkes supporter - recounted to his leader the "evil" means by which in the same election he had been defeated at Orange.

"I met with the most ferocious opposition from the Romans, who were canvassed to a man by the Priests of this and adjoining districts. For the week previous to the polling, these black-coated gentry were prowling about the district secretly interviewing the faithful, and command ing each and every one of them, to plump for Dalton: even some of my own tenants were ordered to support their co-religionist ... Voters were brought from immense distances, at tremendous expense, by the Daltons. Eighty men were brought by rail from Sydney, some of whom voted at Bathurst, the remaining twenty voting in different names at several Polling Places.

"Double voting and Personating were carried out in the most barefaced manner, several dead men were polled, and numerous absentee were represented. We know of some sixteen cases of double voting, and we are at work now, trying to identify the men ... The more respectable portion of the community are indignant at the rascality with which Dalton gained his victory, and have begged of me to write to you on the subject without delay. They say that self registration with voting certificates is the only remedy. It is known now that some hundreds of names were given to the collectors of last year's Electoral Rolls (of) Roman Catholics who have long since left the district, some fictitious names also being added." In a postscript he declared: "While I write I am assured by one of themselves that the Daltons have been preparing for this election ever since the last by putting the names of their own sect on the Electoral Roll.

(1) Parkes to Lord Augustus Loftus, 24.1.83. (P.C., A.916.1). Parkes claimed that the Roman Catholics and the Liquor interests had been "systematically preparing for this election for some time past," with the object of ousting him.
The Police should be prevented from putting names on the Roll without seeing the men personally." (1)

Torpy's friends were not alone in advocating self-registration as the best solution for such abuses. As early as 1873, the Sydney Morning Herald issued a strong plea for "an improved system of registration of voters, such as might check or obviate the prevailing vices of personation and falsification of votes," and declared that only a scheme "founded upon the principle of self-registration" would achieve this object. (2) Parkes had also expressed himself in favour of the principle in 1873, (3) and it was fully discussed in Parliament during the debates on the Electoral Bill of that year. The majority of members opposed self-registration, on the ground-as shown by British experience- that it might foster the growth of registration societies. The party organisation to which this had led in England, with its electoral techniques and mass voting methods, was naturally regarded with disfavour by politicians accustomed to see their "independence" and their power to capitalize on local aspirations as being their chief stock in trade. It was further feared that, in view of the absence of even a tendency towards broad party divisions, self-registration would provide new weapons for the kind of manipulators who were already the main offenders in instigating the abuse of personation. The consensus of opinion was decidedly with W. H. Cooper, who melodramatically depicted

(1) James Torpy to Parkes, 14.12.82. (P.C., A.910.499).
(2) S.M.H. 19.1.74.
(3) Speech on second reading of Electoral Act Amendment Bill, 28.1.74. (S.M.H., 29.1.74).
the voters of New South Wales, under self-registration, as the victims of the whims of sectarian and similar interests. The effect of such a system, he declared, would be:

"to hand over the liberties of the country, bound and shackled, to the tender mercies of those factions which were the country's curse. The voice of the people would be unheard at elections, for the organised and disciplined and registered slaves of factions alone would have votes, alone would rush to the poll and trample honour and justice in the dust."

The view that, in this matter, the cure was worse than the disease, prevailed until the 'nineties. Nor does there appear to have been any attempt to tighten up the functioning of the existing law by requiring more stringent precautions from the roll collectors. The opportunity for personation thus remained unaltered, and full advantage was taken of it by the unscrupulous.

(ii) Plumping and Bunching:

In multiple constituencies, the elector naturally had the right to a number of votes equal to the number of candidates to be returned. He was not, however, obliged to record the full number of votes at his disposal, and hence might "plump" by striking off the ballot paper all but the name of his favoured candidate. Where organised, this practice could add to a candidate's chance of election, not by increasing his support, but by decreasing that of his rivals. (2) In a system in which

(1) Speech in Legislative Assembly, 11.2.74, (S.M.H., 12.2.74)
(2) Plumping was not peculiar to the electoral situation in N.S.W. It had, for instance, been practised for many years in English multiple constituencies. See, e.g., N. Gash, Politics in the Age of Peel, p. 127.
a four-member constituency might contain as few as from 8,000 to 10,000 electors, only 60% of whom usually went to the poll, plumping could be a decisive factor in the electoral struggle.

There can be no doubt that the incidence of plumping was at times very great. This is shown clearly enough in the voting figures for the period. The polls in East and West Sydney for the 1874-5 and 1877 elections might be taken as samples to show the meaning of "plumping" in terms of actual votes. In the following table, "effective voters" refers to the number of electors - minus those recording informal votes - who went to the poll. The total votes they could cast was four times their number. The total votes they actually cast can be ascertained by adding the votes recorded for each candidate. The difference between this sum and the potential voting power represented "lost" votes due to plumping.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EAST SYDNEY 1874-5</th>
<th>EAST SYDNEY 1877</th>
<th>WEST SYDNEY 1874-5</th>
<th>WEST SYDNEY 1877</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voters on Roll.</td>
<td>11,409</td>
<td>13,218</td>
<td>8,853</td>
<td>10,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Voters.</td>
<td>6,430</td>
<td>6,916</td>
<td>5,574</td>
<td>6,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting power of Effective Voters.</td>
<td>25,720</td>
<td>27,664</td>
<td>22,296</td>
<td>24,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votes actually cast.</td>
<td>21,353</td>
<td>21,655</td>
<td>15,331</td>
<td>18,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Lost&quot; votes.</td>
<td>4,367</td>
<td>6,009</td>
<td>6,965</td>
<td>6,071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since voting was by secret ballot, it is, of course, impossible to ascertain how many electors were represented by

(1) The figures from which this table is constructed appeared in S.M.H., 7.12.77.
the total of "lost" votes. Some electors would record votes for three, some for two, and some for one candidate. But whatever the sources of lost votes, or the distribution of discrimination they represented among candidates, there can be no doubt that they were an important factor in determining the actual choice of representatives. This is shown well enough when one notes the size of the margins which divided candidates. In 1877, for example, the distribution of votes polled for the two electorates was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EAST SYDNEY</th>
<th>WEST SYDNEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Votes Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macintosh</td>
<td>4,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>3,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood</td>
<td>3,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>2,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkes</td>
<td>2,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowper</td>
<td>1,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon</td>
<td>1,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephson</td>
<td>1,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melville</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first four men in each of these lists were the ones elected. A glance at the margins separating them from each other and from those immediately following them shows that in each case it would have taken very few of the 6,000 'lost' votes

(1) Base figures from declaration of the poll, S.M.Hes. 25-26.10.77.
to have made a considerable difference in the final result. (1) This observation is given added point when it is remembered that 'plumping' - which accounted for the lost votes - was a device often imperfectly understood by the electors themselves. Plumping was common, for instance, among supporters of the weaker candidates, who seem to have assumed that by this means added value would be given to their votes. This was so, however, only in terms of discrimination against other candidates, and tended to affect the upper rather than the lower end of the scale. In West Sydney, plumpers for Palmer could not possibly have increased his chances of election, though they may well have decided whether Harris or Dangar or even Robertson won a seat. This negative aspect of their tactics was not always uppermost in the minds of plumpers, who frequently, though favouring strong or popular men to fill some of the constituency available seats, recorded no vote for them, "in the mistaken impression" that they already had sufficient support, and that plumping for the voter's first favourite would in some mysterious way increase the absolute number of his votes. A classic case of the curious results that could follow from this fallacy occurred in the two-member Parramatta constituency in 1874, when J. S. Farnell, sitting member, a Minister of the Crown, and universally popular, was rejected in favour of two nonentities. Extreme sectarian bitterness within the

(1) In the case of E. Sydney this applies, however, only to the fifth candidate, Parkes. The margin between him and his successors is decisive enough.
electorate had resulted in organised plumping campaigns by both these men, with the result that not enough electors recorded their second vote to allow Farnell in. The contest thus ended with the ironical result that the tactics of each group of plumpers had assured the election of their bitterest enemies' candidates. (1)

Plumping could, on the other hand, involve conscious exclusion of particular candidates; in narrowly contested seats a well organised minority nominally devoted to the support of an unlikely candidate could exercise a disproportionate influence on the chances of the leading men. It was generally assumed in 1877, for example, that the chief element in the East Sydney election was the plumping of supporters of Dixon and Melville. These men were the picked candidates of a body known as the "Working Men's Defence Association," which took as its policy a demand for protection and the discontinuance of assisted immigration. When Parkes declared his belief in free trade and immigration, the Association advised its members to record no vote in his favour, but to plump for Dixon and Melville. (2) Parkes was thus robbed of a significant section of that working class vote which had always been assumed to be one of his sources of strength. (3)

Though it was not always possible to understand its

(1) S.M.H. 12.12.74.
(2) S.M.H. 26.10.77.
(3) S.M.H. 26,30.10.77
precise effects, plumping was seen by contemporaries to be responsible for serious distortions in the electoral process, and fulminations against it were common. Critics saw it as voluntary disfranchisement, which robbed the majority of the full exercise of its will, often led to the election - by accident - of inferior candidates, and gave undue power to organised minorities. During the debate on the 1873 Electoral Bill, many endorsed the feeling of one member, Onslow, that, through plumping:

"Our system of representation gives undue facilities to the rabid demagogue ... (and) all our elections have fallen into the hands of societies - Protestant Associations, Orange Lodges, Catholic Guilds, et hoc genus omne." (1)

Onslow demanded some form of proportional representation to counter such influences, and considerable discussion took place, both in Parliament and press, of Hare's system and of the views of John Stuart Mill on the subject. (2) But more was involved in the proportional representation question than the mere prevention of plumping, and Onslow's proposals were rejected on other grounds.

A more popular suggestion was that the law should "compel people who had four votes to give four votes, ... (so) that every honest and true candidate might be returned." (3)

In expression of this view, a clause was inserted in the 1880

(1) _S.M.H._ 6:2.74.
(2) See e.g., _S.M.H._ editorial, 11:2.74.
(3) B. O. Holtermann. Election speech (St. Leonards), _S.M.H._ 16:12.74.
Electoral Bill requiring electors to vote for the full number of candidates to be elected. The proposer, Garrett, pointed out that, though no such provision regulated elections in England, "the same result was brought about (there) chiefly by perfect party organisation. That organisation was absent from our political parties. A mere wrangle took the place of intelligent voting at the polls." (1)

Garrett hoped that his measure would curtail the influence of minority pressure groups by forcing an expression of majority opinion, and thus prepare the way for the order implicit in larger and worthier party alignments. He was strongly supported in this view, especially by those hostile to some of the existing minorities in the House. (2) His clause was, however, removed from the Bill by the Legislative Council, which endorsed the opinion of one of its members that compulsion such as that contemplated represented a "garrotting of the people's rights," and of another, that this was a "monstrous proposition ... one that had never yet entered the brain of the wildest ultra democrat." (3)

The clause became the chief issue of contention between the two Houses, and Parkes persuaded the Assembly to accept the Council's view rather than risk the loss of the Bill. But in doing so he gave clear expression to the principle involved:

(2) One Minister, for instance, openly canvassed members to vote for the clause in order to keep down the number of Roman Catholics in Parliament. (*N.S.W.P.D.*, Vol. II., p. 2546).
(3) Piddington and Docker, (ibid., p. 2775).
"I should consider it a great advantage to good
government if it had the effect of destroying
the monopoly of great organisations, and I do not
care whether they are Orange or Roman Catholic
organisations. Any body held together by a
principle common only to themselves have no
right to organise at elections so as to manipulate
votes against the real merits of the question in
the contest." (1)

The way remained open for plumping until 1893, when
the new Electoral Act provided an altogether different remedy
by sweeping away multiple constituencies. The prolongation
of the old system represented, in one sense, a deadlock between
the two Houses of Parliament, with the Assembly refusing to
sanction proportional representation, and the Council - through
its fear of mass majorities - unwilling to rob minorities of
their chief electoral weapon. It is apparent, too, that those
bodies which wielded electoral power through their organisation
of plumping, must have used all their influence to discourage
proposals to prevent the practice. The nature and importance
of these organisations will be seen presently. It is, however,
instructive to note that those most vociferous in their demands
for reform usually voiced their objections to existing practice
in terms of an attack on electoral interference by outside
bodies.

Some counter-acting of the effects of plumping in
multiple constituencies probably took place through the operation
of another commonly used device, "bunching," though this was not
its primary object. Bunching was the endorsement of a selected
group of candidates - up to the number to be elected - by a
particular interest. Electors who favoured this interest would

(1) 8.7.80, N.S.W.P.D., Vol. III, p. 3260.
then be advised to exercise their full voting power, and support the men on the "ticket." (1) It was naturally to the individual candidate's advantage to be included in as many such groups as possible, since those who organized bunches usually had at their disposal the votes of a fairly definite section of the electorate. On the other hand, the potency of the bunch itself was greatly increased if its promoters could attract the allegiance of candidates of known popularity and influence. The arrangement of bunches was thus always a source of much pre-election negotiation and behind the scenes manoeuvre.

Personation, plumping, and bunching were the chief, but not the only ways in which the peculiarities of the Colony's system were commonly exploited. The nomination procedure fostered a great deal of jockeying for position on the hustings, the organisation of spurious support for the show of hands, and the promotion of fraudulent or insignificant candidates to split votes likely to be received by dangerous opponents. A voluntary voting system increased the temptation for interested parties to indulge in bribery, since much was to be gained by inducing and transporting apathetic voters to the poll. Finally, the practice of holding elections for different constituencies on different days gave candidates and their promoters more than one chance of success, and did much to increase the atmosphere of intrigue that so frequently surrounded the nomination and selection of candidates within individual electorates.

(1) This term was actually used during the period.
3. THE SOURCES AND SIGNIFICANCE OF ELECTORAL MANIPULATION:

The interest and importance of all these practices is to be found not so much in themselves, as in what lay behind them. Most of them — and particularly personation, plumping, and bunching — required the operation of some form of organisation to put them into effect. A single candidate could scarcely hope, of his own accord, to attend to all the practical matters involved in the tactical game of electioneering. More important, as an individual, he could rarely exert the influence necessary to induce large numbers of electors to plump, or to support any bunch he might join.

The primary and most overt of contemporary intervening agencies was the candidate's own "Committee," an ad hoc body of personal supporters. The committee conventionally undertook certain functions calculated to foster the prestige of its chosen man. It was usual to open committee rooms and to provide electoral rolls and pledge lists which might be examined and signed by electors. Periodical publication of pledge lists was one of the accepted forms of propaganda. The committee tried to attract to itself influential men of as many creeds and callings as possible, in an effort to impress the public with the apparent popularity of its candidate. It was common for the committee to see to the organisation of canvassing and of election meetings.

(1) e.g., advertisements S.M.H., 5-12-74. "The Committee for securing the election of Mr. Macintosh will meet every evening at the Central Committee rooms, Commercial Hotel, King Street, where lists are to be had."
to issue press advertisements and to print pamphlets and posters. On polling day it might be responsible for providing transport to bring electors to the polls, (1) and for seeing that scrutineers were placed in booths. On occasion—though this was apparently rare—it contributed funds to meet the expenses of the campaign. (2)

The extent of the Committee's activities depended in part upon the personality of the candidate. Influential men frequently needed little campaigning on their behalf, while the energetic might prefer to do the bulk of the work themselves. More important, however, was the relationship that existed between the candidate and his committee, and, in particular, the degree to which he was the master, or the tool, of his supporters. This was the decisive factor in apportioning responsibility for organising and directing the campaign.

A question of greater significance than mere electioneering was involved in this problem of the position of the

---

(1) In an amusing note on the East Sydney poll in 1874, the S.M.H. reported: "Vehicles of all descriptions were dashing about in every direction bearing large posters with the names of various candidates and many citizens who took no interest whatever in politics received the opportunity to obtain a free drive to business, with many others who were desirous of recording their votes." (10.12.74).

(2) J. M. Creed relates how, when he contested the Upper Hunter in 1872, the "election cost me very little, as a committee was formed to arrange for the payment of the necessary costs of printing, public meetings, etc." (Creed, My Recollections, p.73). This was not, however, the usual practice. As late as 1885 Parkes found the payment of his expenses by his Committee a novel thing worthy of remark. He wrote to the Chairman of the Committee: "The circumstance that you have conducted my election free of expense is extremely gratifying, not on account of any monetary consideration, but because it has brought into service a sound and healthy principle." (20.10.85. P.C., A.932).
candidate vis-a-vis his committee. Here we are on somewhat difficult ground: appearances were deceptive, and few records survive of the mass of under-cover negotiations that must have gone on between prospective candidates and their supporters. It is, however, possible to recognize certain quite distinct types of candidate-committee relationship, which give important clues to at least one aspect of the problem of where real power lay.

Many were, either through their promise or their achievements, "inevitable" candidates, chosen or supported almost spontaneously by men of all kinds. Such was, for instance, the successful "roads and bridges" member, who through assiduous cultivation of the material wants of his constituents, endeared himself, or made himself virtually indispensable to them. (1) In like manner, a parliamentarian of prestige might be assured of general support - especially in country areas - within hopeful electorates anxious to possess him as a kind of pet celebrity. Though perhaps as yet untried in politics and maybe even without decided political views, prominent men of proven ability in local affairs who were personally attractive to and popular with all classes were often widely regarded as being worthy of a place among the Colony's legislators.

(1) e.g., "Hoskins ... seems wonderfully strong here, in fact not only his old supporters but his opponents at the last election are equally in favour of him; he appears to have been good on 'roads and bridges.'" (Copeland to Parkes, re Tumut Election, 12.12.74, P.C. A.879. 65).
In a period in which great store was placed on the value of "independence" and personal capacity in members of Parliament, there were many possible varieties of spontaneous selection of this kind. Aspirants to a parliamentary career could themselves take the initiative, announce their candidacy, and gather a committee around them. More often they were invited to stand by committees formed either at public meetings or privately through the efforts of public-minded citizens.

A contrast was provided by candidates either supported or promoted by committees with strong biases in favour of particular interests. Such biases were rarely overt: occasionally special organisations might ostentatiously sponsor a candidate, but this was clearly a bad tactical move in an environment where it was customary to condemn "class" representation and to idealise spontaneous selection of the kind just discussed.

(1) The public were usually presented with a facade that was designed at least to play down the influences at work behind a candidate. This facade was, however, often belied merely by examination of the personnel of a committee, and it was an accepted fact that candidates frequently derived their chief support from special sections of the electorate. In the Riverina, for instance, it was common for squatters to "bring forward" and support one of their own class. (2) Similar

(1) See e.g., S.M.H. editorials on activities of the Workingmen's Defence Association, (25.10.77), and Selectors' Associations and "delegation." (7.11.77).

(2) There were constant reports of this in letters written by Riverina friends to Parkes. e.g., "The squatters are endeavouring to induce Mr. William Officer, squatter of 'Zan,' to stand." (G. Maunsell, Moama to Parkes, 13.10.77, P.G., A.921, 780).
tactics were employed here and elsewhere by farmers and selectors, though well-to-do townsmen or Sydney professional men had generally to be chosen because their limited means effectively prevented most selectors themselves from spending long periods in Sydney to attend Parliamentary sittings. (1) A strong tinge of mercantile and banking influence was usually to be found on the Committees of Sydney's merchant politicians while in other areas there were some members who were frankly the representatives of the mining interest. The financial difficulties of Sydney County Council produced in the 'seventies a crop of candidates whose principal object in entering Parliament was to secure a larger government grant for the city coffers. There can be no doubt, further, that sectarian interests and the major parliamentary factions had at their disposal, in a number of electorates, friends and agents who were prepared to organise Committees at short notice to support any candidate suggested to them. (2)

Pressure groups exerted their influence in ways other than through personal committees. Where organised, indeed,

(1) Typical members of this kind during the 'seventies and 'eighties were Wm. Affleck, (Storekeeper, Gundaroo), John Haynes, (Sydney, journalist), L. F. Heydon, (Sydney, Solicitor), A. Ross, (Physician, Molong).

(2) e.g. During the 1872 Election, a body known as the Protestant Political Association issued nomination orders from headquarters in Sydney to agents in country electorates. On March 2, e.g., the President, John Davies, wired to a Yass agent: "Please get James Pennell, Esq., nominated for Yass if you have no local candidate." A series of confidential telegrams of this kind were delivered to the wrong person, who exposed Davies' operations in the local newspaper. (Extract from Western Examiner, 24.2.72, in General Election, 1872, Newspaper cuttings, etc., Mitchell Library).

The activities of parliamentary factions in this direction are discussed in Chapter 6 below.
they appear to have found the simple technique of endorsing
selected candidates to be the most rewarding method of interference. It had the advantage of being an accepted practice, and
thus of requiring no complicated or costly indirect manoeuvring.
A body like the Public School League observed the manifestos of
candidates, issued lists of those whose attitude to the education
question was a satisfactory one in the light of its principles,
and ordered its members to vote accordingly. (1) Others, such
as the Licenced Victuallers' Association (2) and the Temperance
Societies, plied candidates with questionnaires and then endorsed
or condemned them according to the replies. Sectarian bodies
were less open in their activities, but perhaps even more for­
midable than other groups, since their political tenets were
simple and their followers servile.

An excellent picture of the electoral situation pro­
duced by the operations of these bodies was given in 1877 by the
Sydney Morning Herald, in an editorial deploiring contemporary
"degeneration" in the quality of politicians:

"... It is characteristic of the times that those
who know how elections are managed are inquiring
as to the candidates that the different great
organisations are disposed to favour. We have

(1) e.g., S.M.H., 8.12.74.
(2) e.g., Announcement of E. Scott, General Secretary: "The
attention of members, and the trade generally, is earnestly
directed to the fact that the time has arrived when efforts
should be made to secure just representation and the care of
their interests by returning to the Assembly only those who
are pledged for a favourable situation of questions affecting
them. The Council will cause test questions to be put to all
candidates, and invite the trade carefully to watch for the
replies, and then act as may seem best for their interests." (S.M.H., 7.12.74).
See also statement of L.V.A., president,
J. B. Oliffe, (himself subsequently a member of Parliament),
on activities of the Association's Council in "securing the
election of several candidates." (S.M.H., 31.10.77).
sectarian societies and political societies, and class organisations. We have Orange Societies, and we have St. Mary's which is an organisation in itself. We have the Temperance organisations; we have the Licensed Victuallers' Association; we have the Church Defence Associations; we have the Education League; we have the Working Men's Defence Associations; and we have the Free Selectors' Associations. Nothing is more natural than that people should combine to give effect to ideas that they hold in common; nor is this in itself a thing to be reproached. At the same time it has a bad effect so far forth as the quality of representatives is concerned, especially so long as the country is chopped up into constituencies, in which one or two of these organisations in certain combinations can carry the day. Every candidate has to consider his position with regard to each of these political clubs. It is useless to despise their strength and perhaps useless to attempt it without their assistance. Yet, no really free and independent candidate likes to confess that he is the mere nominee of any particular organisation, or of any two or three. He likes to feel that he has been selected in virtue of his individual merits - in virtue of his political reputation, and in virtue of his attachment to certain well defined principles. Yet if any man publishes his address simply resting on these things, he will probably find that it rests on a broken reed, and that to get elected he must condescend to court, or at any rate to avail himself of the services of people who can work the oracle. * (1)

The existence and power of bodies of these kinds were the products of a number of deep-rooted antagonisms within the Colony's society. The remarkable thing about these antagonisms was the consistency with which they operated, usually quite independently of changing political circumstances at the Parliamentary level. To this extent, the social composition of any given electorate placed a series of continuing and

(1) S.M.H., 12.10.77.
recognisable conditions upon the operations of electoral manipulators. (1) In practice, the only ways in which these conditions could be modified were by the exercise of personal magnetism or oratorical virtuosity by the candidate, or by playing up those local needs - like public works - which were common to all groups, and which tended to unify the interest of the electorate by setting it against that of the rest of the Colony.

The importance of local manipulators who thrived on such group prejudices was enhanced by the fact that elections were rarely fought over any recognisable general question. This was partly the result of the nature of the parliamentary struggle: the tactical manoeuvres of personal factions in a party-less wrangle for power were not calculated to produce national issues likely to override petty antagonism. Individual constituencies were thus left to work out for themselves what combinations of possible political issues were to dominate their

(1) Though assessable, the disposition of group power within any given electorate was a complex matter. An individual could belong at once to any number of the groups that were politically significant, according to his economic status, his religious convictions, his drinking habits, etc. He might thus be at once, say, a squatter, an opponent of land reform, a Protestant, a drinker, a secular educationist. Which of these roles would be dominant in any particular contest depended upon a complex of factors, such as the recent trend of legislation, the local historical and economic background, and even local clashes of personality. This complexity placed great demands on the skill and perception of manipulators. It was also an important influence in creating great variety in the electoral issues uppermost from constituency to constituency.
rather than to the past meant more than making an assessment of the personal capabilities of candidates; it also involved making some judgment on political issues about which the new legislators might soon be expected to be concerning themselves. And candidates supplied these in great profusion.

With a well organised "Public School League" operating in the metropolitan area, the education question was assuming a new importance. The League advocated reforms to make education completely "Free, Secular and Compulsory;" (1) and controversy had been fanned by the counter formation of a "Defence" Association. That hardy perennial, the Land question, featured in most manifestos. Railway extension, municipal reform (especially to expand the area under local government), and various developmental schemes (to improve internal water communication and ensure adequate water supplies to urban areas), were all matters of wide-spread concern. (2) A number of candidates broached new questions which were largely individual to them. A few, (like the merchants Stuart and Dibbs), demanded tariff revision to chop away the last of the Colony's import duties. Dibbs combined this extreme free tradism with an insistence on the need for reform in the Public Finances, and for drastic reductions in taxation. (3) At the same time, an important group of aldermanic gentlemen were pressing for increases in the

(1) Manifesto of Public School League, S.M.H., 8.12.74.
(2) Manifestos of Candidates. Samples, e.g., in S.M.H., 5-10.12.74.
(3) Speeches of Stuart and Dibbs. S.M.H., 5.12.74.
Government grant to the Corporation of the City of Sydney, which was in financial straits at this time. (1)

A novel element was introduced in the East Sydney Contest when the Trades and Labour Council announced the formation of a committee to support the candidacy of Angus Cameron. This man, a carpenter and joiner, declared himself to be "an earnest and bona fide advocate for the rights of labour." From their headquarters at the 'Swan with Two Necks' hostelry, his committee issued a policy statement which, as well as dealing with many of those questions finding a place in the programmes of other candidates, put Trades Union Legislation and the introduction of the eight hour system as the primary items. (2)

Meantime those interested in the drink question were active. A newly formed Licensed Victuallers' Association busily plied candidates with "test questions" to discover their attitudes to the debatable aspects of the liquor trade. (3) Temperance bodies provided counter propaganda, while many candidates themselves had strong opinions, which were independent of the prompting of such organisations, on matters such as licensing and local option.

Complication was not only the product of a multiplicity of issues. It also arose from differences in the emphasis given by candidates to particular items in their manifestos. This was

(1) e.g., W. G. Allen, (Glebe); Chas. Moore, (E. Sydney); G. Oakes, (E. Sydney); S.M.H., 5.12.74. R. Hill, (Canterbury), S.M.H., 23.12.74.
(2) S.M.H., 5.12.74.
(3) S.M.H., 7.12.74.
especially in the city electorates, principally a matter of personal preference or individual assessment of the temper of the voters. At times, however, the stress of local conditions was sufficient to make some issue of paramount importance for all candidates. In the Monaro and Queanbeyan electorates, for instance, where the clash of interest between large and small landholders was especially marked, a bitter controversy raged over the land question. (1) In other areas like Kiama, Illawarra, and Glebe, where sectarian feeling was strong, education became the chief point of political division. But in many country constituencies, strictly "political" questions were unimportant beside the desire for local favours from the central government. There was no dearth of candidates who, like the sitting member for East Macquarie, Cummings, rested their whole claim for support upon their capabilities in this direction. In his nomination speech, Cummings gave an exhaustive recital of the roads and bridges that he had secured for his district, adding that, in his opinion, it was the principal duty of a member of Parliament to "look after the interests of his constituents ... and after that he should look after anything in the shape of national questions." (3) Personal popularity was of importance in some contests. In a post election analysis of the voting,

(2) See declaration of Kiama poll, (S.M.H., 26.12.74), and S.M.H., editorial, 18.1.75.
(3) East Macquarie nomination. (S.M.H., 31.12.74).
the *Herald* drew attention to the number of cases where, irrespective of their attitudes to the Government, sitting members had been re-elected unopposed, adding:

"Nor is there anything in the accounts of the several elections to show that the successful candidates owed their unopposed elections to peculiarly explicit or emphatic enunciations of opinion upon the other two leading questions of the day - that is to say, upon the land laws, or upon public education. On the contrary, most of these hon. gentlemen have been supported and approved of by persons of all degrees and categories of opinion upon both questions, and the inevitable impression produced is that their personal and local popularity was so great as to discountenance opposition upon any grounds whatever, and that their success depended upon causes altogether irrespective of their political opinions." (1)

It was little wonder, in view of the complicated picture presented by elections such as this, that in recently elected Parliaments the debate on the Address in Reply generally included long and inconclusive wrangles about the mandates to be deduced from the results of the late poll, or that some of the political alignments that emerged once the business of the House began were rather confusing. Nor might one perceive, through observing the more obvious aspects of such electoral contests, that the parliamentary factions customarily made determined efforts, before the poll, to organise majorities in the new legislatures.

(1) *S.M.H.*, 181.75.
CHAPTER 6

ELECTORAL MANIPULATION BY THE PARLIAMENTARY FACTION

By the 'seventies, leaders of parliamentary factions had developed advanced - though unsystematised - methods of electoral interference in their own interest. The extent of this interference was not known to the public, since it was mostly conducted by private correspondence or personal negotiation. There remains, however, in Parkes' extant correspondence sufficient evidence of electoral wire-pulling by at least one faction to construct a good picture of the forms and direction it took.

As such wire-pulling was an important aspect of the parliamentary groupings of the period, and since its existence has hitherto passed unnoticed, it merits detailed examination. The activities of the Parkes faction in two sample elections - those of 1872 and 1874 - are accordingly discussed in the sections which follow, as a prelude to a general account of the intrusion of parliamentary factions into the constituencies.
1. ASPECTS OF THE ELECTION OF 1872:


In 1872, Parkes was fortunate in having Edward Butler as his follower. (1) This man brought more than the conventional political skills to the service of his chief. For he soon displayed great energy and capacity in electoral manipulation, using his influence with Roman Catholics to bring strength to Parkes from an unaccustomed source.

In the initial stages of the campaign, Butler led in jogging Parkes into action.

"It is time we began some organisation in East and West Sydney. Everybody's business is nobody's, and who fitter than you to begin? I look upon it that you will contest East Sydney yourself with the best men we can get for your colleagues. I have begun to-day to work for you with our people. I will not say yet with what results ... I have also been looking for support for Wearne, for West Sydney in case we cannot get a more acceptable man with as good a chance of electing him. I have also been trying to prevent a lot of fools bringing out O'Connor, and have got persons who have influence with him to persuade him to refuse to be brought out. So you see I'm not idle. What are you doing? I have written to a few places in the country asking support upon the one test whether the candidate is a ministerialist or an oppositionist - if the latter to support him no matter whether he is an Orangeman or a Papist. I expect in a few days to be able to do a great deal more. But I hear nobody stirring except our opponents and I am ill at ease." (2)

(1) See above, p. 90.
(2) Butler to Parkes. (P.C., A.872. 226).
Parkes answered the summons, and the work of watching and directing the election began. Butler kept his leader closely informed of his activities. From his letters, it is clear that, as the campaign progressed, he made a systematic attempt to canalise the Roman Catholic vote in Parkes' favour.

(1) For this purpose, he appears to have worked in conjunction with some pre-existing organised body, either of the laity or clergy of his church. Soon after his initial letter, for instance, he wrote informing Parkes that he had attended "a consultation of some consequence before the elections," adding that "the bewilderment of those with whom I have been acting is the want of candidates." Parkes himself would be acceptable as a candidate for East Sydney, provided he was accompanied by a suitable "bunch."

"They want no Roman Catholic," he continued, "but only fairly liberal men, and if one of them at least (already) had some popularity with the Catholics so much the better. In like manner they will support a bunch for West Sydney, including Wearne, unless there be a fourth man more acceptable than Wearne and having as good a chance."

(2) The same letter contained a detailed survey of country electorates and of possible candidates, as well as a statement of the kind of influence Butler had at his disposal.

(1) Butler was, unfortunately, extremely lax in dating his letters. Thus their correct sequence can only be established approximately by internal evidence.
(2) Butler to Parkes. (P.C., A.919. 610).
The upshot of all this is that I have come, and have been commissioned to come, for candidates to you. We cannot return the whole of them but I have arrangements made, or rather they were made for me, that in the Northern district I shall communicate with influential persons there and they will get a large amount of the Catholic support throughout the electorates for any person I recommend. In the Western district also they are waiting for opposition men. Will you say as soon as you can whether you can give me a list of men, and as for the Western District, I want the information for Dr. Quinn before he leaves town. (1)

A cloak of secrecy had to be kept over these activities for fear Parkes should lose the support of the militant Protestant movement. Both he and Butler were from time to time concerned lest significant Roman Catholic opinion should make any overt sign in his favour. Discreet enquiries, for example, at one stage enabled Butler to inform his leader that there was "no fear of the 'Freeman' coming out in support of you. I spoke to my brother to make sure." (2) On the eve of the Eastern Sydney election, Parkes received a note of good wishes from Butler, together with a final assurance that "our people are being instructed not to raise their sweet voices at the hustings in your favour for fear of giving a Roman Catholic look to the proceedings." (3) It is interesting to compare — as an indication of the cynical attitude of politicians to matters such

(1) Dr. Quinn was the Roman Catholic Bishop of Bathurst, who acted as Butler's chief agent in the West. He is mentioned on a number of occasions as a source of information regarding happenings in the Macquarie and neighbouring electorates, and made repeated requests to Butler for suitable candidates for the area. (Butler to Parkes. P.C., A 872. 217; A 919. 607. 637. 641).
(2) Butler to Parkes. (P.C., A 919. 610). "Freeman's Journal" was the leading Sydney periodical produced in the Roman Catholic interest.
(3) Butler to Parkes. (P.C., A 872. 224).
as these - the foregoing evidence of intrigue, with a letter Parkes wrote scarcely two months later to a Protestant clergyman. His object was to deny a current rumour "to the effect that I have in some secret or underhand way formed an alliance with or sought the support of the Roman Catholics." In the course of a self-righteous harangue on the "shame" that ought to be felt by those guilty of spreading such rumours, he declared:

"It is quite true, I believe, that many Catholics voted for me in the East Sydney election, but they did so, not from love of me, but in hostility to men who had used them and betrayed them. But I never took any step to secure their votes and nobody was more astonished than myself at their support." (1)

The care which kept Butler's operations secret in East Sydney does not appear to have been so effective in West Sydney, the stronghold of John Robertson. Butler - who detested Robertson - was fearful lest "in the second electorate of the Colony the greatest political scoundrel of the colony will go unopposed." (2) He accordingly began a series of moves designed to weaken Robertson and his followers, and to provide strong candidates - acceptable particularly to Catholics - to oppose them. Through his influence, he prevented his co-religionist, O'Connor, (a known Robertsonian), from "coming out." (3) He was less successful in finding his own candidates.

(2) Butler to Parkes. (P.C., A.872. 230).
(3) Butler to Parkes. (P.C., A.919. 651).
despite feverish letters to Parkes, in which the merits of numbers of men were discussed, he decided upon only one - Wearne - who could be considered suitable. (1) But, more serious, at the last moment word of his activities leaked out, with dire results. On the day of the poll, Butler reported with alarm that

"the John Davies's (2) section of the Orangemen -are in great numbers going to plump to-day for Robertson ... I fear he will get in and then he will by his old means be gathering a party around him again. His old - and young - scoundrels ought to be matched and put out." (3)

The "plumping" tactics of the Orangemen were disastrous to Parkes' interest. Wearne was elected but the three other successful candidates; (Robertson, Booth and Macintosh) were professed opponents of Parkes.

Butler's letters are not only important for the information they contain about sectarian influences in the election. They also record interesting examples of interference of other kinds, and frequently reveal the less obtrusive forces at work among voters. These things are to be seen, for instance, in

(1) Butler to Parkes. (P.C., A.919. 619; A.872. 230).
(2) John Davies - wealthy Sydney ironmonger, and a prominent leader of the Orangemen. A strong supporter of Robertson, and representative for East Sydney in 1874. Davies at this time was president of the 'Protestant Political Association,' a body which attempted to influence the Protestant vote in a similar way to that in which Butler dealt with the Catholic. (See above, p.169).
(3) Butler to Parkes. (P.C., A.919. 648). "Matching" involved interfering in country elections to provide opponents for Robertson's chief supporters. e.g., Butler mentioned Dillon, Eckford, and Garrett as particular men to be foiled. He claimed in this letter to have "settled" Dillon, while he had previously reported that he was "writing to persons in the Camden electorate to try and put a word in season against Garrett." (P.C., A.919. 651).
his correspondence with Parkes about the Western electorates of Carcoar, Bathurst, and East and West Macquarie.

Carcoar was among the electorates mentioned in an early letter as being without a favourable candidate, and Butler at first suggested James Rodd as a suitable man. (1) Subsequently he entered into correspondence on the matter with his brother-in-law, a resident of Carcoar. This gentleman, though "bewildered for a candidate," felt that it would be "uphill work for Rodd." "He says," wrote Butler, "that West, the local candidate is a brute as his father before him was and is, whom it is useless to pledge against the Ministry, for he would take the pledge and afterwards betray it." (2)

No strong candidate offered, however, and Butler's relative, though pressed by his friends to stand himself, was unable to do so through a lack of funds. (3) The only course left to him was to secure a pledge from West, despite the latter's unreliability. This, commented Butler somewhat dolefully to Parkes, "was the best that could be done under the circumstances." (4)

In the three electorates of East Macquarie, West Macquarie and Bathurst, the Parkes interest suffered a further

(1) Butler to Parkes. (P.C., A.919. 637). James Rodd, an auctioneer, had been first elected to Parliament in 1865, and had always been a staunch supporter of Parkes.
(2) Butler to Parkes. (P.C., A.919. 634). West was a local squatter.
(3) ibid.
(4) Butler to Parkes. (P.C., A.872. 283).
defeat. Dr. Quinn sent urgent summonses for candidates for East Macquarie early in the campaign, promising that the Roman Catholics would put out Cummings, the sitting (and a "local") member. At the same time, an influential Catholic land-owning family, the McPhillamys (1) were requesting a suitable opponent for the pro-Martin Webb (2) in West Macquarie. (3) Butler had a number of names to suggest - including the ubiquitous Rodd (4) - but J. G. L. Innes, who entered the lists for Bathurst, was the only 'big name' of the faction who could be spared. In the result, East Macquarie returned Martin himself (5) and Cummings, while the Martin supporters, Webb and Combes, were successful in West Macquarie and Bathurst respectively. Butler's analysis of the influences at work in these districts - based upon the reports of Dr. Quinn - is illuminating.

