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Note on Sources and Method

A study of elections in this period limits the writer almost exclusively to newspapers for his source material. There is no alternative way of gathering information. The influence of the Press upon politics has been assessed variously, but especially in the period under review was it important, for the Press was the only means that many settlers had of learning of Parliamentary business.

Because of the number of newspapers that was published in Tasmania, it has not been found necessary to trust to any single paper’s account of the news. Except for a short period there was always one paper in Hobart Town which was radical in character and opposed to The Mercury, the chief newspaper of the South by 1860.

In addition, the student’s task in evaluating the political happenings and elections is made easier by the amazingly comprehensive account of elections and proceedings of the Legislature. In many cases, candidates’ policy speeches were reported verbatim, as were speeches from the floor of the House of Assembly.

Why did the newspapers of the day deal so exhaustively with Colonial politics. This question could give rise to much interesting speculation, but the question is not one of why reporting was so complete a hundred years ago, but rather why
present-day political reporting is so inadequate. That, however, is a subject outside the scope of this analysis. But doubtless the fact that a number of newspaper proprietors were members of Parliament meant that Parliamentary proceedings would receive a great deal of attention.

The method adopted in studying the political issues and elections of the day has been to read the often conflicting accounts of elections and deliberations of Parliament, and attempt to determine from them the truth, taking into account the unconcealed bias of the papers. The extraordinarily lengthy editorials furnish more than ample material for estimating the characteristics of the newspapers and the extent of influence on the public.

The policy of Parliamentary candidates has been assessed from their policy addresses published in the newspapers, accounts of electioneering meetings, letters to the Press and from often outspoken editorial comment on both measures and men.

Too little study of "ballot behaviour", as it has come to be called, has been made in Australia. It is to be trusted that this work will demonstrate the value of election analysis, from the social, as well as the political and historical points of view.
Location of Electorates in 1856

Note: It has been impossible to determine the exact position of some of the electoral boundaries.
### Rolling Places in Electorates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hobart Town</td>
<td>New Market Place, old Market Place, St George's Hill, near the Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hayley Street, near Antill Street, Harrington Street, near Warwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Street, near St John's Church Argyle Street, near Warwick Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murray Street, near Liverpool Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenborough</td>
<td>Kingston, Sandy Bay, near the second milestone, Cascade Road, near the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reservoir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenorchy</td>
<td>Glenorchy, near the seventh milestone, The race-course at New Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colville Street, near the New Town Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingborough</td>
<td>Kingston, Oyster Cove, Kelly's Point, North Bruny, Three Hut Point,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Levett, Port Cygnet, Victoria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Franklin, Dover, Port Esperance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Norfolk</td>
<td>Court House, New Norfolk styx Bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>Bethwell, Hamilton, Queck Bridge, Woolpack Inn, Macquarie Plains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oatlands</td>
<td>Oatlands, Jericho, Antill Ponds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>Kempton, Pontville.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Richmond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence</td>
<td>Mallorive, Hokeby.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Polling Places in Electorates (cont).
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CHAPTER ONE

The adoption of Representative Institutions

(i)

Some knowledge of events during the decade before the achievement of Responsible Government in 1856 is a prerequisite to an understanding of the 15 years following. Most of the leading politicians in the first years of Self Government had been in the Colony during the period of the gold rushes, and the agitation for the cessation of Transportation. Indeed, the memories of many reached back to the dark years before Arthur became Chief Executive of the Van Diemen's Land penal settlement.

The character of most of the legislators had been moulded by many things, the chief among which was the contrast between their upbringing as lawyers and sons of landed proprietors in the British Isles, and their sudden translation to the soothing Colony of Van Diemen's Land when convict road gangs were an every-day sight, when the Island was still the home of itinerant tribes of aborigines, and when settlers went in danger of their lives not only from the savages but from marauding and murderous bushrangers who, as escaped convicts, lacked any of the colour and romance of the later "gentlemen of the road" in the Mainland Colonies. Men who were elected to Parliament in the year of 1856 had spent years under a harsh penal regime. The long winded and compromising procedure of a fully elected Parliament was strange to them.
In 1849, it became apparent that Van Diemen's Land alone was to be the gaol for the transported offenders of the British Empire. During that year, 20 ships arrived at Hobart Town carrying 1860 prisoners to a Colony already saturated with convicts and ex-convicts. In 1851-2, nearly 5,000 convicts were landed. Van Diemen's Land had nothing to look forward to but compulsory immigration of the worst character. Appalled at this prospect, the leading citizens of the Colony determined on redoubling their previous efforts to secure the ending of Transportation, and the Anti-Transportation League was formed.

The leading agitator for the cessation of Transportation was the Reverend John West, of Launceston, and he had ranged at his side such leading Colonists as T.D. Chapman, T.G. Gregson, Henry Hopkins, Robert Officey, W.P. Weston, Adye Douglas, Henry Bowling, Richard Dry, J.W. Gleadow, T.B. Bartley, John Crookes, W. Kermode and William Henty. These men were prominent in both the semi-elective Legislature and the fully elective Houses.

Plans for a meeting in Melbourne of delegates from all the Colonies were soon set on foot. West and Weston represented Van Diemen's Land at this Conference and a Manifesto was adopted in 1851. It bound the signatories to unswerving opposition to the continuance of Transportation and expressed their determination not to employ any convicts who henceforth were landed. The League was ably organised throughout the Colonies and applied constant pressure on the Imperial Government to abandon the system of Transportation.
In the meantime, an Act to separate Port Phillip from New South Wales had been passed in the British Parliament in 1850, and at the same time representative institutions were granted to Van Diemen's Land, Victoria and South Australia on the lines of the Legislative Council already possessed by New South Wales. The new Councils were two thirds elective, the remaining third of Members being appointed by the Governor. The admission that the Colonies should shortly become self-governing was implicit in the Act, as it stated that the existing Councils should draw up an Electoral act and make other necessary arrangements for the election of the new Council which could then go ahead and form two Houses. An Electoral act was ultimately passed, and Denison spoke to his nominee Council for the last time on July 2, 1850.

Sixteen Members were accordingly elected. They were anti-
Transportationist to a man: R.W. Nutt (Buckingham); R. Dry
(Launceston); J.W. Cleadow (Cornwall); M. Fenton (New Norfolk),
A. Morison (Sorell); T.C. Gregson (Richmond); R. Cleburne (Huon),
R.Q. Kormode (Campbell Town); T.D. Chapman; J. Dunn Jr. (Hobart
Town); H.F. Anstey (Oatlands); Joseph Archer (Longford); James Cox
(Hobart); John Walker (Brighton); W.S. Sharland (Cumberland),
W. Archer (Westbury). In addition to these men, there were
appointed four official Members and four others nominated by the
Governor: P.G. Fraser, Colonial Secretary; Adam Turnbull, Colonial
Treasurer; Valentine Fleming, Attorney General and Francis Smith,
Solicitor General, were the official Members, and these nominated
were R.G. Talbot, W.R. Allison, Edward Bisdce, J. Leake. Richard Dry, a native-born Tasmanian, was chosen as Speaker.

Gold was discovered in Victoria in July, 1851, and a revolution in the prevailing social, economic and political conditions began. Settlers left Van Diemen's Land by the shipload, but the loss of population at the time was more than offset by the boom caused by the demand for goods from thousands of people pouring into Victoria. The national income of Van Diemen's Land increased in leaps and bounds.

At the end of this "annus mirabilis", the new Legislative Council of Van Diemen's Land assembled to deliberate for the first time on December 30, 1851. The official Members acted as Cabinet Ministers, but they were not responsible to the Legislature and could not be displaced by that body. The position of the Ministry, then, resembled that of the Cabinet of the United States of America. The mode of Colonial government was in transition, however, and the Island could look forward shortly to the form of Responsible Government enjoyed by Great Britain.

During this first Session of Parliament, the question of Transportation was at once raised, and provoked much discussion. It was included in the Council's Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech, the Council recording its regret that the Crown's Representative had not seen fit to mention the subject of Transportation and Earl Grey's unfulfilled promise to end the system.
The Council drew up a strongly-worded Address to the Queen, protesting against the continuance of Transportation, although Denison, who remained convinced throughout that the continuance of Transportation was in the best interests of the Colony, expressed his "deep sorrow" at the language of the resolutions. In the eyes of the Council Members, Denison had impugned their loyalty and consequently, upon the opening of the Second Session in June of the same year, Nett, a representative of the Capital, brought forward a notice of motion for an Address to the Queen, in answer to Denison's closing speech. There was a warm debate on this subject and Nett's motion was ultimately defeated. In its place, the Council agreed to an amendment drawn up by Sharland. Denison assured the Council that if he had thought it disloyal, he would have said so in unmistakable terms.

The question of Transportation remained paramount in the mind of the Council, and that body proceeded to despatch a petition to the Sovereign, praying that Transportation to Van Diemen's Land be stopped. The petition was opposed by only four members - Fleming, the Attorney-General, and three nominees. The Colonial Secretary abstained from voting and Turnbull and the Solicitor-General, Smith, threw in their lot with the majority of Councillors. Denison thereupon in effect dismissed H.S. Chapman, the Colonial Secretary, and Turnbull. The Secretary of State upheld Denison's decision to dismiss Chapman; Turnbull also was not again made an official Member, though he was re-appointed to his position as Chairman of the Land Board. No action
was taken against Smith, as he had secured, upon his appointment, "liberty of conscience" upon the Transportation issue.

A vote of no confidence in Denison was carried following his expressions of disapproval of the Council's latest petition to the Crown. The Governor spoke of his contempt for the League and still refused to admit the desirability of the cessation of Transportation: "When the records of the Convict Department show that there does not exist any urgent demand for the labour of men who may be sent here, or when I can discover any other method by which an amount of labour adequate to the supply of its wants can be poured into the Colony, then, and not until then, shall I be prepared to admit that it would be for the benefit of the country, in either a moral or industrial point of view, that Transportation should cease".1

It was at this point that a Tory Government, with Sir John Pakington as Secretary of State for Colonies, came into office. This Ministry lasted but 12 months, and in Pakington's last despatch of December 14, 1852, to Governor Denison came word that Transportation to Van Diemen's Land was to end at last. This decision was printed in The Hobart Town Gazette in May 1853, 50 years after the first settlement of the Island. August 10 was the day on which a joyful Colony celebrated the two occasions. The name Van Diemen's Land, infamous throughout the world, was changed to Tasmania.* A clean break was made with the past.

1. Denison to Grey, Feb. 5, 1848; quoted in Fenton's History of Tasmania, page 196.

* The change was not made official until 1855.
This same year was, as if to celebrate the ending of Transportation, one of amazing prosperity. The discovery of gold across Bass Strait created an enormous demand for food, fodder for animals, and timber. Large areas of land in the Colony were bought by men suddenly made rich, and the volume of shipping increased considerably. But there was constant migration to the Mainland throughout the period, and only the artificially high prices enabled Van Diemen's Land to budget as it did. When the Legislature in later years estimated for expenditure on the basis of gold-rush values — there was £66,000 over the estimated expenditure in 1853 — the Colony was soon in trouble which was felt all the more keenly because of the fatal rapidity with which the bottom fell out of the market. Even if the population of the Colony had remained steady, the sudden decrease in prices would have tested the Administration severely. As it was, the male adult population dropped by 50%, and a desperate situation developed. The Colony might have continued to act as a granary for the other Colonies, but the decrease in the number of men meant also a decrease in the area of land under cultivation. The gold rushes, then, initially operated to the Island's great advantage, but in the long run they proved disastrous. Tasmania experienced economic depression and stagnation of enterprise for 20 years while the Continental Colonies advanced steadily.

The membership of the Council was increased by nine in 1854, even though a Constitution Bill for a fully elective bicameral Legislature was under consideration by the Council: the Sessions of 1853 and 1854 had been largely concerned with constitutional debates.
Three of the new men were nominated by the Governor and the other six elected for fresh constituencies. Denison left the Colony in this year and became Governor of New South Wales. His place was taken by Fox Young.

New Members of the Council were: Adye Douglas, Charles Meredith, T.W. Field, J.A. Gibson, A. Perry and Dr W. Crooke. Men who replaced previous representatives were W.L. Goodwin, Joseph Bonney, James Lord, J.H. Wedge, T. J. Knight, W. G. Elliston and James Lord were made nominee Members.

It was at this time that the Hampton Case came on. The augmented Council, finding itself at a loose end, hit upon the idea of investigating the Convict Department and its workings. The Council Committee enquiring into the Department acted with doubtful legality because, first, the House was not a fully representative one, and secondly, because the subject of their enquiry was an Imperial Department, and not a local administrative unit. In due course, the Committee called upon Hampton, the Comptroller-General of convicts, to testify. He refused to allow himself to be cross-examined, and the Council ordered the Speaker to summon Hampton to the House. The Comptroller-General still stood firm, wherupon the Speaker was instructed to issue a warrant for his arrest. Hampton then offered to allow the Serjeant-at-Arms to hold him prisoner in Hampton's house until his lawyer could take out a writ of habeas corpus. After some discussion on what to do next, a motion of Gregson's "That the letter received from John Stephen Hampton cannot be entertained, that the warrant of the Speaker, in the hands of the Serjeant-at-Arms, be carried out in its entirety, and that John Stephen Hampton be brought to the bar of this House by the Serjeant-at-Arms" was agreed to.
Hampton still remained adamant and would not come to the House. A writ of habeas corpus was now served on both the Speaker ('Conton) and the Serjeant-at-arms (Frazier), and the case began to get more serious. Further steps were being considered by the Council when Governor Young unexpectedly entered the Chamber and dissolved the House.

The Governor came in for much criticism for his action, Colonists maintaining that he was under no compulsion to exercise his Prerogative when the matter was about to be decided by the Supreme Court. There was fault on both sides, because the Council should never have made an attempt to arrest a citizen when its power to do so was, to say the least, doubtful. The Supreme Court gave judgment against the Council, and so did the Privy Council, upon appeal being made to that body. Hampton had left the Colony and gone to England in the meantime, examination of witnesses having supported some of the charges of mismanagement preferred against him.

The Tasmanian Constitution Bill was drawn up later than those of the other Colonies, and took advantage of their experience. Consequently, when the Tasmanian Bill reached England, it met with little delay in ratification. On May 1, 1855, at a meeting of the Privy Council, the Queen assented to an "Act to Establish a Parliament in Van Diemen's Land, and to grant a Civil List to Her Majesty", and the Island Colony became the first of the Australias to enjoy the benefits of a Constitution. The House of Assembly was to elect 30 representatives by a liberal £10 house-holder franchise. The Upper House, also, was not to compose any appointees, but Members elected on a higher
franchise than that employed in the case of the Lower House.

The selection of Ministries would lie with the Chief Executive and all Ministers had to hold seats in Parliament. The Civil List totalled some £15,000 in salaries, and a reserve of a similar amount was made for the support of religion.

The Hobart Town Gazette proclaimed the Constitution Act on October 30, 1855. The Old Council went on to pass an Electoral act, necessary for the election of Members to the new Houses, and the Council was prorogued on February 7, 1856. The elections for the first Parliament were conducted in August and September of that year.

The franchise for the Legislative Council allowed a vote to every man over 21 being a natural-born citizen or naturalised subject of the Queen if he held a freehold estate of the clear annual value of £50 to which he had been entitled for at least six months previously; or who was a graduate of any University in the British dominions, a barrister or solicitor, a legally qualified medical practitioner, officiating minister of religion, or officer or retired officer of Her Majesty's land or sea forces not on actual service and resident in the district for which his vote was to be given for at least 12 months previously. Candidates had to be qualified electors at least 30 years old.

It was further laid down that in the House of Assembly, the vote was given to all adult males who had a freehold estate of the clear value of £100 which he had possessed for two months previously, or who
had occupied for two months any building of the clear annual value of £10, the lease of which had not less than three years to run; or who had the yearly salary of £100. The vote was, in addition, to be exercised by all graduates, barristers, solicitors, medical practitioners, ministers of religion, and naval and military officers not in actual service and residents in the Colony for at least 12 months. Candidates needed to be at least 21 years of age in order to stand for the Lower House. ¹

(ii)

The machinery of election was originally set down in an Act of the lieutenant Governor and Council.² It provided that election writs were to be issued by the Governor to Returning Officers, naming the day, place of nomination, "and, in the event of such Election being contested, the day for taking the poll...and the day on which the Writ shall be made returnable to the Governor", such return to be made within 30 days. Provision was also made in the Act for the erection of booths for polling, and for complete secrecy for electors casting their votes.

The procedure on nomination day began when the Returning Officer presided at a noon meeting. If there were more nominations than seats to be filled, he called for a show of hands from electors to decide their representative. Any candidate could then call for a ballot.

¹. 18 Vic. No. 17
². 19 Vic. No. 24, Sections 50-72.
Candidates were to be present at the nomination and be proposed and seconded by two electors. This open system of nomination, however, was employed in the first election only. It was abolished in 1858.

The blank ballot papers had to be signed and counter-signed by the Clerk of the Peace in Launceston or Hobart Town, and the Returning Officer, who had then to write in the candidates' names in alphabetical order and number them. The names of the candidates had to be displayed on placards both inside and outside the polling booth. Electors, in voting, had to strike out the names of the men they did not wish to see elected. There was no necessity to vote for the number of candidates being elected. Many electors struck out all names but one. A Bill to invalidate voters who did not leave as many names as candidates on the paper was discussed in 1862 but subsequently withdrawn.

Voting took place between nine o'clock in the morning and four in the afternoon, and each candidate was compelled to appoint up to three scrutineers, in whose presence the Deputy Returning Officers were to make an abstract of the ballot and return the boxes to the Returning Officer, who had then to check the voting and announce the result. He had the right to exercise a casting vote in the event of an equal division of votes between candidates. The ballot boxes and papers were then to be returned to the Clerk of the House of Assembly, or the Legislative Council if the election had been for the Upper House, and kept for five years.
Sections 14-79 of the Act dealt with the registration of voters, appeals against omission from the Electoral Roll, and intimidation of voters. There were also enactments defining and punishing "bribery", "treating", "undue influence" and "refreshment of meat, drink or entertaining or money" to voters on the day of nomination or polling.