"Combes was carried in by the Wesleyan and the squatting interest ... Innes would certainly have been returned if he (had) been a little earlier in the field. Cummings and his agents had one story for the Protestants and another for the Catholics - both lies, but still most of the Catholics voted for Innes. Here again the combination of the Wesleyans and the squatters prevailed. The former usually are radical, and they will regret that this selfish clan should be using them through their prejudices." (6)

(1) The McPhillamys held extensive property, ("Engawea" and "Neurrea"), in the Wellington district.
(2) E. Webb, merchant and squatter, Bathurst. Of Webb and the censure vote that defeated the Martin Government in 1872, Butler wrote, "(he) would have come down to support Martin at the risk almost of his life if he could." (Butler to Parkes. P.C., A.919, 610).
(3) Butler to Parkes. (P.C., A.919, 637).
(5) Butler had anticipated this: "I am afraid Martin will slip in for West Macquarie," he wrote to Parkes, "it would be necessary to have a good man there present to oppose him." (Butler to Parkes. P.C., A.919, 607).
(6) Butler to Parkes. (P.C., A.919, 645).
His lateness was not Innes' only misfortune. He also lost "more than a sufficient number of votes in one place to return him owing to a lie circulated that he was an Orangeman. (But) he fought bravely and spent nearly £200 upon the election." Butler added bitterly; "the influence of the big squatters up there is indescribable." (1) Innes subsequently contested the Mudgee seat with success.

Butler himself had an easy campaign in his own constituency of Argyle (Southern Tablelands). The retiring Ministry had placed the Argyle election among the last, (2) and Butler left the early conduct of his campaign to his local committee, which was headed by "an intelligent farmer (he is an Orangeman who has always seconded my nomination for Argyle)," (3) and which contained "several influential men of various religious denominations." (4) A few days before the nomination he left Sydney to conduct a short campaign in his electorate, informing Parkes that, "after looking after the elections of so many other people, it is time to look after my own." (5) He discovered his position to be sound. The only difficulty he encountered was in Taralga, where the "settlers" objected to his "not supporting a tax on wheat." Butler informed them he would not "budge an inch," and "so satisfied them on the whole..."
that they passed an enthusiastic vote in my favour." (1) Apparently his known hostility to the squatters stood him in good stead with such men. The opposition he faced was "only a nominal one" (2) even from the outset, and on nomination day his opponent retired, leaving Butler to be elected unopposed. (3)

(ii) The Hunter Electorates.

Butler was by no means the only politician active in promoting the interest of Parkes in the constituencies. Among a number of others so engaged, perhaps the most interesting was the group which operated in the Hunter area. Here, in a well defined geographic region, a chain of electorates stretched up the valley from Newcastle to the Liverpool Range. Good communications and the natural inter-dependence of the valley communities created especially good facilities for influential local politicians and their agents to keep abreast of the trends of feeling and the movement of candidates throughout the area, and to interfere where it seemed profitable.

The informal liaison which, by 1872, had thus developed among the political supporters of Parkes in the Hunter Valley meant that they were able to assist one another during elections, and provided a service whereby Parkes was kept informed of local events, while his supporters could readily

(1) Butler to Parkes. (P.C., A.872. 242).
(2) Ibid.
(3) Goulburn Herald, 6.3.72. (Newspaper cuttings - General Election, 1872, Mitchell Library).
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appeal to him for help.

The most prominent of the Hunter Valley group was a Maitland stock agent, Stephen Scholey. Himself a politician, Scholey appears to have wielded considerable local influence. Though somewhat illiterate, he was intelligent and energetic, always a valuable source of advice and information for political friends new to the area. (1) An enthusiastic campaigner, he spared himself no pains to aid friends contesting neighbouring electorates. A typical communication from Scholey to Parkes may be noted, to begin a short account of the Hunter campaign of 1872. On the 28th February, he reported having been "out at the Sugar Loafe with J. F. Burns on Monday night," adding:

"he will have all the votes there I believe his return his sure I left there Tuesday morning took the Train for Singleton and worked all day for Brown and voted for him he his opposed by Mr. Bowman a supporter of Martin. I believe that Brown will be returned ... for the Upper Hunter Dr. Creed stands well against White ... I shall go down and help Loyde my son his doing all he can for him he will have plenty to do but still I think he will be returned from what I can hear." (2)

All these men were ultimately successful, though some did not at first share Scholey's optimism. J. F. Burns had already written to Parkes about Lloyd's weak position in Newcastle, adding "I trust you are doing what you can for him." He himself, though pleased with his prospects in the Lower Hunter, was

---

(1) Cooper, for instance, when Parkes' political agent, called on Scholey for advice while en route for the more northerly electorates on the Liverpool Plains, obtaining "three or four letters of introduction" to important men in that region. (Cooper to Parkes, 7.3.72. P.C. A.920. 176).

(2) Scholey to Parkes, 28.2.72. (P.C. A.909. 21). In this letter Scholey reports his own victory in the East Maitland electorate, despite the confidence of his opponent Dodds, who "was so sure (of winning) that he had a ... band of music and dinner prepared for Saturday night."
fearful of the apathy of many electors, and concerned at the expense that would be involved in bringing them to the poll. He asked for £10 towards this cost. Meantime he was not inactive on behalf of others. Having already gone to West Maitland to help Lee, (1) the Parkes man in the contest there, he intended to stay in the electorate "until Lee's election is over, as I know I can aid him a good deal and his friends want me to speak for him at some of his meetings." (2) Lee, though confident of success, had in the previous week suggested to Parkes that he would "materially aid the cause of the opposition by being in the Hunter district," and had offered accommodation, ("if you do not mind the necessary annoyances of a house full of children"), should he decide to come. (3) Robert Wisdom had informed Parkes a day earlier that "Lee thinks you would do him service by coming up to Maitland should Martin (as is rumoured) oppose him." (4) But the fear was groundless; Martin stood for East Macquarie and Parkes did not have to make the trip.

The efforts of the "Eckford Party" (5) to bring out one Levy, (6) in opposition to Lee, caused further alarm.

(1) Benjamin Lee. Maitland merchant, for many years chairman of Hunter River Steam Navigation Co.
(2) J. F. Burns to Parkes, 26.2.72.
(3) Benjamin Lee to Parkes, 20.2.72. (P.C., A.892, 382).
(4) Wisdom to Parkes, 19.2.72. (P.C., A.926, 96).
(5) Lee to Parkes, 20.2.72. Eckford, a publican, appears to have organised the fight on behalf of Martin and Robertson in the Hunter districts. He is referred to by Burns (Burns-Parkes, 26.2.72) and by Scholey (Scholey-Parkes, 28.2.72) as being the chief enemy in the area.
(6) L. W. Levy. A storekeeper at Tamworth.
The odds against this were, however, great: Lee himself did not consider Levy "capable of such conduct," he having always been "a warm supporter of mine - in Politics, and on the present appeal, our views are identical." (1) Wisdom was more practical, and advised Parkes to "see Samuel and get him to choke Levy off, as Lee is one of our best men." (2) Since the only apparent connection between Levy and Samuel was that both men were prominent Jews, (3) Wisdom was thus suggesting a resort to that sort of pressure upon a co-religionist by a leading faction member which had already proved so useful in the work of Butler among the Roman Catholics.

In the Upper Hunter a Scone medical man, Dr. Creed, succeeded in defeating White, "a much esteemed and very wealthy pastoralist." (4) Creed does not appear to have been directly assisted by the Parkes group working in the area, though they accepted his election as a blow to the Martin faction. Unknown to Creed himself, however, Parkes had been in communication with friends in the electorate, and was clearly aware of the factors involved in the struggle there. Knowing White to be a supporter of Martin, Parkes had done a little to stir local antagonism to his election. J. P. Abbott, for instance, wrote from Murrurundi:

(1) Lee to Parkes, 20.2.72.
(2) Wisdom to Parkes.
(4) J. M. Creed, My Recollections, p. 70.
"I am in receipt of yours relative to the Upper Hunter election and agree with you that family influence should not be allowed to be dominant in any electorate, and the feeling in this has hitherto been that there was no use in any respectable man opposing the White family, hence for some time we have had men opposed to them who were without private or political character and each defeat of such opponents by the White family has made the latter more dominant than ever. Dr. Creed has indeed fought a good battle and one for which he deserves the thanks at all events of the liberals in this part." (1)

Creed had been sponsored by a combination of those hostile to squatters as such and of the White family's enemies among squatters themselves, (2) and his campaign was based on a demand for legislation to promote settlement by small landholders. (3) He was thus "brought out" neither by Parkes nor by the district Parkes politicians; his candidature, and his election, were the products of purely local conditions. In his case, the interests of the faction were served by accepting him as the best candidate available and leaving his election to take its course.

The situation was similar in the neighbouring electorate of Patrick's Plains, where W. C. Browne - another independent candidate - was accepted as the best man available considering local circumstances, and aided by Scholey in his campaign. Here the opinion of the regional magnates prevailed

(1) J. P. Abbott to Parkes, 2.3.72. (P.C., A, 919, 61).
(2) J. P. Abbott, though a solicitor, had extensive pastoral interests.
    Creed's Committee paid practically all his expenses.
    (Creed, op. cit., p. 73).
(3) Creed, op. cit., p. 70. The White family provided one of the classic cases of land monopoly for those whose chief political tenet was small settlement.
over that of Parkes, who had advised Burns to put forward a
strong man for the faction.

"You must have overlooked the circumstances that
W. C. Browne who is in the field for the Plains
is a staunch opponent of the Government and
appears to have fair prospects of success," wrote
Burns to his leader, "so that I could not have
brought out another candidate." (1)

Burns was, on the other hand, peevish about the loss of Morpeth,
the only electorate in the area which failed to return a Parkes
supporter:

"We could have carried the Morpeth election if we
had had a good man - Keating was not the man to
represent us and I wrote to Butler to that
effect long before the election came off." (2)

It was scarcely fair, however, to blame Butler for
miscalculation in the choice of the best candidate; Lee
attributed the failure to local "bungling," and explained to
Parkes that he (Lee) would have been certain of election in
Morpeth had he not held aloof because Wisdom had led him to
believe that he was to be nominated. (3) Wisdom explained,
for his part, that through illness he had been "unequal to the
task" of campaigning, and though not happy about Keating's
chances, had been forced to leave the field in his favour. (4)

(1) J. F. Burns to Parkes, 26.2.72.
(2) Ibid.
(3) Lee to Parkes, 20.2.72.
(4) Wisdom to Parkes, 19.2.72.
The Case of W. H. Cooper

The behind-the-scenes story of the elections of 1872 and 1874 would be incomplete without special reference to the work of W. H. Cooper on behalf of Parkes. No other case of a politician of the period possessing a full time "agent" of Cooper's kind has been discovered, but many aspects of this relationship, taken singly, provide apt illustrations of the methods by which the interests of factions were normally advanced in the shifting world of personal politics.

When he first became associated with Parkes, Cooper was a reporter on the Sydney Morning Herald. He was at this time described by Parkes as "a gentleman well-known for his literary talents," (1) and had received some notice as a dramatist. (2) His letters to Parkes display his literary merits to the full; they are perhaps the most attractive of all those to be found in the extant collections of correspondence received by the old politician. Cooper had a natural gift for precise observation and reporting, and Parkes seized upon the opportunity of using him as a travelling agent.

Cooper first approached Parkes in January, 1871, when, incensed by the policy of the Martin Government, he wrote in bitter terms of the "degradation of our institutions by the

(1) Letter of introduction written for Cooper to an unnamed agent in the Shoalhaven electorate, 28.2.72. (P.C.A.915.201).

(2) Cooper's plays had a short vogue in Sydney and E. W. O'Sullivan recalls how, in Hobart during the 'sixties "Several Australian dramas from the pen of Mr. Walter Cooper were ... produced at the Theatre Royal." (From Colony to Commonwealth, p. 82).
traitors who have seized upon the reins of power - the treacherous brigands whose hearts are dead to all ambition save that of acquiring without deserving the rewards which properly belong to merit." Imploring Parkes to lead in ousting these men, he pledged his assistance in extravagant terms:

"To aid in that work, I will do anything that is consistent with honour. No toil will be too severe for me - no personal consideration shall hold me back. I will be your faithful servant in this labour - and though my efforts may be enfeebled by lack of ability they shall be strengthened by earnestness." (1)

Parkes replied on the following day, expressing friendliness and appreciation for Cooper's flattering remarks, and agreeing on the need for a "crusade" for parliamentary purity. (2) The young reporter received his hero's epistle with joy, and hastened to pen another appeal to Parkes to "forget his personal hurts," "come to the fore," and "save the country." (3) The friendship developed rapidly in the months that followed. By February, 1872, Cooper was writing to Parkes for assistance in preparing a public lecture he intended to give on the political situation. In a postscript he added:

"You may command my services in the elections in any way you may think them useful." (4)

A little over a month later, Cooper was touring the Northern

---

(1) Cooper to Parkes, 27.1.71. (P.C., A.878. 36).
(2) Parkes to Cooper, 28.1.71. (P.C., A.878. 26).
(3) Cooper to Parkes, 1.2.71. (P.C., A.910. 171).
(4) Cooper to Parkes, 5.2.72. (P.C., A.910. 175).
Goldfields and Liverpool Plains Electorates, as the paid agent of Parkes and his followers. (1)

Cooper's task was to contact friendly local residents, make a judgment about the best candidates to be supported, organise meetings, and keep Parkes posted on local political feeling. From Tamworth, for instance, he reported:

"I arrived here at 4 this morning and lost no time in commencing operations. Having three or four letters of introduction obtained from Mr. Scholey at East Maitland, I hunted up the parties to whom they were addressed and set myself to discover how the land lay. I soon came to the conclusion that Wilson (2) had not the ghost of a chance. Robertson who held two meetings among the diggers - one at Nundle and the other at Bowling Alley Point - was told in unmistakeable language that his honourable colleague would not suit ... Opinions are divided as to whether Bennett (who is at present away from Tamworth and whom I have not yet seen) or Wallace has the best chance. The balance inclines to Bennett. Rusden cannot go in but will they say, do good service in taking all the votes that might otherwise go to Wilson. The squatters will vote for Rusden in preference to Wilson ... I intend opening fire here to-night - and to-morrow I shall, by Wallace's advice, go up to Bowling Alley Point and Nundle ... There is not much excitement about the election but the town is full of country people and rural turfites who are gathered together by reason of the local races ... The local paper is in a condition of strict neutrality owing to its editor having been drunk and incapable for the last fortnight. As he has been the last day or two upon a course of soda water and repentance, his friends and admirers expect him to come out very strong to-morrow." (3)
His opponents were well aware of Cooper's identity and his mission. "Robertson hangs out on the other side of the street and glares at me," he wrote at the end of his letter. But even Robertson could not have anticipated the damage he was to suffer at Cooper's hands before the evening was out. Its events were vividly recounted to his chief by Cooper in a long postscript added at midnight. He told how he and his henchmen had successfully disrupted a meeting organised in Wilson's interest, had taken it over, and had been finally dispersed, along with the assembled multitude when, "in the midst of one of the speeches, Robertson's people put out the lights." But by this time he had made his assessment of the local situation, and was ready to suggest a plan of action:

"Bennett is beyond doubt the man to be supported. Wallace's candidature is as I have discussed a sham only intended to split votes against Bennett and so let Wilson in. I was at first inclined to go with Wallace, but was very cautious and having now found out exactly how the land lies I shall go in strong for Bennett. I think Bennett will get in but he seems a most unmitigated muff. He is not only ignorant and dull, but he is penniless. He has not a sixpence. He can't employ any scrutineers or put out any bills - or do anything requiring the smallest expenditure. He has not a single Electoral Roll. I have telegraphed to Hicks to send some up. It would be expedient to provide a scrutineer at each of the principal polling places - can I do so? Let me know by telegraph. The expense will be trifling. Try and prevent Wallace receiving any aid from Sydney if you can. He is a traitor in the camp. He is hand and glove with Robertson." (1)

(1) ibid.
Cooper moved from place to place in the Electorate, organising meetings and stirring up the enemies of Wilson. He was particularly successful in the little mining settlements dotted around on the edge of the hills of the Liverpool Plains. From Bowling Alley Point he wrote in explanation of the technique he was using to capture the diggers' vote.

"I have had a good deal of talk with the village politicians of the place and impressed upon them the necessity of selecting a candidate and concentrating their strength in his favour. They are going to hold a meeting here to-night at which the candidate is to be selected. Similar meetings are to be held at Nundle, Dungowan Creek, Hanging Rock, and The Folly, and it is resolved that the electors of these places shall all vote according to the decision of the majority. All the electors of these five places will vote in one way - the minority giving in to the majority." (1)

In the adjacent Northern Goldfields electorate, the pro-Parkes Rodd had been for some time canvassing on his own behalf. He now joined forces with Cooper, and the two toured the New England area widely, focussing their attention upon mining townships, whose inhabitants they sought to convert to concentrated voting of the kind engineered by Cooper in places like Bowling Alley Point. The eventual election of both Bennett and Rodd was, without doubt, testimony to the effectiveness of campaigning of this kind.

Once the election was over, Cooper - who had

(1) Cooper to Parkes, 9.3.72. (P.C., A.878. 21).
(2) Cooper (from Muswellbrook) to Parkes, 14.3.72. (P.C., A.878. 37).
apparently abandoned his position on the Herald — was left without a job. Parkes' offer of a post in the Civil Service was rejected. In a charming letter he told Parkes of his aversion to becoming "the mere hanger-on of some member of Parliament," and of his dreams of a noble literary or political career, "with a niche in Fame's Temple at the end thereof." But:

"a wife and family wake me up to the responsibilities of this life. I am aroused to the necessity of meeting the demands of the baker — and I find that visions of even the most celestial brightness are wholly unproductive of butchers' meat. You will guess now the point of this rigmarole. It is that if you intend establishing a 'Hansard' and think me a competent shorthand writer, I shall be glad of the situation." (1)

But Parkes' Hansard scheme was unsuccessful, and Cooper's request could not be complied with. How he supported himself during the next year or so remains a mystery. But whatever the fluctuations of his material fortunes, he did not abandon his dreams. In November, 1873, he announced himself as a candidate for the East Macquarie seat, in the place of Sir James Martin who had been elevated to the Chief Justiceship.

This was a bold move, and Cooper with his irrepressibility and sense of the dramatic, was not the man to play down its implications.

(1) Cooper to Parkes, 13.5.72. (P.C., A.920. 183).
"I suppose you fancy me a rash man for rushing into this contest," he wrote to Parkes, "and that you have but small hopes of my success .... I am in the midst of your enemies' stronghold, in the place where until now you have been most unpopular - at a time when one section of the people are bitterly opposed to you: (1) - and in spite of all this I shall win. You can score this seat to the Government and let me tell you it will be no small matter. People won't say that the country is agst. you if this constituency returns a member who avows himself your supporter." (2)

In the contest which followed Cooper used every device at his command to manipulate a majority for himself. He invited Parkes to "see my address which I enclose," adding, with disarming frankness, "I had great trouble in putting it into such a shape as to enable me to trim upon it." (3)

"Trimming" involved treading the dangerous ground of compromise between the strong - and sometimes antagonistic - groups among electors, or emphasising different items of his programme according to the kind of audience he happened to be facing. Cooper was not long in discovering the important sections of the electorate to be wooed. In this regard his own judgment was sharpened, and to some degree directed, by Suttor, the most important local Parkesian, whom he had, characteristically,

(1) i.e., those - and especially Roman Catholics - who considered that Parkes had treated Butler shabbily over the Chief Justiceship.
(2) Cooper to Parkes, 21.11.730. (P.C., A.878, 42). Cooper was perhaps over-dramatising the hostility to Parkes in this district. Webb, for instance, had already informed Parkes that his appointment of Martin, the local idol, "as Chief Justice, has made you many friends here." (E. Webb of Bathurst to Parkes. P.C., A.913, 107).
(3) ibid.
contacted for advice upon his arrival in the area. (1)

Sectarian antagonism being particularly strong, Cooper had to consider both Roman Catholics and Protestants as distinct and important groups, while others, such as miners and selectors also merited separate attention. Winning over these people involved far more than the mere construction and manipulation of a political programme. Some assessment was necessary of the special support likely to be gained by his opponents, some attempt had to be made to secure the favour of influential local men, and in the light of these things, the resources of the faction at headquarters were to be used.

Cooper was at first faced by two opponents, Rae and Rotten. The former he considered the most dangerous, since he was locally known to have "the dead weight of the Catholic interest in his favour." (2) On the other hand, "the Orange-men have had orders to go for Rotten." (3) As the campaign progressed, Rae retired, thus giving Cooper the chance of securing Roman Catholic votes - a chance which he clinched by winning over to his side the powerful influence of the

(1) Cooper to Parkes, 20.11.73. (P.C., A.878. 83). Unknown to Cooper, Suttor had already assured Parkes of his support for a favourable candidate. "Neither myself or any of my friends are likely to come out for East Macquarie. So should a good man come forward ... I have no doubt that the general bulk of the Electors would be disposed to return a candidate favourable to the Government." F. B. Suttor to Parkes. (P.C., A.908. 108).
(2) Cooper to Parkes, 20.11.73.
(3) Cooper to Parkes, 28.11.73. (P.C., A.878. 4).
McPhillamy family. (1) But he did not depend only upon his own efforts in such manoeuvres. He pointed out to Parkes that he could win "if you stick to me," adding, "send what letters you can ... People suspect that I am not with the Government, and anything which will convince them to the contrary will be of service." (2) Of one influential local man, Webb, Cooper was uncertain, and he begged Parkes to send him "a line in my favour." Every letter contained urgent appeals for messages from Wearne, Farnell, or Hurley, (prominent in Sydney Orange Lodges and followers of Parkes), which might turn the Orangemen away from Rotten and into Cooper's interest. "They are dangerous," he declared, "and if you can make them safe through Wearne I beg of you to do so. Roseby has been at work against us by letter, but Wearne can turn them - so could Hurley." (3) Similar means were sought to influence miners in the outlying districts: "Did you remember to get a letter from James Vickery to his manager at Palmer's Oakey? If not, have it sent at once. It will get me 30 or 40 votes." (4).

---

(1) John and Charles McPhillamy canvassed for Cooper and the former actually seconded his nomination (Cooper to Parkes, 20, 21.11.73). Cooper himself appears to have had some connection with Roman Catholicism; it is significant that both Wesleyans ("The Wesleyans are not in my favour") and Orangemen were opposed to him in this contest, at a time when the Butler case ought to have aroused their enthusiasm for a professed government supporter. Some years later the leading Sydney Orange Journal referred to "that profoundly learned and newly fledged counsel who rejoices in the name Walter Cooper, Esq.," as the chief offender in certain legal "Popish Paltry Persecutions in Sydney." (The Orangemen and Protestant Catholic, 15.4.78).

(2) Cooper to Parkes, 20.11.73.
(3) Cooper to Parkes, 28.11.73.
(4) ibid.
In the event, Cooper was returned with a large majority. The *Sydney Morning Herald* hailed his election as a victory for the Government, especially as he had won a seat which had formerly been the stronghold of Sir James Martin. Further, it was claimed that:

"East Macquarie does not seem disposed to avenge the wrongs of Mr. Butler. (1) Notwithstanding Mr. Parkes' persistent disclaimer, that gentleman insists on believing that he was sacrificed to the threatened hostility of the Orange Party, and it would be idle to ignore the fact that the same opinion is largely held out of doors. We all know how ready sectaries are to be suspicious or revengeful, and Mr. Butler's "people" are pretty strong in East Macquarie. Yet they have sent in Mr. Cooper to strengthen the Government of Mr. Parkes. Gratitude as well as revenge enters into politics and political gratitude is a lively sense of favours to come!" (2)

The *Herald's* view of Cooper's election as an expression of gratitude for Martin's elevation, and of hope for future Government concessions, was an ingenious one, with perhaps just a grain of truth in it. But, as has been seen, the real key to the success lay in the disposition - depending on local and personal factors - of sectarian forces around particular candidates, and in Cooper's facility for manipulating the weapons at his disposal in the light of these special circumstances.

---

(1) Martin's appointment as Chief Justice had been the immediate cause of Butler's desertion of Parkes.

(2) *S.M.H.*, 4.12.73.
2. **ASPECTS OF THE ELECTION OF 1874:**

(i) **Cooper and the East Sydney and Hunter Elections.**

Parkes faced the electoral campaign of 1874 without the advantage of Butler's comradeship, the ambitious barrister having joined the Robertsonian camp after the affair of the Chief Justiceship. The enthusiasm, influence and organising ability of this man must have been a great gain for Robertson, and a corresponding loss to Parkes. But the latter still had a coterie of loyal followers - not least among them the starry-eyed Cooper - and a great deal of behind-the-scenes activity took place on behalf of the faction. (1)

Cooper's position was of special interest. In the short period during which he had been in Parliament - less than twelve months - he had marked himself out as a young man to be reckoned with. He soon showed that he possessed an outstanding oratorical gift, though on occasion he could be persuasively lucid and logical. (2) It was scarcely surprising that, as a promising newcomer, he was chosen to move the Address-in-Reply on the opening of the Fourth Session of Parliament. (3) His one failing was, however, his quick temper and sharp tongue, which involved him in verbal clashes that were unusually numerous for so young a member. It might have been

---

(1) Over forty letters relating to this election survive in the Mitchell Library's Parkes Collection alone.
(2) He made, e.g., by far the best speech in support of a resolution in the Assembly in favour of payment of members, based on the proposition that "without payment of members, universal suffrage is a nullity." (S.M.H., 18.3.74).
(3) S.M.H., 4.11.74.
anticipated that such a loyal follower of Parkes would designate the leader of the crossbenchers "the premier of the nincompoops," (1) but it was a more serious matter when he made public attacks on the venerable ex-Chief Justice, Sir Alfred Stephen. However, Cooper's natural gentlemanliness saved him from the effects of this indiscretion. In a letter thanking Parkes for having "brought before the Assembly my refutation of an utterly unfounded slander," Stephen gives a glimpse of the side of Cooper's nature which endeared him to so many.

"I am desirous of telling you a pleasing incident of yesterday evening - I mention it, not for repetition, but as a good trait in Mr. Cooper's character, and indeed one that is honourable to him. He asked Wigram Allen (2) to introduce me to him, for the express purpose - as he said - of expressing his regret at the occurrence in the House. Mr. Cooper was accordingly introduced - and did then so express himself - and in the most unqualified terms. When one considers how difficult it is for most men to retract and apologise for an error, it will not be thought strange that I speak of the act as I have done." (3)

There was, however, no withdrawal from another serious mistake into which Cooper's hot temper led him. Shortly after his arrival in the Assembly he became involved in an angry debate on a motion by the representative of a squatting constituency, (T. Robertson, The Hume), requesting that a return be compiled showing the number of conditional purchases of land being paid for, with the individual sums

(1) George Oakes. (S.M.H. 13.2.74).
(2) The Speaker.
(3) Sir Alfred Stephen to Parkes, 1.10.74. (P.C. A.905.336).
outstanding. When some representatives objected to this as an attempt to "parade selectors throughout the whole colony as defaulters, and ... deprive them of all opportunity of getting credit in the districts in which they resided," (1) the cry of "class interests" was raised, and in a heated speech Cooper declared that:

"He had seen a good deal of the free selection in this country, and his opinion was that for every one of the yeomen class to be found among the selectors, they would find ten whose only stock in trade was a bullet mould and a harness cask. He was not at all afraid to express that opinion although he was well aware that there were some members of the House who were extremely tender on the free selectors because they were afraid ... that they would oust them from their seats at the next election... He maintained that hon. members should do justice to the whole country and not favour a particular class by giving them special advantages." (2)

The Assembly recoiled with horror at these words, and member after member stood up to denounce what one of them called "the most malignant libel ever uttered in the House." (3) Cooper never lived down the effects of this unfortunate speech: not only had he dared to attack the class to whom most New South Welshmen paid verbal homage, but he had couched his criticism in vivid terms not easily forgotten. With the "bullet mould and harness cask," he ended his political career almost at its beginning.

This was not yet apparent, however, at the beginning of the 1874 electoral campaign. Cooper confidently announced himself as a candidate for the premier constituency of East Sydney, and was placed among the chosen members of the ministerial bunch. At the side of Parkes himself, he began with his usual vigour the task of wooing the electors. Together they undertook the editing and production of a regular propaganda sheet, *The Representative*, to be distributed first within the metropolitan area, and later in selected country districts. This periodical, if we can judge from the reactions of its victims, was a most effective one. At the Central Cumberland nomination, for instance, John Lackey protested bitterly against the "slanders" he had suffered in Parkes' contributions to *The Representative*, "which had been circulated gratuitously throughout the electorate." He "should have thought," he added, "that Mr. Parkes, the Colonial Secretary, who received £2000 a year of the people's money, would have found the performance of the duties of his office sufficient for him to have attended to without seeking to libel him (Mr. Lackey), by writing articles for an insignificant publication." (1) Earlier, Cooper himself had written from Raymond Terrace, where, as a candidate for the Lower Hunter seat, he was campaigning against Jacob, that "the Reps. have done great good, especially the 'Jacob's Ladder' one." (2)

(1) S.M.H., 5.1.75.
(2) Cooper to Parkes, 29.12.74. (P.C., A.878. 71).
On nomination day, Jacob, in a bitter denunciation of Cooper as the "man Friday" of the Government, called the electors' attention to the way in which he (Jacob) had been vilified in a paper called the Representative, the articles in which were written by Mr. Cooper and Mr. Parkes."

In the minds both of politicians and of electors, the contest in East Sydney always had a special significance. Traditionally the first constituency to return its members at each election, it was in addition of very mixed population, to some extent a "representative" electorate. These elements of timing and of social composition made it customary for press and politicians to seize upon the voting results and analyse them in search of probable trends for the election as a whole. Thus, for purposes of prestige, it was important for Parkes - who moreover liked to think of East Sydney as his own special preserve - to see declared followers elected there. A ministerial "bunch" was accordingly organised, so that, where they desired it, electors could concentrate their voting power in favour of the Government. With Parkes at its head, this "bunch" included Charles Moore, (Sydney auctioneer and alderman), Edward Flood, (wealthy pastoralist and an old friend of Parkes) and Cooper. The latter's inclusion was unavoidable once he had announced his candidature, since his first act had been to issue a manifesto proclaiming, as its chief theme, the virtue of political loyalty:
"I shall be, as I always have been, a consistent supporter of the present Administration ... I do not regard the so-called 'independent member' as the best servant of the Country. Men of fixed opinions and resolute patriotism do not sit upon the cross benches. Those sanctuaries of spurious value are for the most part chosen by men of wavering minds and questionable fidelity, who are always prepared for speedy transit to either side of the House. He who would be useful in public life can do little by himself; but linked to the party that is advancing the welfare of the country he may do much. He should choose cautiously, and not forsake lightly. I chose my party long before the Premier attained his present position; I am with that party now." (1)

The foreseeable balance of forces in the electorate was such that Parkes and his followers could be expected to meet with stern competition from at least three other candidates, each of whom had special claims on some section of the voting population. These were the ironmonger John Davies, doyen of the Orange Lodges, and a strong supporter of the Public School League's demands for increased secularisation of education; the carpenter, Angus Cameron, chosen representative of the workingmen, and a champion of secular education; and Alexander Stuart, wealthy Sydney merchant, "a gentleman highly and justly respected in the Colony, possessing much influence in the city, and commanding the confidence of commercial men." (2) As the principal champion of the status quo in education, Stuart appeared most likely to capture the important "ecclesiastical" (i.e., Anglican and Roman Catholic) vote.

(1) S.M.H., 5.12.72.
(2) S.M.H., Editorial on East Sydney election, 8.12.74. This editorial made a careful analysis of the chances of each candidate, the votes they were likely to capture, etc.
Parkes was discomforted at the prospect of such opposition, a feeling which he betrayed to his closer associates. G. A. Lloyd, for instance, wrote several letters from Newcastle, (1) in answer to the "very gloomy" (2) notes he had received from his leader, urging that "we must fight like noble Britons." Lloyd's letters reveal that considerable misgiving had been felt about the wisdom of sponsoring Cooper's candidature.

"I can very readily understand," he wrote on December 6th, "that the intelligent men of East Sydney may not care to let you drag in a young man like Cooper when they have before them a man like Alexander Stuart. I should not be at all sorry if Cooper were wisely to retire and not expose you to the risk of defeat in his case. You might then do as Sutherland advised, bunch three and leave the one place for the Electors to put in whom they please. You will have quite drag enough upon your wheels with Moore and Flood neither of whom are (sic) very popular and if you weigh yourself too heavily you may find yourself not an easy winner." (3)

Similar sentiments were voiced somewhat more tersely by Stephen Scholey, who observed, in a note from Maitland, "I hear that you have injured yourself with adding Cooper to your train." (4)

It was not long before Cooper, "in consideration of what has appeared to me the interests of my party," withdrew from the contest. (5) He followed this action with a public

(2) Lloyd to Parkes, 6.12.74.
(3) Ibid.
(4) Scholey to Parkes, 7.12.74. (P.C., A.909. 27).
(5) S.M.H. 7.12.74.
address, in which he explained that:

"he retired because he thought that, by remaining as one of the four Government candidates, he would injure the cause of the people in the contest, which had assumed a somewhat angry and bitter character. He saw that the bunching of four candidates would be a declaration of antagonism against the eight others, each one of whom would therefore have got his friends to plump for him, and the result might have been that even Mr. Parkes himself would have been rejected." (1)

In the light of the advice received by Parkes and the - by contemporary standards - unusual nature of Cooper's conception of "party" fidelity, it requires little imagination to guess the real reason for the young man's sudden withdrawal. External pressure, just as much as his own conclusions about the possible reactions of voters to the ministerial four, was undoubtedly responsible. The acute Herald commentators saw this even at the time, duly remarked upon it, and added observations which illuminate both the position of Stuart as an individual, and the nature of contemporary arrangements between candidate and faction.

"A significance ... attaches to the operation which the 'bunch' underwent almost at the last moment before the day of nomination. Whether Mr. Cooper's retirement was voluntary ... or due ... to suggestions from without, those may enquire who are interested in the question. Mr. Cooper's retirement, from whatever cause, left a vacant place in the ministerial ticket, and whether that place might or might not be filled with the name of Mr. Alexander Stuart is a point for the electors to determine as best they may ... Will Mr. Stuart

(1) S.M.H., 14.12.74
"bring to bear all those forces (at his command) on the side of the Ministry without receiving as a quid pro quo the support of ministerial influence? And will ministerial influence be given in support of Mr. Stuart except on some expectation, expressed, implied, or hoped for, that there will be reciprocity." (1)

No satisfactory answers can be given to these questions. Though Parkes' failure to fill the vacancy in his "bunch" might suggest an "implied" support for Stuart, (2) the response on the part of the latter cannot be too lightly assumed. For, once the new House met, Stuart gave a generally independent support to the newly formed Robertson government, and eventually entered the Cabinet itself. (3)

The Herald's questions pointedly indicated the subtlety of the relationship between a candidate of Stuart's kind and the parliamentary faction. It was through an exchange of innuendoes which neither excluded, nor too bluntly requested, an alliance, that the faction members sought the blessing of his allegiance. A pledge would have been a crudity for such a man. Between this kind of relationship and the unusual fidelity of Cooper there lay a wide range of possible degrees of loyalty. With the exception of the chief members of the faction - in this case, for instance, Lloyd, Innes, Piddington, Scholey - all the candidates from whom support was sought stood at some indeterminant point within the

(1) S.M.H., 8.12.72.
(2) Lloyd, for instance, wrote telling Parkes that, "I will be down on Tuesday night ready to get every vote I can control on Wednesday, when I think you will see the Poll as follows - Parkes, Stuart, Davies, Flood." (Lloyd to Parkes, 6.12.72. P.C., 4.892. 72).
(3) Stuart became Colonial Treasurer in Feb., 1876.
range. Each was an individual case, and hence to be studied, wooed, supported or rejected according to circumstances whose variation in time and place excluded the possibility of any set formula for managing elections in favour of a given group. Hence, although it is just to speak of "organisation" of the electorate by faction interests, it has to be remembered that this in no way suggests the existence of anything like the modern party "machine."

Although Parkes himself was returned, the East Sydney election could not be considered a victory for him.

"With all his influence ... and his knowledge of electioneering tactics, he was unable to carry in any one of his 'tail.' Though the seat may be regarded therefore as safe for himself, East Sydney is clearly not a pocket borough, even for the cleverest and most influential politician." (1)

But it was a miscalculation in tactics, rather than a lack of personal prestige, that explained this failure. The group prejudices of voters, and not the factional allegiance of candidates were the deciding factors in the contest, and Parkes had not secured for his "bunch" the best men to take advantage of these prejudices. Of those who were successful, Macintosh "united the corporation and the ecclesiastical vote," Stuart "combined the ecclesiastical vote with a large mercantile support," and Davies had been "too long identified with the Orange Party not to be sure of its support, and as at the last moment he seems to have been adopted as one of the four whom the League regarded as most in accordance with its views, this double interest secured

(1) S.M.H. 10.12.74.
his election. As might have been expected, Davies and Macintosh reacted to the implied hostility of Parkes' exclusion of them from his "bunch" by supporting Robertson in the new Parliament.

Cooper meantime stood unsuccessfully for West Sydney, and then travelled up to the Hunter in search of a seat to contest. Here, armed with letters from Parkes, he contacted the local faction managers and was soon involved in the series of manoeuvres that usually characterised elections in the region.

Parkes was already well-informed of the position in the various Hunter Valley electorates. Lloyd and Scholey had written telling him of the candidates available for each seat, of their chances, and of their personal campaigns. Lloyd, himself, after fighting a stiff battle secured election for Newcastle, while Scholey was returned safely for East Maitland. The greatest concern was felt for the West Maitland seat. Scholey appealed to Parkes to send a strong candidate from Sydney, and was joined in his request by Lee, and by Gorrick, a Maitland solicitor who was a member of the inner circle of

(1) ibid.
(2) Cooper to Parkes, 18.12.74. (P.C. A.878.10).
(4) Lloyd's chief opponent was Stephen, a mine manager, who "opened two public polls with an abundant supply of beer, and brought a contingent of his men down from Stockton - though none of them had a vote in the Newcastle contest - to make the show of hands strong at the nomination." (Lloyd to Parkes, 8.12.74).
local organisers. (1) It appeared to these men that neither of the existing candidates (Hamilton and Cohen) was worth supporting, and that a new-comer might defeat them both. They were fully described to Parkes by Gorrick. Hamilton, he explained, was a phrenologist, universally conceded to be "an unprincipled windbag," who had already twice been a candidate for West Maitland, only to be "ignominiously rejected" on each occasion. Cohen was "a young barrister of no standing or influence either at the Bar or in the country ... inexperienced, wanting in decision of character, and in his endeavour to please everybody, fails to please any but his personal acquaintances, and they do not number very many."