The Returning Officer had the task of making out every year the list of electors. This was published in The Hobart Town Gazette and at least one Launceston or Hobart Town paper, according to the location of the constituency in the North or South of the Island. The list was also fixed to the doors of churches, registered chapels and Police Offices for at least 14 days.

A list of claimants to the list, and a similar list of electors objected to for any reason, was made out by the Returning Officer. These lists were then sent to the appropriate Clerk of the Peace, either in Hobart Town or in Launceston. Revising barristers, appointed by the Chief Justice, made circuits each year for the purpose of examining claims and objections to the Electoral Roll. If the revising barristers' opinion was unacceptable to an elector or would be elector, he had recourse to further appeal to the Supreme Court.

(iii)

In practice, candidates usually began their campaign by publishing in the Press a copy of the requisition made to them from electors, with the names of the voters appended. This was in most cases simply
a statement from the electors in question asking the candidate to stand for Parliament for their constituency. Under the published requisition and signatures, the prospective representative would thank the electors for their compliment, and state that he had much pleasure in standing. Occasionally a candidate would announce his intention of standing without waiting for a requisition.

No policy was propounded till nominations had been concluded when, if there were more candidates than there were seats, a contest was declared. Press addresses were then printed. Nominations were often rowdy affairs. The candidate was proposed and seconded by two of his supporters and then made a policy speech himself during the course of which the crowd at the hustings often kept up a running fire of comments, questions and interjections, their hostility depending on the popularity of the speaker. The speech over, the Returning Officer would call on the next candidate's backers, and so on. When all candidates had put their programme to the electors, a show of hands would be called for to decide the representative. If there were more candidates than seats to be filled, and a poll was asked for, then the Returning Officer would grant it for the day set down in the Election Writ.

The formalities over, the campaign began in earnest. Candidates limited themselves to one Press address to the public, this being printed daily until the election was decided.

The Press did not hesitate to take sides and some candidates' addresses to their constituents do not appear in all papers, though this applied in each election to only a few. It was in the coverage,
or lack of coverage, of election meetings that the newspapers showed their true colours. An account of a radical candidate’s meeting appearing in 1861 in the anti-Government Hobart Town Advertiser, for example, would be far more fully and sympathetically reported than in The Advertiser’s bitter rival, The Mercury. Indeed, occasionally a paper would completely ignore a meeting which had several columns devoted to it in another print.

At the beginning of 1856, there were eight newspapers published in Tasmania, five in Hobart Town and three in Launceston. The five Southern journals were The Colonial Times, The Hobart Town Courier, The Hobart Town Advertiser, The Tasmanian Daily News and The Hobart Town Mercury. In the North, Launceston was the scene of the publication of The Launceston Examiner, The Cornwall Chronicle and The People’s Advocate. In a Colony of 60,000 people, it was unlikely that as the economic depression set in, this large number of newspapers could continue to publish. This proved so. By 1871, there were only three dailies left: The Launceston Examiner, The Cornwall Chronicle and The Mercury, the latter paper having absorbed most of Hobart Town’s numerous papers. Other papers were published over the years, but most of them were short-lived. The Launceston Examiner and The Mercury remained the Colony’s chief prints. Both papers were conservative in their outlook, The Launceston paper much more consistently so than The Mercury. Bitter feuds between the old-established papers such as The Colonial Times and The Courier were carried on before their final demise and political reports are coloured by personal likes and dislikes of the editors.
Many election meetings were held in the hotels, since the number of electors was small, though occasionally "monster meetings" were convened at Market Place in Hobart Town. In the Capital, a candidate's activities consisted chiefly of travelling from one hotel to another each night addressing electors.

Letters to the Editor were published in great numbers, the papers being quite unashamed of their blatant partisanship in publishing only those which agreed with their views.

Invective in Editorial comment was the order of the day, and the law of libel must have been dormant, though some sections of the Press went too far in their denouncing of Gregson, Premier in the second Ministry, and were charged with libel.

The elections were not all held on the one and the same day, but were spread over a period of three weeks or a month. The date of an election in a constituency was determined by the writ, and as far as can be discovered, there was no consistent practice as regards the order in which the elections were to be held. If election contests had all been held on the one day, the voters who owned property in more than one constituency would have been disenfranchised to some extent.

After the voting was over and the results announced, the poll was declared, usually within a day or so. It was not uncommon for candidates to be subjected to a rain of missiles at these declarations.
By the time of the 1862 election, a change in the Electoral Act had been made. The change (21 Vic. No. 32) made unnecessary the need for a show of hands when candidates were being nominated.

In the first elections a few candidates expressed their contempt for the secret ballot then in use. It was a demoralising factor, they asserted, and only encouraged men to say one thing and mean another. Some candidates refused to canvass for votes at all, claiming that such an appeal to the electors was inimical to the spirit of the ballot.

The task of the Returning Officer to make up the electoral rolls led to much discontent, the Officer often being accused of laxness. Consequently, by an act (26 Vic. No. 4), these election officials were enabled to use the valuation and assessment rolls in making up their returns.
The Election of 1856

The Candidates.

Forty-one candidates stood for election to the 30 seats to be filled in the House of Assembly. That there was no sudden hurrying into power of new men elected by the recently enfranchised Colonists, the 110 householders, may be seen from the fact that of the 41 candidates, 16 had been Members of the old Council, 12 of them as recently as the year before. Of these 16, 14 were elected to the new Lower House. Thus almost half of the Chamber was composed of men who had experience in government.

Thirty Members of the House were returned from the 24 constituencies, Hobart Town electing five Members and Launceston three.

Only eight electorates were contested: Clarence, Cumberland, Hobart Town, Kingborough, Queenborough, Richmond, Campbell Town and Launceston. Norfolk Plains was to have had another candidate but at the eleventh J.S. Smece "walked away across the Common and lay concealed in a ditch all day," thus leaving the seat for J.C. Gregson, a son of T.C. Gregson, the foremost Radical politician of his day.

The contested seats were nearly all in or near the two centres of population, Launceston and Hobart Town. As was to happen in election after election, many of the rural seats went uncontested, falling to

---

1. See Appendix A.
2. T.D.N., Sept. 16, 1856.
One candidate year in year out. Even when an election was fought in the country constituencies, it was often between the same few candidates, all landed proprietors or their representatives. Of the 41 candidates, at least 14 were squatters, of whom 10 were elected.

Five Members of the Lower House were merchants. Consequently a merchant-squatter alliance would be enabled to exercise a majority.

To anyone familiar with the earlier history of Van Diemen's Land, the man who dominate the Legislature will be no strangers. Men such as Charles Meredith, J. D. Balfe, R. G. Kermode, F. M. Innes, Richard Dry, T. D. Chapman, Francis Smith, A. T. N. Champ, T. G. Gregson, Adye Douglas, W. L. Dobson, Edward Abbott, James Maclanachan, W. S. Sharland, J. M. Wilson and James Whyte were nearly all old Colonists. Many of them had arrived in the Colony during Arthur's term of office, been Members of the first Legislative Council, taken part in the struggle to accomplish the cessation of Transportation, fought Wilmot, and Denison in the Council and helped frame the Constitution Act under the provisions of which they were now being elected. But the aim which had held many of these men together i.e. the ending of Transportation and the establishment of Responsible Institutions, being realised, the old "opposition" forces fell apart.

Some new men made their appearance in Tasmanian politics. Most important among them in this election was Maxwell Miller, who stood for Hobart Town, and Messrs Moore and Matthews who contested seats in...
Launceston. These three men sought the votes of the 510 householders and deliberately set out to woo the workers' votes. Miller, "The People's Choice", was proprietor of The Tasmanian Daily News, a paper in which Gregson held an interest, and he was successful in his candidature.

Moore was the proprietor of the Launceston People's Advocate, a daily which opposed the wealthy candidates and championed the industrial class. Together with Matthews, he appealed for the votes of the new voters but failed to secure enough to gain election. Both men were indifferent speakers and, unlike Miller in the South, were not supported by any politician of standing, such as Gregson. As well, a mistake was made in nominating two men, as this succeeded only in splitting the working class vote.
The Issues.

There were few clear-cut issues in the election. With some exceptions—Richmond, Hobart Town and Launceston—apathy characterised the selection of parliamentary representatives. "The real points at issue are very few and those principally of a local character." The Editor of The Hobart Town Mercury had previously pointed out the noticeable vagueness, and even puerile nature, of candidates' promises, and urged prospective members to stop mouthing "ability", "integrity" and "stake in the Colony", and put forward some constructive measures. He also deplored the lack of questions put to those on the hustings.

But candidates had, of course, no previous Administration at which they could level attacks. Consequently they were rather in the dark about what policy they could announce to the electors. Some attention was paid to the condition of the Colonial Treasury and the declining revenue, but rural candidates contented themselves with merely announcing that they would do their best for the good of the Colony.

(i)

The place of a displaced Administration was taken over to some extent by Champ and Francis Smith, the ex-Colonial Secretary and ex-Attorney-General. But even so, these men were not opposed because of any action they had instigated while in the old Council, but

1. H.M., Sept. 15, 1856.
rather than the ill-assorted abuse and a compensation for
"irreality to lot of office" under the Constitution. etc.