Gorrick himself wanted to see J. N. Brunker (2) - "a universal favourite" - stand in the Parkes interest. Although Brunker, through business commitments, was disinclined to enter Parliament, Gorrick felt sure that "when all else fails ... he will come to the rescue." (3) With Lee and Scholey, Gorrick had favoured Parkes' Secretary for Lands, J. S. Farnell, as a candidate, but this wish was made impossible by Farnell's

(1) Gorrick's name frequently appears in the letters received by Parkes from the Hunter. Lee, e.g., mentions having sent a number of telegrams "through Mr. Gorrick," while it was to Gorrick that Cooper brought his letters of introduction from Parkes (Lee to Parkes, 14.12.74. P.C. A.893. 121; Cooper to Parkes, 18.12.74. A.878. 10).

(2) James Nixon Brunker. Influential Maitland stock and station agent, and subsequently a prominent politician. Brunker had for many years been a supporter of Parkes. As early as 1863, for instance, he had attempted to sponsor Parkes as a candidate for East Maitland (Brunker to Parkes, 3.8.63. P.C. A.873. 186).

(3) Gorrick to Parkes, 14.12.74. (P.C. A.886. 133).
election for St. Leonards. (1) Parkes suggested that Flood (defeated for East Sydney) or T. S. Mort should be induced to stand, but neither of these men was willing, and, though favoured by Lee, they were considered unsuitable by Brunker. (2) Lee added his voice to Gorrick's plea that Parkes should apply pressure to Brunker.

"If you could induce Brunker to consent he is certain of election and if he only holds (the seat) for a few months that will be of service to your party. If Parramatta was lost by bad management this seat will be lost to you from want of management. I would urge your not leaving it to fate, but press Brunker who will I think stand by you at this juncture." (3)

But Lee's hopes were futile - on the very day on which he wrote these words to Parkes, Brunker sent notes to Lloyd and Parkes re-affirming his inability to contest the election and requesting that a candidate be sent from Sydney. (4)

Several days later Cooper came to Maitland, but he was too late to fill the breach. For by this time Joseph Eckford, defeated at the Wollombi, (5) had been promoted by the Robertsonian supporters as a new candidate.

"Another chance has been thrown away here," wrote Cooper on his arrival. "Had I come up a day earlier, or even sent up a telegram, I could have gone in easily, but Eckford was brought up

(1) Farnell had been defeated in his "home" constituency of Parramatta through "plumping" by the supporters of his two antagonists (see above, p.159).
(2) Lee to Parkes, 14.12.74. (P.C.A.893. 121); Brunker to Parkes, 14.12.74. (P.C.A.873. 173).
(3) Lee to Parkes, 14.12.74. (P.C.A.893. 121).
(5) Lee to Parkes, 14.12.74. "Eckford, if defeated for the Wollombi, is sure to try his luck here."
"from Sydney by Riley and of course his entering the contest reduced my chances as he split up the support which I should have got." (1)

Being thus prevented from advancing the interest of the faction by contesting the election himself, Cooper took the next best step, by pledging Cohen, who became the successful candidate.

In announcing this to Parkes, Cooper wrote:

"Cohen is an intelligent fellow, far superior to any of the other candidates, and he pledged himself to me that he would take his seat on the Government benches and support you. Still, I doubt whether he has any strong love for the Ministry. One thing he can't retreat from his word, as the telegram I sent you yesterday was sent in his presence, and he gave me permission to convey to you his pledge of support." (2)

Meantime Cooper had been preparing to contest another seat. Scholey and Gorrick advised him to choose the Lower Hunter, though he himself would have preferred the Hunter itself, whose sitting member, Burns, had deserted Parkes in the

(1) The favour with which Cooper was regarded by Roman Catholics has already been remarked, and it appears that it was this support that Cooper here assumes he would have received. Gorrick, in subsequently reporting Eckford's defeat wrote to Parkes: "Eckford was brought out at the last moment under the 'Green Flag,' but the 'Harp of Erin' has been silenced." (Gorrick to Parkes, 22.12.74. P.C. A.836. 123).

(2) Cooper to Parkes, 21.12.74. (P.C. 4878. 67). Cooper's assessment of Cohen was at variance with that of Lee. His remarks on the nomination show this also, in that Cohen is favourably contrasted with his rivals: "The nomination here was a curious business - and I don't suppose such a collection of curiosities were ever seen in one group as were seen on the platform to-day. Cohen made a good speech - Hamilton is evidently insane - Brookes babbled as usual - Farthing is 'very inferior copper' indeed - and the immortal Joe (Eckford) I need not say, expectorated with all his wanted power." (Cooper to Parkes, 18.12.74). Hamilton and Brookes were candidates nominated at the last moment, whose appearance represented, in Gorrick's opinion, "an attempt ... to degrade the liberty given by our Constitution by nominating men who if they had their deserts would be precluded from even having an opportunity of recording their votes." (Gorrick to Parkes, 22.12.74).
previous Parliament. (1) Burns was unpopular with the miners and with the Roman Catholics, and Cooper felt sure he could secure the support of both these groups. Brunker drove him through the electorate to make enquiries, however, and he finally decided that he would have more chance in the Lower Hunter. (2)

Here he faced the formidable opposition of A. H. Jacob, a local magistrate and ex-farmer, and a skilled campaigner. Cooper—as usual—was optimistic and set to work with a will. In four long letters he recorded vividly days and nights spent in the saddle, travelling around the electorate canvassing and addressing meetings. (3) Brunker reported that Cooper "fought the battle manfully, and could do no more," adding with some admiration, "he is not afraid of work—not yet of his enemies." (4) The young man himself snapped back viciously even at Parkes when the latter dared to suggest that he might have exerted himself a little more.

"You ought to know that, whatever my faults may be, idleness is not one of them, and that having accepted a challenge I don't spare any pains to secure a victory." (5)

---

(1) Scholey had already informed Parkes that Burns was fairly safe, "though some of his friends dos (sic) not like his conduct to your Ministrye (sic)." (Scholey to Parkes, 14.12.74).

(2) Cooper to Parkes, 18.12.74. (P.C. A.878. 10).


(4) Brunker to Parkes, 5.1.75. (P.C. A.873. 194).

(5) Cooper to Parkes, 29.12.74.
Parkes had a special interest, however, in seeing that everything possible was done, and might have been forgiven for showing some concern. For he was having Cooper's candidature financed from Sydney. The sum involved was apparently fairly large: Cooper at first requested £50 for current expenses, as well as another £20 to pay bills still outstanding from his West Sydney venture. (1) After this money had been provided, he still asked for more, adding, "I shall spend much, but I hope you will not see me run down for want of a few pounds." (2) His hopes were not vain - every need was provided. (3)

Finance was not the only aid sought from Sydney. Papers and political information of various kinds were requested. On several occasions, having heard that new candidates were likely to come up from Sydney, Cooper pleaded with Parkes to use his influence to detain them, lest they should endanger his chances by splitting the available votes. (4) In his letter of 21st December he asked Parkes to "get something done with Eales and Bolding and Charles Barnett on my behalf." These were absentee landlords: of Eales, for instance, he later wrote:

"Wisdom ... says that if Eales can be induced to come up and talk to his tenants the victory is certain. Brunker says the same thing. I telegraphed to you about Eales, and both Wisdom and Dr. West telegraphed to Eales himself." (5)

(1) Cooper to Parkes, 21.12.74.
(2) Cooper to Parkes, 28.12.74.
(3) Cooper to Parkes, 29.12.74.
(4) e.g., Thornton (Cooper to Parkes, 21.12.74), Campbell (Cooper to Parkes, 28.12.74).
(5) Cooper to Parkes, 29.12.74.
Parkes was meantime keeping local friends stirred up; Gorrick, for example, wrote on 22 December that he was

"sorry my influence is limited in the Lower Hunter Electorate, (though) I have a few friends in Morpeth who have promised 'to do all they can' for Mr. Cooper." (1)

But the odds against Cooper's success were heavy. The "bullet mould and harness cask" speech put him at a disadvantage among selectors (2) especially in a struggle against an ex-farmer. He again faced the hostility of the Orange movement, (3) while he lost even the Roman Catholic vote. "If I could get the Roman Catholic interest, nothing could keep me out, but Jacob is resorting to all kinds of meanness to get (it)," he wrote to Parkes. (4) He soon discovered that this weakness had been aggravated by carelessness on his own part: "The priest here is ... favourable to Jacob and is hurt because I have not waited upon him." (5)

On the hustings, Cooper made a courageous speech in which - amid great uproar - he admitted the error of his much-publicised attack on the free selectors.

(1) P.C. A. 886. 123.
(2) The "bullet mould and harness cask seems to tell against him everywhere" (Gorrick to Parkes, 22.12.74). After Cooper's defeat, Brunker wrote: "He must content himself for a little and let the scandal respecting the harness cask and bullet mould wear off. This took a great many votes from him - in fact had this not been against him he would have beaten Jacob easily." (Brunker to Parkes, 5.1.75).
(3) "The 'Protestant Standard' the organ of Orangeism - is everlastingly attempting to bring him into disfavour." (Gorrick to Parkes, 22.12.74).
(4) 28.12.74.
(5) 29.12.74.
"He would not shelter himself under any miserable excuses; he did not say he had been misrepresented with regard to what he had said about the free selectors, but he was there to express his regret for what he had said. Better men than he had made foolish speeches before." (1)

But it was too late to relent. Jacob was returned and with this defeat, Cooper's career as a politician ended. But, irrepressible as ever, he wrote informing Parkes of

"the political decease of one of your most faithful followers - Walter H. Cooper - who expired yesterday at Raymond Terrace after a severe but somewhat lingering illness." ... The disease "which has brought about this melancholy result," he added, "first showed itself in Sydney, and has been styled the 'Bullet Mould Fever.'" ... Three causes are stated as having brought about Cooper's death. First the prayers of the Holy Roman Catholic Church were not offered up for him. Second, bribes of all kinds were given to his followers and they were, vulgarly speaking, 'choked off' in various ways: Third, the statement that Cooper was against the Free Selectors and wouldn't allow a poor man to earn a crust aggravated his disease. I don't think the first two causes need be thought of: the last was the really fatal one. Cooper himself struggled hard against his fate. He strove night and day to counteract the poison so insidiously spread, and in that outer world from whence he now beholds the conflicts of his former companions, he consoles himself doubtless with the thought that he left no stone unstruck in the effort to secure a place among them." (2)

(ii) Some Other Contests.

It is not possible to consider here the many interesting contests that took place in other electorates in 1874.

Each was an individual struggle, and could only be examined as

(1) S.M.H., 31.12.74.
(2) Cooper to Parkes, 5.1.75. (P.C., A.878. 62).
such. A number are, however, deserving of brief outline as samples, on the one hand, of the kind of interference which was undertaken by the parliamentary faction, and, on the other, of the mixture of personal and social pressures which were decisive in particular constituencies.

Argyle was, as has been seen, the stronghold of Edward Butler, who by 1874 was a bitter enemy of Parkes. It was thus with joy that the latter received a long letter, written on December 14, from one John Wearne, a Goulburn storekeeper, requesting his aid in providing a candidate to oppose Butler. Wearne claimed to have influence with the local farmers who "all say that Butler has done nothing," and practically guaranteed the return of any influential nominee, adding:

"All he need do is promise just what is wanted roads, bridges and the Educational question is a rather divided one here. Your policy will suit first rate." (1)

Butler's local enemies had earlier chosen a Goulburn merchant, William Davies, as their champion, but he had withdrawn from the contest. This, Wearne considered, was an act of treachery, and clearly the result of intrigue with Butler. (2)

The culprit was, however, a personal friend and a supporter of Parkes, and when the latter had decided upon a possible

---

(1) John Wearne to Parkes, 14.12.74. (P.C. A.913. 417). Wearne added in a postscript, "If you propose one (i.e., a candidate) and let me know I will quickly send word to the head men Farmers and all about." 

(2) ibid. Of Davies, Wearne said "he has bridged us, sold his birthright." Parkes did not, at any stage of the lengthy correspondence that followed, inform Wearne of his friendship with Davies. In his last letter to Parkes Wearne was still confused about this matter: "I was much surprised at Mr. Davies' frequency of using your name." (Wearne to Parkes, 24.12.74. P.C. A.913. 139).
opponent for Butler, he wrote informing Davies as well as Wearne. The man chosen was one of the faction's foremost members, John Hurley, a wealthy and popular mine owner. (1) Davies left no doubt of his loyalty in the reply he sent to Parkes, though his remarks had an enigmatic air about them.

"Upon receiving your note I felt very sorry that I had not sooner known of Mr. Hurley's coming out for Argyle. I have wired you as follows: 'cannot actively interfere but will help candidate named. Will have hard fight. Late in the field but has a chance.' If Mr. Hurley thinks there is in this any inducement he should lose no time in issuing his address ... Butler is working hard, but I should certainly have beaten him. I hope you will have a working majority in the new House." (2)

Wearne was, for his part, highly delighted at the proposal.

"Many up here know Mr. Hurley," he wrote, "besides he is a Church of England man, and my calculations are these that the Wesleyan, Presbyterian and all Disenters (sic) are sure to vote for him and he would split the Church vote. Whatever you may think Butler through his paper has made it a religious contest." (3)

This note reported that a start had already been made in campaigning for Hurley: posters and pamphlets were still needed, but a "squib" had been inserted in the Goulburn Herald requesting electors to refrain from pledging their support for existing candidates, and canvassing was under way.

This excitement was, however, premature. Parkes had written to Hurley suggesting that he contest Argyle, (4) and

(1) Hurley was one of the original owners of Hill End Mine.
(4) "As yet I have had no word from Mr. Hurley who is in Wellington. I have written and telegraphed to him and he will probably reply to-night or Monday morning." Parkes to Wearne, 19.12.74. (P.C., A.915. 309).
feeling confident that this would be possible, had informed Davies and Wearne without awaiting a reply. But Hurley had meantime been in the Wellington district and decided to stand for the local seat. To Parkes he wrote regretfully that "I should like to contest against Paddy B., but I'm sure that I'm on a safe course here." (1) Parkes lost no time in contacting Wearne.

"I wrote to Mr. Hurley and received his reply. He has received a warm support in Wellington and has determined to go to the poll in that electorate. Indeed he is just the man when he puts his hand to the plough, not to turn aside from his mark. So it is of no use to think of Mr. Hurley.

"The name that occurs to me now as best is that of James Pemmell. This gentleman is to some extent known in the district. He is a man of unblemished character who can speak to the purpose. He is also a man of great activity.

"Mr. Pemmell is sound as far as I regard members opinions. If you think he would do, let me know by wire tomorrow morning. I believe I could induce him to come up by train at once. He objects to spending more than £100 to £150." (2)

On hearing the news, Davies agreed that "Mr. Hurley acts wisely not to chance Argyle, (as) Butler is working and many of my friends have gone over to him since I retired." He made no mention of Pemmell, having decided that further opposition to Butler would be fruitless. (3) But Wearne

(3) Davies to Parkes, 22.12.74. (P.C., A.882. 238).
thought otherwise.

"... I have spoken to many interested in the district some of whom know Mr. Pemmell and they speak in high terms of him and believe he will go in. Please get him to come as soon as possible. Mr. Stevenson will have all arrangements ready to take him to the country... Butler and Co. have so stired (sic) up the mud that our side if I may so term it by that I mean most of the Protestants wont look at him and will vote for any person 'in opposition to him'... We have gone to work tonight. We have an advertisement that Mr. Pemmell is coming forward and representing some of his good qualities - also we have ordered 200 posters also to be done tonight... so we have committed ourselves." (1)

Then began a period of uneasiness and frustration. On December 23, Wearne anxiously wrote again to Parkes, appealing to him to apply pressure to Pemmell, and drawing attention to the need for the latter to appear as soon as possible in person.

"(Though) I believe he will go in by a majority it would be better if he could come up and drive around to the little towns. You see sir many of the Farmers know Mr. Pemmell also many of the Gold and Copper miners. I have written to him with this - explained every thing that I can think of... I dont think it would be very expensive for the country people use their own horses and conveyances and it cannot cost much otherwise now." (2)

Three days later Parkes replied that his overtures to Pemmell had been unsuccessful, and suggested that Wearne approach one of several other candidates who were yet available, adding,

(2) Wearne to Parkes, 23.12.74. (P.C. A.913. 150).
"If I can advise you I should be glad but of course I can take no active part." (1) This depressing news was confirmed by a letter from Pemmell's daughter "wherein she stated in her Father's absence that she was deputed to open and answer his letters and she stated to three invitations No! No!! No!!! in red ink." (2) It was by now too late to sponsor anyone else; December 27 was the day of the nomination, and though a final telegram was sent by Pemmell's intending proposer, he "got no answer." (3) Butler was thus elected without opposition. But Wearne, though the intrigue and hard work he and his friends had carried out were rendered fruitless, was not utterly crushed. He closed his correspondence with Parkes on a cheerful note.

"... I firmly believe if Mr. Pemmell had consented he would have gone in - notwithstanding Jerry. Butler's slurs I tell you sir they were all frightened he never pushed the Electorate before and now it is not by the voice of the people but by a fluke, of course that's no matter he is in - one thing I assure you that all their speeches has not weakened your government in the opinions (sic) of the people ... I assure you sir whatever has been done on my part has been done in sincerity and if it has failed it has shook them up a bit and I trust will be better next time, and with all your faults long may you reign." (4)

(1) Parkes to Wearne, 26.12.74. (P.C., A.915, 326). It is important to notice that the need for secrecy was a paramount consideration in all these negotiations. At one stage, through the treachery of someone in Goulburn, Parkes' letter of Dec. 21 fell into Butler's hands. He was able to make great capital out of it (Wearne to Parkes, 28.12.74). The letter in question is itself endorsed in pencil, in a hand other than Parkes': "This is the smuggled note Mr. William Teece will explain he swears it never left him after he took it ... I have not acted a Traitor so help me God." (P.C., A.915, 321).

(2) Wearne to Parkes, 28.12.74. (P.C., A.913, 139).

(3) Ibid. This was "Mr. Whiting who came to Goulburn yesterday - from Crookwell as he said on purpose to propose Mr. Pemmell." (4) Ibid.
The unsuccessful attempt to outmanoeuvre Butler in Argyle was the most complicated of the sets of negotiations in which Parkes was involved during this election. In a number of other cases existing candidates or their agents sought his aid in terms similar to the following:

"I am a candidate for election as member for Central Cumberland in the Legislative Assembly. I believe you can aid me with your influence amongst your friends in the Electorate, and if you approve of my political principles and are willing to give me the benefit of your assistance I shall feel obliged." (1)

The writer, C. E. Jeanneret, was subsequently elected and became one of Parkes' consistent supporters. Influence of this kind was sought by Henry Copeland, in the Southern Goldfields, (2) R. R. C. Robertson, in Glen Innes, (3) and P. L. C. Shepherd in the Nepean. The latter felt it bad strategy, however, to appear openly as a supporter of Parkes. "I have had a good deal to contend with parties hostile to your government," he wrote, "I therefore thought it better to say as little as possible on the hustings on the subject of support." (4)

In other cases, the initiative came from Parkes or his lieutenants. Lloyd, for instance, was delegated to sound out one William Barker, an influential Sydney solicitor, who wrote briefly:

(2) Copeland to Parkes, 12.12.74. (P.C., A.879. 65).
(3) Robertson to Parkes, 10.12.74. (P.C., A.904. 255).
"only a word. Received your letter on Saturday evening. I say let the present ministry go on and prosper, and any votes that I may be able to influence will be used to that end. I am quite certain that any change will not be for the better." (1)

Two important South Coast identities, John Biggar, a Wollongong auctioneer, and James Colley, (2) of Kiama, were contacted by Parkes himself. Both provided much useful information about prospects in their areas, and through Biggar Parkes was able to secure a virtual pledge of support from the successful candidate for the Illawarra seat. The stages by which this occurred, and the nature of the struggle that took place in the electorate, are clearly reflected in three letters Biggar wrote to Parkes during December, 1874. (3) The first, written on December 4 and marked "Private," contained an acknowledgement of Parkes' approaches, and a brief account of local electoral conditions.

"Yours of yesterday is received in the spirit of confidence intimated and you are right in supposing I am friendly to your government. Mr. S. W. Gray of Kiama is to be invited by requisition to become a candidate for Illawarra. From our private interviews I consider he is bound to accept the position. He will combine the leading members of the railway, (4) school league and Orange bodies in the electorate as his strong supporters and his return is nearly sure; of course the R.C.'s and a few good people of the C.E. Defence will oppose him ... If Mr. Gray is returned I think he will give you a general independent support." (5)

(1) Barker to Lloyd, 21.12.74. (P.C., A.873, 232)
(2) Colley to Parkes, 19.12.74. (P.C., A.878, 187)
(3) Biggar to Parkes, 4.12.74, 15.12.74, 22.12.74.
   (P.C., A.874, 80, 124, 87)
(4) i.e., a "Railway League," which existed at this time to agitate for the construction of a railway from Sydney to the South Coast.
(5) Biggar to Parkes, 4.12.74.
On December 15, Biggar sent Parkes a further assurance of Gray's favourable opinion of the Government, though he could only promise "effective support while you keep to the policy that the public have a good right to look for from you." (1) This was ambiguous, but the best that could be done, and Parkes had to content himself with it. The futility of attempting to interfere was amply demonstrated by the sectarian tangle which developed once the contest began. At least on Biggar's account - which was naturally not altogether an objective one - the local cross currents arising from the issue of state aid to Education almost beggared description. Everything hinged around an attempt by interested parties to unite Roman Catholics and extreme Anglicans in defence of denominational education. Biggar's report of the results is amusing and instructive.

"Mr. Gray was brought out by a very largely signed requisition - the R.C.'s tried to join some of the extreme defence C. England people - but between these two bodies they were unable to get a candidate to suit the Church of England folks - the Catholics then pressed Mr. Lysaght to come forward - he did so and the Church party (i.e. Church of England) would not vote for a Catholic and then made cause with the R.C. priest and forced Evans out as a candidate. The priests ordered Lysaght to retire in favour of Evans - but he refused and a large number of his co-religionists sided with him and for the first time in my recollection we have the very satisfactory position of the R.C. flock being nearly divided one part being the willing tools of the priests - the other part

(1) Biggar to Parkes, 15.12.74.
"siding with their lay brother Lysaght. It became so clear that Gray was strong enough to beat both of the other candidates ... that Evan's Protestant supporters became frightened that Lysaght would get in ... and insisted that he (Evans) should withdraw. Evans being last in the field he was nominated last and when he came to address the electors he at once withdrew to Lysaght's extreme horror. The priest's party will all go for Gray and will visit poor Lysaght's disobedience to the R.C. church with the utmost severity and will do all in their power to serve him out and bring him into disgrace ... Mr. Gray must now be returned as Lysaght can only secure the votes of the R.C.'s who go in opposition to the priest and a few low-minded Protestants."

Biggar then added, somewhat disconsolately:

"I think we ought to do all in our power to restore Lysaght for his courage in braving the displeasure of his connections - if more Catholics followed his example that disgrace to our social relations the 'ecclesiastical vote' would soon become impolitic."

Whether this analysis justly represented the real sources of his strength or not, Gray was elected, and Parkes, with little effort on his own part, secured a conditional supporter.

(1) Biggar to Parkes, 22.12.74. (P.C. A.874. 87).
The contests discussed in the foregoing sections provide ample testimony that in 1872 and 1874 the activity of the Parkes faction in the electoral field was widespread and determined enough to be thought of as a rudimentary form of electoral organisation. The beginnings of such practices probably dated back almost to the institution of Responsible Government. It is certain that they were in operation as early as 1858. In that year, for example, Parkes wrote to his colleague, W. C. Windeyer:

"... I wonder whether many men will be forthcoming at the general election. It is really impossible to forecast the character of the new House. What with the changes in the electoral divisions and the great addition of numbers, the little personal parties that have hitherto existed will be all sixes and sevens. The present ministers will, of course, do their utmost to supply constituencies with ministerial candidates but they will be puzzled to get any infallible test for trying the ministerial quality." (1)

Of the same election, he commented at a later date:

"We must bear in mind that to do anything of value we must consider the general election as a whole, and place our men - I am speaking hypothetically - so as to secure as large a force as possible in the House." (2)

As will be seen, there is abundant evidence that "organisation" of the kind which was apparent by the beginning of the 'seventies was commonly practiced throughout that decade and during the 'eighties.

(1) Parkes to W. C. Windeyer, 25.11.58. (Windeyer family papers).
(2) Parkes to W. C. Windeyer, 1.12.58. (Windeyer family papers).
Electoral organisation by parliamentary factions during this period was significant for a number of reasons. Though it was natural that political leaders should try to manipulate the struggle in the constituencies in such a way as to secure a parliamentary majority to themselves, the lack of political division on principle and of party-type electoral machinery, combined with the bewildering variations in the conflict from one area to another, might have been expected to render their activities ineffective. This was not the case, but the above circumstances forced the adoption of techniques depending upon personal - and usually secret - contact. Hence the scope and significance of intrusion by parliamentary factions into the electoral situation were largely unknown to the contemporary public, and, through a paucity of written records to bear witness to their existence, have been overlooked by subsequent observers. Parkes' correspondence, however, leaves little doubt that the political leaders of the period accepted the view that electoral interference was not only practicable, but one of the keys to parliamentary success.

Much light is in addition shed upon the nature of the faction by observing it in action within the constituencies. The great variations in the electoral struggle, and the consequent opportunism imposed upon those whose task it was to reduce this chaos to the order of a parliamentary group, go far to explain the importance of personal loyalty as a cohesive force within the faction, to illuminate many of the
methods used to hold factions together within Parliament, and to emphasize the unlikelihood of factions, as such, representing any one interest group.

Finally, it was in its approach to the electorate that the parliamentary faction had its closest connections with the political parties that emerged at the end of the 'eighties. Its methods may have been crude, but many of them were capable of systematisation once conditions were ripe for the institution of permanent electoral machinery. More important, their exercise was accustoming a number of politicians and political agents to the idea of electoral interference, and training them in the required techniques. It was thus hardly surprising that, as soon as powerful incentives and potent rallying cries appeared, interested men could rapidly construct electoral organisations which proved capable of forcing existing personal parliamentary factions into the mould of a party system.

A number of examples of interference by the Parkes faction in the elections of 1872 and 1874 have already been examined. In view of the significance of such interference, attention has to be paid to some of its chief features, as demonstrated both in these and in other elections during the period.

(i) **The Electoral Agent**

In the absence of established electoral machinery, contact between faction leaders and the electorates depended
upon the existence of individuals, or agents, acquainted with local circumstances, who might act as intermediaries. The term "agent" must in this case be given a very wide interpretation, to permit it to encompass persons whose functions ranged from that of Walter Cooper, who was for a time engaged as full-time campaigner in Parkes' interest, to that of a man like William Barker, who in particular circumstances was prepared to exert his personal influence temporarily in the politician's favour. (1)

Between these two extremes were to be found men of varying loyalty, subjection and influence, but all had in common the fact that they provided an instrumentality through which, by devious means, a faction leader might hope to secure the election of candidates likely to support him in parliament.

Most commonly, in country electorates, the agent was a man of intelligence, of some local consequence, and often in a position which gave him special facilities for acquiring information and spreading propaganda by personal contact. The motives of such agents in advancing the interest of their chosen political leader varied: they might entertain a genuine admiration for him or be on terms of personal friendship with him; they might see him as the most likely of possible champions for some cause dear to their hearts. Parkes, for instance, could rely upon a large group of such men. Typical examples were Cassin, a Mudgee clerk; Maunsell, Police Magistrate for Moama; Mayger and Barrett, country newspaper editors of Deniliquin and Dubbo; Biggar and

(1) See above, p. 226.
Plunkett, auctioneers at Wollongong and Gulgong; Whereat, Tenterfield miller; Colley and Manby, of Kiama and Bega respectively. Each of these men must be credited with having been, in varying degrees, admirers of Parkes as a statesman, and convinced that, if in power, his gifts might be exercised to the benefit of the colony at large. Their correspondence usually betrayed, however, additional and more particular reasons for their allegiance. Cassin — for many years Parkes' chief agent in the Mudgee district — naturally favoured a leader who — at least by repute — shared his fear of the political influence of Roman Catholics. (1) The same was true of Biggar and Colley. (2) Maunsell, Mayger and Barrett were all antagonistic to the squatters in their respective districts and hopeful that Parkes might repay their loyalty by introducing measures for land reform. (3) Recompense of a different sort was hoped for by Plunkett, for whom the chief consideration was that "there are local requirements to be attended to." (4) Manby's attachment to Parkes began when he attempted to secure the influence of the latter in providing a candidate who might oust the sitting member in his area, Henry Clarke. Since Clarke was a political opponent of Parkes,

(1) Cassin to Parkes, 17.2.72, 9.8.73, 15.12.75. (P.C. A.879, 136, 249, 63). Also Robertson to Parkes, 16.10.85. (P.C. A.902, 26).
(3) Maunsell to Parkes, 18.3.72, 13.10.77. (P.C. A.925; A.921, 780). Mayger to Parkes, 18.2.69, 19.5.72, 29.6.72, 10.1.74. (P.C. A.925, 651; A.895, 222; A.897, 123, 135). Barrett to Parkes, 8.10.77, 13.11.77. (P.C. A.922, 267, 269).
(4) Plunkett to Parkes, 7.10.76. (P.C. A.926, 529).
this was a case in which mutual detestation of an individual—though for different reasons—forged a bond between political agent and leader. (1)

Parkes also had a large number of personal friends and political acquaintances who through their knowledge of and influence in particular areas could usually be relied upon to serve his interest. These people differed from the kind of agent just discussed in that they were less inclined to be subordinate to the will of faction headquarters in Sydney. Two such men were the selector-pastoralist J. E. Kelly, of Trangie, and the Queanbeyan squatter, L. F. De Salis. Parkes carried out, by letter, a number of lengthy political discussions with both. Kelly, though a close personal friend, anxious to assist where he could, was not prepared to place his attachment to Parkes above any local cause that he considered just. (2) Similarly, De Salis reveals himself in his correspondence to have been no mere endorser of Parkes' political opinions. His admiration for Parkes was just enough to motivate him, during one stage of that improvident politician's leadership of the

(1) Manby to Parkes, 20.10.77. (P.C., A.896. 267). Manby's hostility to Clarke arose from "the fact that though member for the (Eden) electorate he is not its representative but the mere mouthpiece of a few ambitious followers with whom he has business relations, leaving the rest of his constituents to help themselves or go to the Devil."

(2) On 3.3.86, for example, Kelly wrote, in reply to a request from Parkes to exercise his influence in the current election against Sir Patrick Jennings: "I am in receipt of yours of 2nd inst. — contents noted. I certainly shall not oppose Sir Patrick but if he does not pledge himself to at once amend the Land Act in the direction indicated, I shall do all in my power to help anybody who opposes him." (P.C., A.903. 443).
Opposition, to "cheerfully contribute" £100 towards his personal upkeep, with the remark:

"I consider ... that the honester portion of the community are under obligation to you for heading an opposition that is now more than ever necessary and that we ought to join in assisting you to devote so much of your own time to that public object." (1)

Yet despite this attitude - which also manifested itself in his readiness to supply Parkes with a wealth of information about political feeling and pressures in Queanbeyan - he could on occasion be biting in his criticism of the failure of all politicians to institute reforms that took his fancy. (2)

Where they were localmen, friendly politicians naturally formed another valuable link with the electorate. Usually they were well versed in local conditions, and experienced in methods of electoral manoeuvre. It was not uncommon for a political career to be prefaced by a period spent as a correspondent and worker for a faction leader. William Affleck, storekeeper of Gundaroo, James N. Brunker, Maitland stock and station agent, and O. O. Dangar, Kempsey auctioneer, provide examples of men who, having served for some years as agents for Parkes in the areas in which they lived, later

---

(1) De Salis to Parkes, 13.7.75. (P.C., A.882. 223).
(2) In 1872, for instance, he wrote to Parkes endorsing the election statement of his son that it was high time some reform took place "in the Financial Direction," since "every country elector was paying annually £35 a year, but getting value for only £10 a year, - to our poor district something like £30,000 of unnecessary taxation." (19.3.72. P.C., A.881. 395a). Financial reform did not at this time feature in Parkes' policy.
became themselves successful candidates for their local seats.

(1) The converse was also true: in a number of cases ex-
members of Parliament who had been his supporters became local
agents for Parkes. Perhaps the most notable of such men was
L. F. De Salis, who had been member for Queanbeyan in the
'sixties. In this case personal friendship reinforced politic-
al loyalty. But there were numerous instances of men like
Andrew Kerr, a Wellwood squatter, whose personal association
with Parkes was not a particularly close one, but who, on re-
tiring from his position as member for Orange, made strenuous
efforts to secure the election of successors likely to give
political support to Parkes. (2)

Politician friends often kept Parkes closely informed
of the progress of their campaigns, so that he could assist
them or they could themselves help friends. This has already
been seen in the 1872 and 1874 elections. The records of the
campaigns of men like F. B. Suttor in Bathurst (1877 and 1882),
(3) J. Hoskins in Tumut (1877), (4) J. Watson at Young (1880),
(5)

(1) Affleck to Parkes, 19.2.87. (P.C., A.919). Brunker
was a member of the Hunter Valley group of pro-Parkes elec-
toral managers, and has already been mentioned in that connect-
ion. He was working around Maitland for Parkes as early as
1863. (Brunker to Parkes, 3.8.63. P.C., A.873. 186).
Though he was not elected to Parliament until 1889 Dangar was
in Kempsey using his influence in Parkes' interest in 1878.
(Dangar to Parkes, 6.6.78. P.C., A.882. 110).
(2) Kerr was one of the promoters of the candidacy of James
Torpy. See, e.g., Kerr to Parkes, 13.11.86. (P.C., A.890.
492).
(3) Suttor to Parkes, 20.11.77. (P.C., A.909. 352),
30.11.82. (P.C., A.908. 135, 26.11.82, 3.12.82. (P.C.,
A.928. 482, 492).
(4) Hoskins to Parkes, 28.10.77. (P.C., A.887. 17).
(5) Watson to Parkes, 16.11.80. (P.C., A.914. 332).
and J. Torpy in Orange (1882), (1) show that liaison such as that witnessed during the 1872-4 period was commonly practised in the years that followed. The closer political associates of Parkes - prominent faction members who could be assured of Ministerial posts in the event of their leader's success - always kept in touch with him during elections. On occasion such men shared in the task of watching over and corresponding with agents in the electorates. (2)

(ii) The Work of the Electoral Agent

In the light of those aspects of the elections of 1872 and 1874 that have already been examined and of some of the more revealing of the large number of letters which remain as relics of other contests, it is possible to consider, in general terms, the work commonly undertaken by electoral agents.

The most important task of the agent was to assess the disposition of power among the known groups within the electorate and the modifications to this pattern that could be

(1) Torpy to Parkes, 26.11.82, 14.12.82. (P.C. A.910.269.499).

(2) G. A. Lloyd, for instance, took the initiative in organising for the election of 1885. There was something reminiscent of Butler in his letter to Parkes of 2.11.80: "I have sent you by this mail some papers with Political speeches and leaders which I have marked. You will see how both sides here are organising their forces so as to command the election as much as possible and if we wish to succeed we ought to do something of the same kind. We must not leave the elections to take their chance but we must have men ready for every vacant place and use all the influence at our disposal to put them in. I have been talking to Watson about this business and he feels it very strongly and would help it by his influence and his purse." (P.C. A.891.405).
expected in the light of current political feeling and emphasis. On the basis of this judgment, he was able to suggest the type of candidate likely to succeed, thus permitting the placing of men who, through their known loyalty to the faction leader, were desirable as potential members of Parliament. This done, immediate steps had to be taken to announce and support the chosen man. The whole process could take a number of forms, with the initiative coming either from the faction leader or from the electorate. Two of the most usual methods of procedure are illustrated in letters received during the 'eighties by Parkes from agents in Kiama and Illawarra. The first of these relates to an 1886 by-election, and was written from Jamberoo by John Colley.

"I received yours and today being one of public business in Kiama I embraced the opportunity of ascertaining the opinions (sic) of a goodly number of people on the present political situation both Mr. Cameron and Mr. Watson would have a large number of supporters but there are rumours afloat about the former that would be sure to be exaggerated (sic) in a political contest. I prefer Mr. Watson but will use all the influence in my power on behalf of either under the present circumstances ... Great care must be taken that a third candidate is not brought into the field if there is only two I think we have a very fair prospect of success but the candidate must ... issue his address forthwith as there is no time for a requisition." (1)

It is interesting to note, as a contrast, an urgent appeal sent to Parkes from Illawarra during the 1882 election, by an agent of Sir John Robertson's. (It will be recalled that Robertson and Parkes were in alliance at this time).

I wrote and telegraphed to Sir John at the request of influential people some days ago asking if it were possible to get a candidate to oppose Mr. Stuart but have not heard from him. If we had announced a good candidate at first Mr. Stuart would not have had a chance, they have now formed committees &c., and got the support of several we should have had. However, I feel confident yet, but we cannot get ... the requisition in the town. We must go out amongst the farmers and miners. We have the earnest support of Mr. John Biggar, (1) who is a host in himself. He will take the leading part in Mr. Wisdom's candidature. Several leading farmers are very anxious for opposition to Stuart and the miners do not care for him - if Mr. Wisdom will address the electors at Bulli, Dapto and Wollongong at an early date I am confident of success. (2)

Where it was not possible to promote a favourable candidate it was still practicable to choose the most likely of existing candidates, and seek to exact a pledge, or even an implied promise of support from him. The work of Butler, in pledging West at Carcoar (1872), and of Cooper, in securing the allegiance of Cohen in the Hunter (1874), has already been noted.

Of still greater interest were cases like that of the Goulburn election of 1881, when an agent and his local friends had questioned likely candidates and made their assessment even before the campaign began.

(1) Wollongong auctioneer. (See above pp. 233-4).

(2) Roberts to Parkes, 28.11.82. (P.C., A.929. 168).
"I was out of town when your telegram came and my partner replied. Mr. Gannon is surely out as a candidate and so soon as the seat is declared vacant he will address the people. He will support the Government in the measures at present before Parliament and you will find him, I think, an average member. Mr. Douglas has retired. He has not a chance, nor has either of the other candidates, except Heydon, who may slip in if the Protestant interest is kindled ... We shall work for Gannon ... Geo. Rankin on the Land and S. Smith on the Railway Rates, and Heydon as a general obstructionist will give trouble, but Gannon you will find when you know him a very nice fellow." (1)

Infinite variety and great subtlety marked the process of private negotiation. All those who had "influence" to exert - the manipulators of minor groups and organisations, individuals who, as employers or patrons, exercised some control over the opinions of men who were electors, friends of important local personalities, and many others, - were to be sought out, wooed and used, either by the agent or by his master in Sydney. Some idea of the chain of intrigue that could result is suggested in the following note, sent to Parkes by Robertson during their period of alliance.

"I have your note about Angus Cameron, and the Braidwood election. I had already telegraphed to my friend the editor of the local paper (he had telegraphed to me for a candidate) to put up posters and announce Cameron. Since the receipt of your note just acknowledged, I have seen O'Connor and he has written to his friends ... and as you suggested I have telegraphed to Rowland Hassall." (2)

(1) Wm. Davies to J. Watson, 23.11.81. (P.C.. A.881.313). Watson was at this time Parkes' Colonial Treasurer.
(2) Robertson to Parkes, 19.10.85. (P.C.. A.927.85).
Parkes' and Robertson's Braidwood agents were in this case in search of a candidate, just as surely as Cameron was in search of a seat. But agents could be relied upon to organise committees and secure support for desired men even when they were not actively seeking candidates themselves. The practice of holding elections for different constituencies on different days made this a great boon, since it might facilitate a prolonged parliamentary existence for politicians especially valued by their leaders. When, for instance, in 1872, W. R. Piddington, one of Parkes' most valued colleagues, felt himself in danger in the Hawkesbury contest, he wrote in alarm to Parkes:

"I find that some of my indiscreet friends have brought forward Burdekin in opposition to Moses. I am not therefore sure of my election. Now I should not like to be out of Parl. at the next session. There is the district of Hume, nomination day Monday 7th. Could you communicate with Mate or any of the Albury people? I am in their interest on the Border question. This is secret and confidential, and must be managed carefully for if known prematurely will injure me here." (1)

It was not unusual for the agent, besides supplying information and arranging for committees to be formed, to take an active part in campaigning for the chosen candidate of the faction. This is to be seen in the numerous statements in letters to Parkes that the writers are "working hard" for their men, and in reports such as that received from William Walker,

(1) W. R. Piddington to Parkes, 28.2.72. (P.C., A.900. 30)
of Windsor, in 1880:

"I am acting as Bowman's Secretary and solicitor and the whole conduct of the election here on his part is in my hands. The reports in the Herald and Telegraph were sent by me." (1)

(iii) The Question of Expenses

Contesting an election was not, even for the most frugal of candidates, a cheap business. Lodgings while touring the electorate, printing and advertisements, hire of meeting halls, and the cost of transport were inescapable for all. Scrutineers and canvassers were usually paid. (2) It was common for candidates to provide facilities for bringing supporters to the poll, (3) while there were numerous ways in which the more unscrupulous might spend money to influence the minds of voters. Heavy penalties were provided in the electoral law for bribery, (4) but convictions were difficult to obtain, and candidates frequently provided entertainment and free liquor for those prepared to support them. (5)

(1) Wm. Walker to Parkes, 18.11.80. (P.C. 4930).
(2) See, e.g., letter of Cooper to Parkes re employing scrutineers on Bennett's behalf. (p. 196).
(3) The Parkes Correspondence abounds in reports such as that sent by Lloyd from Newcastle: "The other side are spending a lot of money ... They have engaged all the omnibuses but we have got some Hansomes and Buggies and Spring Carts and my friends are sanguine that we will (win)." (Lloyd to Parkes, undated. P.C. A.392. 196).
(4) Fines of up to £200 were provided for a very-comprenhesive list of corrupt practices of this kind. 44 Vict. No. 13. Part IV. These were identical with the provisions of the 1858 Act. (21 Vict. No. 20. Cl. 59-64).
(5) In 1874, for instance, the wealthy ex-mineowner, B. O. Holterman, chartered steamers to carry supporters on pleasure trips in Sydney Harbour. (S.M.H. 14.12.74). In some cases, candidates went so far as to employ hotel licencees to provide free drink for all comers on polling day. (e.g., Lloyd to Parkes, on activities of Steven in Newcastle, 1874. See p. 213).
It would be impossible to make any estimate of the average cost of a campaign to individual members, since conditions varied greatly. Parkes claimed in 1883 that an election rarely cost him more than £30, (1) but it is to be remembered that an influential politician of his type could be assured of having among his committee men many who were able and willing to contribute funds. In most cases the parliamentary aspirant had himself to be prepared to forfeit considerable sums of money. In 1872 Butler reported to Parkes that Innes had spent nearly £200 in an unavailing attempt to capture the East Macquarie seat. (2) Several years later, one of Parkes' closest political associates, Saul Samuel, reluctantly decided not to stand for Parliament because

"I do not wish just now to incur the expense of contesting the election which I have reason to think would be at least £200." (3)

Though the amount mentioned was considerable it was not claimed in either case to be excessive. Standards, however, varied: Pemmell refused to contest the Goulburn election in 1874 if it promised to cost more than from £100 to £150. (4) Yet in 1885 Davies was able to write, of the same electorate:

(2) Butler to Parkes, (P.C., A. 372. 217).
(3) Samuel to Parkes, 18675. (P.C., A. 906. 60).
(4) See above, p. 223.
"I understand from Mr. Cooper that the expenses of the election are very moderate. I don't think Holborrow spent less than four to five hundred pounds." (1)

For men of moderate means, the cost of financing their own candidature could be crippling, and this consideration frequently held back some who could be almost positive of a seat. A. A. P. Tighe, for instance, who had been a member of the Assembly throughout the 'sixties, rebuffed an appeal from Parkes in 1877 to resume his parliamentary career because he could not face the expense of election. (2) He was at the time Police Magistrate at Waratah. A similar reason was given by William Tunks, a publican and sitting member for St. Leonards, for his disinclination to stand for re-election in 1874. To Parkes he wrote:

"There are a few very troublesome persons in the electorate who will have a contest principally with a view to the expenditure of money ... Having regard to the frequency of elections I am unable to afford the expense in justice to my family, and I am not poor enough to do the pauper dodge. There then remains nothing for me to do but either spend money I cannot afford or to clear out - I have chosen the latter." (3)

What Tunks meant by "the pauper dodge" is not clear, though it may refer to the possibility of appealing to

(1) Davies to Parkes, 10.4.85. (P.C., A.382-14).
(2) Tighe to Parkes, 17.3.77. (P.C., A.910.428).
(3) Wm. Tunks to Parkes, 5.12.74. (P.C., A.929.112).

Tunks' remarks suggest that businessmen and others who profited from election campaigns were in the habit of putting up spurious candidates to ensure that a contest would take place.
political comrades for assistance. There is much evidence to suggest that, though no permanent general fund was maintained for the purpose, the Sydney faction leaders frequently supplied finance for favourable candidates. It has already been seen that Cooper, both as agent and candidate in 1873-4, was financed from Sydney. This money was apparently raised among the wealthier faction members, and from "subscription lists" distributed among supporters. Lloyd, for example, wrote to Parkes that:

"I would gladly help Cooper but if I do not mind I shall be in the same position. I have already paid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>my subscription</td>
<td>5 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my share West Sydney</td>
<td>32 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle election</td>
<td>350 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash out of pocket say</td>
<td>20 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>407 10 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and Cooper has sent me an acct. still owing for West Sydney, which I expect I must pay. I have seen Samuel who will not take a list but will give £10 which I will get and give Cooper tomorrow but it will take 20 Samuels to pay the whole debt." (1)

It was doubtless from such a source that Burns requested money to transport his supporters in the Hunter electorate to the poll, (2) and Parkes promised to provide funds to support the candidature of anyone opposing Butler in Argyle. (3) The

(1) Lloyd to Parkes, 10.4.75. (P.C., A. 891.414). Lloyd was a merchant - the "Newcastle election" referred to was his own contest.

(2) J. F. Burns to Parkes, 26.2.72.

(3) An account of this contest is given on pp. 221-225 above.
sequel to the latter case, when the promise was only fulfilled under extreme pressure, provides an amusing illustration of the importance placed upon secrecy in such transactions. After the election, one W. Stephens, who had been an assistant of Wearne's, (1) wrote to Parkes in a letter endorsed "private":

"Sir,

I have twice written you about the Argyle Election and no reply has been received. I have all ways thought it courteous on the part of any Gentleman when written to, to furnish reply, as you have already been informed parties request me to Pay Bills, your letter to Goulburn - copy of which I retain, concluded by saying we might expend £150.0.0 on Mr. Pemmells behalf, a very trivial amount as been expensed and I am expected to pay it if no reply be receive to this communication By Telegram to morrow I shall Pay Bills and immediately advertise whole Proceedings in Sydney and Goulburn papers." (2)

In 1883, when in alliance with Parkes, Robertson moved on his own initiative to provide financial support for certain favourable candidates, assuming that repayment would be forthcoming from wealthier friends.

"I have entered actively into support of Taylor - against McElhone - or against all comers, and have, without waiting for aid which I no doubt will get, given my friend D. Cassin a credit of £100 to be expended by him for Taylor's election." (3)

(1) Wearne acted as Parkes' agent in Argyle (see above p. 221-5). Stephens is mentioned on a number of occasions in Wearne's letters.

(2) W. Stephens to Parkes, 23.1.75. (P.C., A.908.278).

(3) Robertson to Parkes, 23.2.82. (P.C., A.902.22).

Cassin, it will be recalled, was Parkes' agent in Mudgee, the electorate to which this letter refers.
Two years later, Lloyd, in writing of the need to secure the election of as many favourable candidates as possible, informed Parkes that Watson, fellow politician and merchant, was prepared to help "by his influence and his purse." (1) It was, apparently, from such a source that the journalist, H. W. H. Stephen, who successfully contested Monaro in this election, was able to meet his outstanding electioneering liabilities. He wrote thanking Parkes for arranging to have the "outstanding liabilities in connection with my recent election" paid, adding:

"As I am not aware of the name of the gentleman who has so generously offered to assist me, I must address myself to you, and ask you to be so kind as to make him acquainted with the substance of this letter." (2)

The "substance" of the letter was Stephen's account of the moneys still owing. It is an interesting document, since it reveals that Parkes had already made a contribution to Stephen's candidature. It also shows the kind of election expenses that had to be incurred even by a frugal man.


"Spring "Manaro Mercury" Advertising £3.17.0 £12
&c. Reduced to

Miller "Cooma Express" £39.11.0 34
Tweedie "Bombala Times" Paid on my £3.10.0
Jones "Bombala Herald" behalf by 3.
Bombala School of Arts, Hire of Hall)Mr. Walters £2.12.6
Pfeiffer "Scrutineer" Bredbo
Wholshaw "" Nimitybell 1
Gill "" Berridale 2.

Advance per Sir Henry Parkes K.C.M.G.

Edw. M. Stephen 60. 2.6

20. 0.0 (3)

(1) Lloyd to Parkes, 2.10.85. (P.C. A.891. 405).
(3) ibid.
Material assistance was occasionally rendered to campaign managers by faction leaders in kind rather than in money. Cooper, as has been seen, sought various items of propaganda literature from Sydney during his 1872 operations. In Goulburn in 1874, Wearne received leaflets from Parkes for local distribution, and considered it not unreasonable to ask that posters should also be supplied to him.

"I received your telegram and will attend to the Papers which I have just got. The article about Mr. Butler is quite true. Mr. Stevenson is going to send them out to Crookwell and other places and scatter them but we thought the(re) would be placards or posters these we would have posted up all about ... I should like some posters by Monday night's train." (1)

A similar demand was made in 1877 by Barrett, Parkes' Dubbo agent, though in this case a desire for free posters was given additional strength by the fact that the local newspaper was hostile to Parkes, which made it unlikely that any supporter of his would be able to have posters printed in Dubbo itself. (2)

Assistance of these kinds might be considered a species of bribery by which the faction leader sought to guarantee support for himself in the event of the election of candidates in whose interests he had arranged for payments in money or kind. From another point of view, it could be thought of as a very crude and unorganised forerunner of the

(2) G. Barrett to Parkes, 8.10.77. (A.922. 267).
aid commonly provided for their members by the funds of political parties. The name one cares to use is not, however, important. Beyond doubt, one way in which parliamentary factions sought to augment their strength was by providing assistance to potential or actual members facing the expensive task of electioneering. This represented a most important intrusion into the electoral field.
CONCLUSION

"I entertain the view strongly that Ministers of the Crown ought not to interfere in Elections, and I have acted consistently with this view in the recent case of Mudgee." (1)

In these words, Parkes once tried to rebut a charge of having communicated with agents to prevent the success of an opponent in a by-election. Though quite inconsistent with his own practice, the principle he enunciated here was one to which all politicians of the time ostensibly subscribed. It was a corollary of the notion of "independence," and the chief influence in forcing the leaders of parliamentary factions to shroud their work in the constituencies with a mantle of secrecy. (2)

In the electorates themselves, a bewildering variety of interests struggled to give political expression to their aspirations. The electoral system contained peculiarities which could be readily exploited, while there was little difficulty in organising opinion and playing upon social prejudices in restricted areas. Pressure groups and influential

(1) Parkes to O'Connor, 9.9.73. (P.C., A.898.182).
(2) The feeling against electoral interference by faction leaders and ministers was strong until the late 'eighties. See especially S.M.H. editorial of 16.11.77; defence by Lackey of his actions in the 1877 election (S.M.H., 6.12.77); and bitter debate following motion by O'Sullivan on the impropriety of Ministers "using the power of office in the election of representatives to serve in Parliament." (29.3.87, N.S.W.P.D., Vol. XXV, pp. 455 et seq.).
personalities had thus become in many cases the arbiters of local elections.

In this context, the leaders of parliamentary factions appeared as super manipulators. They had either to come to terms with the existing complex of interests and personalities, or themselves to adopt the role and tactics of local pressure group organisers. The method favoured varied, according to circumstances, from electorate to electorate. But it was always marked by intrigue and directed only towards the end of securing personal support in Parliament. Principle had little part in this process. In interfering in elections, faction leaders thus showed little tendency to impose order upon them; the most successful strategy, indeed, was to exploit their natural disorder.
PART II

THE EMERGENCE OF THE FIRST POLITICAL "PARTIES"

1887 - 1889

"A caucus, when properly worked, may introduce a good candidate instead of a bad one, and may secure the return of a valuable member, who without the aid of a political organisation might inevitably have lost his election. The tendency, however, of political combinations ... is to work for their own ends and not for the sake of the public ... The machinery of the caucus, it has been truly said, is constructed to place the nomination of candidates in a very few hands, and to force the entire body of each political party to vote for these candidates without question."

(Sydney Morning Herald, 7 November, 1878).
THE EMERGENCE OF THE FIRST POLITICAL "PARTIES."

1887 - 89

Factional politics of the kind described in the first part of this study prevailed in the Colony until 1887. In this year, at the general election, the first political "parties" emerged, on the basis of a Free trade- Protection division.

The rise of these new political bodies will be traced in the following chapters, and an attempt made to assess their significance.
1. THE FREE TRADE "TRADITION."

From the time of the establishment of Responsible Government until the mid-'eighties there was little serious opposition in New South Wales to the traditional tariff policy of free trade. (1) After an incipient protectionist movement led by Sir James Martin had been crushed in the General Election of 1863, (2) politicians who advocated tariff reform to encourage "native industry" were few in number, and came to be regarded by their fellows as impractical and amusing oddities. By 1872, the Sydney Morning Herald was able to observe that a man who had recently drawn attention to himself by delivering a fiery protectionist harangue in Parliament had "... precipitated himself into a forsaken arena, where he could only fight with the remains of the departed... Like the noble hero whom madness had touched, he ran around the field challenging the victors who had already triumphed, and were gone." (3)

But although ardent devotees of free trade, most of the Colony's politicians tacitly accepted the view that the Custom

---

(1) Great variation had occurred between 1800 and 1852 in the customs duties of N.S.W., which had been regarded by Governors as "a sponge to be squeezed when moisture was required." (Rusden, History of Australia, Vol. 3, p.6). Free trade was formally adopted in the "Deas Thomson tariff" of 1852, which systematised customs imposts, cutting dutiable articles down to a small number (beer, wine, spirits, tobacco, tea, sugar, coffee). The scale of duties was revised in 1854 and 1855, to raise the rates on goods already in the Schedule, and to add opium to them. Otherwise the tariff remained unaltered until 1866. (T. A. Coghlan, The Wealth and Progress of N.S.W., 1900-5, pp. 153-5).

(2) See speech of Burns, 28.2.4. (N.S.W.P.D., Vol. XI, p.2087).

(3) S.M.H., 13.12.74.
House should provide a high proportion of State revenue. Customs duties, so long as they did not have a "protective incidence" were a flexible and painless form of indirect taxation. Thus financial difficulty was met in 1866 by imposing 5 per cent ad valorem duties on a wide range of goods, (1) on the principle that a temporary emergency did not justify radical changes in the public revenue system. But when increasing Land Revenue permitted the lifting of these duties in 1873, the fortunate ministry in power made great political capital of their "vindication" of free trade principles, (2) and the Governor enthusiastically wrote to the Premier (Parkes) that "... in connection with this measure your name will live as a 'household word' in the homes of those who labour, and will be remembered with the same affection and gratitude which surrounds the name of Sir Robert Peel in the Old Country." (3)

Though this prediction was a little optimistic, Parkes used the incident to add body to his picture of himself as the local prophet and guardian of the free trade heritage. The Cobden Club honoured him with a medal, and in the enthusiasm of the moment few noticed that the revised schedule still contained fifty-five articles, (4) and was - on Parkes' own admission -

---

(1) Malt, hops, rice and dried fruits were added to the list of goods on which specific duties were chargeable, and a 5 per cent ad valorem duty imposed on all other goods except those on the "free list," the latter being composed of flour, wheat, animals, fresh fruits, wool, tallow, and some articles of re-export. (Coghlan, ibid., p.156).

(2) See, e.g., S.M.H. comment on statement by Lloyd at close of Budget Speech, (24.10.73).

(3) Sir H. Robinson to Parkes, 16.10.73. (P.C., A.927, 164).

(4) The number of articles subject to specific duties had been very largely increased in 1871. (Coghlan, ibid.).
far from being "simple and symmetrical." (1)

2. **EARLY PROTECTIONIST ORGANISATIONS**

The late 'seventies and early 'eighties saw some spasmodic and ineffective attempts to raise the banner of protection. The Workingmen's Defence Association of 1877 included protection in its platform, and tried unsuccessfully to use this principle as the ground for an alliance with Free Selectors' Associations. (2) In 1880, a temporary wave of unemployment led a few enthusiasts to look to protection as a means of relief, and resolutions in favour of tariff revision were moved in the Assembly. (3) Although these were firmly rejected, the more discerning of the old politicians stirred uneasily at the prospect of the tariff question shortly becoming a major issue. (4) Colour was lent to their predictions by the presence in Parliament of a few avowed protectionists - all doctrinaires - who, though never managing to amalgamate into an effective pressure group, delivered constant and

---

(1) Parkes to Sir H. Robinson, 16.10.73. (P.C., A.932).
(2) See *S.M.H.* editorial, 10.9.77, on attempts of Workingmen's Defence Association to secure this alliance; also report of meeting, *S.M.H.* 16.10.77. The Workingmen's Defence Association was re-organised in December, 1877, becoming the New South Wales Reform Association, with Protection as its principal article of faith. (*S.M.H.* 13.12.77).
(3) Motion by D. Buchanan on need for levying customs duties "so as to encourage and promote our native industries." (27.1.80, *N.S.W.P.D.* Vol. I, p. 900).
(4) F. B. Sutor, e.g., in thanking Parkes for a gift copy of Cobden's speeches, wrote: "I fancy the day is not far distant when the battle of Free trade and Protection will be fought out in this Colony, and it will be well for those who will have to take part in the struggle to study the speeches delivered by our greatest Freetrader." (13.5.80, *P.C.* A.928. 451).
impassioned speeches against the established tariff system. (1)

In 1882, a contributor to the Debator observed that "a slight wave of Protection ... is now rippling on the social horizon of the Colony," and claimed that

"The Protectionist party in New South Wales appears to be composed of four distinct classes — manufacturers, who know well that Protection will benefit themselves very largely; needy politicians, burning for notoriety, who see a chance of riding in the chariots of popular favour ...; artisans, fatuously possessed with the idea that Protection will cause a rise in their wages; and a section of young natives imbued with the 'Rule Britannia' spirit, who, with the assurance of an Ajax defying the lightning, make believe to look upon their native land as one of the 'boss' nations of the earth, charged with a mission to breathe defiance to all other communities." (2)

This incipient "movement" took shape in 1884, when the first extra-parliamentary organisations designed to promote protectionist feeling were formed in Sydney. They owed their origin to the parliamentary doctrinaires, Melville, Heydon and Vaughan, and a group of radical agitators like E. W. O'Sullivan, (printer, journalist, and Trades and Labour Council official), W. P. Crick, (solicitor), and W. H. Traill, (journalist of Bulletin fame). The year 1884 was one of intellectual ferment among the young journalists and self-educated radicals

(1) Chief of these early parliamentary protectionists were D. Buchanan (Barrister), L. F. Heydon (Solicitor), R. M. Vaughan (Civil Engineer), N. Melville (Undertaker), H. Clarke, (Produce Merchant). Their motley backgrounds suggest they had little economic interest in promoting the Protectionist cause.

(2). Debator, 8.7.82. (This short-lived "Weekly Liberal Penny Newspaper for the free discussion of all subjects," intended as "a debating club in print," was the organ of the "Liberal Association of N.S.W." The Association, formed to proclaim "the inherent right of all individuals to hold, practise, and proclaim any opinions, on all subjects whatsoever," boasted a "fine library of 800 volumes, ... a Debating Club and a Psychological section." ibid.).
of Sydney. In the words of one of them:

"That was a time of mental upheaval, of intellectual readjustment. Things established were daily weighed in the balance, and found wanting, and the cry was: What shall we put in their place? We studied night and day all the political, economic and philosophical treatises which could be bought, or preferably borrowed, and subjected to close scrutiny every new scheme for the regeneration of mankind." (1)

Protection was one of the subjects discussed at the debating clubs and studied by the bookish. In 1884–5 O'Sullivan and his circle formed two radical associations— the Democratic Alliance and the Land and Industrial Alliance—each of which had advocacy of Protection as one of its chief aims. The Democratic Alliance had a measure of success almost from the beginning and on O'Sullivan's account soon boasted a paid-up membership of over 600. (2) It stood for a number of democratic reforms, including the payment of members and abolition of assisted immigration; and appears to have captured some working-class allegiance. The Land and Industrial Alliance was designed, in the words of O'Sullivan

"to combine the farmers with the workers in the city and towns, as a democratic movement." (3)

Protection was to be the common bond between these classes, and also the lure by which it was hoped that the support of manufacturers would be gained.

(2) E. W. O'Sullivan, From Colony to Commonwealth, p. 166.
(3) ibid.
The tactics, rather than the real strength, of these bodies, kept them before the public eye. An interesting account is given by O'Sullivan, in his memoirs, of the early numerical weakness of the Land and Industrial Alliance, and of the tactics used to camouflage this weakness. For quite a time the Alliance consisted of only three members; a President, (O'Sullivan), a Vice President, (Crick), and a Secretary, (Byrnes). But, comments O'Sullivan, the three members were very active ones,

"and we made as much noise as if we had been 300. We used to hold a public meeting occasionally, and as I generally reported the gatherings, I used to get in half-column speeches with ease. At other meetings if we were not asked to speak, I used to get in by moving an amendment." (1)

But if the early protectionist movement was vocal rather than strong in numbers, and stirred up by enthusiastic proselytizers rather than spontaneous in nature, its growing success depended on the development of favourable conditions for the reception of its doctrines. As B. R. Wise unsympathetically put it a few years later,

"times of distress or depression offer noisy agitators a better platform for the airing of their grievances." (2)

And economic disturbance - in marked contrast to the confidence and prosperity of the 'seventies - was taking place in New South Wales by the middle 'eighties. Disastrous droughts from 1883

(1) op. cit., pp. 166-72. (O'Sullivan was at this time a reporter on the Daily Telegraph). B. R. Wise claimed as late as 1886 that at protection meetings in the city, "the same people always turn up," while in the country, "whenever two or three persons meet together ... a telegram announces the formation of a 'Protection Association.'" (D.T., 8.11.86)
(2) ibid.
to 1885 reduced pastoral and agricultural incomes and had a generally depressing effect on the economy. (1) This effect was heightened by a slackening of capital investment in the pastoral industry, due both to its own unfavourable aspect and to the land legislation of 1883-4, which stopped auction sales of land, reduced pastoral rents, and hedged in the purchase of pastoral lands with considerable difficulty. These tendencies were important for the growing protectionist movement in two ways. Economic difficulty favourably pre-disposed particular interests to the idea of protection. It also raised new problems in securing State revenue, and the search for a solution to these problems became the immediate occasion for making protection (in the language of the day) a "burning" political question.

Protectionist propaganda was from the beginning directed chiefly towards what were, in New South Wales, three minor classes; skilled artisans, farmers and manufacturers. Each was experiencing difficulties by the mid-'eighties. A series of years of chronic unemployment began in 1884. (2) Farmers, feeling the effects of drought,

(1) The drought of 1883-5 caused especially great losses to the pastoral industry. N.S.W., which had for many years prior to 1883 supplied sheep and cattle to the other Colonies, in that year became a purchaser, and still remained so in 1885. (See S.M.H., 31.12.84, 31.12.85). For interesting accounts of the effects of the depression on industry, trade, and public finance, see Speeches of Kethel and Wall, (6.7.86, N.S.W.P.D., Vol. XXI, p. 3096; 22.7.86, ibid., p. 3549 and Supplementary Financial Statement by Jennings (6.10.86, ibid., pp. 5429 et seq.).

and hampered by heavy transportation costs, were unable to hold the local market against the competition of cheap seaborne produce from South Australia and Victoria. (1) Manufacturers, beset by high costs of production, were no match for Sydney's merchant princes in a period of falling prices. They curtailed their operations, and began looking to the incipient protectionist movement for hope for the future. (2)

During 1884-5, a third protectionist organisation was established in Sydney, independently of the knot of organisers responsible for the first two. This was the Protection and Political Reform League, less radical, and designed to capture middle class support. "Political Reform" to this League meant the investment of politics with a new probity by electing men of principle rather than parish pump politicians. The chief

(1) Farmers' representatives made a number of unsuccessful attempts to persuade governments in the 'seventies to reduce railway rates on agricultural produce, and then turned to protection. As W. Clarke, M.L.A. for Orange, put it in 1881; "... it is within my knowledge that the farming community are fast becoming protectionists because the government after settling the people on the lands of the country, ... are charging a scale of rates which will not allow their produce to be brought to market. The farmers have to compete with the farmers of South Australia, who can send their wheat by water for 10/- a ton, while our farmers have to pay something like £1 a ton from my district, distant 190 miles by rail from Sydney." (16.2.81, N.S.W.P.D., Vol. IV, p. 480). Clarke subsequently became the first leader of the "Hay and Corn Party," a pressure group which demanded agricultural protection well into the 'nineties. In 1886, this group numbered 28 and had formed itself into a committee which met outside the Chamber to organise tactics and speakers before each parliamentary discussion of the tariff. (D.T., 2.9.86, 10.9.86).

(2) See, e.g., circular distributed among manufacturers in 1885, on competition which "will compel many of you to take orders at unremerative rates or close up your works, unless joint action ... is taken in conjunction with other organisations to effect the necessary legislation;" also statements of manufacturers at a meeting to establish a Chamber of Manufactures. (S.M.H., 31.7.85).
principle to which this new elite must subscribe, was protection. The tone of press reports of the League's fortnightly meetings suggests that its chief backing came from capitalists, and particularly from manufacturers. (1) These reports always included lists of those elected to membership, and it is noticeable that manufacturers predominate, (2) while the League depended on donations (some were as large as £100), rather than small regular subscriptions for its financial requirements. Conferences were at times held with Trades and Labour organisations (e.g., in June, 1885, to discuss the extension of protectionist propaganda; (3) in October, 1886, with the Iron Trades Association to discover their attitude to a move made in Parliament to have railway locomotive orders placed locally, (4) but it is apparent that the League always regarded itself as being distinct from these organisations and from the protectionist bodies which drew much of their support from them.

3. THE "POLITICAL CONFERENCE" OF 1885

An attempt was made in July, 1885, by the Land and Industrial Alliance (now well over its birth pangs), to promote

(1) *See:* *e.g.:* D.T., 2.9.86, 10.9.86.
(2) *e.g.:* D.T., 29.7.85. New members: B. Tulloch, (of Tulloch & Co., Phoenix Ironworks); Thos. Aitken, (agricultural implement maker); Blacket & Co., (engineers); J. Basset & Co., (alkali manufacturers).
(3) D.T., 3.7.85.
(4) D.T., 6.10.86.
common action by existing protectionist bodies in issuing propaganda and supporting candidates at the forthcoming elections. These and other matters were discussed at a Political Conference called at the instance of the Alliance. Delegates representing between thirty and forty different organisations took part, and although the aims of the Conference were not fully achieved, it represents an important stage in the growth of protectionist party organisation. It also deserves some attention in that its decisions and deliberations give a good indication of the ways in which most protectionist leaders hoped to exploit existing social and economic tensions in the colony.

As well as the central Land and Industrial Alliance organisation, fourteen of its country branches sent delegates to the conference, as did six Free Selectors' Associations and five Farmers' Unions. Other organisations represented were the Sydney Democratic Alliance, the Protection and Political Reform League, certain Trades Unions, (bootmakers, coach-makers, iron-workers and stonemasons), the Land Nationalisation League, the Lithgow Protection League, the Eskbank Ironworkers, and the Western Miners' Association. Some manufacturers attended, although not in the significant numbers that the Alliance had expected. (1)

The inaugural speech of Heydon, president of the Land and Industrial Alliance, set the keynote of the Conference. The country, he said, was being ruined by the prodigal policy

(1) D.T., 31.7.85.
of its governments. Transient prosperity, through unprecedented borrowing, was accompanied by annihilation of the revenue from public lands. The latter represented a coup by the squatters, who had secured security of tenure for a total rental of less than a million a year.

"This," declared Heydon, "is the work of a dominant class of monopolists, who have ruled our country too long. This Conference is the only existing vestige of any organisation of the classes who have been so plundered. Here alone meet the selectors and farmers who people our soil, the artisans who throng our cities, and those toiling men who wring from the stubborn earth the treasures of the mine... Here (i.e., in N.S.W.), there are only two real political classes, the one, that of the capitalist - that is to say, the merchants, squatters and bankers - the other comprising all the rest of the people ... Here with no Liberal organ in the Press, with no cohesion between farmers and town artisans, with no manufacturing leaders, and no payment of members, the people are subdued... The bulk of the Liberal army, farmers and working men, cannot maintain an expensive and complete and long continued organisation. Manufacturers are the natural officers of the Liberal Army; (they) alone can maintain the newspapers, find money for elections, maintain a hall with secretaries and officers, pay lecturers to travel the country and generally keep up the sustained campaign necessary for success against the unity, wealth, social influence, untiring activity, and steady, patient, craft of the Conservatives." (1)

This rhetoric is worthy of quotation at some length because it was typical of much of the propaganda put out at the time by protectionist bodies. Its significance lies in the evidence that it gives of the existence, even at this early stage, of a well developed scheme - and one differing radically from the local political tradition - for an effective political

(1) ibid.
movement. On the one hand were social and economic tensions capable of being interpreted, if not in terms of crude class warfare, at least in such a way as to capitalise on passion and prejudice; on the other were the elements of effective electoral organisation. The time was not yet ripe for the full scale emergence of an organised political party on this basis; but the essential ingredients were there, and there were those who were conscious of their potentialities.

In fact, the position was neither as extreme nor as simple as Heydon believed. The proceedings of the Conference itself showed this. Many farmers' delegates, for example, deprecated extreme denunciation of squatters, (1) while their support for protection was generally limited to "fair trade" for agriculture, i.e., lifting duties on items like tea and replacing them with an import tax on grain, and there were dissenting voices against even this. (2) In the matter of electoral organisation, the Conference unanimously passed the

(1) D.T., 1.8.85.
(2) See debate of 2.8.85, (D.T., 3.8.85), especially speeches of Croker and Knight, in favour of substituting grain for tea duties, and of Clemisha and Stinson, against protection as such. The farmers' opinions were best expressed at a conference of the N.S.W. Farmers' Union later in the same month, when, while passing strong resolutions in favour of agricultural protection, delegates agreed in condemning "the wholesale protection advocated by that trinity of idiots, Heydon, Luscombe, and O'Sullivan." (D.T., 20.8.85).
comfortable resolution

"that in order to confront the dominant influence of the pastoral and importing interests, the farmers, manufacturers, miners, and industrial classes should combine in political unions for the self defence and the promotion of the welfare of the community at large." (1)

But no steps were taken to devise any particular form for such unions, nor was there any indication that the manufacturers were ready to play the fairy godfather role that Heydon wished to assign them.

The election of 1885 thus found the protectionist forces unorganised as a whole, though as individual bodies the Land and Industrial Alliance and the Protection and Political Reform League were both most active. They sponsored lecture tours, printed and distributed propaganda literature, formed new country branches, and provided approved candidates with much moral and a little material support. (2). The

(1) D.T., 4.8.85.
(2) e.g., in August, the president of the Alliance undertook lecturing tours in the Mudgee, Lithgow and Orange districts, and the secretary in Goulburn, Bungendore, and Queanbeyan. Protectionist "bunches" for East and West Sydney were prepared "to strike a keynote for the general election," while inquiries were begun to determine those aspects of the Alliance's policy which could be most profitably emphasised in different districts. (D.T., 20, 28.8.85). The League was busy forming country branches, and raising funds. On 2 July, e.g., a member reported that a gentleman had offered to place £100 down towards the expenses necessary for his election "purely in the protection interest," (D.T., 3.7.85), while at the end of the month, the secretary reported receiving twenty-eight new donations of from 10/- to £1 each "on behalf of the approaching election." The secretary was forthwith instructed to "proceed at once to organise a general scheme for meeting political demands at the forthcoming election." (D.T., 25.8.85).
usual multitude of disparate and confusing interests marked the electoral campaign. But protection was now at least one of these issues, and the new Assembly met to discover that the protectionist section of its membership had swollen to twenty, and threatened to assume the role of a new and dangerous pressure group.
PARTY "MACHINES" AND THE ELECTIONS OF 1887 AND 1889

1. THE TARIFF ISSUE IN PARLIAMENT, 1885-87

The economic difficulties which had done so much to give life to the protectionist movement were soon to bring important developments in the factional alignments in Parliament. In December 1885, the newly elected Dibbs Government shocked the country by announcing a deficit of over a million pounds in the public finances. Declining land revenue and the legacy of government extravagance left from the palmy days of the 'seventies had brought the first serious crisis in state finance for many years, and politicians were at last faced with the unpleasant task of devising an effective and acceptable system of taxation. Dibbs failed, and resigned. Parkes, sensing in the political situation new forces that he might exploit, refused to co-operate with Robertson in forming a Ministry, and power reverted to the Dibbs faction, this time camouflaged by being placed under the leadership of a genial old squatter and clubman, Sir Patrick Jennings. Meantime, the deficit rapidly climbed to the two million mark, and the Jennings Government brought down a three point plan to restore the Colony's finances by imposing stamp duties, land and income taxes, and a 5 per cent ad valorem tariff plus certain specific import duties. The protectionist group, which in the Legislative Assembly held the balance of power
between the Parkes and Jennings factions, swung to the support of the Government with cries that the first instalment of protection was at hand, and Parkes donned his mantle of "guardian" of the colony's free trade heritage. The stage was set for one of the stormiest sessions in the political history of New South Wales.

Unprecedented scenes were witnessed in the House when the Government introduced its Customs Duties Bill. The measure was, in fact, quite an innocuous one, but the combined effect of protectionist fulminations and Parkes' cunning twisting of the measure into an attack on free trade was sufficient to raise feeling to fever-heat. In the face of determined obstruction on the part of the Opposition, the Government equipped the ante-rooms with bedding for its supporters, forced three-day continuous sittings, excluded the press, cheered the ejection of several Opposition members guilty of gross disorder, and passed the Bill. But the triumph was short lived. The Legislative Council rejected Jennings' Land Tax Bill, and in the face of external attack and internal dissension, the Government broke up. Parkes formed a minority government, dissolved the House, and went to the country. Amid cheers from the protectionists, he declared:

"We will appeal to the whole of the electors of the country to give their votes under this motto: 'He who is not with us is against us.' We will appeal to them to set their faces against all the chicanery of the so-called independent candidates, who seek to steal into parliament under a cover, which simply hides their own
selfseeking or worse purposes. Let those who believe in the retrograde policy of protection say so, fight for it, and we shall respect them ... Therefore there will be no mincing about the issue to the country. It will be for the government or against it; for free trade or for protection. (1)

Parkes' formulation of the election issue in these terms was in one sense the culmination of a series of clever tactical moves within the framework of the old factional politics. Behind it, however, lay the politician's sensitivity to pressures existing outside Parliament, and, even to the most obtuse, it must have been apparent by January, 1887, that the rapidly maturing protectionist movement was a force to be reckoned with.

2. THE PROTECTION UNION; (1886-7)

The three protectionist associations formed during 1884-5 kept their identity and met regularly. Then, three months before the election, the movement stirred again, this time with great vigour. In September, 1886, a new body, the National Protection Association, was formed. Reports of the inaugural meeting suggest that the principal elements represented in the Association were Trades Organisations and a sprinkling of manufacturers. T. Rose, a well-known radical agitator, was elected president, and his first speech on the

(1) 24.1.87. (N.S.W.P.P., Vol. IV, p. 113).
need for protection was enthusiastically supported by J. V. Wiley, president of the Trades and Labour Council. A manufacturer, R. Scott Ross, moved the most significant resolution of the meeting: that existing protectionist organisations should send delegates to a conference to discuss the establishment of a Central Council to govern the whole movement. This suggestion was strongly supported by the rope manufacturer, Archibald Forsyth, and by that ubiquitous founder of protectionist organisations, E. W. O'Sullivan, and was unanimously adopted. (1)

From this conference sprang the first effective protectionist party organisation. Committees were appointed to draw up plans for the different functions of the proposed Union, and these were presented, and the new organisation formally established, in November of 1886. According to its constitution, the "Protection Union of New South Wales" was designed

"to unite the advocates of protection and the various organisations formed for and now advocating the introduction of a protective policy for N.S.W. into an active political organisation"

whose objects were to be

"to disseminate information by lectures, essays, pamphlets, tracts and public meetings; to collect funds; to arrange, provide, and assist candidates for the various electorates, and initiate branches of the union throughout the Colony." (2)

(1) D.T., 18.9.86. (Scott Ross was also president of the Protection and Political Reform League. See D.T., 6.10.86)
(2) S.M.H., 12.11.86.
By a system of personal, affiliated, and branch membership, (with regular subscriptions in each case), the Union became at once a body in its own right, and a federation of similar bodies, and as such, the organising centre for the whole protectionist movement. (1)

To launch it with gusto, a great demonstration was promoted on November 13th. A procession consisting of 6 bands, 2,000 persons and nearly 100 floats advanced through the city to the Sydney Domain, where on four different platforms protectionists harangued the crowd and simultaneously moved the following resolution:

"That in the opinion of this meeting, the depressed condition of the colony justifies the immediate adoption of a discriminative protective tariff for the purpose of promoting agriculture, fostering industry, and giving employment to the people." (2)

Protectionist members of Parliament, manufacturers, and trades representatives were the chief participants, and the dominant note of the meetings was struck by the President of the Trades and Labour Council, who declared from his platform that

(1) "The Union shall consist of personal, affiliated, and branch members. Personal members shall be those who have paid £1 and upwards into the funds of the Union as an annual subscription. Affiliated members shall be those who are members of existing Associations that advocate protection, on such Associations paying not less than £2 to the funds of the Union as an annual subscription. Branch members shall be those who are members of branches of this Union, on payment by such branches of not less than £2 as an annual subscription." (D.T., 12.11.86).