The speech indicated the hatred of the permanent positions of
the Governor, Colonial Secretary and Colonial Treasurer an annual
salary of £100 to the Governor; £70 to the Colonial Secretary, £60 to
the other Colonial; and £50 to the Colonial Treasurer as a laudable
measure, "not the least every") The Colony's feelings about the
adoption of either one of the latter alternatives, according to
the descriptions of election meetings, appeared to be
described by one advocate who labelled the acceptance of the bonus
as "the most iniquitous job that ever took place under the sun of
national service". The incensed Daily Times did not hesitate to add
that Crewe and Smith had taken their compensation from an
unsavoury and deplorable. The paper urged the asylum of the
unsavourable pair (Crewe had chosen the pension and was not
standing for election) "who will cling to office and its salaries while
there is an area of white land to sell or a publican to fine in the
Colonies."

The bonus question and its place as an election issue soon became
of interest. John Cripps in Brunswick explained the clause and showed
that by acceptance of the 1600, the Colony had actually gained, since
the salary over the years would have amounted to much more than this.

[Text continues...]

F.J.S., Aug. 3 and 25, 1856.
The question of "ways and means", of keeping the Colony from bankruptcy, occupied the attention of some candidates, so rapidly had prosperity disappeared. One newspaper noted that bank assets had decreased by over £330,000 in one year, while deposits had decreased by over £260,000. In the same financial year (1854-5), Bills of Exchange had increased by £214,000.\(^1\) In a tiny Colony, these figures spoke for themselves and there were few candidates who did not, at least in theory, subscribe to some form of retrenchment and increased taxation. But the tragic disagreement on what to tax and how much to tax was to be a stumbling-block in the way of legislation for the next two decades.

The Launceston candidate Moore did not want any heavier taxes on essential goods, and he and Matthews declared for a property, income, luxuries and mortgage tax, as well as a duty on agricultural and domestic servants. Other Launceston candidates were inclined to favour an increase in taxation but were uncertain as to how far to go. The Examiner hit the nail on the head when it pointed out the difficulty of imposing a property tax - it was a direct tax and therefore unpalatable to land owners.\(^2\)

In the South The Courier declared that direct taxation was "odiously inquisitorial"\(^3\), and left no doubt as to where it stood in the matter. Miller, the popular candidate, demanded an income, property and luxuries tax\(^4\) and Smith contented himself with the

2. L.E., Sept. 5, 1856.
cautious statement that "taxation, however viewed, is a great evil". The Courier strongly opposed the "ridiculous proposition" of a tax on wool and exports, but suggested that a property tax, not an income tax, would meet with the people's approval.

Candidates understandably tended to steer clear of the taxation question. Rather than tax, they would retrench, and retrenchment was advocated by most of the men standing. But they were very uncertain of where the projected pruning was to take place, and to what extent. In fact, the new Members of the House of Assembly took their places with only a hazy idea of what steps needed to be taken to restore the diminishing prosperity of the Colony.

(iii)

The Masters and Servants Act, which provided among other things that male servants guilty, in the eyes of their masters, of violent conduct might be given in charge by their employers without a warrant and sent to gaol if unable to pay for any damage over £1 they might have caused, afforded Southern candidates an issue which they thought was bound to appeal to the voters. Evidently the Act had been enforced to the letter in Hobart Town, because the issue was never heard of in the North. In addition, the greater number of ex-convicts in the Capital would doubtless result in the more frequent application of the provisions of the Act.

A number of Hobart Town candidates spoke out on the brutality of the law, Miller instancing it as an example of the hasty

1. N.M., Sept. 10, 1856.
legislation passed by the old Council in its last days. Smith disclaimed responsibility for the offending Statute, and said that he had no interest in the Act, although he thought that Parliament might do well to make the Masters-Servants contract a civil one.

The harsh nature of the Act was a result of legislation by men who had lived through the days of Transportation when convict labourers were regarded as hewers of wood and drawers of water. As the men against whom the Act was directed left the Colony for Victoria, it came in for more and more criticism.

Another issue, which developed in Hobart Town and Launceston, was the question of government by the wealthy. Although anyone who discussed a change from the dominance of the property-holders was engaging in absurd speculation, the rural constituencies outnumbered those of the towns and the only men who had had experience in Government were those men elected to the old Council on a property qualification - The Tasmanian Daily News and The People's Advocate hammered home their opinion for the necessity of change.

The Launceston paper could see no other candidates but Moore and Matthews. The last-named, during his election campaign, became obsessed with "the Evil Genius of Brisbane Street", the influence of the property-holders, under whose power previous representatives were
alleged to have fallen. Accusations of "class legislation" were
levelled at Champ, and The People's Advocate, which was shortly
to cease publication, became, as it threshed in its death throes,
incredibly biased in favour of Matthews and Moore and fanatically
opposed to "The Brisbane Street Mob".

In the South Maxwell Miller was, according to his own newspaper,
brought forward to represent "The People" by "a spontaneous movement
among the working classes" which desired some opposition to be
offered to Champ and Smith. "In the present aspect of our political
affairs, it is radical measures that are needed to work out any
permanent advantage", declared The Tasmanian Daily News. The paper
proceeded to state that unless new blood was infused the Legislature
of the Colony, the old order would still prevail. There was "only
too much reason to dread - so general is public indifference - that
exertions of friends of progress and advocates of radical reform will
be overborne and outmanoeuvred by the practised partizans of the
listless legislation and obstructive officialism, which have so long
discredited and oppressed Tasmania". 1

Miller adopted a different attitude from his opposite numbers in
Launceston. Where they attacked the Colony's former representatives
tooth and nail, Miller was much more moderate. He, too, championed
the working classes, but to him the issue was not so much the

1. T.D.N., Sept. 6, 1856.
destruction of the old system, and even the present one, and the introduction of complete democracy, as the inauguration of a number of reforms which would revivify the Colony. These reforms, the imposition of an Income Tax being the principal one, were to be carried through triumphantly by the new working class representatives, as the forerunners of "classless" legislation which would open up a new era of prosperity in the history of the Colony.

During 1855, unemployment had become serious in Hobart Town especially, and it was to the body of men who were often out of work that Miller appealed. Additional grievances included the high price of flour and bread caused by the poor harvest of 1854-5. This ground for complaint was accentuated over the years as fewer and fewer employers continued to supply their hands with rations.

It is a curious and interesting reflection of Colonial political thought that a section of the Press and of Parliament could view Miller's election as a signal triumph of popular democracy, and another group see it with alarm as the thin edge of the wedge of government by demagogy. Both sections failed to realise that while the nature of the rural constituencies remained the same - and there was no reason to suppose that they would change in the near future - then the status quo would not and could not be altered to a noticeable extent. The fancied importance of the results of the Hobart Town poll, and the fact that all eyes turned there, was a result of the days not so
long past, when Hobart Town had been the second city of Australia, indeed perhaps the chief one; and as the seat of a dictatorial Colonial administration, every Colonist had addressed himself to the Capital. Now the city was losing its importance but, as the seat of Government, it still bulked large in the view of the Colony. But no longer was the opinion of Hobart Town & final one.

(v)

A minor issue was the question of the recovery of debts. It was justly claimed that since all debts above £10 were recoverable only in the Supreme Court, justice was being denied because the cost of an action would, in some cases, make the recovery of a debt unprofitable. Miller and Brewer, another Hobart Town candidate, advocated County Courts to deal with the small debts, and The Courier took the matter up: "Nothing can be more unjust or oppressive than the present state of this matter; nothing more calculated to shield the dishonest debtor..."¹

The ex-Attorney-General, Francis Smith, prevented further political capital being made out of the debt question, however, when, after a most hostile reception on nomination day, he soothed his audience by telling them that he had drawn up a Bill to make debt recovery

¹. H.T.C., Aug. 1, 1856.
The Policy of Champ and Smith.

There was no out-going Government to stand on its record and thus afford electors and candidates some guide as to the issues of the day, but two members of the Executive of the old Council standing for election - Champ and Smith - were looked upon as the potential core of the new Cabinet. In this light their statements to the electors have a special significance. Although Chapman had been a prominent member of the Old Council, he said very little during the campaign.

Champ stood for one of the three Launceston seats but he devoted most of his time to refuting charges by The People's Advocate and Messrs Matthews and Moore that he was the nominee of a particular class, than he did in advancing a constructive policy. As well as this he had to convince the electorate that he and Smith, by accepting the bonus, had not merely feathered their own nests at the public expense.

Champ was an old Colonist. He had arrived in 1829 as a Lieutenant in charge of a detachment guarding convicts, and had then taken up land in the Colony. After spending some time in New South Wales, he returned to Van Diemen's Land and was appointed Civil Commandant of Port Arthur upon the retirement of Captain O'Hara Booth.

Regarding the financial position of the Colony, Champ declared that in his opinion taxation should be revised so that a man taxed by the Government should pay in proportion to the amount
of property he owned. He was, further, aware that the Colony could not make ends meet and regretted that opposition to ad valorem duties i.e. duties that varied according to the value of goods, was so widespread. Champ went on to say that a Property Tax was in his opinion the next best thing, but here again he was aware that a direct tax would be resisted.