(2) S.M.H., 13.11.86.
It was a red letter day in the history of N.S.W. To-day there had been a grand wedding, the wedding of capital and labour ... The employers had worked hand in hand with those they employed to bring about this victory which they were met to celebrate, and to show their countrymen the only means of securing abundant labour for the people. (1)

An executive body, the Protection Council, was appointed by the new Union, offices were secured, and the work of preparing literature and organising lecture tours began. (2) When, in January, 1887, Parliament was dissolved and writs issued for the election, a formal connection was made with the parliamentary party at a conference between protectionist members and representatives of the Council. At this meeting, joint finance, literary and electoral committees were formed to conduct the campaign. (3)

This was the final stage in the creation of a full-scale "party" organisation, based on a federation of local bodies, and directed by a central committee composed of representatives of the parliamentary and extra-parliamentary groups. (4) It is impossible to follow in detail here the activities of these central committees. But throughout the campaign they met regularly - the chief of them, the electoral committee, twice a

(1) S.M.H., 15.11.86.
(2) D.T., 10.1.87.
(3) The electoral committee was ordered immediately to "prepare a list of suitable candidates and lay the matter before the Council." (D.T., 27.1.87).
(4) "Once these mother-cells, parliamentary groups and electoral committees, have come into being, it is enough that some permanent co-ordination be established between them and that regular connections unite them, for us to find ourselves faced with a true political party." (M. Duverger, Political Parties, p. xxix).
day — and organised the printing and distribution of literature, the movements of speakers, and the provision of candidates. Close touch was maintained with all local bodies, to facilitate adjudication between rival protectionist candidates, and to arrange "bunching" in multiple constituencies. There can be no doubt that the return of over forty protectionists to the new House was in large measure a tribute to the efficiency of the new organisation.

3. THE FREETRADE ASSOCIATION

Freetraders were unable to remain inactive under the pressure of the protectionist threat, and the Freetrade Association undertook the task of organising the elections in the interests of the party.

This Association had been established in 1885 by a group of intellectuals and men with mercantile interests to counter the propaganda of the protectionist leagues of the period. Its original manifesto emphasised its independence of existing political factions, and its debating society function,

(1) but by late 1886, with branches and correspondents in many

(1) D.T., 5.10.85. The principal objects of the Association were stated to be: "To advocate freedom of trade; to oppose, by all constitutional means, any attempt to levy taxes through the Custom House for the benefit of one part of the community at the expense of the bulk of the population; and to refute the sophistries and expose the frequent misrepresentations of protectionists."
electoral districts, (1) it was being forced by protectionist tactics to undertake political organisation as well as propagandist activity. Eventually, at the beginning of the 1887 campaign, and two days after the central protectionist body had been formed, a meeting of the Freetrade Association in Sydney decided that the Council of the Association should form itself into a Central Committee "for furthering the election of freetrade candidates and to prevent as far as possible the division of the freetrade vote." (2)

(1) D.T., 8.11.36, letter from B. R. Wise.
(2) D.T., 29.1.37.

The extent of the activities of the Association are clearly shown in day to day reports in the newspapers. The following may be quoted as typical of these reports for the whole campaign period. They were matched, of course, by accounts of similar work by the Protectionist Union.

The secretary of the Freetrade Association informs us that the office was almost besieged yesterday by applicants for parcels of pamphlets and leaflets for distribution all over the city, suburbs, and country districts, and he states that there is every appearance of the freetrade battle being fought with great enthusiasm. A large number of telegrams were received from country electorates. During the day it was arranged that Mr. Nicholas B. Downing should contest Northumberland ... It is possible that Mr. W. W. Lloyd, of Islington, Newcastle, will be the second freetrade candidate. Mr. J. T. Lingen, barrister, will contest Braidwood. A meeting of the freetraders is to be held there tonight to arrange election matters on his behalf. The Bathurst branch Association telegraphed an invitation to Mr. Wise to contest that electorate, but being already fixed for South Sydney he, of course, could not accept. An eligible candidate is expected to be decided on today, also one for West Macquarie.

A telegram received from Emmaville (Glen Innes electorate) states that Mr. Fergusson has retired. The Association is in communication with a likely candidate for the seat, which is thought safe for the freetrade party. Four telegrams were received from the Carcoar electorate pressing for a second freetrade candidate ... (D.T., 1.2.37). With regard to the Canterbury election, a meeting is announced to take place in the Petersham Town Hall, with a view to assisting in the general effort being made in that electorate to reduce the number of freetrade candidates. A meeting is also to be held at Burwood, in the same electorate ... and at Ashfield, and the secretary of the Freetrade Association, Mr. Pulsford, will be present to assist in the removal of the present block. (D.T., 3.2.37).
It is important to notice that at this stage the protectionist organisation was a much more highly developed one than that of the freetraders - a matter, indeed, of which the latter frequently complained. Circumstances forced greater efficiency on the protectionists, since they were the minority movement; moreover, their narrower class appeal, and the fact that the external organisation was matched by a close-knit parliamentary faction, made it easy for them to develop a complete party machine with rapidity. The unifying of the parliamentary and the electoral bodies of protectionists was implicit almost from the beginning, when the knot of parliamentary protectionists played a leading part in establishing electoral associations.

By contrast, both the Freetrade Association and the Freetrade party were, (to use that debatable term), "forces of resistance." The Association arose through a process of what Duverger calls "contagion" (1) to counter protectionist propaganda and methods, but from the beginning it remained distinct from the political party. There were no members of Parliament among the early Association organisers, and as late as November, 1886, a Sydney newspaper was able to observe, with justice, that

(1) M. Duverger, op. cit., p.xxvii.
"It is one of the humiliations of the present extraordinary political situation that the task of defending freedom of trade has devolved upon a voluntary association. Both Government and parliament have acted with a treachery which is neither sheltered nor palliated by precedent." (1)

In fact, there was no Freetrade party in the same sense as there was a Protectionist party. Most existing members had vaguely subscribed at the time of their election, to the traditional free trade principle, which they were prepared to interpret broadly enough to encompass the actions of both Government and Opposition, even in so appropriate a measure as the Dibbs–Jennings Customs Duties Bill. Parkes, as the archpriest of freetrade, claimed that the only "real" free-traders were those who had assisted him in his obstruction of the Bill. But this so-called "Freetrade party" was merely the Parkes faction in another guise. Parkes' acuteness lay in his justifying his natural resistance to the ruling faction in terms of resistance to protection, and thus using the fiscal controversy that was developing outside Parliament to place himself at the head of a new and powerful political movement.

The Freetrade Association, however, did not become the tool of a "party," in the old factional sense. It endorsed the Parkesian freetrade candidates for the election, gave them the use of its facilities, and frequently organised

(1) D.T. 6.11.86.
meetings at which prominent parliamentarians were invited to speak. But co-operation ended here: the parliamentarians held aloof from the deliberations of the Freetrade Council, even though they were invited to participate. (1) Parkes independently corresponded with personal supporters in electorates as far afield as Queanbeyan, suggesting candidates, arranging meetings, and generally carrying out a campaign on the old lines, in support of the "Ministry," (and of "freetrade" only by implication). (2)

It is easy to sense, in this division of purpose, a feeling of distrust on the part of Parkes and his followers. The Freetrade Association was a force that could not be easily bent to the purposes of the old politicians, yet it could not be ignored. It alone provided the effective answer both to protectionist tactics and doctrines. But like the protectionists, it professed disillusionment at the alleged demoralisation

---

(1) Parkes was invited to attend the critical meeting at which the Freetrade Association discussed, and accepted, the proposal that its Council should become "a central committee for furthering the election of freetrade candidates." (See G. N. Griffiths to Parkes, 27.1.87, P.C., A.886, 113). But he was not present and B. R. Wise occupied the chair. (P.T., 29.1.87, 15.3.87). An extreme example of the older politicians' hostility to the Association was given when Robertson bitterly assailed it at a freetrade banquet after the election. He recalled the fight for the Deas Thomson tariff 28 years before, and declared that it had been won openly, "not by collecting subscriptions, forming associations, and paying candidates to convince the people that free trade was right." (S.M.H., P.T., 15.3.87).

(2) Of abundant evidence of this in the Parkes Correspondence, the following letters may be cited: E. Hunt to Parkes (25.1.87, A.887, 174), R. C. Close to Parkes (28.1.87, A.879, 45), G. Munro to Parkes (31.1.87, A.896, 82), W. Clarke to Parkes (3.2.87, A.878, 116), H. J. Foreman to Parkes (4.2.87, A.884, 442).
of parliamentary life, (1) and there was implied censure in its emphasis on the need for infusing new blood into the political body of Freetrade. Its propaganda was marked by a high-toned idealism, and a readiness to interpret "Freetrade" as a total, liberal philosophy, that stood in sharp contrast to the tendency of the older politicians to dwell at length on the sins of their opponents and to capitalise upon passions and prejudices remaining from long dead political battles. (2) The election produced a well defined group of young Association politicians — men like the merchant William McMillan, and the lawyers B. R. Wise and J. H. Carruthers, who collectively represented the strongest influences behind the "new" freetrade movement, namely the Sydney mercantile interest, and an amorphous but growing urban "liberal" movement. (3) Between 1887 and 1889 these

(1) McMillan, e.g., declared in his Manifesto that the political and economic ills of the Colony could "be traced to the low moral tone of our public life, the want of a sense of responsibility in the high function undertaken, the petty municipal Lilliputian attempt at statesmanship ..." (D.T., 2.2.87).

(2) Examples of the interpretation of Freetrade as a broad political philosophy are to be seen in the statements of position published by two prominent Association members during 1887-9: A. B. Smith, Liberty and Liberalism (1887); B. R. Wise, The Position of the Liberal Party (1888); A. B. Smith, Freetrade and Liberal Associations, Their True Province (1889).

(3) e.g., after the freetrade banquet of March, 1887, the D.T. commented on its composition as being "typical of the strength of the Freetrade Party," and drew attention to the number of merchants present, together with enthusiastic leaders like G.H. Reid, B. R. Wise ("an ardent young Australian with a political ambition"), and E. Pulsford ("a thoughtful citizen whose intellect works on happy terms with his conscience"), adding that "it is ... a people's movement to which these men have committed and devoted themselves." (15.3.87).
"new" freetraders appear to have gradually begun to secure control of the parliamentary freetrade party, (1) a development which marked the beginning of Parkes' decline, (though delayed as yet by the residue of prestige remaining from former days and the initial success of his championing of diversionary causes like Federation), and which was accompanied by a tightening up of the party structure.

Indeed, this process of squeezing, by which the older parliamentary elements were forced into new moulds, or else fell by the wayside, took place on both sides of the House after the 1887 election. The election itself witnessed, (under pressure from the electoral organisations), a series of most remarkable conversions on the tariff issue, so that, with a few notable exceptions, the old members who remained kept their factional identity and yet succeeded in fitting into the two-party system. Dibbs managed to keep his freetradism unsullied for almost six months, until he was at length granted the vision and left the discomfort of the crossbenches to take over leadership of the Protectionist party. J. H. Want and George Reid alone of all the old politicians refused to sacrifice either their freetrade principles or their hatred of Parkes, and remained in splendid isolation.

(1) Parkes' 1887 Cabinet contained no Association politicians, and included three suspected protectionists, (Abigail, Roberts, Clarke). But in 1889, Bruce Smith, J. H. Carruthers, D. O'Connor, and W. McMillan - all "new" freetraders - were included in the Ministry. The conversion of the Freetrade to a "Liberal" party in 1889 was carried out under the direction of McMillan, and with but half-hearted acquiescence on Parkes' part.
4. **THE ELECTION OF 1889**

Two recognisable parliamentary "parties" - whatever their internal composition - thus faced each other at the election of 1889, and each co-operated from the first with its respective electoral machine. A meeting of the Freetrade party, held under the chairmanship of McMillan, (Parkes, though leader of the party, contented himself with sending a letter of good wishes), elected a Central Elections Committee of nine, which co-operated with the Council of the Freetrade Association (1) in directing the campaign. (2) The Protectionist party established a strong Central Executive, composed of party leaders, and delegates from the external protectionist organisations. (3) Daily meetings of the central bodies were held, and the campaign was conducted along the lines developed in the previous election, though with much greater efficiency than before.

The nature and degree of this efficiency was such that even to the minds of contemporaries there was an obvious parallel to be drawn with the English Caucus system. In this connection it is instructive to note two most revealing passages from the press of the day. The first appeared in a column of

---

(1) **D.T.** 19.1.89. The comment made on Parkes' gesture in sending his letter was significant: this action, claimed the D.T., showed that "in spite of recent differences he is still ... with his party and insists on the primal duty of unity and determination."

(2) **D.T.** 21.1.89. The Committee described its function as being "not to act in any dictatorial manner, but to provide well established men holding freetrade views for all the constituencies."

(3) **D.T.** 22.1.89.
political comments in the Sydney Morning Herald, and refers to the Freetrade Associations.

"These societies are developing in a way which perhaps ought to have been expected, but is nevertheless one which may lead us to think how far they should be allowed to go. Certain ffretrade association lights would seem to claim an authority which it may be necessary to curtail. A friend of mine proposed the other day to stand for a certain constituency. He announced his intention, and straightway certain persons ... called to know whether he had 'reported' himself 'to the Association.' The implication appears to be that no one is to be regarded as a fit and proper person to represent or even to become a candidate for a constituency who does not bear the hallmark of the association ... There are, of course, those who regard the 'caucus' system as without flaw, and curiously enough those who desire to curtail the free choice of free electors are, both here and at home, for the most part members of the party which claims to be called 'liberal,' and yet most of all insists upon subjecting the individual to its own particular 'discipline.'" (1)

A few weeks later an angry correspondent wrote to the Daily Telegraph in similar vein:

"With the most unblushing effrontery, the extraordinary doctrine is promulgated by the protectionist leaders that it is right and just in the public interest that a political organisation should have the sole right of nominating candidates for the legislature and would be justified in boycotting and persecuting any candidate holding similar views who would not submit to its dictation. Practically, this is a system of government, not by the people through their chosen representatives, but by a political organisation through its nominees.

(1) S.M.H., 26.1.89.
"A man may be honourable and upright, possessed of ability, culture and business capacity, in every way eminently qualified for legislative duties, and may have the respect and confidence of a constituency, but because it does not happen to suit the purpose of a clique of wire pullers that he should have a seat in the Assembly he is to be hounded down or, as they put it, 'the mutineers should be so dealt with that until they consent to become subject to authority they shall never receive support." (1)

The freetraders won the election, but only by the barest of majorities. This near defeat caused great concern among freetrade organisers, and in a burst of vigour they established over one hundred new branches of the Freetrade Association during the three months following the election. (2) Then in March, 1889, a special meeting of existing and past members of the parliamentary party decided to form a Freetrade and Liberal Association, to take over control of the whole Free-trade movement in New South Wales. The committees appointed by this meeting produced, and had adopted, a scheme for converting the Freetrade party into a "Liberal" party, with a very broad platform, and an extra-parliamentary organisation based on local Liberal Associations. (3) These Associations were to send delegates to an annual conference, which in turn was to appoint a permanent Central Executive of five. A conference with the Freetrade Association resulted in the conversion of existing branches of that body into Liberal Associations. (4)

(1) D.T., 11.2.89.
(2) S.M.H., 16.3.89.
(3) See S.M.H., 2, 28.3.89; 2, 8.4.89.
(4) S.M.H., 1.5.89.
The development towards a unified party structure has now been completed. With its platform, its permanent executive, (representing a continuing body uniting the parliamentary party and the external associations), its party rules, and its requirements of a pledge from all members; this organisation was an almost identical model of the type of structure used by modern Australian Non-Labour parties, as well as displaying many of the technical features soon to be "devised" by the Labour party itself.

5. THE FATE OF THE NEW "PARTY" STRUCTURES: A POSTSCRIPT

The establishment in 1889 of the "Liberal Party," and the maturing of Protectionist organisation appeared to herald the coming of a new era in the politics of New South Wales. These pyramidal "party" structures, reaching down into the electorates and upward into Parliament, gave promise of regular two-party conflict, the end of "personal" faction strife, and possible governmental stability. In reality, however, it was the end of an epoch. In the next election - that of 1891 - the name "Liberal Party" was rarely to be heard, and the Freetrade campaign, despite the efficient blueprints of 1889, was even less organised than that of 1887.

It is beyond the scope of the present study to
attempt to account in detail for these unexpected developments.  
(1) The period from 1889 onward was one of deep change, producing new issues which could not be encompassed in terms of a freetrade-protectionist division, however great the ingenuity of the interpreters of these principles. The federation question split both parties, while the social and political upheavals that accompanied the eruption of the Labour movement took them by surprise, and left them confused and immobilised. The "radical" protectionism and the "liberal" freetradeism of the party elites that had sprung from the electoral organisation of 1887-89 appeared reactionary beside the theories of the infant Labour party, and it was not until Reid attached novel meanings to "Freetrade" in 1894 that the older political elements were able to harness the new social forces to their purposes. (2)

The success of the parties of 1889 was also vitiated by the continuing influence of fragmenting forces such as localism, and the survival of faction remnants unaccustomed to the conditions imposed upon parliamentary warfare by a party system. The notion of political "independence" remained strong, and the discipline implicit in electoral organisation

(2) For an account of Reid's work, see article by the present writer, "Freetrade and Protectionist Parties in New South Wales." (Historical Studies - Australia and New Zealand, Vol. 6., No. 23, Nov., 1954).
was not matched by party discipline at the parliamentary level. This resulted as much from the nature of the "parties" and of their origin, as from the continuing power of tradition.
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CONCLUSIONS

1. THE PERIOD OF PARLIAMENTARY FACTIONS IN NEW SOUTH WALES

The first part of the present study dealt with a period in New South Wales during which no regular political parties existed. The dominant aspect of politics was the struggle of rival faction leaders for power. They organised parliamentary groups on the basis of small, tightly knit coteries of personal followers, eschewing principle as a source of unity, in favour of processes which had two phases: electoral and parliamentary. In the first, through widespread secret "wire-pulling," they sought to exploit a variety of local conflicts to promote the election of members likely to support them in the Assembly. In the second, through intrigue and tactical manoeuvre, they sought in Parliament to attract constellations of members to their faction nuclei, to construct those majorities upon which power depended.

Politics was thus an art in which considerations of personality, strategic skills, and mild corruption generally determined the location of power. Group or ideological conflicts within society were not strong enough to impose
order upon the struggles taking place within the almost closed arena of Parliament. Social groups organised and expressed their demands at the electoral level, whence, through the constraint of public opinion and the search of faction leaders for support, they filtered up to receive desultory attention at the parliamentary level. (1) Extreme electoral activity, and the formation of pressure groups in the House itself occasionally enabled special interests to short-circuit this roundabout process. But their ends were always limited, and their activities conditioned by the clash of parliamentary factions.

This political milieu in many respects resembled that of eighteenth century England. The personal faction nuclei of New South Wales were analagous to the cabals that had jockeyed for position in the British Commons a century before, while the notion of "independence" had already found eloquent expression in speeches such as Burke's celebrated delivery "at the Conclusion of the Poll." (2) Even the work of faction leaders in the constituencies of New South Wales, though not characterised by the same wholesale bribery, could

(1) This situation is very well expressed in the words used by Prof. W. L. Burn when describing eighteenth century politics in England: "Public opinion existed and counted. But it gave very little in the way of a day-to-day lead to the Government. It was, rather, in the nature of a minefield through which the government could walk, at the risk of being blown up." (ed. S. D. Bailey, The British Party System, p. 24).

(2) "You choose a member indeed; but when you have chosen him, he is not a member of Bristol, but he is a member of Parliament." (Quoted by C. S. Emden, in The People and the Constitution, p. 25).
be compared to those electoral intrigues recently brought to light by British historians of the Namier school.

In both periods, there were "few issues sufficiently acute and fundamental for the nation at large to take permanent sides upon." (1) The cabals of the eighteenth century arose naturally in a legislature in which, thanks to a restricted suffrage, a single social class predominated. For different reasons, a similar situation had developed in New South Wales, where despite manhood suffrage, the middle classes had a practical monopoly of parliamentary representation. The expensiveness of pursuing an active political career accounted in some measure for this. More important, however, were the homogeneity of social values, and the widely spread economic ease, brought by prosperity. White collar and skilled workers aspired to the possession of property and tended to adopt the manners and ideals of their masters. Though hardening, the structure of Colonial society was still fluid enough to prevent these dreams of self-betterment being entirely impractical. The unskilled, lulled by good wages, and with their aspirations as yet unformulated in political terms, accepted with equanimity the financial barrier, and left the parliamentary game to men of substance. The latter, rarely divided deeply by interest or principle, inevitably arranged themselves in evanescent combinations clustering around individuals of talent and

(1) W. L. Burn, op. cit., p. 23.
influence, whose chief end was to secure the personal emoluments and power of office.

2. **THE PROTECTIONIST AND FREETRADE "PARTIES" 1887-89**

The parties that emerged in the late 'eighties were of "electoral origin." (1) This was a natural development from the preceding period, when both sectional interests and politicians had become accustomed to look to the electoral process as being peculiarly amenable to interference. Techniques of organisation within the constituencies had been pioneered by minority movements, but, though efficient, existing bodies were too diverse in their aims and limited in their appeal to produce consistent voting patterns from electorate to electorate. The early protectionists modified this heterogeneity by using the tariff issue to federate a number of existing organisations with those they created themselves.

A peculiar combination of circumstances made this possible.

The protectionist movement sprang from the enthusiasm of doctrinaires and the stirrings of radicals in the mid-'eighties. It extended its appeal through the promised solution it offered for economic problems being currently faced by a number of interests. Its first electoral efforts

(1) M. Duverger, *Political Parties*, pp. xxiv et seq.
produced a small but close-knit parliamentary group, whose ceaseless propaganda coincided with an unexpected decline in State revenue to create the impression that fiscal policy was the "coming" political question. As the protectionist electoral machine expanded under the impetus of combined idealism, economic pressure, and social prejudice, doctrinaire defenders of free trade and the threatened mercantile and financial interest found themselves obliged to adopt the tactics of their antagonists.

Within the constituencies, the new freetrade and protectionist associations rapidly took over the functions of the old ad hoc election committees, interpreting local issues and conflicts to suit their own purposes. Working under the direction of central bodies, they forced politicians to declare their fiscal faith, and hence produced two distinct "parties" in the legislature. The old faction alignments were forced into new moulds, and an era of political order appeared to be dawning when each parliamentary "party" became linked through formal institutions with its respective electoral machine.

Both electoral organisations, once formed and having tasted the sweets of power, gained an impetus of their own. This, combined with the limited appeal of single tariff principles, made it inevitable that, to spread the vote-catching
net, tariff labels should be converted into political philosophies. The tendency of the protectionists to subsume a number of economic grievances and social prejudices under a fiscal tag was an early example of this, while the conversion of the Freetrade party into a "Liberal" party exhibited it in a more matured form. But though successful in the electoral field, these tactics were insufficient to produce united parliamentary groups. Within a new elite springing directly from each of the extra-parliamentary organisations, ideological convictions were strong enough to promote discipline. But in each "party" this group was surrounded by old-type faction, local and independent members, for whom the mere attachment of a fiscal name was insufficient sanction for more than occasional conformity on restricted issues. Unfamiliar with, and afraid of the new political methods foreshadowed in the demands imposed by electoral machines, they relapsed into faction struggles once they had negotiated the constituencies and reached the comparative seclusion of Parliament. This tendency was accentuated by the survival of the old leaders, and the continued clogging of the legislative process by localism and administrative necessity.
The present study suggests that at least one continuous thread is to be discerned in the otherwise confused political history of late nineteenth century New South Wales: a progressive evolution of organisation in the constituencies. Faction leaders pioneered methods of central manipulation as a source of personal power. But as social needs expressed themselves most effectively at the electoral level, these techniques were especially suited to serve as instruments through which such needs might be co-ordinated and channelled to Parliament. The freetrade and protectionist machines, taking the initiative for centralised electoral organisation from the hands of faction leaders, and founding new electoral bodies by federating certain social groups, advanced a step in this direction. But the conditions they had exploited for this purpose were ephemeral, and the political implications of the combined social aspirations they represented were vague, so that the parliamentary bodies they produced lacked cohesion and purpose. It remained for the Labour party to show how electoral organisation on a restricted social base, combined with clear political principles, could produce a disciplined and effective political party.
But although the protectionist and free-trade organisers of the 'eighties extended and systematised techniques already in use in New South Wales, some of their inspiration undoubtedly came from contemporary political trends outside the Colony. In England, the National Liberal Federation, established in 1877, was demonstrating the effectiveness of centralised electoral organisation along lines suggested by the Birmingham Association, (1) while Gladstone's victories (2) showed what power could stem from alliance between such extra-parliamentary bodies and parliamentary leaders. The Liberal Caucus aroused great interest in New South Wales, where the developing electoral organisations had much in common with it. (3)

Nearer home, Protection and National Reform Leagues flourished in Victoria in the mid-'seventies, to be amalgamated and exploited as an electoral machine by Graham Berry's "Liberal" party in 1877. (4) The tariff issue had already

---

(1) M. Ostrogorski, Democracy and the Organisation of Political Parties, pp. 176 et seq.
(2) Particularly in the election of 1880, (ibid., pp. 179, 204).
(3) See, e.g., comments on electoral manipulation in 1889, above, p. 282, and as an example of earlier interest in the Caucus, S.M.H., editorial of 14.11.78, discussing the implications of the celebrated clash between Forster, Liberal member for Bradford, and the borough organisation.
(4) J. E. Parnaby, Economic and Political Development of Victoria, 1877-81, (Unpublished thesis, Melbourne University Library), Ch. XII, "The Leagues."
come to a head in Victoria, where public revenue was unsupported by a large income from the land, and population pressure had united farmers, artisans and manufacturers in a strong protectionist movement. The early protectionists of New South Wales were thus provided with a model, to which they clearly owed much, both in doctrine and in forms of organisation. Despite greatly differing circumstances in the two Colonies, they took over the notion of protection as both instrument and end in a "democratic" struggle against the "monopoly" of wealth represented by merchants and pastoralists. In the words of Victorian apologists for protection they found much useful propaganda, while clever interpretation of the statistics of Victorian progress - to show the efficacy of their favoured tariff principle in action - was for them a convenient weapon. Nor were similarities between protectionist organisation in the two Colonies entirely accidental; even direct links existed through men like E. W. O'Sullivan, who, before his period as a founder and unifier of Leagues in New South Wales, had been a "lieutenant" of Berry's in Victoria. (1)

Novel political methods - especially in the electoral field - were thus "in the air" to help give direction to the efforts of those organising the new "machines." However, in England and - to a lesser extent - in Victoria, pre-existing

---

parties built up or joined with electoral bodies to enhance their strength. In New South Wales, on the other hand, the extra-parliamentary organisation played a major role in creating parliamentary "parties." It was this which gave them a uniqueness, and permitted them to exploit without restriction both indigenous tradition and techniques suggested by experience elsewhere.
APPENDIX I

TABLE 2
NEW SOUTH WALES TRADE, 1870 - 90

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Imports £</th>
<th>Exports £</th>
<th>Total Trade £</th>
<th>Wool Exports £</th>
<th>% of £ Export</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>8,284,378</td>
<td>8,030,578</td>
<td>16,314,956</td>
<td>2,741,141</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>9,335,067</td>
<td>11,261,219</td>
<td>21,196,286</td>
<td>4,748,160</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>9,572,404</td>
<td>10,483,656</td>
<td>20,056,060</td>
<td>3,342,290</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>11,516,629</td>
<td>12,764,872</td>
<td>24,281,501</td>
<td>4,273,380</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>11,650,154</td>
<td>12,457,975</td>
<td>14,108,129</td>
<td>5,010,125</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>13,735,133</td>
<td>13,797,397</td>
<td>27,532,530</td>
<td>5,651,643</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>13,800,505</td>
<td>13,061,412</td>
<td>26,861,917</td>
<td>5,565,173</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>14,352,778</td>
<td>13,345,790</td>
<td>28,310,678</td>
<td>5,256,038</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>15,104,945</td>
<td>13,134,405</td>
<td>28,239,050</td>
<td>5,723,316</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>14,503,826</td>
<td>13,131,931</td>
<td>27,635,757</td>
<td>6,491,198</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>14,176,063</td>
<td>15,682,802</td>
<td>30,858,865</td>
<td>8,040,625</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>17,587,012</td>
<td>16,307,805</td>
<td>33,894,817</td>
<td>7,149,787</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>21,467,899</td>
<td>17,677,355</td>
<td>39,145,254</td>
<td>7,433,091</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>21,522,941</td>
<td>20,262,273</td>
<td>41,785,214</td>
<td>9,598,761</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>23,160,916</td>
<td>18,577,290</td>
<td>41,738,206</td>
<td>8,953,100</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>23,737,461</td>
<td>16,750,107</td>
<td>40,587,568</td>
<td>7,246,842</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>21,313,127</td>
<td>15,717,937</td>
<td>37,031,064</td>
<td>7,028,596</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>19,171,317</td>
<td>18,521,750</td>
<td>37,693,067</td>
<td>8,911,155</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>21,229,277</td>
<td>20,920,130</td>
<td>42,149,407</td>
<td>9,059,776</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>22,863,057</td>
<td>23,294,934</td>
<td>46,157,991</td>
<td>10,620,636</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>22,615,904</td>
<td>22,045,937</td>
<td>44,660,941</td>
<td>8,991,396</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base figures from N.S.W. Statistical Register, 1892. (Table - "Statistical View of the Progress of the Colony of N.S.W.").
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#### TABLE 3

**EXPORT PRICE LEVELS, NEW SOUTH WALES, 1870-1889**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Domestic Produce</th>
<th>Wool</th>
<th>Coal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>1,595</td>
<td>1,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>1,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>1,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>1,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>1,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>1,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>1,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>1,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>1,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td>1,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>1,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>1,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>1,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>1,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>1,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>1,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>1,222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## APPENDIX I

### TABLE 4

NEW SOUTH WALES STATE REVENUE, 1871-89

(£)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Taxation</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Land Revenue</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1,063,204</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,497,978</td>
<td>561,679</td>
<td>116,939</td>
<td>2,238,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1,200,203</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,137,914</td>
<td>728,875</td>
<td>111,585</td>
<td>2,082,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1,364,806</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,426,166</td>
<td>770,895</td>
<td>99,318</td>
<td>3,214,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>1,200,489</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,020,629</td>
<td>858,497</td>
<td>116,764</td>
<td>3,418,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1,122,002</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,773,003</td>
<td>965,327</td>
<td>137,925</td>
<td>5,037,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>1,161,406</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,199,532</td>
<td>162,937</td>
<td>5,751,876</td>
<td>6,636,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>1,093,903</td>
<td>139,229</td>
<td>3,236,277</td>
<td>1,119,532</td>
<td>162,937</td>
<td>5,751,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>1,156,792</td>
<td>152,926</td>
<td>2,325,704</td>
<td>1,183,582</td>
<td>172,915</td>
<td>5,482,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1,127,250</td>
<td>147,471</td>
<td>1,632,024</td>
<td>1,328,302</td>
<td>248,618</td>
<td>5,482,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1,203,916</td>
<td>213,378</td>
<td>1,646,436</td>
<td>1,594,082</td>
<td>254,178</td>
<td>5,491,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>1,124,165</td>
<td>346,684</td>
<td>2,820,988</td>
<td>1,945,076</td>
<td>177,414</td>
<td>5,415,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>1,514,262</td>
<td>389,150</td>
<td>2,914,394</td>
<td>2,363,085</td>
<td>6,714,327</td>
<td>7,129,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>1,546,857</td>
<td>344,851</td>
<td>1,656,069</td>
<td>2,666,731</td>
<td>255,833</td>
<td>4,204,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>1,726,811</td>
<td>426,043</td>
<td>1,753,344</td>
<td>2,942,643</td>
<td>268,751</td>
<td>3,591,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>1,359,955</td>
<td>492,696</td>
<td>1,876,452</td>
<td>3,168,463</td>
<td>289,802</td>
<td>5,857,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>2,068,571</td>
<td>543,264</td>
<td>1,643,954</td>
<td>3,089,235</td>
<td>249,276</td>
<td>5,924,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>2,011,947</td>
<td>652,601</td>
<td>2,378,995</td>
<td>3,245,907</td>
<td>293,361</td>
<td>8,562,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1,883,958</td>
<td>798,825</td>
<td>2,268,253</td>
<td>3,664,100</td>
<td>272,124</td>
<td>8,886,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1,905,883</td>
<td>771,286</td>
<td>2,137,563</td>
<td>3,924,955</td>
<td>323,710</td>
<td>9,063,397</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figures of Customs Revenue from *N.S.W., Statistical Register*, 1885 (pp. 184-5), 1892 (p. 270).
## APPENDIX I

### TABLE 5

**MALE BREADWINNERS, GRADE OF OCCUPATION, NEW SOUTH WALES, 1871 and 1891**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>1871 Employers</th>
<th>1871 Wage Earners</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1891 Employers</th>
<th>1891 Wage Earners</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Producers</td>
<td>38,470</td>
<td>24,432</td>
<td>62,902</td>
<td>51,229</td>
<td>47,821</td>
<td>99,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>6,035</td>
<td>4,243</td>
<td>10,278</td>
<td>18,530</td>
<td>48,992</td>
<td>67,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>4,762</td>
<td>19,249</td>
<td>24,011</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>103,306</td>
<td>122,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,711</td>
<td>6,711</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>9,227</td>
<td>9,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19,030</td>
<td>19,030</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>8,638</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,638</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>57,905</strong></td>
<td><strong>73,665</strong></td>
<td><strong>131,570</strong></td>
<td><strong>89,614</strong></td>
<td><strong>209,346</strong></td>
<td><strong>298,960</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1871</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>56.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1891</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>70.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXPLANATORY NOTE

The above table rests on the assumption that, although the employer-employee ratio cannot be worked out for the whole of the breadwinning population for both the periods examined, it is possible to gain an indication of the changes that occurred by considering the large sample of occupations for which comparison is possible. Since the segment of total breadwinners considered in the above figures is 76.1 per cent in the case of the 1871 census, and 78.1 per cent in that of the 1891 census, the results of the sample must be taken as highly representative.

In the census figures of 1871, no distinction was made between employers and employees in the numbers of those engaged in mining, in the production of food and drink, and in the professions. These callings have accordingly been disregarded. Owing to the differences in the basis of classification adopted in the two censuses, careful regrading of data was necessary to make the figures comparable. Comparison, indeed, is possible only for the general total, and not for the individual classes of occupation. The principal cause of the discrepancy in the components of the totals arises from the fact that the 1871 census grouped all unskilled workers (pastoral, agricultural and industrial) together, and included a category of "miscellaneous" occupations which embraced over 8,000 employers or men working on their own account. Both of these groups
were, in the more detailed classification of 1891, absorbed into the general figures at the appropriate places. They were thus accounted for, but cannot be identified for purposes of detailed comparison. On the other hand, the unemployed were included, in 1871, in the appropriate groups of wage earners. For this reason it has been necessary to add the figures of unemployed to the same general category, (wage earners), in the relevant totals of 1891. None of these differences, however, affects the general totals.

A detailed account of the mode of reclassification used in the construction of the table follows. (Sources, Census of N.S.W., 1871, pp. 861 et seq.; Census of N.S.W., 1891, pp. 584 et seq.).
## Mode of Reclassification of Census Data, Table V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CENSUS</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>PRIMARY PRODUCERS</th>
<th>COMMERCIAL</th>
<th>INDUSTRIAL</th>
<th>DOMESTIC</th>
<th>UNSKILLED</th>
<th>MISCELLANEOUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>Class VI</td>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>Class VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Classes</td>
<td>Sub-Classes</td>
<td>Sub-Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1, 2)</td>
<td>1 (1), 2(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (1), 2(1, 2)</td>
<td>3 (1), 4(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (1), 4(1)</td>
<td>5 (1), 6(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Wage Earners</td>
<td>Class VI</td>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>Class VIII</td>
<td>Class IX</td>
<td>Class IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Classes</td>
<td>Sub-Classes</td>
<td>Sub-Classes</td>
<td>Sub-Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>1 (2), 2(2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>3 (1), 4(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (1), 4(1)</td>
<td>5 (2), 6(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grades of "Employer," "Engaged Own Account" and "Relative Assisting."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1891</th>
<th>Employers</th>
<th>Class V</th>
<th>Class III</th>
<th>Class IV</th>
<th>Class II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Order 21</td>
<td>Orders 4-6, 8-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Order 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Orders</td>
<td>(i.e., Order 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Order 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grades of "Wage-Earner" and "Unemployed."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1891</th>
<th>Wage Earners</th>
<th>Class V</th>
<th>Class III</th>
<th>Class IV</th>
<th>Class II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Order 21</td>
<td>Orders 4-6, 8-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Order 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Orders</td>
<td>(i.e., Order 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Order 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 6

### MALE BREADWINNERS, GRADE OF OCCUPATION, N.S.W., 1891

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>(a) % of Total Male Population</th>
<th>(b) % of Male Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>53,403</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged on own account</td>
<td>49,482</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative assisting</td>
<td>8,943</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage earners</td>
<td>245,175</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>18,512</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependents</td>
<td>229,882</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>605,397</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL (excluding dependents)</strong></td>
<td>375,515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(b) This percentage is based on male population, excluding those whose grade of occupation was "not stated," those whose occupations were not specified, and those workers (included above in the 229,882 dependents) to whom Grade of Occupation was not applicable.
APPENDIX II

ATTITUDES OF MEMBERS OF NEW SOUTH WALES LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY TO PRINCIPAL GOVERNMENTS, 1872-87

PRELIMINARY NOTE

The pages which follow represent an attempt to discover, by tabulating the votes they recorded in certain critical parliamentary divisions, the attitudes of men holding seats in the New South Wales Legislative Assembly between 1872 and 1887 to the six principal governments of the time.

These Governments and the Parliaments in which they held office, were as follows:

1. Parkes Ministry (1872-4) Seventh Parliament,
2. Robertson Ministry (1875-7) Eighth Parliament,
3. Farnell Ministry (1878) Ninth Parliament,
4. Parkes-Robertson Coalition (1879-82) Tenth Parliament,
5. Stuart Ministry (1883-5) Eleventh Parliament,

The tabulation presented here finds its justification in the assumption that, despite the strength of those sanctions contemporaneously imposed on politicians by the notion of independence, and the absence of anything resembling 'party' discipline, there were a number of occasions when a direct expression of opinion in favour of or against a government, as such, seemed inescapable. If a number of such divisions are
considered, it is logical to expect that voting consistencies should indicate those members who were regular supporters or opponents of the government in question.