The tone of Champ during the election was that of a man who realised that a radical departure from the old methods of raising money was necessary, who was aware that a fresh start needed to be made in the light of the slump in trade, but who also sadly knew that imposition of ad valorem duties or a property tax would be impossible while land-holders and merchants had majority voting power in both Houses.

Francis Smith, a very able lawyer, had also to explain his acceptance of the bonus for liability to loss of office, not the actual loss itself, as popular opinion had it. His chief recital of policy took place at the nominations in Hobart Town, but his speech was limited to the bonus question and the Masters and Servants Act.

The policy that Champ and Smith might adopt if elected, then, was obscure. It appeared certain, however, that no direct taxation would be imposed, since Smith had branded it as "evil" and Champ had left the unmistakeable impression that he knew any taxation Bill would be unpopular and defeated in the House; or if not in that Chamber, then in the Legislative Council. This being the case,

1. L.E., Sept. 6, 1856.
revenue could only be raised by increasing the tax on essentials, or by floating loans, if the chief source of Government income, the Customs duties, did not increase.

A certain amount of confusion respecting policy and issues was inevitable in this first election under the new Constitution in Tasmania. Once an Administration had established a policy and remained in office for a term, then, in theory, more clear cut issues would develop. But the necessary prerequisite was the growth of an Opposition. Unfortunately, factionalism became the order of the day, the cliques refusing to unite in anything but their opposition to the imposition of a Property and Income Tax.
The Elections.

(a) Hobart Town. Only seven candidates stood for election to Hobart Town's five seats. Three of the seven - Chapman, Butt and Smith - had been in the Old Council and consequently stood a more than even chance of being elected. Of the other four candidates, Brewer, Worley and Dunn campaigned in an orthodox fashion on orthodox platforms. But Maxwell Miller, the proprietor of The Daily News came before the electorate in the role of the nominee of the working class. He was subsequently elected, with the three men who had had legislative experience, and Dunn, one of the few native-born men standing for election.

The election campaign got into full swing when a meeting of the working class was held and Maxwell Miller nominated in the interests of that group to represent it in the new House. Other candidates were damned eloquently and often by the speakers in passionately inconsistent argument. The Hobart Town Mercury referred to the gathering as "another 'unwashed' meeting", pointed out that it had started one-and-a-quarter hours late and mentioned the fact that when a hat was produced to defray the expenses of the assembly, there was "a simultaneous rush for the door". The Courier noted that there were "200 or 300 present, including a large number of boys".

The sympathies of the Hobart Town Press, with the exception of The Daily News, were not with Miller and those who were endeavouring to elect him.

The Daily News convinced itself that it had a winning point in

1. H.M., August 6, 1856.
2. H.T.C., August 5, 1856.
the bonus question and made much of the fact that Champ and Smith had withdrawn from the exchequer the sum of upwards of £10,000; but the hue and cry against these two men died down upon their explanation of the bonus.

Worley's election meeting was held on September 3. This candidate favoured the imposition of a property tax, the only just way, he declared, to raise money, at the rate of 5/- on income, 4d an acre on cultivated land, 2d per acre on sheep runs. Such a scheme, he estimated, would bring in £50,000 a year to a Colony that could make valuable use of that sum. As well, Worley told his listeners that the system of immigration should be changed in order to attract settlers and make it worth their while to remain in the Colony, urged retrenchment and expressed his abhorrence of the State aid at present being given to churches.

Miller accepted the nomination of the "working class meeting" and his public announcement to stand for Parliament was reported at great length in his own paper.

The speaker painted a gloomy picture - commerce was falling, trade stagnating, imports decreasing, exports diminishing, revenue becoming less and expenditure greater. Dismayed at a £3259 decrease in Customs duties collected in one year, Miller demanded an Income, Property and Luxuries Tax. The cure for the Colony's ills, stated the speaker, lay not in a policy of grinding the working class into the dust by taxation of essential goods, but in taxation of the wealthy.

---

In other words, absentees should be taxed, as well as property and income and luxuries. In addition, the fee to license hotels should be reduced because profits had decreased; and the penal code abolished: Victoria had excluded freed men from the Colony because Tasmania still supported a penal code and thus was still, in appearances, the evil Colony of yesteryear.

Miller also wanted the way made easy for a "young yeomanry" to settle in Tasmania. He opposed the manner in which the Masters and Servants act functioned, and advocated the establishment of County Courts.  

Miller was supported by a speech from Gregson.

The nominations were held before a crowd of three or four thousand people, and Chapman was first man nominated and seconded. One of the 16 men elected to Denison's Council in 1851, he had been born in the County of Bedford in 1815, arrived in Van Diemen's Land about 1844 and set up in business as a merchant. During his time in the Council he earned a reputation for liberalism, and favoured the abolition of Transportation. He was President of the Anti-Transportation League, active in opposition to Denison and recognised as the leader of the liberal section of the Council. Chapman, however, gave offence to some people when he left the ranks of that group to join forces with Champ in the Government about to be elected. There are indications in the Press during the campaign that Chapman had done something which had displeased Colonists. It may have been anticipated where his loyalties would lie when the new Parliament met.

Chapman's proposer and seconder could scarcely make themselves heard because of the noise at the hustings and the "fearful excitement" which greeted mention of the Masters and Servants Act. Chapman himself made no promises but spoke of his record as an anti-Transportationist, a framer of the Constitution Act and contender for the establishment of Municipal Councils. Concerning the tariff, he now saw that Free Trade was not practicable, and favoured some form of Customs duties. Touching on the bonus question, Chapman told electors that he would accept the responsibility for the granting of the bonuses. But in Launceston, Champ had already exploded the myth that the bonus was a work of the Devil.

Brewer was the next speaker and he began by attempting to refute allegations that he was a nonentity and had not spoken out enough in the Council. The speaker, further, declared that retrenchment must be implemented, beginning at the top of the tree with the highly-paid Government officials. We also alluded to the desirability of a cheap and easy way to recover debts through the courts, the impracticability of railways until it was certain that they would be self-supporting, and the need to reform the Penal Code and the Masters and Servants Act.

Smith, one of the recipients of the unpopular bonus, was received by the crowd with "a perfect hurricane of cheers, yells and hisses" when he stepped forward, and it was not until Miller intervened and asked the crowd for a fair field and no favour,
reminding it of its English heritage of impartiality, that the
ex-Attorney-General was able to make himself heard. He at once
went into an account of the bonus and explained convincingly that
he had a right to the compensation granted to him, which was not for
the loss of office, as many evidently thought, but for the
liability to loss, an entirely different thing. With his
audience pacified; either by the cogency of his argument or through
breathlessness after the tumultuous nature of his reception, Smith
went on to disclaim all responsibility for the Masters and Servants
Act, and deplore the necessity for taxation in any shape or form.

Nutt, in the strongest terms, deprecated the existence of
parties, and told his listeners that he was not attached to any
particular group but would, if elected, pursue an independent
course. The speaker foresaw difficulties between the two Houses
regarding privilege, since they were both composed of elected men,
and was certain that only the Lower House should originate Money
Bills. Nutt favoured the extension of education and disapproved of
the Masters and Servants Act, a measure which he "hoped to God would
be abrogated within a month of the meeting of Parliament."

Worthy endeavoured to show that James Dunn, one of his
opponents, had obtained a requisition by undue influence, in
contravention to the spirit if not indeed the letter of the law
viz. Clause 77 of the Constitution Act. Having thrown a handful of
mud to his satisfaction, he got down to business and expressed his
approval of judicious retrenchment; but a statement that he would
tax houses, land, gardens, orchards and sheep runs rather than land

or wool doubtless throw his audience into confusion and lost him the

votes of some small property-holders. Such men were being persuaded
to vote for Miller; in any case, and one of his supporters had, in an
outburst of inspired invective, already told the electorate where

Worley stood with the Miller organisation - Worley was "a pigmy

politician, destitute of principle and sentiment and incapable of

either feeling or action."

Miller said very little - His opinions on the political issues

of the day, he stated, would be known to all who had the wisdom and

intelligence to subscribe to the organ of which he had the good

fortune to be proprietor.

The last speaker was Dunn, a man of but 24 summers who had been

born and bred in the Colony. He made a strong appeal to the

Tasmanian-born, demanding that the exclusive system be broken up and

they way made clear for the Native Youth to gain office. The speaker
also demanded the implementation of retrenchment in the public service,
as well as the introduction of a land policy directed in such a way
as to secure the poor man from the overwhelming influence of the

rich land-holder.

A show of hands was called for by the Returning Officer and it
favoured Chapman, Nutt, Brewer, Miller and Dunn. Smith and Worley
then asked for a poll which was granted for Monday, September 15.

The Press commented with a steady directness of purpose from then

on regarding election prospects, The Mercury supporting Smith and

opposing Hiller: "He has given no pledges to society, he has nothing
to tie him to our soil". The paper had no time for democratic
notions: "The doctrine of political equality....may be left to the
self-styled convention of the working classes."

The Daily News acted as might have been anticipated. It had
grave doubts of Smith's fitness to be in Parliament, for had he not
said that if three or four officers of the government held their
seats in the Council by virtue of their offices, then 'all the
benefits of responsibility' Government might be obtained in
a cheaper manner...."?