This mode of procedure has some defects, and these must be admitted at the outset. The number of divisions, of the kind referred to, which took place during the life of a government was usually small, and even so, few members recorded a vote for each of them. Thus the assessment of a politician's general attitude to a government has at times to be based on the slender evidence of but a handful of votes. There were also occasions when, despite the fact that the fate of a government was clearly in the balance, other issues involved in the situation were more vital to some members, and affected their votes accordingly. The Land Bills on which the Farnell and Parkes-Robertson Government fell were clear instances of this. In each case many staunch supporters of the government, who also had strong views on the land question, unwillingly voted with the Opposition, even though they knew that in doing so they were helping to overthrow an Administration in which they had every confidence. Where possible, this kind of dilemma has been allowed for in the survey, but it is obvious that many instances must escape observation, and these provide a possible source of errors in classification.

Where the data provided here are used to assess the balance of power within particular parliaments, it has also to be remembered that - as will readily be observed from the tables -
there are a number of instances where members cannot be justifiably classified at all because they recorded too few votes in the listed divisions. They have thus to be omitted from such calculations, though in fact they may have been quite consistent in their attitude to the Government of the day. A similar problem is posed by men entering Parliament at by-elections. Since no distinction can be made in the survey between these members, and those who had been elected at general elections, some distortion necessarily enters into assessments, deduced from the voting analysis made below, of the relative strengths of groups within particular Parliaments. To be accurate, such assessments should provide a picture of the position at a given time. In fact, the situation represented in the figures presented in the table on p. below is somewhat unreal, since the numbers given are actually totals of all classifiable members who had at any time held seats in the designated Parliaments. Despite these defects, however, the techniques used here do serve to illustrate the opinions of the majority of the politicians of the period, and to indicate certain regularities of behaviour which might not in any other way be observable. Though a margin of error exists, it cannot vitiate the general conclusions to which this evidence points.

KEY TO TABLES:

The figures at the heads of columns designate the divisions considered, according to the key set out below.

The symbol "x" represents a vote for the Government
of the day, and "O" against.

In surveying the voting patterns of individual members, observable consistencies are taken to indicate that the person concerned regularly supported the Government (indicated by the symbol "G") or opposed it ("O"). Where no consistency occurs, the member is classified as an Independent ("I").
SEVENTH PARLIAMENT - (PARKES GOVERNMENT)

DIVISIONS TABULATED

1. Election of Chairman of Committees. 13.6.72.
3. Border Duties Convention Bill, Third Reading. 10.7.72.
4. Attendance at Ministerial Dinner (Government Supporters) 29.9.73.
5. Censure motion (on reinstatement of civil servant, Moriarty). 30.10.73.
6. Resolutions criticising Government Railway policy. 9.12.73.

SOURCES: Issues of Sydney Morning Herald on dates following the divisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>ALLEGIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbott, R.P.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen, G.W.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold, W.M.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker, E.A.</td>
<td>Mineralogist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bawden, T.</td>
<td>Storekeeper and Farmer</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett, H.</td>
<td>Auctioneer (Tamworth)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booth, J.</td>
<td>Timber Merchant</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, S.C.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, T.</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne, W.C.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan, D.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns, J.F.</td>
<td>Merchant and Shipowner</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler, E.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, J.</td>
<td>Merchant (Morpeth)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, H.</td>
<td>Produce Merchant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combes, E.</td>
<td>Engineer (Mining)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper, W.H.</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creed, J.M.</td>
<td>Medical Practitioner</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER</td>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ALLEGIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummings, W.</td>
<td>Land Agent</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumnen, J.A.</td>
<td>Land Agent</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangar, T.G.G.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Salis, L.W.F.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver, R. Junr.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnell, J.S.</td>
<td>Ex-Public Servant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzpatrick, M.</td>
<td>Land Agent</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forster, W.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett, T.</td>
<td>Land Agent</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grahame, W.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greville, E.</td>
<td>Printing Materials</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannell, J.</td>
<td>Importer</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay, W.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill, R.</td>
<td>Orchardist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoskins, J.</td>
<td>Gold Mine Owner</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurley, J.</td>
<td>Gold Mine Owner</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurley, J.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innes, J.G.L.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob, A.H.</td>
<td>Ex-Civil Servant</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings, P.A.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lackey, J.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, B.</td>
<td>Merchant and Shipper</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy, L.W.</td>
<td>Storekeeper (Tamworth)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd, G.A.</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord, G.W.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas, J.</td>
<td>Builder and Contractor</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macintosh, J.</td>
<td>Ironmonger</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER</td>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ALLEGIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macleay, W. Jun.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, J.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLaurin, J.</td>
<td>Pastoralist (Cattle)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore, C.</td>
<td>Auctioneer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses, H.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neale, J. H.</td>
<td>Storekeeper (Orange)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson, H.L.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nowlan, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakes, G.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Connor, J.G.</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onslow, A.A.W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkes, H.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phelps, J.J.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piddington, W.R.</td>
<td>Bookseller and Publisher</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raphael, J.G.</td>
<td>Import merchant</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson, T.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodd, J.</td>
<td>Estate Agent and auctioneer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel, S.</td>
<td>Stock Agent</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholey, S.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, J.D.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, J.S.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, R.B.</td>
<td>Solicitor and Squatter</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart, J.</td>
<td>Stock and Commission Agent</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland, J.</td>
<td>Builder and Contractor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, H.</td>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER</td>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ALLEGIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teecle, W. Junior</td>
<td>Boot Manufacturer</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, S.H.</td>
<td>Private Means (Inherited)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunks, W.</td>
<td>Publican</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warden, J.</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson, J.</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wearne, J.</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb, E.</td>
<td>Storekeeper (Bathurst)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West, T.H.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EIGHTH PARLIAMENT - ROBERTSON GOVERNMENT

#### DIVISIONS TABULATED

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Censure motion which overthrew Parkes Government. 28.1.75.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Attendance at Ministerial dinner (Government supporters).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Land Bill. Second Reading. 13.5.75. 23.3.75.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Motion condemning Government on Banking Policy. 12.7.75.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Censure motion. 20.1.76.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Declaration of vacancy of seat of Forster. (Colonial Treasurer) 25.1.76.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Agreements Validating Bill. Acceptance of Report. 9.2.76.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public Schools Act Amendment Bill. Second Reading. 14.3.76.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(SOURCES: Issues of S.M.H. on dates following the divisions)

#### MEMBER | OCCUPATION | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | ALLEGIANCE
---|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
Abbott, R. P. | Solicitor (and pastoral interests) | o | x | o | o | o | I
Allen, G. W. | Solicitor | o | x? | Speaker | d. 1 March '75 | o | 0
Arnold, W. M. | Pastoralist (cattle) | o | x | x | x | x | x | G
Bawden, T. | Farmer and Merchant | x | x | x | x | x | x | G
Baker, E. A. | Minerologist | x | x | x | x | x | x | G
Bennett, H. | Auctioneer (Tamworth) | x | o | o | o | o | o | G
Booth, J. | Timber Merchant | x | x | x | x | x | x | G
Brown, H. H. | Pastoralist (Cattle) | x | x | x | x | x | x | G
Brown, S. C. | Solicitor | x | x | x | x | x | x | G
Brown, T. | Farmer | x | x | x | x | x | x | G
Browne, W. C. | Pastoralist | x | x | x | x | x | x | G
Buchanan, W. | Barrister | x | x | x | x | o | o | I
Burns, J. F. | Merchant and Shipper | x | x | x | x | x | x | G
Butler, E. | Barrister | x | x | x | x | x | x | G
Byrnes, C. J. | Tweed and Woollen Manufacturer | x | x | x | x | x | x | G
Cameron, A. | Carpenter | x | x | x | x | x | x | G
Charles, S. | Pastoralist | x | x | x | x | x | x | G
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>ALLEGIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, H.</td>
<td>Produce Merchant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen, H.E.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coombes, E.</td>
<td>Mining Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummeen, J.A.</td>
<td>Land Agent</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangar, H.C.</td>
<td>Barrister (and Pastoral interests)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangar, T.G.G.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies, J.</td>
<td>Ironmonger</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day, G.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dibbs, G.R.</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver, R.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnell, J.S.</td>
<td>Retired Civil Servant</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzpatrick, M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forster, R.H.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forster, W.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett, Thos.</td>
<td>Land Agent</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goold, S.S.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, S.W.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greville, E.</td>
<td>Merchant and Publisher</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay, W.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill, R.</td>
<td>Orchardist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoskins, J.</td>
<td>Gold Mine Owner</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungerford, T.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurley, J.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurley, J.</td>
<td>Mining Interests</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob, A.H.</td>
<td>Ex Civil Servant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER</td>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>ALLEGIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston, W.</td>
<td>Merchant (Clarence Town)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lackey, J.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leary, J.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd, G.A.</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long, W.A.</td>
<td>Wine and Spirit Merchant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord, G.W.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas, J.</td>
<td>Builder and Contractor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch, A.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macintosh, J.</td>
<td>Ironmonger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McElhone, J.</td>
<td>Hide and Tallow Merchant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer, S.</td>
<td>Grocer</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montague, A.</td>
<td>Pastoralist (Storekeeper, Mill owner etc.)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses, H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson, H. L.</td>
<td>Storekeeper</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onslow, A.A.W.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkes, H.</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phelps, J.J.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piddington, W.R.</td>
<td>Book seller and Publisher</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilcher, C.E.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson, J.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouse, R.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholey, S.</td>
<td>Stock Agent</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd, P.L.C.</td>
<td>Seed and Plant Merchant</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER</td>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>ALLEGIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, J.S.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, R.B.</td>
<td>Solicitor, (and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Squatting interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, C.J.</td>
<td>Colliery Manager</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart, A.</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland, J.</td>
<td>Builder</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton, F. B.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton W. H.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, H.</td>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teece, W. Junior</td>
<td>Boot Manufacturer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, S.H.</td>
<td>(Private Means)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner, W.</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warden, J.</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson, J.</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson, W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wearne, J.</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, F.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windeyer, W.C.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom, R.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, J. J.</td>
<td>Storekeeper</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NINTH PARLIAMENT - (FARNELL GOVERNMENT)

#### DIVISIONS TABULATED

1. Farnell's Amendment to Address in Reply of Robertson Government 5.12.77.
2. Motion of Censure (Stuart), 24.1.78.
3. Criticism of railway proposals (Censure, Robertson), 29.1.78.
4. Land Bill, second reading. 5.12.78.
5. Motion of Censure. 18.12.78.

(SOURCES: Issues of Sydney Morning Herald on dates following the divisions).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>ALLEGIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen, G. W.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badgery, H.S.</td>
<td>Stock and station agent</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker, E. A.</td>
<td>Mineralogist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbour, R.</td>
<td>Sawmiller</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton, E.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowden, T.</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett, H.</td>
<td>Auctioneer (Tamworth)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyers, H.L.</td>
<td>Mine Owner (Gold)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowker, R.R.S.</td>
<td>Medical Practitioner</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowman, A.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, H.H.</td>
<td>Land Agent</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, S.C.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne, W.C.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan, D.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns, J.F.</td>
<td>Merchant and Shipper</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron, A.</td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER</td>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ALLEGIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles, S.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, H.</td>
<td>Produce Merchant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen, H.E.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combes, E.</td>
<td>Mining Engineer</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coonan, W.T.</td>
<td>Mining and Squatting Interests</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copeland, H.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangar, T.G.G.</td>
<td>Produce Merchant</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies, J.</td>
<td>Storekeeper (Goulburn)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day, G.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillon, J.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver R. Junior</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckford, J.</td>
<td>Publican</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnell, J.S.</td>
<td>Ex Civil Servant and Land Agent</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fawcett, C.H.</td>
<td>Ex Civil Servant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett, T.</td>
<td>Land Agent</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, S.W.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood, J.</td>
<td>Clergyman</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greville, E.</td>
<td>Printing Materials</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris, J.</td>
<td>Independent Means</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hezlet, W.</td>
<td>Commission Agent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoskins, J.</td>
<td>Goldmining Interests</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungerford, T.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurley, J.</td>
<td>Gold Mine Owner</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER</td>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ALLEGIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurley, J.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob, A.H.</td>
<td>Ex Civil Servant</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston, W.</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerr, A.T.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lackey, J.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leary, J.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long, W.A.</td>
<td>Wine and Spirit Merchant</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas, J.</td>
<td>Builder and Contractor</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch, A.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macintosh, T.</td>
<td>Ironmonger</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCulloch, A.H.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior McElhone, J.</td>
<td>Produce, Hide,</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas, J.</td>
<td>Builder and Contractor</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCrindle, H.M.H.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melville, N.</td>
<td>Undertaker</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merriman, J.</td>
<td>Shipowner</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses, H.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy, J.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Connor, D.</td>
<td>Auctioneer, Mining and Station Agent</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Sullivan, D.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onslow, A.A.W.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkes, H.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilcher, E.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renwick, A.</td>
<td>Medical Practitioner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson, J.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ninth Parliament — (Farnell Government)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Allegiance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roseby, J.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouse, R.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Horse Stud)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd, J.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholey, S.</td>
<td>Stock Agent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson, C.W.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, R.B.</td>
<td>Solicitor, (and Pastoralist)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, T.R.</td>
<td>Auctioneer</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart, A.</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland, J.</td>
<td>Builder</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutor, F.B.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutor, W.H.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant, H.J.</td>
<td>Surgeon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, E.</td>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teece, W. Junior</td>
<td>Tanner and Boot Manufacturer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, S.H.</td>
<td>Independent Means</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, J.B.</td>
<td>Selector</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson, J.</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb, E.</td>
<td>Merchant and Storekeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom, R.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windeyer, W.C.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TENTH PARLIAMENT: (PARKES-ROBERTSON COALITION)

DIVISIONS TABULATED: (VOLUME AND PAGE REFERENCES ARE TO N.S.W. P.D.)

1. Milburn Creek Company - Award of arbitrators. 9.3.81. (Vol. IV, p.248).
4. Amendment to Address in Reply. 25.8.82. (Vol. VII, pp.169-et seq.).
5. Land Bill. Second Reading. 16.11.82. (Vol. VII, p.11293).

(NOTE: The Symbol "G" indicates a member who, though a Government supporter, voted against the Land Bill.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>ALLEGIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbott, J. P.</td>
<td>Solicitor (and squatter)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbott, R. P.</td>
<td>Solicitor (and squatter)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail, F.</td>
<td>Boot Manufacturer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen, G.W.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews, J.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badgery, H.S.</td>
<td>Stock and Station Agent</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker, E.A.</td>
<td>Mineralogist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton, B.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton, R.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyers, H.L.</td>
<td>Mine Owner (Gold)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodel, J.</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowman, A.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brodribb, W.A.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, H.H.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, J.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER</td>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ALLEGIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, S.C.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunker, J.N.</td>
<td>Stock and Station Agent</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan, W.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burdekin, S.</td>
<td>Independent Means</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns, J.F.</td>
<td>Merchant and Shipper</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrnes, C.J.</td>
<td>Tweed and woollen manufacturer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron, A.</td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, G.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, W.R.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter, G.L.</td>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass, G.E.</td>
<td>Wine and Spirit Merchant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, H.</td>
<td>Produce Merchant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, W.</td>
<td>Banker</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combes, E.</td>
<td>Mining Engineer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooke, H.H.</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copeland, A.</td>
<td>Mining and Squatting Interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramsie, J.</td>
<td>Storekeeper</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangar, H.C.</td>
<td>Barrister (and pastoral interests)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangar, T.G.G.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies, J.</td>
<td>Ironmonger</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day, G.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillon, J.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas, J.H.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckford, J.</td>
<td>Publican</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnell, J.S.</td>
<td>Publican</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fawcett, C.H.</td>
<td>Retired Police Magistrate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER</td>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ALLEGIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fergusson, W.J.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzpatrick, M.</td>
<td>Ex Public Servant</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher, J.</td>
<td>Colliery Manager</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forster, W.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster, W.J.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser, A.R.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremlin, A.R.</td>
<td>Fellmonger</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullford, J.</td>
<td>Publican</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gannon, J.T.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrard, J.</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett, T.</td>
<td>Land Agent</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garvan, J.P.</td>
<td>Produce Merchant</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay, W.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henson, W.</td>
<td>Private Means</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He ydon, L.F.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hezlet, W.</td>
<td>Commission Agent</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holborow, W.</td>
<td>Storekeeper</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoskins, J.</td>
<td>Mining Interests</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungerford, T.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob, A. H.</td>
<td>Ex Civil Servant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings, P.A.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerr, A.T.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidd, J.</td>
<td>Storekeeper</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lackey, J.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levin, R.H.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levin, L.</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd, G.A.</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughnan, G.C.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch, A.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyne, W.J.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER</td>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ALLEGIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, W.F.</td>
<td>Commission Agent and Produce Merchant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCulloch, A.H.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McElhone, J.</td>
<td>Hide and Tallow Merchant</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLaughlin, J.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melville, N.</td>
<td>Undertaker</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>G-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell, J.</td>
<td>Wood, Hay and Produce Merchant</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray, R. L.</td>
<td>Surveyor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers, P. G.</td>
<td>Auctioneer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Connor, D.</td>
<td>Auctioneer, Mining and Station Age nt</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Mara, T. C.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkes, H.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peche, A.J.</td>
<td>Surveyor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piggott, W.H.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilcher, C.E.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole, W.T.</td>
<td>Engineer and Contractor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor, W.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>G-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purves, J.M.</td>
<td>Grazier</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quin, E.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>G-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid, G.H.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renwick, A.</td>
<td>Medical Practitioner</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseby, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross, A.</td>
<td>Medico</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutledge, T.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Allegiance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryrie, A.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See, J.</td>
<td>Shipper</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slattery, T.L.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, B.</td>
<td>Barrister (and Shipping Interests)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, R.B.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, S.</td>
<td>Auctioneer and Land Speculator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, T.R.</td>
<td>Auctioneer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart, A.</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland, J.</td>
<td>Building Contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suttor, F. B.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant, H. J.</td>
<td>Surgeon</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teece, W. Jun.</td>
<td>Tanner and Boot Manufacturer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, S. H.</td>
<td>Private Means</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, J.B.</td>
<td>Selector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooth, R. L.</td>
<td>Brewer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trickett, W. J.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner, W.</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughn, R.M.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson, J.</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson, W.J.</td>
<td>Wine and Spirit Merchant (Young)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb, E.</td>
<td>Merchant (Bathurst)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkinson, R.B.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, A.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom, R.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withers, G.</td>
<td>Builder</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, F.A.</td>
<td>Carrier &amp; Produce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, J.H.</td>
<td>Commission Agent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT - (STUART GOVERNMENT)

DIVISIONS TABULATED: (SOURCE REFS: TO N.S.W., P.D.)

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Election of Speaker. 3.1.83. (Vol. VIII, p.21).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Move by Parkes to lay Crown Lands Bill aside. 2.10.84. (Vol. XV, p.5569).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Hostile amendment on &quot;political railways.&quot; 16.10.84. (Vol. XX, p.5883).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Vote on Budget. 18.3.85. (Vol. XVI, pp. 240-1).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEMBER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbott, J.P.</td>
<td>Solicitor (and Pastoral interests)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail, F.</td>
<td>Boot Manufacturer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen, G.W.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badgery, H.S.</td>
<td>Stock and Station Agent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker, E. A.</td>
<td>Mineralogist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbour, R.</td>
<td>Sawmiller</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton, E.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton, R.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, H. H.</td>
<td>Pastoralist and Land Agent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunker, J.L.</td>
<td>Stock and Station Agent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan, D.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burdekin, S.</td>
<td>(Private means)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns, J. F.</td>
<td>Merchant and Shipper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher, R.</td>
<td>Wine and Spirit Merchant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER</td>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron, A.</td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, G.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, W.R.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass, G. E.</td>
<td>Wine and Spirit Merchant (and selector)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman, M.</td>
<td>Auctioneer and Commission Agent</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, H.</td>
<td>Produce Merchant</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, W.</td>
<td>Banker</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen, H. E.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combes, E.</td>
<td>Mining Engineer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coonan, W.T.</td>
<td>Mining and Squatting Interests</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copeland, H.</td>
<td>Storekeeper (Balranald)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalton, T.</td>
<td>Merchant and Importer (Orange)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangar, T.G.G.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day, G.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Sais, G.F.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dibbs, G.R.</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis, J.C.</td>
<td>Shipowner</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnell, J. S.</td>
<td>Pol.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson, D. A.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson, W. J.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher, J.</td>
<td>Colliery Manager</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremlin, A. R.</td>
<td>Fellmonger</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gannon, J. T.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrard, J.</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett, T.</td>
<td>Land Agent</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garvan, J. P.</td>
<td>Produce Merchant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbes, F. J.</td>
<td>(Private Means)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill, J.</td>
<td>Squatter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER</td>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorrick, J.A.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gould, A.J.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, S.W.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffiths, G.W.</td>
<td>Stock and Station Agent</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammond, M.J.</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris, J.</td>
<td>(Private Means)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellyer, T.H.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henson, W.</td>
<td>(Private Means)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heydon, L.F.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holborrow, W.H.</td>
<td>Storekeeper (Richmond)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holtermann, B.</td>
<td>Miner</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphery, F.T.</td>
<td>Pastoralist (Q'land)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchinson, W.A.</td>
<td>Soap and Candle Manufacturer</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ives, T.E.</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings, P.A.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, A.G.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lackey, J.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, C.A.</td>
<td>Storekeeper (Merchant) (Tamworth)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levien, R.H.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levin, L.</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd, L.</td>
<td>Copper Smelter (Bathurst)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughnan, G.C.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luscombe, R.C.</td>
<td>Insurance Agent</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch, A.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyne, W.J.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machattie, R.R.</td>
<td>Surveyor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackinnon, J.A.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCourt, W.</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCulloch, A.H.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER</td>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McElhone, J.</td>
<td>Hide and Tallow Merchant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLaughlin, J.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McQuade, H.M.H.</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melville, N.</td>
<td>Undertaker</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merriman, G.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell, J.</td>
<td>Wood, Hay and Produce Merchant</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses, H.</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray, R.L.</td>
<td>Surveyor</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Conner, D.</td>
<td>Auctioneer, Mining and General Agent</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olliffe, J.B.</td>
<td>Publican</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Mara, T.C.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkes, H.</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkes, V.</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigott, W.H.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole, W.T.</td>
<td>Engineer and Contractor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor, W.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purves, J.M.</td>
<td>Grazier</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quin, E.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid, G.H.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, C.J.</td>
<td>Publican</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross, A.</td>
<td>Medical Practitioner</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryrie, A.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryrie, W.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See, J.</td>
<td>Shipper</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slattery, T.M.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, A.B.</td>
<td>Barrister (and shipper)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, R.B.</td>
<td>Solicitor (and squatter)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, S.</td>
<td>Auctioneer and Land Agent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, T. R.</td>
<td>Auctioneer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, G.</td>
<td>Civil Servant (Inspector of Selections)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen, S.A.</td>
<td>Notary Public</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stokes, A.</td>
<td>Publican (and squatter)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart, A.</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland, J.</td>
<td>Builder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suttor, F.B.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant, W.S.</td>
<td>Hartley</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, A.G.</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, H.</td>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teece, W. Jun.</td>
<td>Boot Manufacturer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tighe, A.A.P.</td>
<td>Police Magistrate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooth, R.L.</td>
<td>Brewer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trickett, W.J.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughn, R.M.</td>
<td>Civil Engineer and Building Contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson, J.</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, R.H.D.</td>
<td>Bank Manager</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkinson, R.B.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, A.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom, R.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withers, G.</td>
<td>Builder and Estate Agent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, F.A.</td>
<td>Produce Merchant and Carrier</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, J.H.</td>
<td>Commission Agent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TWELFTH PARLIAMENT — (DIBBS-JENNINGS GOVERNMENT)

DIVISIONS TABULATED: (SOURCE REFERENCES TO N.S.W. P.D.)

1. Motion of Censure (New Hebrides), 13.4.86. (Vol. XIX, p.1319).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>ALLEGIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbott, J.P.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail, F.</td>
<td>Boot Manufacturer</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker, E.A.</td>
<td>Mineralogist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbour, R.</td>
<td>Sawmiller</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton, E.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton, R.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton, A.T.</td>
<td>Commission Agent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowman, A.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, H.H.</td>
<td>Pastoralist (and land agent)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne, D. C.</td>
<td>Mining and land agent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunker, J.N.</td>
<td>Stock and Station Agent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bull, N.G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burdekin, S.</td>
<td>Independent Means</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke, M.</td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns, J.F.</td>
<td>Merchant and Shipper</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher, R.</td>
<td>Wine and Spirit Merchant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TWELFTH PARLIAMENT — (DIBBS-JENNINGS GOVERNMENT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Allegiance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cameron, A.</td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, W.R.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass, G.E.</td>
<td>Wine and Spirit Merchant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chanter, J.M.</td>
<td>Auctioneer and Commission Agent</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, H.</td>
<td>Produce Merchant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, W.</td>
<td>Banker</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, C.</td>
<td>Storekeeper (Tamworth)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colls, L.</td>
<td>Publican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coonan, W.T.</td>
<td>Mining and Pastoral Interests</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copeland, H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramsie, J.</td>
<td>Storekeeper</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creer, J.</td>
<td>Auctioneer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalton, T.</td>
<td>Storekeeper</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies, J.</td>
<td>Ironmonger</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson, H.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day, G.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dibbs, G.R.</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewing, T.T.</td>
<td>Surveyor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson, D.A.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson, W.J.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzgerald, R.G.D.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher, J.</td>
<td>Colliery Manager</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsyth, A.</td>
<td>Rope Manufacturer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster, W.J.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garland, C.L.</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrard, J.</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett, T.</td>
<td>Land Agent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER</td>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ALLEGIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garvan, J.P.</td>
<td>Produce Merchant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbs, F.J.</td>
<td>Independent Means</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gormley, J.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gould, A.J.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammond, M.J.</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassell, T.H.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne, J.S.</td>
<td>Softgoods retailer</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes, J.</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henson, W.</td>
<td>Independent Means</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heydon, L.F.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan, P.</td>
<td>Produce Merchant and Commission Agent</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holborrow, W.H.</td>
<td>Storekeeper (Richmond)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey, F.T.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungerford, T.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inglis, J.</td>
<td>Tea Merchant</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ives, I. E.</td>
<td>Warehouseman</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings, J.A.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, T.</td>
<td>Mine Owner (Gold)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judd, W.G.</td>
<td>Storekeeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kethel, A.</td>
<td>Timber Merchant</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidd, J.</td>
<td>Land Agent</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, C.A.</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levin, R.H.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd, G.A.</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd, L.</td>
<td>Mine Owner (Copper)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyne, W.J.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lysaght, A.</td>
<td>Publican</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macgregor, W.P.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackinnon, J.A.</td>
<td>Stock and Station Agent</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER</td>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ALLEGIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCulloch, A.H.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeks, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melville, N.</td>
<td>Undertaker</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Moore, S.W.</td>
<td>Mining Interests (Tin)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nield, J.C.</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Connor, D.</td>
<td>Auctioneer, mining and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Station Agent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olliffe, J.B.</td>
<td>Publican</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Sullivan, E.W.</td>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkes, H.</td>
<td>- Pol.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkes, V.</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor, W.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purves, J.M.</td>
<td>Agent and Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quin, E.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid, G.H.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renwick, A.</td>
<td>Medical Practitioner</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, C.J.</td>
<td>Publican</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson, J.</td>
<td>Pol.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross, A.</td>
<td>Medical Practitioner</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryrie, A.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawers, W.B.S.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, L.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See, J.</td>
<td>Shipper</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd, J.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slattery, T.M.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, J.F.</td>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, R.B.</td>
<td>Solicitor (and squatter)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, S.</td>
<td>Auctioneer and land</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, T.R.</td>
<td>Auctioneer</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER</td>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ALLEGIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, G.</td>
<td>Inspector of Selections</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen, H.W.</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen, S.A.</td>
<td>Notary Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenson, R.</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stokes, A.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland, J.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter, F.B.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tait, F.</td>
<td>Manager, Building Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targett, W.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant, H.J.</td>
<td>Surgeon</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, A.G.</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, H.</td>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teece, W.</td>
<td>Boot Manufacturer</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, R.W.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toohey, J.M.</td>
<td>Brewer</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trickett, W.J.</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughn, R.M.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall, W.C.</td>
<td>Selector</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want, J.H.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson, W.J.</td>
<td>Wine and Spirit Merchant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, R.H.D.</td>
<td>Bank Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkinson, R.B.</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkinson, W.C.</td>
<td>Medical Practitioner</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson, T.M.</td>
<td>Publican</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom, R.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, J. H.</td>
<td>Commission Agent</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, J. D.</td>
<td>Ex-publican</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX III**

**SUMMARY OF ATTITUDES TO MAJOR GOVERNMENTS**

**NEW SOUTH WALES - MEMBERS OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1872-87**

(Compiled from foregoing voting Analyses)

**EXPLANATION OF SYMBOLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Independent member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Supporter of Parkes Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Supporter of Robertson Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd.</td>
<td>Member of &quot;Third Party,&quot; and supporter of Farnell Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Supporter of Stuart Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>Supporter of Dibbs-Jennings Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Supporter of Parkes-Robertson Coalition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Opposition Supporter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>Regular Supporter, but voted against Land Bill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
<th>9th</th>
<th>10th</th>
<th>11th</th>
<th>12th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbott, R. P.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen, G. W.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker, E. A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bawden, T.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett, H.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booth, J.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, S. C.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, T.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browne, W. C.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan, D.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns, J. F.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler, E.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, J.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, H.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combes, E.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>10th</td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>12th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper, W. H.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creed, J. M.</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummeen, J. A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangar, T. G. G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Salis, L. M. F.</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver, R.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnell, J. S.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzpatrick, M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forster, W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett, T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham, W.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greville, E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannell, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay, W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill, R.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoskins, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurley, J. (C.C.)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurley, J. (N.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innes, J. G. L.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob, A. H.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings, P. A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lackey, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd, G. A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord, G. W.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macintosh, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macleay, W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
<th>9th</th>
<th>10th</th>
<th>11th</th>
<th>12th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McLaurin, J.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses, H.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neale, J. H.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson, H. L.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakes, G.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Connor, J. G.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onslow, A. A. W.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkes, H.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phelps, J. J.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piddington, W. R.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raphael, J. G.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson, J.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson, T.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodd, J.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholey, S.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, J. D.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, J. S.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, R. B.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart, J.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland, J.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, H.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teece, W.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, S. H.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunks, W.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warden, J.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson, J.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wearne, J.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb, E.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West, T. H.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, H. H.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrnes, C. J.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**NEW SOUTH WALES - MEMBERS OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY - 1872-87**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
<th>9th</th>
<th>10th</th>
<th>11th</th>
<th>12th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cameron, A.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles, S.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen, H. E.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangar, H. C.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies, J.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>DJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day, G.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dibbs, G. R.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forster, R. H. M.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goold, S. S.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, S. W.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>DJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungerford, T.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston, W.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td>DJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leary, J.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long, W. A.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch, A.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McElhone, J.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer, S.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montague, A.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilcher, C. E.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd, P. L. C.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens, C. J.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart, A.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suttor, F. B.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suttor, W. H.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson, W.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windeyer, W. C.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom, R.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, J. J.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badgery, H. S.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbour, R.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton, E.</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX III

**SUMMARY OF ATTITUDES TO MAJOR GOVERNMENTS**

**NEW SOUTH WALES - MEMBERS OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY - 1872-87**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
<th>9th</th>
<th>10th</th>
<th>11th</th>
<th>12th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beyers, H. L.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowker, R. R. S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowman, A.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>DJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coonan, W. T.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copeland, H.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies, W.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillon, J.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckford, J.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fawcett, C. H.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris, J.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hezlet, W.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerr, G. T.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCulloch,</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McQuade, H. M. H.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>DJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melville, N.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merriman, J.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy, J.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Connor, D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remwick, A.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseby, J.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd, J.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson, C. W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>DJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, T. R.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant, H. J.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>DJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, J. B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbott, J. P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail, F.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton, R.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodel, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBER</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>10th</td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>12th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunker, J. N.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burdekin, S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, G.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, W. R.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter, G. L.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass, G. E.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, W.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooke, H. H.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramsie, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas, J. H.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fergusson, W. J.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster, W. J.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremlin, A. R.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullford, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gannon, J. T.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrard, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garvan, J. P.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henson, W.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heydon, L. F.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holborow, W.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidd, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levien, R. H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levin, L.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughnan,</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyne, W. J.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, W. F.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLaughlin,</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray, R. L.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>PR-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX III

**SUMMARY OF ATTITUDES TO MAJOR GOVERNMENTS**

**NEW SOUTH WALES - MEMBERS OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY - 1872-87**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
<th>9th</th>
<th>10th</th>
<th>11th</th>
<th>12th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O'Mara, T. C.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piggott, W. H.</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poole, W. T.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor, W. C.</td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purves, J. M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quin, E.</td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid, G. H.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross, A.</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutledge, T.</td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryrie, A.</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slattery, T. M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, A. B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooth, R. L.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trickett, W. J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughn, R. M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkinson, R. B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson, A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withers, G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, F. A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, J. H.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher, R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman, M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalton, T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Salis, G. F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis, J. C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson, D. A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>DJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbs, F. J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill, J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## SUMMARY OF ATTITUDES TO MAJOR GOVERNMENTS

**NEW SOUTH WALES - MEMBERS OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY - 1872-87**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
<th>9th</th>
<th>10th</th>
<th>11th</th>
<th>12th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gould, A. J.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffiths</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammond, M. J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellyer, T. H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holtermann, B. O</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphery, F. T</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>DJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchinson, W. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ives, J. E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd, L.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luscombe, R. C</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machattie, R. R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackinnon, J. A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCourt, W.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliffe, J. B.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkes, V.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, C. J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryrie, D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring, G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen, S. A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stokes, A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, A. G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tighe, A. A. P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, R. H. D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targett, W. S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also 34 additional members who held seats in the Twelfth Parliament only, divided as follows: **DJ - 23; 0 - 6; 1 - 5**.
## APPENDIX IV

### SEQUENCES OF LOYALTIES

**MEMBERS HOLDING SEATS IN TWO OR MORE PARLIAMENTS, 1872-87**

*(NOTE: 116 Members who held seats in one Parliament only are disregarded here. Number in brackets indicates number of Parliaments in which seats held.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A PARKES</th>
<th>B ROBERTSON</th>
<th>C PR-3RD SEQUENCE</th>
<th>D 3RD SEQUENCE</th>
<th>E INCONSISTENT</th>
<th>F INDEPENDENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen (2)</td>
<td>Booth (2)</td>
<td>Farnell (5)</td>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>Baker (3)</td>
<td>Abbott R. P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown S. C. (3)</td>
<td>Combes (4)</td>
<td>Moses (4)</td>
<td>Dibbs (3)</td>
<td>Buchanan (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunneen (2)</td>
<td>Dangar (4)</td>
<td>Stuart (4)</td>
<td>Barbour (3)</td>
<td>Butler (2)</td>
<td>Terry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurley J. (C.C.)</td>
<td>Forster W. (3)</td>
<td>Bennett (2)</td>
<td>Coonan (3)</td>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>Reid (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson (2)</td>
<td>Hoskins (4)</td>
<td>Driver (2)</td>
<td>Merriman (2)</td>
<td>Warden</td>
<td>Watson J. (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkes H. (6)</td>
<td>Lackey (5)</td>
<td>Greville (2)</td>
<td>Tarrant (3)</td>
<td>Dangar H. C. (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piddington (2)</td>
<td>Lord (2)</td>
<td>Hurley J. (N) (2)</td>
<td>Abbott J. P. (3)</td>
<td>Day (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholey (3)</td>
<td>Lucas (3)</td>
<td>Macintosh (2)</td>
<td>Fergusson W. (2)</td>
<td>Gray (3)</td>
<td>Hungerford (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Onslow (3)</td>
<td>Stewart (2)</td>
<td>Fremlin (2)</td>
<td>Lynch (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robertson (6)</td>
<td>Sutter W. H. (2)</td>
<td>Garvan (3)</td>
<td>McElhone (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teece ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pilcher (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Webb (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sutter P. B. (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brown H. A. (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bowman (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Byrnes (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McCulloch (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O'Connor D. (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX IV

SEQUENCES OF LOYALTIES
MEMBERS HOLDING SEATS IN TWO OR MORE PARLIAMENTS, 1872-87

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARKES</th>
<th>ROBERTSON</th>
<th>PR- 3RD SEQUENCE</th>
<th>3RD SEQUENCE</th>
<th>INCONSISTENT</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cameron (4)</td>
<td>See (3)</td>
<td>Remwick (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies J. (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shepherd J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long (2)</td>
<td>Cass (3)</td>
<td>Smith T.R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom (5)</td>
<td>Cramsie (3)</td>
<td>Barton R.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Campbell G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POST 1879

| Badgery (3) | Slattery (3) | Clarke W. (3) |
| Beyers (2) | Withers (3) | Fletcher (3) |
| Eckford (2) | Butcher (2) | Heydon (3) |
| | Kidd (2) | |
| Abigail (3) | Ferguson D.A. | Levin (2) |
| Brunker (3) | Humphery (2) | McLaughlin (2) |
| Burdekin (3) | Lloyd (2) | Pigott (2) |
| Foster W.J. (2) | Oliffe (2) | Poole (2) |
| Garrard J. (3) | Stokes (2) | Quin (2) |
| Henson (3) | | Ryrie A. (3) |
| Holborow (3) | Targett (2) | Wilkinson (3) |
| Proctor (3) | | Trickett (3) |
| Ross (3) | | |
| Smith S. (2) | |Dalton (2) |
| Tooth (2) | | Gibbes (2) |
| Vaughan (3) | | Gould (2) |
| Young J. H. (3) | | Mackinnon (2) |
| Parkes V. (2) | | Stephen (2) |
| Roberts (2) | | Burns F. J. (6) |
| | | Sutherland (5) |
APPENDIX V

THE GARDINER CASE IN PARLIAMENT

(THIRD - FOURTH SESSIONS, SEVENTH PARLIAMENT, 1874-5)

Towards the end of the Third Session, a public outcry arose against a decision made by the Governor, Sir Hercules Robinson, to release the ex-bushranger, Frank Gardiner, upon condition of his leaving the country. The career of this criminal had been accompanied by certain mitigating circumstances which gained him much sympathy. "In December, 1859, having been previously sentenced to fourteen years for horse-stealing, he obtained a ticket of leave. But, being suspected of cattle stealing, his ticket was cancelled in May, 1861. Two months later he was captured in a hut in the bush, but he wounded one of his captors, and while the other was absent procuring assistance he escaped. During the twelve months that followed, Gardiner was supposed to be the leader of a gang of bushrangers. After a considerable Gold Escort robbery, which it was then supposed he planned and directed, Gardiner disappeared. He was subsequently discovered in the interior of Queensland, where he had, it was asserted, been living a quiet and industrious life for two years. Gardiner was brought to Sydney, tried, and sentenced to thirty-two years
imprisonment, the first two in irons. Shortly after the arrival of Sir Hercules Robinson in the Colony this prisoner's case was brought before him; and petitions were presented, numerously and influentially signed, praying for his release on the grounds of the desire to reform evidenced by the prisoner before his capture, and his conduct since his imprisonment. (1)

The Governor's decision to exercise the prerogative of pardon in this case was met with loud protests, and in the Legislative Assembly Combes moved a resolution disapproving of the action. This was defeated on the casting vote of the Speaker. Six petitions were next presented to the Governor from various parts of the Colony, praying him to reconsider his decision; one of these petitions being the product of a large and influential meeting held at the Exchange, Sydney. On June 23, the Governor communicated a Minute, reviewing the whole previous history of the case, to the Executive Council. In this Minute, Robinson stated that he thought the end and object of all punishment would seem to have been secured by the release of Gardiner. The prisoner had been sufficiently punished, and he could with safety be set free, upon condition of his leaving the country. If while entertaining - as he did - these opinions, he were to break faith with the prisoner,

and retain him in gaol beyond the time specified for his liberation, he should be doing so not because he thought such a course necessary, but simply in response to clamour which he believed to be unreasonable and unjust. It was indispensable for the maintenance of prison discipline that every hope held out to prisoners be scrupulously fulfilled; that every promise, made or implied, should be held sacred, or broken only on grounds the sufficiency of which would be apparent even to prisoners' minds. He could see no such grounds in the present case. He was sorry to think that such an exercise of the Royal prerogative of pardon was unfavourably regarded at the present moment by certain sections of the public, but it appeared to him that the course which he had suggested was the only course consistent with honour and justice, and he confidently anticipated that the fairness of this view would eventually be acknowledged by all impartial and reflecting members of the community. This Minute was laid on the Table of the House by the Premier on the day of the prorogation of Parliament at the end of the Third Session.

Soon after the Fourth Session began, Combes raised the Gardiner issue again by moving that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the Governor's Minute. Parkes announced that the Government would treat the matter as one of confidence, since they were willing to accept the responsibility of supporting the Governor's attitude, and for
having actually laid the Minute on the Table. The motion was
carried by 28 votes to 26. In Committee, by a majority of one,
Combe's resolutions protesting against the Governor's action
was carried, and when the House resumed and the resolutions were
reported, the division on the motion for their adoption showed
28 for and 28 against. The Speaker then gave his vote with
the noes. Thus the Resolutions were not transmitted to the
Governor, but the Premier accepted the general result as a
defeat, and resigned.

It was clear from the debates that, although the matter
had been ostensibly (and probably, from Combes' point of view,
sincerely) brought forward as a constitutional issue, Parkes
was correct in regarding the motion as an attempt to overturn
the Government. The constitutional matters involved were con­
fused and complex: the chief complaint made by the Opposition
was that by tabling the Minute, the Government had permitted
Robinson to use the records of the House to censure the people.
They also alleged that the right of petition had been attacked,
that the Government had acted improperly in advising the
Governor in a matter involving the Royal prerogative, and that,
through its indirect references to discussions in the Chamber,
the Minute was a breach of the constitutional privileges of
Parliament. Experience during the previous session, when the
matter had come up before, had demonstrated clearly enough the
Government's disposition to defend the Governor and assume
responsibility for agreeing with the release of Gardiner. Even on that earlier occasion, there was no doubt that Parkes' opponents had expected that their support of Combes' complaints would embarrass the Government. Although Combes specifically denied that he had any intention other than to register a complaint against what many considered to be a dangerous release, his motion had been definitely planned to overturn the Government. The incident was related by one witness, Greville, in the following words: "One of the members of the Opposition who scents the battle from afar and sees where any advantage lies - Mr. Garrett - saw the opportunity it presented of damaging the Government, and when Mr. Combes was about to put his motion censuring them for their conduct in the business, that gentleman waylaid him and advised him to put his motion in the shape of an amendment to the motion for going into Supply. Mr. Combes fell into the trap, and altered his motion by giving notice of moving it in the manner he had been advised. Now what was the consequence? When a Government is defeated upon a motion for going into Supply, it is bound to resign. As an abstract proposition the motion would have been carried with an overwhelming majority ... But the abstract justice of the matter was lost in the tedious paths of party politics. The whole matter at once assumed the form of a party question ... it was no longer a question as to the propriety of releasing Gardiner, but a vote of want of confidence in the Government that was
entertained.** (1) In these circumstances, the professed astonishment of the Opposition when Parkes declared that he would accept the second set of resolutions as a matter of confidence cannot be accepted literally.

(The above account is based on the following sources: Thomas Richards, **Official History of N.S.W.** (1883), pp. 524, 530 et seq.; **S.M.H.** summary of the Gardiner case, 28.11.74; debates in Legislative Assembly, as reported in **S.M.H.** 24.11.74, 25.11.74; Speech of E. Greville during Braidwood election, **S.M.H.** 25.12.74).
APPENDIX VI

DIVISION ON FARNELL'S LAND BILL, 1878

Note. The following classification is based on division tabulations appearing above, pp. 319-322. The affiliation of individual members, as indicated in divisions prior to that on the Land Bill, is shown as follows: "G" = Government supporter, "O" = Opposition member, "I" = Independent. The names of pastoralists are marked "x".

**FOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Political Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bennett (G)</td>
<td>Macintosh (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns (G)</td>
<td>Merriman (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke (I)</td>
<td>x Murphy (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen (G)</td>
<td>O'Connor (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coonan (G)</td>
<td>Pilcher (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day (G)</td>
<td>Roseby (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnell (G)</td>
<td>x Shepherd (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzpatrick (G)</td>
<td>Smith, T.R. (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurley (G)</td>
<td>Sutherland (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leary (G)</td>
<td>x Suttor, W. H. (G)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Against**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Political Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Badgery (I)</td>
<td>Hoskins (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker (O)</td>
<td>x Hungerford (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbour (I)</td>
<td>x Hurley (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bawden (I)</td>
<td>Jacob (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyers (G)</td>
<td>x Lackey (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowman (O)</td>
<td>Long (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown H. (O)</td>
<td>Lucas (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown S. (G)</td>
<td>McCulloch (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown W. (G)</td>
<td>Moses (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron (I)</td>
<td>x Onslow (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles (I)</td>
<td>Parkes (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copeland (G)</td>
<td>Robertson (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danger (O)</td>
<td>x Simpson (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies J. (O)</td>
<td>x Smith, R.B. (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies W. (I)</td>
<td>x Suttor, F.B. (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillon (O)</td>
<td>Teece (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver (G)</td>
<td>Terry (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckford (G)</td>
<td>Thompson (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett (G)</td>
<td>Watson (O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray (I)</td>
<td>Webb (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood (I)</td>
<td>Wisdom (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris (I)</td>
<td>Windeyer (I)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Affiliation</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoralists</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX VII

STUART GOVERNMENT, 1883

FACTION POSITION PRIOR TO CROWN LANDS BILL

GOVERNMENT SUPPORTERS

Abbott, J.P., Solicitor and pastoralist.
Barbour, R., Sawmiller.
Butcher, Wine merchant.
Campbell, W. A. Pastoralist.
Cass, Wine merchant.
Chapman, Auctioneer.
Cohen, Barrister.
Coonan, Mining and pastoral interests.
Copeland, Storekeeper.
Cramsie, Storekeeper and pastoralist.
Dalton, Merchant.
Day, Merchant.
Dibbs, Solicitor.
Farnell, Solicitor.
Fergusson, Fellmonger.
Fremlin, Produce merchant.
Garvan, Solicitor.
Gorrick, Capitalist.
Harris, Solicitor.
Hellyer, Solicitor.
Heydon, Solicitor.
Holtermann, Capitalist.
Jennings, Pastoralist.
Jones, Pastoralist.
Levin, Merchant.
Loughnan, Pastoralist.
Lynch, Pastoralist.
Lyne, Pastoralist.
Mackinnon, Pastoralist.
McLaughlin, Solicitor.
Melville, Solicitor.
Merriman, Solicitor.
O'Mara, Undertaker.
O'Mara, Publican.
Poole, Engineer.
Quin, Pastoralist.
Reid, Barrister.
Smith, A.B., Barrister.
Stokes, Publican.
Stuart, Merchant.
Targett, Physician.
Tarrant, Solicitor.
Trickett, Carrier.
## APPENDIX VII (Continued)

### OPPOSITION MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opponent</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abigail,</td>
<td>Stock Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badgery,</td>
<td>Stock Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, H.H.,</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunker,</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns,</td>
<td>Carpenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron,</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, G.,</td>
<td>Produce Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, H.,</td>
<td>Banker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, W.,</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangar, T.G.G.,</td>
<td>Colliery Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher,</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gannon,</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garred,</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbs,</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill,</td>
<td>Storekeeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gould,</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holborrow,</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lackey,</td>
<td>Produce Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leiven,</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell,</td>
<td>Surveyor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkes, H.,</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigott,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson,</td>
<td>Boot Manufacturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, R.B.,</td>
<td>Solicitor and pastosalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, S.,</td>
<td>Auctioneer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, T.R.,</td>
<td>Auctioneer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland,</td>
<td>Builder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suttor,</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, A.G.,</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, H.</td>
<td>Butcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teece,</td>
<td>Boot Manufacturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tighe,</td>
<td>Ex-civil servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooth,</td>
<td>Brewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughn,</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom,</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withers,</td>
<td>Estate Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young,</td>
<td>Commission agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Connor,</td>
<td>Auctioneer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purves,</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts,</td>
<td>Publican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross,</td>
<td>Physician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See,</td>
<td>Shipowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slattery,</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring,</td>
<td>Ex-civil servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen,</td>
<td>Notary Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkinson,</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson,</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## INDEPENDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan,</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combes,</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Salis,</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis,</td>
<td>Shipowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett,</td>
<td>Land Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffiths,</td>
<td>Stock Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey,</td>
<td>Pastoralist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchinson,</td>
<td>Manufacturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCourt,</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCulloch,</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McElhone,</td>
<td>Hide Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McQuade,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Connell,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purves,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slattery,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkinson,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-356-
SUMMARY

Government supporters 44  (9 pastoralists)
Opposition members 39  (7 pastoralists)
Independents 23  (5 pastoralists)

Classifications based on divisions on Speaker's election and precedence to Government business
(See above, Appendix II, pp.328-332).
## APPENDIX VIII

### LAND BILL OF SIR JOHN ROBERTSON, 1882
### DIVISION ON SECOND READING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR, 33. (8 PASTORALISTS)</th>
<th>元</th>
<th>元</th>
<th>元</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrews,</td>
<td>Grazier.</td>
<td>Foster,</td>
<td>Barrister.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badger,</td>
<td>Stock agent.</td>
<td>Frazer,</td>
<td>Pastoralist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton, R.</td>
<td>Squatter.</td>
<td>Fullford,</td>
<td>Publican.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodel,</td>
<td>Merchant.</td>
<td>Garrard,</td>
<td>Engineer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns,</td>
<td>Merchant.</td>
<td>Hungerford,</td>
<td>Squatter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrnes,</td>
<td>Manufacturer.</td>
<td>Lackey,</td>
<td>Grazer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckford,</td>
<td>Publican.</td>
<td>Martin,</td>
<td>Commission agent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fawcett,</td>
<td>Ex-civil servant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGAINST, 43. (11 PASTORALISTS)</th>
<th>元</th>
<th>元</th>
<th>元</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbott, R. P.,</td>
<td>Solicitor and pastoralist.</td>
<td>Cramse,</td>
<td>Hay,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail,</td>
<td>Boot Manufacturer.</td>
<td>Dangar, H.C.,</td>
<td>Heydon,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, J.,</td>
<td>Pastoralist.</td>
<td>Farnell,</td>
<td>Barrister and pastoralist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunker,</td>
<td>Stock agent.</td>
<td>Fergusson,</td>
<td>Jennings,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass,</td>
<td>Merchant.</td>
<td>Fremlin,</td>
<td>Pastoralist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, H.</td>
<td>Prod. merchant.</td>
<td>Garrett,</td>
<td>Levien,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, W.</td>
<td>Banker.</td>
<td>Garvan,</td>
<td>Loughnan,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Solicitor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McCulloch,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McElhone,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hume,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Landowner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undertaker.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGAINST, (11 PASTORALISTS)

Mitchell, Produce Merchant
Murray, Pastoralist
O'Mara, Barrister
Proctor, Pastoralist
Quin, Barrister
Reid, Shipowner
See, Solicitor
Slattery, Solicitor and pastoralist
Smith, R.B., Auctioneer
Smith, S., Merchant
Stuart, Physician
Tarrant, Estate agent
Withers, Carrier
Wright,
APPENDIX IX

MEMBERS OF NEW SOUTH WALES LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
1872-89

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

(Electorates and dates of election indicated in brackets.
For explanation of abbreviations see bibliographical note,
p.422 below).

a. BECKETT, William Channing
   Pastoralist. Maryvale and Sarsfield Pass Stations,
   Wellington.
   (The Bogan, 1889).

ABBOTT, Joseph
   (Newtown, 1888, 1889, 1891; Newtown-Camperdown, 1894)
   b. Parramatta, 1843. After early period mining in
   Queensland, secured (1863) position with T. S. Mort
   and Co., eventually becoming the firm's senior wool
   auctioneer, and a partner, with interests in pastoral
   holdings. Director, Commercial Union Assurance Co.,
   and A.M.P.

ABBOTT, Robert Palmer
   (Gunnedah, 1880, 1882, 1883, 1885; Wentworth, 1887,
   1889, 1891, 1894, 1895).
   b. Ireland. Solicitor, but also pastoral interests.
   (Egerton Estate, Ashford).

ABBOTT, William Edward
   Squatter, Abbotsford and Glengarry Estates, Wingen.
   H. M. Mackenzie, Among
   the Pastoralists, Hall, 1895, p. 191.
Amigall, Francis
(b. London, 1840. Arrived in Sydney in 1861, and set up business as manufacturer of boot and shoe uppers, and importer of leather.

Mennell, Morrison.

Alison, William
Pastoralist.

(The Bogan, 1889).

Allen, Alfred
Insurance Agent

Alexander Wilson to Parkes, 14.7.91. (P.C.).

Allen, George Wigram
b. Sydney, 1824. Solicitor and Educationalist.

(Paddington, 1887, -89, -91).

Morrison, p. 494.

Allen, William Johnston
Soap maker, Waverley.

(The Glebe, 1869, -72, -73, -74, -77, -80, -82).

S.M.H., 24.7.85.
Serle, p. 9.

Allen, William Johnston
Soap maker, Waverley.

(Paddington, 1888).

Sands, 1888.

Andrews, Joseph
Grazier, Woodside (Manning R. district).

(Hastings and Manning, 1880).


Arnold, William Munnings

Pastoralist (Stradbroke Estate, Patterson R.).

Mennell.)
BADGERY, Henry Septimus  
  (East Maitland, 1878;  
  Monaro, 1880, -82).  

Until 1864 worked on his father's station, then  
set up as stock and station agent, at Sutton  
Forest. Went to Maitland in 1870, and amalgamated  
business with that of J. E. Wolfe and J. N. Brunker.  
A founder of Pitt Son and Badgery. (This firm  
originated from a business established in 1862  
by G. M. Pitt, a stock salesman at Blacktown.  
He subsequently built saleyards at Annandale,  
Homebush and Flemington. Pitt admitted his son,  
R. M. Pitt, to partnership in 1871, and later his  
son-in-law, H. S. Badgery. The firm was  
registered as a public company in 1888).

Mennell.  
Australian Men of Mark,  
Ser. 4, Vol. II.

BAKER, Ezekiel Alexander  
(Goldfields South, 1870,  
-72, -75, -77, -79;  
Carcoar, 1880, -84, -85).

b. Middlesex, 1823. Arrived N.S.W., 1853.  
Mineralogist.

Mennell.

BARBOUR, Robert  
(The Murray, 1877, -82,  
-85, -87, -89, -91).

Sawmiller and Selector, Moama.

Sands' Country Directory,  
1881-2.  
S.M.H., 30.10.77. (Case  
Ricketson v Barbour).

BARNES, John Frederick  
(Gundagai, 1889, -91, -94,  
-95, -98, 1901).

1882 settled in Cootamundra, as merchant store-  
keeper. First mayor of Cootamundra.

D.T., 21.7.94.
BARTON, Edmund
b. Sydney, 1849; d. 1920.
Barrister.
(University of Sydney, 1879; Wellington, 1880; East Sydney, 1882-1885, 1891).
J. Reynolds, Edmund Barton.
(Bourke, 1880, -82, -85).
BARTON, Russell
Squatter, Moolcula Station, Bourke.
(The Clarence, 1869, 1872, 1874-77).
BOWEN, Thomas
Storekeeper, Grafton. For some years Mayor of Grafton.
BENNETT, Hanley
Auctioneer, Tamworth.
(Greveille's Post Office Directory, 1872, p.482.
BEYERS, Hugo Louis
With B. O. Holtermann, discovered, and made fortune from Hill End Gold lode, near Bathurst. Spent money improving town of Hill End.
BLACK, Reginald James
b. 1845. Educated Sydney Grammar School. At age of 18, joined Bank of N.S.W., of which his father was manager. Eventually became an inspector. In 1882 left the Bank to become partner in firm of Jones and Black, share brokers, and stock and station agents. A director of the A.M.P. Society and Bank of N.S.W.
Cyclopedia of N.S.W., p. 85.
BODEL, John
Merchant, Forbes.

Sands' Country Directory, 1881-2
(Forbes, 1880).

BOLTON, Alexander Thorley
Commission Agent, Wagga.

Sands' Country Directory, 1881-2
(The Murrumbidgee, 1885).

BOOTH, John

Sands' Country Directory, 1881-2
(West Sydney, 1872; East Macquarie, 1875).

Booth, John


BOWES, John Wesley.
Timber merchant and agent.

(Morpeth, 1887, -91).

A. P. Elkin, Morpeth and I., p. 184.
Sands' Country Directory, 1881-2

BOWKER, Richard Ryther Steer

(Newcastle, 1877).

b. Lincolnshire, 1815; d. 1903.
In 1831 apprenticed at Nottingham General Dispensary. Studied medicine in Scotland, London and Paris. At age of 22 began practising at Bingham, but ill-health led him to undertake work as medical superintendent in immigrant ships. Made two voyages. Stayed a short time in Newcastle, N.S.W. Did research work on tropical diseases in East Indies for two years. Settled in Newcastle, 1853; moved to Darling Point in 1873.

Heaton.
Squatter, Oaklands, Singleton.


BRODRIEB, William Adams (Wentworth, 1880).

b. London, 1809.

Arrived in Tasmania, 1816, with father who became clerk to the Judge-Advocate and Under Sheriff. Went to N.S.W. in 1836 and acquired interests in large pastoral properties in the Monaro and near Gundagai. Established a sheep and cattle station in Port Phillip District. 1836-8 spent exploring Gippsland. Relinquished Goulburn property and managed Bradley’s, on Monaro, for twelve years. In 1885 crossed Alps with sheep and cattle and after four months travelling settled on Wanganella Run. Sold out in 1861 and went to Melbourne. Represented Brighton in Parliament for a year, then spent two years in England. Returned to N.S.W., and formed several stations on Lachlan. During second visit to England in 1874, elected F.R.G.S., and F.R.L.I.

Heaton.

BROWN, Alexander (Newcastle, 1889).

Solicitor, managing director in Newcastle of Dalgety’s, colliery proprietor.

Johns.

BROWN, Herbert Harrington (The Patterson, 1875, -77, -80, -82, -85, -87, -89, -91, -95).

Native of Parramatta, went to Colstoun (estate on Upper Patterson, above Gresford) with parents in 1843. On death of his father, Brown became possessed of Colstoun by buying out other branches of the family. Also owner of Lostoch (11,000 acres) and Strathisla (3,000 acres). Principal of firm H. H. Brown and Co., Land Agents.

BROWN, John
Grazier, Ellerslie, Jerry's Plains.
Greville, 1874, p. 253.

BROWN, Stephen Campbell
((Newtown, 1864, -69, -72, -74, -77).
b. Sydney, 1829; d. 1882.
Solicitor. Educated at Cape's school.
Entered office of Thurlow, to whom articled.
1852 admitted as attorney.

Heaton.

BROWN, Wyman
(Sturt, 1889).
Warden and Police Magistrate at Broken Hill.
Resigned from public service to contest election.

Wichcot, E.B., The Silver Mirror.

BROWNE, Thomas Frederick de Courcy
(Mudgee, 1885; Wentworth, 1887).
Mining and Land Agent.

Morrison, p. 583.

BUCHANAN, David
(Morpeth, 1860; East Macquarie, 1864; East Sydney, 1869; Goldfields West, 1872; Mudgee, 1879, -80, -82; Central Cumberland, 1888).
b. Edinburgh, 1832; arrived N.S.W., 1852;
d. 1890.
Barrister (Middle Temple, 1869).

Mennell.

BRUNKER, James Nixon
(East Maitland, 1880, -82, -85, -87, -88, -89, -91, -94, -95, -98, 1901).

D.T., 3, 8, 9.
Mennell, p. 64.
Johns.
BURDEKIN, Sydney

b. Sydney, 1840, son of Thos. Burdekin, a native of Sheffield, who arrived in Australia in 1828. Educated at Cape's School, then Sydney University. Decided to adopt legal profession; articled to W. W. Billyard, the Crown Solicitor. At termination of articles, became pastoralist in Northern districts, until sold out in 1875 and took up residence in Sydney, where owned extensive property. Considered "one of the few Australian millionaires" - a patron of the arts, and a liberal contributor to charity.

Evening News, 18.12.99
D.T., 8.2.87.

BURKE, Michael.

Carpenter and builder.

(Tamworth, 1885).

Greville, 1878-9.

BURNS, John Fitzgerald

b. Northern Ireland, 1832; arrived Sydney at an early age. Director, Australian Steam Navigation Co., and engaged in mercantile operations in the Hunter River district.

(The Hunter, 1861, -64, -72, -75, -77, -80, -82, -85, -87; St. Leonards, 1889).


(Paddington, 1882, -85).

BUTCHER, Robert

Wine and spirit merchant.

Sands, 1884, p. 524.

ARGYLE, 1869, -72, -74).

BUTLER, Edward

b. Kilkenny, Ireland, 1829. Arrived N.S.W., 1853, d. 1879.

Barrister.
BmNES, Charles Joseph  
(Parramatta, 1874, -80).

b. Parramatta, 1835;  d. 1917.
Woollen manufacturer and mine manager. Served articles with Hamilton Walsh of Goulburn.  

S.M.H., 23.10.77.
Cyclopedia of N.S.W., p.201.

CAMERON, Angus
(West Sydney, 1874, -77, -80, -82; Kiama, 1887; Waverley, 1894, -95).

b. Edinburgh, 1848; arrived N.S.W., 1854;  
d. 1896.

Carpenter and joiner; sometime secretary of N.S.W. Trades and Labour Council.

CAMPBELL, George.
(Carcoar, 1881, -82).

Squatter (blocks at Cowra Rocks, Warrawrie, Bong-long).

Macphail, p.23.

CAMPBELL, James
(Morpeth, 1864, -69, -72).

Merchant. (Morpeth).


CAMPBELL, William Robert
(West Sydney, 1868; The Gwydir, 1880, -82, -85).

CARRUTHERS, Joseph Hector  
(Canterbury, 1887, -89, -91, St. George 1894, -95, -98).  
D.T., 3.8.94, 20.6.94.  
Mennell, p. 84.  
Serle, p. 147.  

CARTER, George Lard  
(Tailor and Mercer, Sydney).  
(South Sydney, 1880).  
Sands, 1880, p. 346.  

CASS, George Edwin  
(Wine and spirit merchant).  
(The Bogan, 1880, -82, -85, -89, -91).  
N.S.W.P.D., Vol. XX, p. 5527.  
D.T., 19.7.94.  

CHANTER, John Moore  
Free Selectors, established Auctioneering and Commission Agency at Moama, 1881.  
Morrison, p. 558.  
D.T., 23.7.94.  

CHAPMAN, Michael  
(The Glebe, 1883, -87, -89).  
Partner, Chapman, Michael and Thomas. Oil and colourmen.  
Sands, 1874, p. 297.  

CHARLES, Samuel  
(Kiama, 1874, -77).  
b. Northern Ireland, 1818.  
Captain of coasting vessels. After varied seafaring career, settled on "Eureka" Estate, Kiama, which he had purchased.  

CLARKE, Henry  
(Eden, 1869, -72, -74, -77, -80, -82, -85, -87, -89, -91; Bega, 1895, -98, 1901).  
b. Londonderry, 1822; arrived N.S.W., 1841.  
Farmer at Braulee (South Coast) until 1845, when opened business in Sussex St., Sydney, as a produce merchant and commission agent. Also
owned several coastal trading vessels. In 1861 gave up business, bought a station near Moruya and was a pastoralist until 1865. Returned to Sydney, and re-established original business, in which active until 1894.

S.M.H., 22.6.03.

CLARKE, William.


Mennell.

CLUBB, George.


Sands, 1881, p. 491.

COLLINS, Charles

b. Goulburn, 1850. d. 1898.

Worked in stores of Goldman & Reuben (Goulburn), and subsequently became partner in Cohen and Levy, storekeepers, Tamworth.

D.T., 28.7.94.


COHEN, Henry Emanuel

Barrister.

Mennell, p. 100.

COLLS, Thomas

(Yass Plains, 1886, -87, -89, -91).

Publican - "a gentleman of means."

Morrison, p. 585.
COMBS, Edward
Mining engineer.

COOKE, Henry Harry.
Proprietor, Parkes Gazette.

COOPER, Walter Hampson
Newspaper reporter, dramatist, and finally barrister.

COPELAND, Henry
Mining and pastoral interests.

COPLAND, David
Storekeeper, Wagga.

CORTIS, William Richard
Physician and surgeon.

CRAMSIE, John
Storekeeper (of Cramsie Bowden & Co.), Balranald.
CREED, John Mildred
Physician and surgeon at Scone and Sydney.

CREER, Joseph
Auctioneer and general storekeeper, Newcastle.
(Ex carpenter and contractor).

CREER, Joseph J. M.
Creed, My Recollections.
N.S.W. P.D., Vol. XII, p. 2931.
(Northumberland, 1885, -87, -89).

CRICK, William Patrick
Solicitor.

CROUCH, Frederick George
Storekeeper, Casino.

CROICKSHANK, George Alexander
Son of pioneer pastoralist in Western districts and manager of his father's properties. Prior to settling at Inverell (1878), made a tour of England, the Continent, Africa and India.

CULLEN, Joseph Francis
Ex-Congregational minister, having resigned from clergy in 1886 to become proprietor and editor of a North Sydney newspaper.

CUNNEEN, James Augustine
Land Agent in Sydney.

CREED, John Mildred
(Upper Hunter, 1872).

J. M. Creed, My Recollections.

CREER, Joseph
(Northumberland, 1885, -87, -89).

Morrison, p. 567.

CRICK, William Patrick
(West Macquarie, 1889, -90, -91, -94, -95).

CRICK, William Patrick
(Sands' Country Directory, 1881-2).

CROUCH, Frederick George
(The Richmond, 1887).

CRICKSHANK, George Alexander
(Inverell, 1889, -9, -94, -95, -98).

D.T., 24-7-94.

CULLEN, Joseph Francis
(St. Leonards, 1889, -91; Willoughby, 1894+).

CUNNEEN, James Augustine
(The Hawkesbury, 1860, -64, -65. Wollombi, 1872, -74).

D.T., 27-7-94.

CUNNEEN, James Augustine
Land Agent in Sydney.

G. R. Nichols, Historical notes on the Hawkesbury, p.73.
(Mitchell Library).
DAITON, Thomas (Orange, 1882, -85, -87, -89).
Merchant and importer. (Orange), also pastoral interests (Gulgo, Milbey and Bygoloree Stations on the Lachlan).


DANGAR, Henry Cary.
(West Sydney, 1874; East Sydney, 1878).

Mennell.
Australian Men of Mark.
Mackenzie, Among the Pastoralists, p. 131.

DANGAR, Otho Orde
Auctioneer, West Kempsey.

Greville, 1875-7, p. 385.

DANGAR, Thomas Gordon Gibbons
(The Gwydir, 1865, -69, -72, -74, -77; The Namoi, 1880, -82, -87, -89).
b. Sydney, 1829, son of Thos. Dangar, younger brother of Henry Dangar; d. Sydney, 1890.
Educated at Sydney Grammar School. In 1849 settled on Namoi River near Wee Waa. Advocated locking of Darling-Barwon and succeeded in having vessels brought up as far as Walgett.

Australian Encyclopedia.

DAVIES, John
(East Sydney, 1874, -77; South Sydney, 1880, -85).
b. Sydney, 1879; d. 1896. Ironmonger and Blacksmith.

Mennell.
DAVIES, William (Argyle, 1877).
Storekeeper, Goulburn and Yass.

DAVIS, William Walter (Bourke, 1889, -98, 1900, -01).
Squatter, Kerribree Station, Bourke.

DAWSON, Henry (Monaro, 1885, -87, -89, -91).
Solicitor, first at Cooma, later in Sydney.
F. F. Mitchell, Back to Cooma, p. 60.

DAY, George (The Hume, 1874, -77, -80, -82, -85, -87).
b. 1826, Hawkesbury district; educated at Windsor and Richmond. When fourteen went to reside with brother, James Day, manager of a station in Manero district. Opened a general store at Livingstone Creek, on Omeo goldfields. Purchased Table Top Station, near Albury, Matta Matta Station on Murray River, and Yarra Yarra Station on Billabong Creek. Also storekeeper, stock and station agent, and miller in Albury.
Cyclopedia of N.S.W., p. 81.
Morrison, p. 503.

DE SALIS, George Fane (Queanbeyan, 1882).
Squatter.

DE SALIS, Leopold William Fane (Queanbeyan, 1872).
Squatter.
DIBBS, George Richard. (West Sydney, 1874; St. Leonards, 1882, -83; The Murrumbidgee, 1885, -86, -87, -89, -91, -93; Tamworth, 1894).

b. Sydney, 1834; d. 1904.
Educated Australian College. In partnership as merchant with brother. Eighteen sixty-seven went bankrupt, but by 1875 paid creditors in full.

DICKENS, Edward Bulwer Lytton. (Wilcannia, 1889, -91).

Educated at Tunbridge Wells and Royal Agricultural College, Gloucestershire.
Migrated to Australia, 1869, and went to work on Mamba Station. Subsequently became manager of a station at Mt. Murchison. In 1881 established stock and station agency in Wilcannia.

DILLON, John Barrister.

DOUGLAS, James Henry Squatter.

DOWEL, William Springthorpe Architect and estate agent.

DRIVER, Richard, Junior.
b. Liverpool, N.S.W., 1829; d. 1880. Solicitor.
ECKFORD, Joseph


EWING, Thomas Thomson

b. 1856; d. 1920.
Surveyor.

EDMUND, Walter

Barrister.

ELLIS, James Cole

Shipowner and merchant.

FARNELL, James Squire

b. Parramatta, 1827; d. 1888.

FAWCETT, Charles Hugh

Retired Police Magistrate.
FERGUSON, David Alexander

b. N.S.W., 1884; d. 1891.

Pastoralist. 1862-69 managed father's estate, Newry, on the Bell River. Inherited, with his brother, this property and Mullingudgery. Also owned 1,500 square miles in Queensland. Built Wellington flour mills, 1879.

Morrison, p. 579.

FERGUSON, W. J.

Solicitor (Glen Innes).


FITZGERALD, Robert George Dundas

Solicitor.

Morrison, p. 546.

FITZPATRICK, Michael

b. Parramatta, 1816; d. 1881.

Public servant. Educated at Australian College. Tutored at Normal Institution. 1837 entered Lands Department as clerk. 1851 Clerk of Executive Council. 1856 first Under Secretary for Lands and Works. 1869 retired.

Mennell.

FLETCHER, James

b. Durham, 1855; arrived N.S.W., 1885; d. 1891.

Manager of Wickham and Bullock Island Colliery.

Morrison, p. 564.

Mennell.
FORSTER, William
Pastoralist and lawyer.

FORSYTH, Archibald
Rope manufacturer.

FOSTER, William John
b. Rathescair, Co. Louth, 1831.

FRASER, Augustus Ryan
Pastoralist (cattle), Mole River Station, Tenterfield.

FREMLIN, Alfred Reginald
Fellmonger.

FULLER, George Warburton
b. Kiama, 1861; educated Sydney University (B.A., M.A.), 1884 called to bar.
FULFORD, James
Innkeeper, West Maitland.

Innkeeper, West Maitland.

GRELLE, John
Proprietor of Queanbeyan Age.

MORRISON, p. 560.

GANNON, John Thomas
Solicitor, Goulburn.

ARGYLE, 1881, -82.

GARLAND, Charles Launcelot
b. England; educated in New Zealand; arrived N.S.W., 1879. For fifteen years engaged in mining; subsequently editor and proprietor of Carcoar Chronicle.

CARCOAR, 1885, -87, -89.

GARRARD, Jacob
b. Harwick, Essex, 1846; arrived Sydney, 1867.

Engineer at Mort's Dock, later land agent.

Mennell.

EARLY TRADES UNIONIST AND ADVOCATE OF EIGHT HOUR DAY.

GARRETT, Thomas
b. Liverpool, 1830; arrived N.S.W., 1839; d. 1891.

Early life spent at sea, then apprenticed as a printer. 1855 established Illawarra Mercury, later Alpine Pioneer and Cooma Mercury. Land agent.

Mennell.
GARVAN, James Patrick
b. Ireland, 1822.
Produce merchant. Founder and first managing
director of Citizens' Life Assurance Co., Ltd.,
secretary, Australian Building Society, City
Mutual Fire Insurance Society.

GIBBES, Frederick Jamieson
(Tamworth, 1882).
Educated Sydney College and University (B.A.,
1860) - legal training. But of independent
means and time devoted principally to sport.

GILL, John
(Tamworth, 1882).
Pastoralist. (Rock Vale, Sugar Loaf, Falconer
West, Moonlei, Wandoobar, Moore Creek, and
Swamp Oak Creek Stations).

GOODCHAP, Charles Augustus
(Eden, 1880, -82, -85, -86,
-87, -89, -91).
b. Kent, 1837; arrived N.S.W., 1853; d. Sydney,
1896. Public servant. 1853 became Clerk in
Colonial Secretary's office. 1856 transferred to
Lands and Works Department, 1859 to Public Works.
1870 Chief Clerk for Railways. 1875 Secretary
for Railways. 1878 Commissioner for Railways.
Retired 1888.

GOODWIN, Thomas Henry Hall
(Gunnedah, 1887, -95, -98).
Pastoralist. ( Booloocooroo Station, Curlewis).

Cyclopedia of N.S.W., p. 589.
Sands, 1880, p. 76.
Morrison, p. 524.

Morrison, p. 487.

Mennell.
S.M.H., 21.10.96.

Hall, 1875, p. 199.
Hall, 1895, p. 199.
GORDON, James (Young, 1887).
Pastoralist. (Tooraboorima Station, Young).

Morrison, p. 588.
Hall, 1895, p. 214.

GORMLY, James
(The Murrumbidgee, 1885, -87, -89, -91; Wagga, 1894, -95, -98, 1901).

b. Ireland, 1836; arrived Sydney, 1840.
Lost parents in flood at Gundagai, 1852. Went gold mining in Victoria and N.S.W., was a coach proprietor, and finally a pastoralist. Mayor of Wagga for two years.

D.T. 7.7.94.
(Newspaper Cuttings, Mitchell Library).

GORRICK, Joseph Albert
b. Wilberforce, 1843. Solicitor.

GOUR, John George
Builder, at Young.


GOULD, Albert John
(Patrick's Plains, 1882, -85, -87, -89, -91; Singleton, 1894, -95).


Morrison, p. 509.
Mennell.
Johns (1906).

GRAHAME, William
(Monaro, 1865, -72; Newcastle, 1889, -91).

Pastoralist. (Dry Plain, Frying Pan Creek and Gunningera Stations, Monaro).

Macphail, 1871, p. 30.
GRAY, Samuel William
Pastoralist. (Clarence R. district).
Macphail, 1871, p. 30.

GREENE, George Henry
b. Ireland, 1839; arrived Melbourne, 1842;
d. 1911. Educated Melbourne Grammar School and University.
Large scale agriculturist (pioneer of share-farming in N.S.W.), - Iandra Estate, Greenthorpe.

D.T. 2.8.94.
S.M.H. 25.12.11.

GREENWOOD, James


GREVILLE, Edward
Established first evening newspaper in Sydney, also weekly, Southern Cross. Set up telegraph agencies of his own in Victoria, N.S.W., and New Zealand, and acted as Reuter's agent. Founder of a large wholesale importing business for printing material, machinery and type.

Evening News, 11.7.03.

GRIFFITHS, George Neville
Stock and station agent. (Sydney).

Sands, 1883, p. 345.

HAMMOND, Mark John
Engineer.

Sands, 1883, p. 367.
HARRIS, John

b. County Derry, N. Ireland, 1838. Arrived Sydney at age of four. Educated at Dr. Fullerton's Haymarket Academy, Normal Institution, and Sydney University. Inherited large fortune in land and property, and on completion of his studies, devoted himself to the management of this estate. Mayor of Sydney five times. Died 1911, leaving estate of £97,000.


HASSALL, Thomas Henry

Pastoralist, and land and financial agent.

Morrison, p. 539.

HAWKEN, Nicholas

Commission Agent. Much experience in local government.

Morrison, p. 485.

Cyclopedia of N.S.W., p. 82.

HAWTHORNE, John Stuart

Land agent and speculator. For many years head of leading softgoods retail firm of Hawthorne and Reilly.

D.T. 19.7.94.

Morrison, p. 485.

HAY, William

Squatter.

Gormley, Reminiscences, Vol. 3, p. 44.
HILL, Richard
(Canterbury, 1868, -69, -72, -74).

Orchardist. b. Sydney, 1810; d. 1895.

Lived at Vaucluse. Worked fine orchard in Lane Cove district. Rowed across Harbour every morning by ten aboriginals and walked four miles to orchard. Supplied oranges to Victorian goldfields in '50's. About 1860 sold orchard and took up land in New Zealand, but returned and bought Butterbone Station, Lower Macquarie.

HOGAN, Patrick
(The Richmond, 1885; The Macleay, 1889, -91; Raleigh, 1894).

HOLBOROW, William Hilhis
Storekeeper in Richmond.