The Courier and The Mercury busily sniped away at one another;
but the former, together with the Colonial Times, had fallen on
hard times and was no longer the powerful paper of the days of the
anti-Transportation struggle. It reported with ill-concealed glee
that the crowd at the Market Place on Nomination Day had managed to
get the proprietor of The Mercury, John Davies, in the centre and
had given him a "jostling" before the police extricated him.

The Daily News made a final effort on election day to persuade
the population to vote for Miller. It stressed the fact that he had
been brought forward by "a spontaneous movement among the working
classes", and that he had not stooped to canvass the electors in person.
It further drew its readers' respectful attention to the candidate's
fine work as a journalist in exposing corruption*, and gravely told
electors that the crisis to which the country had been brought

1. H.M., Sept. 12, 1856.
2. T.D.N., Sept. 12, 1856.
* This probably refers to the part The Daily News played in
agitating for investigation of Hampton's management of the
Convict Department.
demanded new measures and new men.

When the news came that Miller had come second on the poll, only 23 votes behind Chapman's 921 votes, the reaction of the Press was mixed. The Daily News rejoiced mightily, but The Mercury saw no reason to be glad. "No one will be foolish enough to affirm or believe that Mr. Maxwell Miller really expected to occupy the position on the poll which he does. He owes his election far more to the apathy of those who professed to and did not support his opponents than to the real strength of his supporters." The Mercury was convinced that the new House of Assembly would turn out to be a radical body, and the paper, with a heavy heart, turned for comfort to the Legislative Council which it saw as the ultimate stay of sound and constitutional legislation. Here at least a fit and proper sense of the proprieties of government would surely be found. 1

The election in the Capital over, both The Mercury and The Courier lost interest in the country elections still coming off, but The Daily News continued to give an extremely comprehensive coverage as, indeed, it had done from the beginning of the elections. The paper noted with regret the small accession of new men but seemed to pin its hopes for the future on Maxwell Miller and one of two others who might conceivably make a stand against the dominance of the landed proprietors. But as the election drew to a close it became clearer to all but a blind man that radical measures were going to be the last thing the new Legislature would think of. The finances of the

1. H.H.I., Sept. 17, 1856.
Colony were to go from bad to worse but a desperate situation was not to call forth vigorous fresh measures.

Little that is not obvious may be deduced from the election in Hobart Town. The number which voted was unexpectedly small, only 1076 out of 3127 striking a blow for freedom. There is no way of discovering just how many of those who failed to record a vote were the newly-enfranchised electors, though it is reasonable to assume that the new voters plumped heavily for Miller.

Chapman, Nutt and Smith, as members of the Old Council, were virtually assured of seats by virtue of this fact, although the bonus affair militated against Smith initially. But once the true nature of the "liability to loss of office" was realised, he was safe. Chapman's undoubted worth as an administrator, plus his record in the vividly remembered events of the last decade, no doubt account largely for his position at the head of the poll.

Dunn, the fifth Member, was a young man to be elected to the House, but the successful and well-known his father had played in Colonial affairs no doubt helped his cause.
(b). Launceston. The election in the Northern city was notable for the effort made by Moore and Matthews to secure seats as representatives of the working class. The other three candidates were Champ, Rogers and Douglas. Champ and Douglas had both served in the old Council and could thus expect to be re-elected. Rogers was the new Solicitor-General who had brought official approval of the new Constitution with him from England. He was consequently a popular man, and looked forward to election both on account of his being the bearer of good tidings and also on account of a shrowdly-conducted election campaign. Launceston returned three members and consequently Rogers had, in reality, only the two nominees of the industrial class to oppose him.

Moore was the solo proprietor of the short-lived People's Advocate and, to judge from the stumbling speeches made by him and Matthews, who always campaigned together, it was the paper which secured them that support they received.

The first event of importance in the Launceston election was a gathering of the working classes which was addressed by their prospective representatives. Previously the organ of the group had thrown out mysterious hints of the nomination of an "anti-bonus" man to oppose the "Brisbane Street Hob", by which term the paper meant the merchants and other men of substance who had their centre of operations in the main street of the town. There were 600 people at the Clarence Theatre meeting and it was pointed out to them Moore and Matthews had entered the political arena for the purpose of suppressing the evil of heavy taxation.
Both men were indifferent speakers but conveyed to their audience the desirability of universal education and the harmful effects of the imposition of a tariff on essential goods. Matthews made it clear that he would support any action taken to tax luxuries and property and income; however, and he favoured a protective tariff. As things stood, he stated, the merchants of the Colony would not invest money in infant industries because such employment of money would ruin their import businesses. The speaker added a few words concerning the black record of Adye Douglas and Champ and earnestly advised the electorates to have nothing to do with these servants of Brisbane Street.  

Rogers outlined for the benefit of the audience his career at Oxford and the Inns of Court, and did not omit to mention that it had been he who had the pleasure to bring to the Colony the Royal assent to the new Constitution. Rogers steered clear of the current class war controversy, denied the existence of any coalition between Matthews and Douglas, and declared expansively that the interests of labour and employers were closely connected — what was good for the one was good for the other. He went on to speak of the main features of the theory of responsible government, and indicated his approval of the introduction of the electric telegraph and railways, and the opening up of mines.  

It was now the turn of Adye Douglas. He was a man of 41 at the time of the election, having been born in Norfolk during the year of Waterloo. He became a solicitor in 1838 and arrived in Van Diemen's

2. L.E., Sept. 4; C.C. Sept. 6, 1856.
Land the following year. Douglas was admitted to the Bar in Hobart Town but abandoned his career to move to the Port Phillip settlement, where he was a squatter for two years. He returned to Launceston and in 1855 proposed a survey of a railway line to run from Launceston to Hobart Town. Douglas was also prominent in the fight against the continuance of the system of Transportation. He spent 31 years from 1853 as an alderman of Launceston, and was mayor for five years.

At his election meeting, Douglas lost no time in acquainting those of his audience who did not know them, with the chief events of his career. He then turned to the tariff question. Here he denounced protection in no uncertain terms. The speaker concluded that a Property Tax would be a wise measure, as would imposition of a tax on spirits, but he did not favour imposts on tea, sugar, beer and tobacco. The speaker went on to declare it his intention to do what he could to inaugurate the electric telegraph and a Deloraine-Launceston Railway, projects initially suggested by himself. He very properly reminded the audience that it had been he who had assisted to secure the secret ballot. State Aid to churches Douglas opposed, and he concluded a well-received speech by poking fun at the unpractised electioneering of Matthews and Moore. If the reception of the electors at the meeting may be accepted as a criterion of how Douglas would poll, he could congratulate himself on being already elected.1

It only remained for Champ to put his views before the voting public; and all candidates would have opened their election campaigns.

1. L.E., Sept. 4, 1856.
The ex-Colonial Secretary placed enough importance on the allegation that he would speak only for the Brisbane Street capitalists to begin at once by denying that he was the nominee of that section of the community, although he admitted having friends there.

The speaker went on to mention his 20 years service to the Colony and his part in framing the legislation which gave Tasmania the ballot. If elected, Champ declared, he would feel it incumbent on himself to further the cause of a Western Railway to Deloraine, and the Bass Strait telegraph. He expressed his opposition to a division of the town into wards for election purposes. Such a step, Champ said, was a retrograde one, for it would make the possibility of class representation, of which he heard so much, not only much more likely but almost inevitable. The speaker concluded his address with a few well-chosen words justifying his acceptance of the bonus.

At later meetings, Champ made further efforts to convince the electorate that he was not tainted with the money of Brisbane Street, and expressed some anxiety as to how the Colony would make ends meet if, as he thought likely, ad valorem duties and property taxes were rejected by Parliament.

As the day of the election drew near, it became clearer that Moore and Matthews would be the defeated candidates. The People's Advocate became a viler print each day as it reported in deplorable detail the hotel back-yard meetings of its proprietor and his fellow

1. C.C., Sept. 6, 1856.
candidate: Matthews at his final meeting warned the electors, in
striking out the names of the people they wanted to exclude from the
Assembly, to be sure to use blotting-paper before they folded up their
ballot paper, for fear the lines might be impressed on other names.
Exhortations such as "Vote for Moore and Matthews, the Friends of the
People, and down with the Swell Mob" appeared in The People's Advocate.