HOLTERMANN, Bernard Otto
(St. Leonards, 1882).

In 1856 began to work Hawkin's Hill, seeking gold; persevered until in 1871 discovered a vein yielding 50 oz. to the ton when crushed. His partner, Beyers, sold out for £70,000, but Holtermann held on to his interest, and on 21 June, 1871, discovered at Hill End the largest mass of gold in Australia, weighing 630 lbs., and worth £12,000. Devoted part of fortune to improving photography.

HOSKINS, James
Varied experience on gold diggings. b. London, 1823; d. 1900.
HAYES, James  
(The Hume, 1885, -87, -89, -91, -94, -95, -98, 1901).

b. Ireland. Miller in Albury and Goulburn, retired to live in Sydney, 1890.

HAYNES, John  
(Mudgee, 1887, -89, -91; Wellington, 1894, -95, -98, 1901).


HELLOVER, Thomas Henry  
(Solicitor.


HENSON, William  
(Canterbury, 1880, -85, -87).

"A Capitalist of considerable wealth."

HEYDON, Louis Francis  
(Yass Plains, 1882, -85, -86).

b. Sydney, 1848; d. 1918. Solicitor.

HEZLET, William  
(Paddington, 1880).

Commission Agent.

Morrison, p. 480.

Bulletin, 8.1.87.

Mennell.

Sands, 1880, p. 462; 1875, p. 354.
HUME, James Peter

(Readfern, 1888, -89; Bourke, 1891).
Proprietor of a boot warehouse, Waterloo.
Sands, 1888, p. 600.

HUMPHERY, Frederick Thomas

(Shoalhaven, 1882, -85).
b. Berrima, N.S.W., 1841; d. 1908.
1864-82 Official Assignee. Owner, Mt. Debateable Station, Queensland.
Johns, (1906).

HUNGERFORD, Thomas

(Squatter.

HURLEY, John

b. Ireland, 1790; d. 1882.
Squatter, at Campbelltown and then Cootamundra (pioneer of town).
Morrison, p. 21.

HURLEY, John

(Central Cumberland, 1872; Hartley, 1876, -77, -87.
An old gold-digger, and one of the original owners of the Hill End mine.
Morrison, p. 540.
Newspaper Cuttings, Vol. 25, p. 82 (Mitchell Library).

HUTCHISON, Alexander

(Book publisher. (Hutchinson, Alexander & Son; book publishers and importers).
Morrison, p. 480.
Sands, 1888, p. 605.
Farmer, Stonehenge (Glen Innes district).

Hall, 1895, p. 286.

Hutchinson, William Alston (Balmain, 1882)


Hyam, Solomon Herbert (Balmain, 1885).
b. Jamberoo, N.S.W., 1837; d. 1901.

Produce Merchant. Alderman and mayor of Balmain.

Hyam, Solomon Herbert, b. Jamberoo, N.S.W., 1837; d. 1901.

Sands, 1888, p. 479.

Morrison.

Inglis, James (New England, 1885, -87, -89, -91).

Inglis, James, b. Scotland, 1845. Merchant. Educated Normal School, Edinburgh, and Edinburgh University. 1864 went to New Zealand, 1866 to India. 1877 arrived Australia. 1881 founded James Inglis & Co., Tea, East India and General Merchants.

Mennell.

Johns (1906).

Innes, Joseph George Long (Mudgee, 1872).
b. Sydney, 1834; d. 1896. Barrister and judge. Educated King's School, Parramatta. 1851 entered Survey Office. Transferred to Department of Justice. 1856-9 studied law in London and called to bar at Lincoln's Inn. 1863 admitted to New South Wales bar. 1865-9 District Court Judge in Queensland.

Innes, Joseph George Long, b. Sydney, 1834; d. 1896. Barrister and judge. Educated King's School, Parramatta. 1851 entered Survey Office. Transferred to Department of Justice. 1856-9 studied law in London and called to bar at Lincoln's Inn. 1863 admitted to New South Wales bar. 1865-9 District Court Judge in Queensland.

Mennell.

S.M.H., 9.5.74.

Cyclopedia of N.S.W., p. 303.
IVES, Isaac Ellis

Merchant ("Argyle Bonded and Free Warehouses").

JACOB, Archibald Hamilton

b. 1828. Studied for the Church, but abandoned it. After four years in banks at Liverpool and Manchester, came to Australia and took up agricultural and pastoral pursuits in Hunter Valley; subsequently entered Civil Service, and magistrate at Raymond Terrace.

JEANNERET, Charles Edward

Miner and sailor in early years. Successful shipping agent and boat owner.

JENNINGS, Patrick Alfred

Pastoralist.

JOHNSTON, William

Merchant, Clarence Town.

JONES, Auber George

Squatter, and speculator in stock and stations.

Morrison, p. 497.

(Merchant, IlArgyle Bonded and Free Warehouses).

JACOB, Archibald Hamilton

(Lower Hunter, 1872, -75, -77; Gloucester, 1880).

JEANNERET, Charles Edward

(Carcoar, 1887, -91).

JENNINGS, Patrick Alfred

(The Murray, 1869, -72; The Bogan, 1880, -82, -85, -86).

JOHNSTON, William

(The Williams, 1877).

JONES, Auber George

(The Murrumbidgee, 1882).

JONES, Travers (Tumut, 1885, -87, -89, -94, -95).
Mine owner (gold) at Muttama and Adelong.

Judd, William George (Canterbury, 1885).
Storekeeper (St. Peters).

Kelly, John Edward (The Bogan, 1887).
Pastoralist - one of the founders of Bourke, in which town prominent in business pursuits and a large property owner.

Kerr, Andrew Taylor (Orange, 1879, -80).
Squatter (Wellwood).

Kethel, Alexander (West Sydney, 1885, -87).
b. Scotland, 1832; arrived Sydney, 1853; d. 1916.
Period spent as sea captain, and miner.
Partner of John Booth in wholesale timber firm and shipping agency.

b. Scotland, 1838; arrived Australia, 1857.
General storekeeper in Campbelltown for sixteen years. Retired and went to England.
On return elected to Parliament. Prominent in Congregational Church.

Morrison, p. 577.
D.T., 19.7.94.
Sands, 1883, p. 394.
Morrison, p. 510.
Greville, 1872.
Morrison, p. 467.
Johns, 1908.
D.T., 31.7.94.
LACKEY, John
(Parramatta, 1860; Central Cumberland, 1867, -69, -72, -75, -77, -78, -80, -82).
b. Sydney, 1830; d. 1903. Educated Sydney College. Took up stations to westward of Peak Downs (Queensland), and afterwards secured Buckwarson and Amphitheatre Stations, between Cobar and Wilcannia, and the Austermere (Moss Vale) and Mereworth Estates, the latter being famous for their fattening qualities.

Evening News, 7.10.99.
Mennell.

LAKEMAN, Allen
Pastoralist.

(Balranald, 1887, -89).

LAMB, Alfred
Principal, Alfred Lamb & Co., merchants, shipping and general agents, Sydney.

(Morrison, p. 506.

Sands, 1888, p. 630.

LEARY, Joseph
Solicitor, (Sydney).

(Narellan, 1860, -69; Murrumbidgee, 1878).

S.M.H., 26.12.74.

LEE, Benjamin
(West Maitland, 1864, -69, -72).
b. Bedfordshire, 1825; arrived N.S.W., 1830.
For sixteen years Police Magistrate at Bathurst and for four years Stipendiary Magistrate in Sydney. For thirteen years Chairman of Hunter River Steam Navigation Co. Still in trade at 90.

Illustrated Sydney News, 27.6.74.
D.T., 5.11.1915.
LEE, Charles Alfred
b. Parramatta, 1842. Merchant at West Maitland and Tamworth.

Morrison, p. 526.
D.T., 24. 7. 94.

LEES, Samuel Edward

D.T., 9. 7. 94.

LEVIN, Leyser
Merchant, Corowa.


LEVYEN, Robert Henry
(Tamworth, 1880, -82, -85, -87, -89, -91; Quirindi, 1894, -95, -98).
Solicitor.

Morrison, p. 575.

LEVY, Lewis Wolfe
(Liverpool Plains, 1871; West Maitland, 1874).
b. London, 1815; d. 1885.
Storekeeper at Tamworth. Also pastoral interests (owned following stations:
Yarraman, Liverpool Plains; Carlginda; Bundilla, Merrigal, Corrodgery).

MacPhail, 1871, p. 33.

LINSLEY, John Richard
(Central Cumberland, 1889).
b. Hawkesbury, 1827; d. 1889. Member of City Council for some years, Mayor of Ryde for three years.

S.M.H., 5. 6. 89.
LLOYD, George Alfred

Educated Aske's Hospital School. 1830 employed in shipping and insurance broker's office. 1837 farmed on Williams River. 1840 set up as auctioneer in Sydney. 1851 became successful general merchant in Sydney.

LLOYD, Lewis

Copper smelter and mine owner (Burrara).

LONG, William Alexander

Wine and spirit merchant.

LORD, George William

b. Sydney, 1818; son of Simeon Lord, merchant; d. 1880. 1837 became squatter near Wellington.

LOUGHNAN, George Cumberlege

Squatter.
LUCAS, John
(Canterbury, 1860, -64; Hartley, 1864; Canterbury, 1871, -72, -74, -75, -77).
b. Newtown, 1818; d. 1902. Educated Church of England School, Liverpool. At sixteen apprenticed as carpenter. Became builder and contractor. 1858 appointed magistrate, and for a number of years on Central Police Court bench.

LUSCOMBE, Richard Charles
(Chernhursham, 1883).
Insurance Agent.

LYNCH, Andrew
(Carcoar, 1876, -77, -80, -82).
b. 1819; d. 1884. Resident of Carcoar for nearly forty-five years. Squatter.

LYNE, William John

LYSAGHT, Andrew
(Illawarra, 1885, -91).
Publican.

Mac GREGOR, William Peter  (Wentworth, 1885,-87)
Squatter (Glenlyon Station, Wilcannia)


MACHATTIE, Richard Randolph  (Bourke, 1882)
Surveyor, (Bathurst)


MACINTOSH, John

1821; arrived Australia 1839; d. 1911.
1846 founded business of John Macintosh & Son, ironmongers.

MACKINNON, James Archibald (Young, 1882,-85,-87,-89,-91)
Squatter, stock and station agent.


MACLEAY, William, jun.

1820; arrived Sydney, 1839; d. 1891.
Politician, squatter and scientist. Educated Edinburgh Academy and University. 1838 widowed mother died, and he went to Australia with his cousin William Sharp Macleay. Took up land near Goulburn, and later on Murrumbidgee. By 1855 well established. 1874 conducted scientific expedition to New Guinea on own barque, Chevert. Chosen in 1862 President of new Entomological Society of N.S.W. 1874, Linnean Society of N.S.W. founded, with Macleay as President. Left this Society £6,000 in his will and £35,000 to provide four scholarships of £400 p.a. each to encourage research in natural sciences. Left £12,000 to Sydney University to establish a chair in bacteriology.

Serle Mennell
S.M.H., 8.12.91.
MARTIN, James

(Goole & Westmoreland, 1856, 57, 58; East Sydney, 1859; Orange, 1862; The Tumut, 1865; Monaro, 1864; The Lachlan, 1866; East Sydney, 1869, 70; East Macquarie, 1872)
b. County Cork, Ireland, 1820. Came to Sydney with parents 1821. d. 1886. Educated at Cape's School. After a short period as a reporter, was articled to G.R. Nicols, a well-known barrister of the period. Became attorney, and barrister. Became Chief Justice, 1873.

Serle.            S.M.H., 8.11.86

MARTIN, William Fraser

(West Sydney, 1880; Shoalhaven, 1887)
Commission agent and produce merchant.
Sands, 1880, 1884.

MARTIN, James

(South Sydney, 1889, 91; Sydney-Bligh, 1894)
Hardware and machinery merchant. 1889 a Sydney alderman.
D.T., 16.6.94.

MATHESON, George McLeod

(Glen Innes, 1887)
Mining engineer.
Sands, 1888.

McCourt, William

(Camden, 1882, 87, 89, 91; Bowral, 1894, 95, 98, 1901; Wollondilly, 1904, 07, 10)

McCULLOCH, Andrew Hardie, junior. (Central Cumberland, 1877, -80, -82, -85, -87)

Solicitor, and pastoralist.

McELHONE, John

(The Upper Hunter, 1875, -77, -80; East Sydney, 1882; Upper Hunter, 1882, -87)

Hide and tallow merchant. (Also stock, station and wool agent)

McFARLANE, John

(The Clarence, 1887, -89, -91, -94, -95, -98, 1901, -04, -07, -10, -13)


McLAUGHLIN, John

(The Upper Hunter, 1880, -82; Raleigh, 1895)

b. 1850, Ireland. Came to N.S.W. in infancy. Educated at Lyndhurst College. Admitted solicitor, 1874.

McLAURIN, James

b. Scotland; arrived Sydney 1837. Cattle breeder and station owner.

E.W. O'Sullivan, "Romance of the McLaurines", in Under the Southern Cross, pp. 82-3.
McWILLIAN, William  (East Sydney, 1887,-89,-91; Burwood, 1894,-95)

b. Londonderry, 1850; arrived N.S.W. 1869. Educated Wesley College, Dublin. Resident partner in Australia of W. & A. McArthur Ltd., merchants and importers. 1886 President of Sydney Chamber of Commerce.


MELVILLE, Ninian, Junior  (Northumberland, 1880,-82, -85,-87,-91)


N.S.W.P.D., Vol.XII, p.3009.

MERRIMAN, George  (West Sydney, 1882,-87)


S.M.H., 18.11.93.

MERRIMAN, James  (West Sydney, 1877)

Shipowner.

Sands, 1873, p.431.

MEYER, Solomon  (Carcoar, 1874)


Sands, 1873, p.431.

MILLER, Gustave Thomas Carlisle  (Monaro, 1889,-91,-94,-95, -98,1901,-04,-07,-10,-13,-17)

b. Prospect, N.S.W., of Irish-German parentage. Went into printing trade with uncle at Gutenberg printing office, Sydney. 1876 went to Cooma to manage Monaro Mercury. 1879 started Cooma Express.

D.T., 31.7.94.
MITCHELL, Joseph

Wood, hay and produce merchant, Newtown.

Sands 1880, p. 554.

MOLESWORTH, Edmund William

Shipowner and Customhouse Agent.

Sands 1880.

MONTAGUE, Alexander

b. County Tyrone, Ireland, 1815; d. 1894.
Educated at a County school and private seminary.
Became farmer. At age 26 emigrated to Australia, staying in Sydney until 1848, when went to Cooma, then a cattle station. Purchased land in 1850 at first sale of land after proclamation of Cooma as a township, and erected first store. Business proved profitable, and after 6 years purchased Cooma Run. In 1857 sold this run to Ryrie Bros., and subsequently bought and built up Numerella and Dooloondoo Stations. Also held large Town lands, and in 1861 built first steam mill at Cooma.

F.F. Mitchell, Back to Cooma, p. 67.

MOORE, Charles

Merchant and auctioneer (Sydney).

Sands, 1873, p. 435; 1880, p. 557.
S.M.H., 31.7.74.

MOORE, Samuel Wilkinson

b. Fiji, 1854. Educated Newington College.
Took up mining on Tingha tinfields.

Johns, 1906
D.T., 28.7.94.
MORTON, Philip Henry (Shoalhaven, 1889,-91,-94,-95)

Chairman of directors, Australian Joint Stock Bank (1906), and had always been connected with banking institutions. Managed many country branches of Commercial Banking Co. Owner of a number of country properties, and breeder of stud horses and cattle.

MURRAY, R.L. (Inverell, 1880)

Surveyor (ex-selector).

MURPHY, John (Monaro, 1877)

Pastoralist. ("Kybean", Monaro)

MYERS, Phillip George (Argyle, 1880)

Auctioneer, Goulburn.

NEILD, John Cash (Paddington, 1885,-87,-91,-95,-98)


NELSON, Harris Levi (Orange, 1872,-74)

Storekeeper, Orange.

NICOLL, Bruce Baird (The Richmond, 1889,-91)

Steamship owner and lessee of Victoria wharf.
NOBBS, John  
(Central Cumberland, 1888, -89,-91; Granville, 1898, 1901,-04,-07,-10)  

Founder of the **Cumberland Independent**. Also a conveyancer.  

*Bulletin*, 5.2.87.  
Sands.  

OAKES, George  
(Parramatta, 1856,-58,-59; East Sydney, 1872)  
b. 1813, son of Francis Oakes, ex South Sea Island missionary. For many years engaged in pastoral and agricultural pursuits.  
d. 1881.  


O'CONNOR, Daniel  
(West Sydney, 1877,-80,-82, -85,-86,-87,-89)  
b. Ireland, 1842; arrived Sydney at age 9.  

Morrison, p.460.  
O' Connor to Parkes, 13.9.88,  
P.C., A.899.82.  

O'CONNOR, Joseph Graham  
(Mudgee, 1873)  
b. King's County, Ireland. Came to Australia at age 2, about 1840. Apprenticed to Thomas Clayton, to learn wood engraving and letter-press printing.  

OLIFFE, Joseph Benjamin  (South Sydney, 1882, -85)
Proprietor, Hyde Park Hotel, Sydney. President of L.V.A. in 1877.

Sands, 1880, p. 580.
S.M.H., 31.10.77.

O'MARA, Thomas Chrysostom  (Tumut, 1882; Monaro, 1887)
Barrister.

D.T., 24.6.91.

ONSLOW, Arthur Alexander Walton  (Camden, 1869, -72, -75, -77)
b. Trichinopoly, 1833; arrived Australia, 1838; married Elizabeth, only daughter James Macarthur, 1867; d. 1882.
1838 brought to Australia to stay with grandfather, Alexander Macleay. 1841 returned to England, and 1847 entered Navy.
Served in Channel and Mediterranean squadrons, off W. African coast, and in Baltic during Crimean war.
1857-61 engaged on survey of Shark Bay, Torres Straits, and Barrier Reef. Ill-health caused resignation.
1871 gazetted post-captain; thence lived in Sydney.

O'SULLIVAN, Edward William  (Queanbeyan, 1885, -87, -89, -91, -95, -98, -99, 1901; Belmore, 1904, -07)
Journalist. Father died when O'Sullivan a child.
Began work as a printer's devil on Hobart Mercury.
Became reporter, and went to Sydney in 1869, but returned to Hobart and started the Tribune. Latter sold in 1873, and from 1874-82 O'Sullivan in Victoria, as editor of St. Arnaud Mercury, and then on staff of Argus. Member of Victorian Typographical Union, and active in politics. Joined Sydney Daily Telegraph in 1882; president Typographical Union and Trades and Labour Council.

Serle.
E.M. O'Sullivan, The Hon. Edward William O'Sullivan
(Mitchell Library)
PARKES, Varney
Architect.

PAUL, William Henry
Saddler (Bathurst)

PECHEY, Alfred John
Surveyor, (Bathurst).

PENZER, Joseph

PERRY, John

PHELPS, Joseph James
Pastoralist.

PIDDINGTON, William Richman

Morrison, (Bathurst, 1889)
Greville, 1885-7, p.43.
(The Bogan, 1887)

Morrison, p.510.
(The Richmond, 1889,-91; Ballina, 1894,-95,-98,-99, 1901; The Richmond, 1904,-07)

(Balranald, 1864,-69,-72,-74)


(Macphail, 1871, p.40. S.M.H., 17.12.72.)

Pastoralist.

(Balranald, 1864,-69,-72,-74)

PIGGOTT, William Hilson  
Solicitor.  
(Canterbury, 1880,-82)  
Johns, 1906.

PILCHER, Charles Edward  
b. 1844, d. 1916. Educated West Maitland High School, King's School, and Sydney University. Barrister.  
(West Macquarie, 1875,-77,-80)  
(Cyclopedia of N.S.W., p.305. Johns, 1914.)

PLUMB, John  
Pastoralist. (Kempfield, Trunkey)  
(Carcoar, 1889)  
(Hall, 1895, p.157.)

PURVES, John Mitchell  
Held landed properties on the Clarence River; principally Carramanna estate, Grafton.  
(The Clarence, 1880,-82,-85)  

QUIN, Edward  
Squatter. Managing partner in Tarella, one of the largest and best improved stations in the Deniliquin district.  
(Wentworth, 1882,-85)  

RAPHAEL, Joseph George  
Import merchant.  
(West Sydney, 1872)  
Sands, 1873, p.558.
REID, George Houston (East Sydney, 1882,-85,-87, -89,-91; Sydney-King, 1894, -95,-98)

Barrister. b. Renfrewshire, 1845; arrived Australia 1852; d. 1918. 1864-78 in Treasury, 1878-9 secretary to Attorney General. 1879 called to Bar.

RENWICK, Arthur (East Sydney, 1879,-80,-81; Redfern, 1885,-86)

RILEY, Alban Joseph (South Sydney, 1887)
Partner, Riley Bros., drapers and clothiers, Sydney. City Council alderman, Mayor 1887.

RITCHIE, Robert Adam (Central Cumberland, 1889,-91)
Contractor, Auburn.

ROBERTS, Charles James (Hastings and Manning, 1882, -85,-87,-89)
b. Sydney, 1846. 1867 inherited from father "Crown and Anchor" Hotel, Sydney, which he subsequently rebuilt as "Roberts" Hotel. 1877 Alderman of city, 1878-9 mayor.

Newspaper Cuttings, Vol.166, p.37, Mitchell Library.
ROBERTSON, John

Pastoralist and professional politician. b. London 1816; arrived Australia, 1820; d. 1891.
Family received grant of 2,500 acres of land in Upper Hunter Valley. Educated Sydney, went to sea, worked passage to England, visited France and S. America, and rejoined family in N.S.W. Married at 21, worked on land, and took a leading part in the struggle of squatters against Governor Gipps. 1858-9 Secretary for Lands and Public Works in second Cowper ministry. 1860-61 Premier and Secretary for Lands. 1861 M.L.C. to pilot Land Bill through Council. 1865 Secretary for Lands again in fourth Cowper ministry. 1868-70 Premier and Colonial Secretary. 1870-2 Colonial Secretary in Martin Government. Premier and Colonial Secretary, 1875-7. Vice President of Executive Council 1879-81, acting Premier 1881-2, Premier 1885-6.

Serle
Mennell
S.M.H., 9.5.91.

ROBERTSON, Thomas

Solicitor.

S.M.H., 30.11.73.

RODD, James

Estate agent and auctioneer, Sydney.

Sands, 1880, pp.619, 717.

ROSS, Andrew

Physician.

N.S.W.P.R.
ROUSE, Richard (Mudgee, 1876,-79)
b. 1840, South Creek. d. 1906. Prominently connected with horse-breeding and horse-racing from boyhood. Established a well-known and successful stud on Biraganhil Estate, near Gulgong.

S.M.H., 14.2.06.

RYRIE, Alexander (Braidwood, 1880,-82,-85,-87,-89)
Squatter (35,000 acres at Michelago) "A man of good education, and extensive wealth in land, mines, and flocks."

Morrison, p.516.
N.S.W.P.D., 14.11.82,

RYRIE, David (Monaro, 1884)
With Alexander, at one time owned and ran Burnima Station. Bought Coolringdon run (26,000 acres) in 1877, which he occupied and developed until his death in 1888.

F.F. Mitchell, Back to Cooma, p.69.

SAMUEL, Saul (Orange, 1859; Wellington, 1862,-65,-68; E. Sydney, 1872)


SAWERS, William Bowie Stewart Campbell (Bourke, 1885; Tamworth, 1898)
Squatter.

N.S.W.P.D., Vol.XXIII, p.5280.
SCHEY, William Francis

Seaman, labourer, railway clerk, secretary N.S.W. Amalgamated Railway & Tramway Service Association.

SCHOLEY, Stephen

Stock agent.

SCOBIE, Robert

Owner of Mount Pleasant fruit and vine orchards, Maitland district.

SEAVER, Jonathan Charles Billing Pockerage

Geologist, civil and mining engineer.

SEE, John

b. Huntingdonshire, 1845; arr. N.S.W. 1853; d. 1907. Worked on family’s farm on Hunter R. 1863, took up land on Clarence River with brother. 1865, went to Sydney, started John See & Co., produce dealers, and became partner in the firm which developed into the North Coast Steam Navigation Co.

SHEPHERD, John

Solicitor, apparently with pastoral interests in Wellington district.
SHEPHERD, Patrick Lindsay Crawford  
(Nepean, 1874)  
Plant Catalogues, Mitchell Library.

SIMSON, Colin William  
(Balranald, 1877)  
Squatter, Hay.  
Mannsell to Parkes, P.C., A.921.780.

SINGLE, Joseph Daniel  
(Nepean, 1872)  
b. 1826, d. 1900.  
Squatter, Castlereagh and Gwydir districts.  
Greville.  
Macphail, p.43.

SLATTERY, Thomas Michael  
(Boorowa, 1880,-82,-85,-87, -89,-91,-94)  
Solicitor. b. 1844. 1864, junior clerk in N.S.W. Customs. 1874 chief clerk of Supreme Court, deputy registrar of Divorce Court and secretary of Barristers' Admission Board. 1875 admitted attorney, solicitor, and proctor.  
Mennell.  
Morrison, p.512.  
D.T., 25.7.94.

SMITH, Arthur Bruce  
(Gundagai, 1882; The Glebe, 1889,-91)  
Mennell  
Johns (1906)  
SMITH, John Samuel

Squatter.

SMITH, Robert Burdett

b. Sydney, 1842; d. 1895. Educated Cape’s School, St. James’ Grammar, Surrey Hills Academy and privately. 1858, articled to William Roberts, solicitor. 1863 admitted solicitor of Supreme Court of N.S.W. Had widespread squatting interests by the ’eighties.

SMITH, James Francis

Butcher, Newtown.

SMITH, Fergus Jago


SMITH, Frank James

Lawyer, and manager of Sydney Mercantile Agency.

SMITH, Sydney


J. Hurley to Parkes, 19.12.74.
P.C., A.887.348.

(The Hastings, 1870,-72,-74,
-77; The Macleay, 1880,-82,
-85,-87)

(Smith, 1885; Newtown-
Camperdown, 1901,-04)

Sands, 1880, p.647.

(West Macquarie, 1887)

Cyclopedia of N.S.W., p.86.

(Macphail, p.43.

(Morrison, p.471.

(Melville, 1882,-85,-87,
-89,-91; Bathurst, 1894,-95;
Canterbury, 1900)

Mennell,
Johns (1906)
Morrison, p.550.
D.T., 3.8.94.
SMITH, Thomas Richard (Nepean, 1877,-80,-82,-85,-95,1901)
Auctioneer, Penrith.


SPRING, Gerald (Wellington, 1869; Young, 1882,-85,-86)
For a time Inspector of Selections, Murrumburrah; then land and commission agent.

Sands' Country Directory, 1881-2
Porter, History of Wellington, p.46.

STEPHEN, Harold Wilberforce Hindmarsh (Monaro, 1885,-89)
b. 1841, d. 1889. Journalist.


STEPHEN, William (Redfern, 1887,-89; Botany, 1894)
b. Northern Ireland, came to N.S.W. in 1848. Varied career, goldmining and fruit growing. Proprietor of a woolscouring and fell-mongering business.

D.T., 4.8.94.

STEPHEN, Septimus Alfred (Canterbury, 1882,-85)
Notary Public.

Sands, 1884, p.742.

STEVENs, Charles James (Northumberland, 1874)
Manager, A.C.C. Colliery, Newcastle.

STEVenson, Richard

(Wollombi, 1886,-87,-89,-91; Northumberland, 1894,-98)

b. Surrey, 1832. Worked in printing house and came to Australia after gold discoveries of 1851. Joined staff of Sydney Morning Herald, and remained there.

Morrison, p.584. D.T., 28.7.94.

STEWART, John

(Illawarra, 1866; Kiama, 1871,-72)

Lawyer, and commission agent.

Stewart to Parkes, P.C. A.928, pp.707, 709.

STOKES, Alfred

(Forbes, 1882,-85,-87,-89)

b. Yackandandah, Victoria, 1858. Went to Forbes with parents in 1863. Became publican and squatter (owner of Mickey's Plain Station, Forbes)


STREET, John Rendell

(East Sydney, 1867,-89)

Commission agent.


STUART, Alexander

(East Sydney, 1874,-76,-77; Illawarra, 1880,-82,-83)


Serle. Mennell. S.M.H., 20.11.74; 25.2.76.
SUTHERLAND, John

Building contractor.

Mennell.

SUTTOR, Francis Bathurst


SUTTOR, William Henry, jr.


TAIT, Francis

b. Durham, England, 1838. Entered Wesley missionary College, Surrey, - went as missionary to Fiji. Spent 10 years in Fiji, then moved to Sydney for health reasons, gave up ministry, and became manager of a Goulburn building society.

TARRANT, Harman John

Surveyor.

TAYLOR, Adolphus George

Journalist. b. Mudgee, 1857; d. 1900. From age 13 - 17, pupil teacher. Subsequently joined Mudgee Independent. At age 25, returned


TAYLOR, Hugh
Butcher; local (Parramatta) agent and reporter for S.M.H.

TEECE, William, jnr.
Of William Teece & Co., Tanners and boot manufacturers, Goulburn.

Wyatt, History of Goulburn.

TERRY, Samuel Henry
"Grandson of Sam Terry, an early Australian millionaire".

G.H.F. Cox, History of Mudgee, p.214. (Typescript, Mitchell Library)

THOMPSON, Richard Windeyer
Solicitor, Newcastle.

Morrison, p.553.

THOMPSON, James Banford
Selector, Queanbeyan.


TONKIN, James Ebenezer

D.T., 17.7.94.
TOOHEY, James Matthew
(South Sydney, 1885,-87,-89,-91)

Bulletin, 16.5.1903.

TOOTH, Robert Lucas
(Monaro, 1880,-82)
Of brewing family: chairman of directors when formed company in 1888. Owner of Kameruka Estate, near Bega, famed for its Jersey herds and cheese experiments. 1881-9, a director of Bank of N.S.W., and of Colonial Sugar Refining Co.
Tooth & Co., The First Hundred Years (History of Kent Brewery)

TORPY, James
(Orange, 1889,-91)
b. Ireland, 1832. d. 1903.
A gold digger, and agitator at Lambing Flat and on Turon fields. For 22 years a merchant at Orange, then took over local newspaper, the Advocate.
Bulletin, 2.7.1903.

TRAILL, William Joseph
(South Sydney, 1889,-91)
Journalist. b. London, 1842; d. 1902. Educated Edinburgh and London. Destined for the army, but in 1859 went to Sydney and became jackeroo on a station near Dalby. Visited England, then joined Mines Department in Melbourne and Lands Department in Queensland. 1869 joined staff of Brisbane Courier. Became editor of Sydney Mail. 1879 became Reuter's agent in N.S.W. Contributed to Bulletin when it started in 1880. When, as a result of libel actions, this journal fell into printer's hands, Traill bought it, and transferred a fourth interest to Archibald and Haynes, the original proprietors. Subsequently became editor. 1886 sold interest in Bulletin, and entered politics. When defeated in 1895, engaged in mining and pastoral pursuits.
Serle. D.T., 14.6.94.


TRICKETT, William Joseph

Solicitor. b. Gibraltar, 1843; d. 1916. 1866 admitted solicitor. From 1875 alderman and several times mayor of Woollahra.

TUNKS, William

Publican ("Curriers' Arms"). Mayor of St. Leonards for 18 successive years.

TURNER, William

Reporter on staff of Newcastle Herald & Miners' Advocate. Candidature sponsored by N.S.W. Reform League, which guaranteed him £300 p.a. for political services while in Parliament.

TURNER, Edwin Woodward

Squatter, Tumbarumba.

VAUGHN, Robert Matheson

Mining engineer and civil engineering and building contractor.

VIVIAN, Walter Hussey

Estate agent, Manly.
WADDELL, Thomas  (Bourke, 1887,-89,-91; Cobar, 1894,-95,-98,1901)

Pastoralist.  b. Ireland, 1854;  d. 1940.

Serle.
D.T., 26. 7. 94.

WALL, William Chandos  (Mudgee, 1886,-87,-89,-91)

Selector and agent, "regarded by his constituents very highly for his efforts in Parliament on behalf of mining interests."

Morrison, p. 558.

WANT, John Henry  (Gundagai, 1885,-86,-87; Paddington, 1889,-91)

Barrister.  b. Glebe, Sydney, 1846;  d. 1905.
Educated Sydney Grammar School and at Caen, Normandy.  Became pupil of Sir Frederick Darley, Chief Justice of N.S.W.  1869 admitted to Bar, and built up large practice.

Serle.
Johns (1906)
Mennell.

WARDEN, James  (Shoalhaven, 1871,-72,-74)

Farmer, Ulladulla.


WATSON, James  (The Lachlan, 1869,-72,-75,-77,-79; Young, 1880; Gundagai, 1884)

Merchant.  b. County Armagh, 1836;  d. 1907.
Went to N.S.W. early in life and became partner in firm of John Frazer & Co., Sydney.  Also chairman of directors, City Bank.

Mennell.
Johns (1906)
WATSON, William John  (Young, 1880,-85)
Wine and spirit merchant, Young.

WEARNE, Joseph  (West Sydney, 1869,-72)
Proprietor of "Anchor" Flour Mills, Sydney.
Letters to Pkes, P.C., A.915.204, 206.

WEBB, Edmund  (West Macquarie, 1869,-72; East Macquarie, 1878,-80)
Merchant, Bathurst.
N.S.W.P.D., 14.10.84, p. 5750.

WEST, Thomas Henry  (Carcoar, 1872)
Squatter, Cudgelo.
Greville, 1875-7, p. 193.

WHITE, Francis  (The Upper Hunter, 1874)
Pastoralist. b. Ravensworth, Hunter Valley, 1830; d. 1875. Educated at E. Maitland and went on land, living first at Beltrees, then at Edenglassie, Muswellbrook. Took up stations, with his two brothers, in Liverpool Plains and New England areas.

WHITE, Robert Hoddle Driberg  (Gloucester, 1882,-85)
Manager, Mudgee branch, Bank of N.S.W.

WILKINSON, John  (Albury, 1889,-91,-94)
Pastoralist.
A Glance at Australia in 1880; pastoral directory.
WILKINSON, Robert Bliss

(Balranald, 1880,-82,-85,-87,-89,-91)

Commenced practice as solicitor in Albury, in 1881, but soon turned to pastoral pursuits, becoming a large squatter.

D.T., 24.7.94.
Morrison, p.506.

WILKINSON, William Camac

(The Glebe, 1885,-87)


Morrison, p.491.
Johns (1906).

WILLIAMSON, Thomas Michael

(Redfern, 1885)

Publican ("Limerick Arms", Redfern). First mayor of Redfern.


WILLIS, William Nicholas

Grazier, Brewarrina.


WILSON, Alexander

Squatter.

Morrison, p.515.
WINDEYER, William Charles  (The Lower Hunter, 1859; West Sydney, 1860,-66,-69,-70; The University of Sydney, 1876, -77,-78)
Judge.  b. Westminster, 1834; arr. Australia 1835, d. 1897.  Educated Cape's School, and King's School and Sydney University.  1857 called to Bar. Law reporter for Empire.  1879 appointed acting judge, 1881 puisne judge.  Deeply interested in education: trustee of Sydney Grammar School and of Public Library, President of Sydney Mechanics School of Arts, 1883-7 Vice-Chancellor of University, 1885-6 Chancellor.

Serle.
Mennell.
S.M.H., 15.9.97.

WISDOM, Robert  
(Goldfields West, 1859,-60; The Lower Hunter, 1864,-69; Goldfields North, 1870; Morpeth, 1874,-77,-79,-80, -82,-85)

WISE, Bernhard Ringrose  (South Sydney, 1887,-91; Sydney-Flinders, 1894; Ashfield, 1898,-99)
Barrister.  b. Sydney, 1858; d. 1916.  Educated Rugby and Queen's College, Oxford.  President of Union and of Athletic Club.  1883 called to Bar, Middle Temple.  Returned to Australia a keen federationist.  1897 represented N.S.W. at Federal Convention.  1900-8 M.L.C., travelled and lived in England.  1915-16 Agent General for N.S.W.

Serle.
Johns (1906)
S.M.H., 21, 22.9.1916.
WITHERS, George
(South Sydney, 1880, 82, 87)
Began as tradesman, became builder, and successful speculator in real estate.
Morrison, p.466.

WOODWARD, Francis
(Illawarra, 1887, 89)
Solicitor, Wollongong.

WRIGHT, Francis Augustus
(Redfern, 1882, 83; Glen Innes, 1889, 91, 94, 95, 98, 1901)
Carrier. b. London, 1835; d. 1903.
1836 arrived N.S.W. Went to sea, then worked on goldfields. Finally became partner in Wright, Heaton & Co. Ltd., general carriers, Sydney.
D.T., 26.7.94.

WRIGHT, John James
(Queanbeyan, 1874)
b. Ireland, 1823; arr. Australia 1843.
Postmaster at Queanbeyan, then general storekeeper. Subsequently established thirteen branches of the business in different parts of the Goulburn district, employing over 100 hands. Interested in pastoral properties in Monaro, and Queanbeyan Steam Flour mill. First mayor of Queanbeyan.
Morrison.

YOUNG, James Henry
(The Hastings & Manning, 1880, 82, 85, 86, 87, 89, 91; The Manning, 1894, 95, 98)
b. England, 1834; arrived Australia, 1859. Began life in P. & O., but gave up seafaring for commerce in 1853, and in 1859 set up as a commission agent in Sydney.
Johns.
Sands, 1880, p.783.
YOUNG, John Douglas

(West Sydney, 1865)

b. Lanarkshire, Scotland, 1842. d. 1893.
Apprenticed to engineering profession at age of 13, but at 15 left home for seafaring life. Followed this calling until 1865, when settled in Sydney. 1865-8 worked at gasworks, 1869 licensee of an hotel. Subsequently proprietor of several hotels. Keen sport, turf and aquatics.

S.M.H., 17.11.93.

---

A note on abbreviations

The following abbreviations have been used in referring to the sources for material presented above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.T.</td>
<td>Daily Telegraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greville</td>
<td>Greville's Official Post Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directory of New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Syd., various issues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Hall's Business, Professional and Pastoral Directory of New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Syd., various issues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heaton</td>
<td>Sir J.H. Heaton, Australian Dictionary of Dates and Men of the Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Syd., 1879)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns</td>
<td>Johns' Notable Australians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Syd., various issues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macphail</td>
<td>Myles Macphail, The Australian Squatting Directory (Melb., 1871)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mennell</td>
<td>Philip Mennell, The Dictionary of Australasian Biography from the Inauguration of Responsible Government (Syd., 1892)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison</td>
<td>W.F. Morrison, The Aldine Centennial History of New South Wales (Syd., 1888)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSWPD</td>
<td>New South Wales Parliamentary Debates, Series I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSWPR</td>
<td>New South Wales Parliamentary Record (Syd., 1907)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.M.H</td>
<td>Sydney Morning Herald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sands</td>
<td>Sands’ Sydney Directory (Syd., various issues)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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