Results of the voting were: J.W. Rogers 563, A. Douglas 512,
W.T. Champ 501, Matthews 229, Moore 172. There were 1409 electors
of whom 749 voted.2

At the declaration of the poll, Rogers repeated his promise to
reduce taxation, and cause what was left to fall more equitably.
Then Douglas tried to address the crowd "the mob began to throw in a
sharp fire of rotten eggs". The new representative of the people
found it impossible to speak and at the same time dodge missiles, and
he was compelled to leave the platform. Champ fared little better,
and also was obliged to retire in confusion. The crowd now marked
down Moore and Matthews and the fire increased in intensity when they
appeared. Moore's only words audible to The Examiner's reporter being
"oligarchical party", and "working classes against the Brisbane Street
Mob". Douglas foolishly attempted to speak again, but was obliged to
retreat when the eggs gave way to sticks and stones.3

"The 'people' have again to succumb to Brisbane Street",
despaired The People's Advocate, and it proposed to set on foot a

2. L.E., Sept. 21, 1856.
3. L.E., Sept. 9 and 11, 1856.
society "to oppose systematically, all systematised attempts to throw all power, civil, Religious and Political, into the hands of any oligarchy..."1

The result of this election was, it may be safely said, a fore-gone conclusion from start to finish. The error of nominating two men to campaign on behalf of the working classes was a fatal one in such a small electorate. One man may have been successful in securing enough votes from the new electors to gain a seat in the House, but two had little or no chance. The beginning of a "popular" party was evident in the election but in Launceston nothing more was heard of it. The rebuff the movement received was discouraging and the greater prosperity and smaller population of Launceston, as compared with Hobart Town made less the number of disgruntled workers who would presumably lend their support to working class candidates. An additional factor militating against the election of Moore or Matthews was their apparent lack of political experience and a clear aim, and their inability to speak well.

(c). **Campbell Town.** With the exception of Launceston, Campbell Town was the only electorate that was contested in the North. There were only two candidates. W.R. Allison, a prominent Colonist and land-holder, entered political life in 1846, when he was nominated to the Legislative Council by Wilson. He had also been an elected Member of the 1851 Council. He was opposed by one Scott, who does not appear to have been particularly prominent in Colonial affairs, though possibly he was well-known locally. It later transpired that Scott had been nominated against Allison at the instigation of R.A. Kermode who had been elected to the old Council in 1851 but, according to The Mercury, subsequently threw away his office at some imaginary offence to his high dignity and "showed he thought far more of Mr Kermode, than of Mr Kermode's constituents".  

At the nominations, Kermode proposed Scott and spoke of how Allison always seemed to range himself on the side of authority and not on the side of the liberties of the people; Allison, furthermore, had resisted the Constitution Bill to the last, and the land regulations for which Allison took so much credit, had turned out to be illiberal and adapted for the benefit of the few.

Allison, when his turn came to speak, accused Kermode of giving a garbled account of the land regulations in question, and also of Allison's attitude to the Constitution Bill.

Scott raised the level of the discussion by declaring that it

---

1. H.M., Aug. 11, 1856.
was his intention always to act on unprejudiced principles and faithfully for the district and Colony, but he suffered defeat at the hands of Allison, 130 votes to 57.

This election was obviously contested only because the influential Kermoda had an axe to grind. The results, if it was possible to analyse them, would if nothing else doubtless confirm the fact that Allison's personal friends outnumbered those of Kermoda. This election may be instanced as a typical rural election in that it was a contest of personalities, not principles.

1. H.T.C., Sept. 12, 1856.
(d). Clarence. In the constituency of Clarence the election of Edward Abbott was a result that did not cause surprise. He was a resident of long standing, having been born in New South Wales in 1800. Upon his arrival in Van Diemen's Land, he took a leading part in Colonial affairs. The candidate was a Police Magistrate and Coroner at the time of the election, and in his speeches dwelt at length on the years he had been in the district. His opponent, Strachan, was little-known outside the electorate, and the Press, in its coverage of the election, pays little attention to him.

Abbott put a comprehensive policy before the voters. Underlining the need for more energetic action on the part of the Immigration Department, he declared that small areas of land should be available on easy terms in order to secure the influx of a continuous stream of efficient labourers. In addition, he suggested that school attendance be made compulsory.

Concerning the bonus question, Abbott said that he could hardly blame Champ and Smith for taking the money, but he called the electorate's attention to the alarming fact that only a few months before, public servants with small incomes were put to serious loss and inconvenience by stipends not being disbursed by the Government when due. The candidate concluded his statement of policy with an axiom of democratic government which was lost sight of in the succeeding years—an organised opposition is as essential to good government as a vigorous and efficient administration.  

Strachan, in his election manifesto, did little but dilate upon the necessity for retrenchment, and the duties devolving on parliamentary representatives. He was defeated 109 votes to 35. Both men, at the declaration of the poll, "expressed themselves very amiably towards each other".

This "contest" is another example of the light-hearted manner in which campaigns were conducted in the rural constituencies. When a difference of opinion arose it was not one of political philosophy but almost invariably an obscure personal quarrel.

---

2. H.T.C., Sept. 10, 1856.
(c). **Kingborough.** Richard Cleburne, the "old Member" for Muon, the electorate of the Kingborough area in the old Council, was defeated by T.C. Nicholas by 136 votes.

The campaign was not conducted on a very high level, Cleburne claiming that The Advertiser was opposing his election, and that 30 names on Nicholas' requisition had been written in without the knowledge of the electors concerned. Indeed, one man had been in London for three years, complained Cleburne in elaborate and righteous indignation. The candidate almost had no time to mention that in his opinion Champ and Smith had a right to avail themselves of the bonus.

For his part, Nicholas challenged Cleburne to prove his charge, accused The Daily News of attacking him and denied that he was a nominee of J.D. Halfe\(^1\), a well-known Colonist of Irish extraction.

At the declaration of the poll, Cleburne lodged a protest about the manner in which the ballot had been conducted at Ironstone Creek, where he had been outvoted to the tune of 26 votes to none. Cleburne claimed that the polling place had been changed without anyone telling his supporters.\(^2\)

Nothing came of this charge, evidently, for Gellibrand triumphantly took his place in Parliament at the end of the year.

---

1. T.D.N., Sept. 12, 1856.
2. N.T.G., Sept. 19, 1856.
(f). Richmond. This election provided the most entertaining contest of the campaign. The centre of attraction was the most colourful politician in the Colony, Thomas George Gregson.

He had arrived in the Colony in 1821, three years before Arthur, and became one of the Lieutenant-Governor's most outspoken and determined opponents. He was elected to the old Council in 1851, and was the man who moved the rejection of a Bill to raise duties on sugar, tea and foreign goods from 5% to 15%, adopting as a slogan the ominous "no taxation without representation". Wilmot claimed that the intransigent spirit Gregson was exhibiting was "more radical and even Jacobinical" than he had ever seen in Parliamentary factions. Gregson contended that his stand in opposing exactions for convict purposes was in the best interests of the Colony. He went on to join in leading the growing opposition to the Governor which came to a head in the affair of the "Patriotic Six", when six Councillors - Dry, Kermode, Kerr, Fenton, Gregson and Dunn - left Wilmot without a quorum.

Gregson played an important part in the blended Council, notably in the committee which prepared the draft of the Constitution Bill under the provisions of which he was now standing for election.

Gregson's opponent was Bassett Dickson, the "Eagle of Glen Ayr", another Richmond landed proprietor who had been an early settler in the area. However, he had neither the background of service of Gregson, nor the ability to speak possessed by the "Old Member".
The Daily News was the only newspaper to support Gregson, which was not surprising, as he had an interest in it, and appeared on the same platform with Maxwell Miller, its proprietor.

The other Hobart Town papers expressed opposition to his candidacy in no uncertain way. The Mercury, for instance, saw Gregson's career as "an accumulation of dishonour not very easily paralleled". It failed to find any law he had introduced, any institution he had founded or any reform he had carried. Gregson, declared the Editor, warming to his subject, "should claim kindred with the treachery of Sunderland or the bullying infamy of Tyrconnel"; he had attained his eminence "from a wanton recklessness of insinuation and abuse, backed by an utter disregard to truth and scorn of all ultimate consequences, even to himself."

Gregson stood for election on his record, despite The Mercury's opinion of it, but as well proposed a wool tax, a question on which there was bitter disagreement in the Colony.

For his part, Dickson made no specific promises, declaring that he would act for the benefit of the Colony. He had no feelings of deep hostility towards his neighbour Gregson, and appeared rather surprised when he was suddenly made the centre of implacable opposition to the "Old Member", who was accused by the Chairman of Dickson's election committee, one W.V. Smith, of being the author of

2. H.T.C., August 5, 1856.
rivald lines which he had sung in a public house at Richmond. 1

On Nomination Day Gregson was escorted to the hustings by a crowd of men on horseback. Among those on the platform was Francis Smith, down from Hobart Town to assist Dickson to defeat Gregson. After some skirmishing about who was to speak first, Gregson took the stand, claiming that a fuggleman had been planted in the crowd, and that it was not Dickson who opposed him at all, but the firm of Champ, Smith and Co. "Great confusion here prevailed", Gregson engaging in argument with the crowd respecting his attitude to Roman Catholic emancipation.

The speaker then turned from the touchy subject of religion and intimated that Smith was present for some sinister purpose (Gregson's defeat presumably). This touched off a personal dispute between the "Old Yorher" and Smith which continued throughout the meeting whenever Gregson could not get a hearing from the crowd. Upon Dickson's denial that he was Smith's nominee, the ex-Attorney-General got to his feet and openly opposed Gregson who, he charged, had taunted him with the colour of his complexion (Smith had spent some time in the West Indies). At this point the Returning Officer lost what little control he still retained over the crowd, which now addressed any speaker who had the courage to come forward.

In a lively account of the proceedings on polling day, The Daily News recorded that W.V. Smith "galloped madly" to Jerusalem, the other polling place, when it became known that Gregson had won at

Richmond. "The crowd occupied the interval in a little more
drinking and a good deal more fighting" till the news was received
that Gregson had also won in Jerusalem. "At this, fighting became
general and serious /embodying/ the worst features of a Tipperary
row".  

"In vain have the great exercised their influence", cried The
Daily Farmers exultantly, for Gregson had won by 114 votes to 106.
"Richmond has consented to its own degradation", lamented The
Mercury, which predicted that the whole Colony would regret Richmond's
folly and ignorance in electing Gregson, who would be at best a
legislative nuisance.

The declaration of the poll found the defeated Dickson praising
the one who had vanquished him and agreeing with Gregson on the
necessity for retrenchment, while a triumphant Gregson told the
electors how he was once again Richmond's Member, despite the
"Government, poverty, Press, priests and police", and promised a
wool tax, retrenchment, secular education, the multiplication of
County Courts and a revised tariff.

2. T.D.M., Sept. 21, 1856.
Conclusion.

The striking feature about this, the first election in Tasmania under the new Constitution, was the apathy - only eight constituencies out of a total of 24 were contested. Of these eight, two were Launceston and Hobart Town, the centres of population; and of the others, nearly all were adjacent to the two chief towns. In other words, only 14 out of a total of 30 Members actually were compelled to fight for their seats in the House. There were 10,359 registered voters, of which 3751 voted for the contested elections. 1

The majority of the Members, then, were representatives of rural constituencies, many of them "sheep walks" and little else, and were elected unopposed on a vague, airy but confident promise to do their best for the good of the Colony. Nearly all the candidates make this statement and then adjourn to feast their supporters at the nearest hotel. Small wonder then that any efforts to bring down legislation imposing taxes on property were doomed to failure. It should also be remembered that Members, with the exception of those few holding a portfolio, were not paid, and who but those with wealth could afford to stand for Parliament?

Although it would appear on the surface that the country Members exerted perhaps undue influence in framing the laws of the land, the population of the Island was so distributed that the constituencies were relatively even in their population. Admittedly there was a glaring anomaly in the fact that Glamorgan's 128 voters and Selby's 597 elected one representative for each constituency, but in the main the electorates were intolerably unbalanced. Within ten years, however
there was need for reform in electoral representation as the constituencies, especially the Southern ones, lost their voters to Victoria. The voting power of those who were not landed proprietors in the rural constituencies cannot be ascertained, but it is not unlikely that the £10 house-holders would include the tenant farmers. These people would doubtless vote for their landlord or the candidate he was supporting. In a small electorate it would be easy to determine the political leanings of a person.

There appears a strong resemblance between Tasmania in 1856 and England in the eighteenth century. In both States the era of industrialisation had as yet scarcely begun. The landed families had a great influence in government. In England their strength lay in a long history of benevolent domination over rural areas whose populations had become conditioned to it. In Tasmania a few families had gained popular support from the early days of the Colony when they had opposed the Governors and later fought for self-government and the ending of Transportation. Until the development of secondary industries created an urban population whose needs were different from those of the country areas, the possibility of any marked change and enlivening of the Colony to vigorous activity could be ruled out.

In other words, there was no potential middle class in the Colony. The young and able men of vision and enterprise, and those prepared to gamble on the chances of the Colony becoming prosperous, were not to be found. Although there is no way of proving it, the impression remains strong that the Victorian gold rush lost to Tasmania many of its association.
the best type of Colonists, though certainly there departed from
the Island a great number of men whose backs it was only too
glad to see in the ox-convicts. The Statistician's report of
1833 furnishes figures which reflect the character of those the
Colony lost. Consumption of spirits during the year 1833 had
totalled 104,000 gallons, but now, with over twice the population, it
had fallen to 66,500 gallons. In 1835, when the population was
45,000, 68,000 gallons of rum had been consumed; in 1836, only
21,000 gallons had been drunk by a population of 100,000.

According to Margaret Kiddle has shown, the Tasmanians who ran
properties in both Victoria and Tasmania had begun to move to
the Port Phillip settlement even before the economic depressions
set in. Indeed, it was in the occupation of land by the lower class
which set these trends in motion.

There is, in the occurrence of this depression, both cause and
effect of the predominance of land-holders in the Island's Legislature.
Throughout the ten years or so, the price of wool remained high and
this did not compel the squatters to leave the Colony, as the lack of
work and increase of prices brought about by the Administration's
policy of raising money by increasing tariffs, certainly and did
compel the labouring class to do. There was more scope in Victoria
for the squatter; certainly, especially if he had "squatted" say
20 years earlier; before land claims and sales were closely subjected
to. But the die-hard squatters who had become entrenched in the
ironically enough, from

2. Papers and Proceedings of the Tasmanian Historical Research
Association; Vol. 3, No. 3: "Vandemonian Colonists at Port
Phillip, 1834-50".
Colony and were not to be worried by increased liabilities and responsibilities inevitably occasioned by extra Mainland commitments, remained behind on the soil of their adopted country. They were, moreover, men who looked upon direct taxation as a delusory expectation of benefit.

Thus there came into being a not unusual situation: government by a coalition of conservative land-holders and merchants, with changes in the nature of the Administration determined by private family feuds and arrangements. Outside the group stood a few other land-holders of yeomen stock, radicals not altogether because they were opposed to authority simply because it was authority, though this perverse attitude was characteristic of some, but also because they sincerely wanted to see the new-voting working class exercise some power in the government of the Colony. Gregson is an example of this type.

Altogether then a classical situation, but one marred by one factor - the Island was not self-supporting. If the population had been able to largely clothe and feed itself, then Tasmania might have become a huge feudal estate. But while it needed to float loans to balance the Budget which was becoming more and more unmanageable because of decrease in both exports and imports, and inability, or impossibility, to reduce the cost of government, the Colony was running on to the rocks. Victoria's policy of Protection was, ironically enough, framed partially to protect Tasmanians - those men who had left the Island for the easy wealth of the gold diggings
and who now found themselves without work, with the easy pickings of the alluvial mines disappeared. To employ these men, Victoria felt the need to start secondary industries, and it was partially this that brought her to Protection. The close search for gold in Tasmania can be easily understood. It was unfortunate that eyes had become dazzled by the precious metal, for showing on the surface of Colonial ground was some of the richest tin and copper lodes in the world. It took Tasmania 20 years to find them, however, during which time she lost her place in the councils of the Colonies. It was as if Britain had seen the Industrial Revolution start on the Continent of Europe.
### The 1856 House of Assembly Election

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Electors</th>
<th>No. voting</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>W. Abbott (109) d. Strachan (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>T. L. Gellibrand (128) d. W. G. Sharland (125)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>319</td>
<td></td>
<td>W. Crooke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glamorgan</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Meredith.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenorchy</td>
<td>415</td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart Town</td>
<td>3127</td>
<td>1076</td>
<td>T. D. Chapman (921), W. Hiller (897), R. W. Nutt (857), F. Smith (850), J. A. Dunn (835); Brewer (606), Worley (349).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingborough</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>T. G. Nicholas (136) d. R. Cleburne (112).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Norfolk</td>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Fenton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oatlands</td>
<td>243</td>
<td></td>
<td>H. P. Anstey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenborough</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>D. McPherson (90) d. F. Lipscombe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>T. G. Gregson (114) d. B. Dickson (106).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorell</td>
<td>343</td>
<td></td>
<td>A. Morison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell Town</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>W. R. Allison (130) d. Scott (57).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deloraine</td>
<td>288</td>
<td></td>
<td>H. R. Rooke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>395</td>
<td></td>
<td>J. A. Gibson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fingal</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td>L. F. Steiglitz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Town</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. S. Henty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launceston</td>
<td>1409</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>J. W. Rogers (563), Adye Douglas (512), W. T. N. Champ (501), Matthews (229), Moore (172).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electorate</td>
<td>Electors</td>
<td>No. voting</td>
<td>Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horvon</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td>F.M. Innes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Plains</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
<td>J.C. Gregson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringwood</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td>W.P. Weston.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selby</td>
<td>579</td>
<td></td>
<td>R.C. Gunn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbury</td>
<td>337</td>
<td></td>
<td>T.W. Field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbott</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>Oatlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>Campbell Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anstey</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>Oatlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hobart Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>Surgeon</td>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Launceston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>Hobart Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleburne</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>Kingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crooke</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickson</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunn</td>
<td>Bank director</td>
<td>Hobart Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenton</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>New Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>Westbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gellibrand</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregson T.G.</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregson J.C.</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>Norfolk Plains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>V.D.L. Co. Agent</td>
<td>Devon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunn</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>Selby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henty</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>George Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Morven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipscombe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queenborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>Glamorgan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews</td>
<td></td>
<td>Launceston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McPherson</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>Queenborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Newspaper proprietor</td>
<td>Hobart Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>Newspaper proprietor</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>Sorrell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>Kingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natt</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>Hobart Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>Surgeon</td>
<td>Glenorchy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooke</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>Deloraine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>Campbell Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharland W.S.</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Hobart Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steiglitz</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>Fingal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strachan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clarence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ringwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hobart Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER THREE

The First Parliament, 1856-61

In its first eight months of Responsible Government, Tasmania had no less than four different Ministries - those of W.T.N. Champ, T.G. Gregson, W.P. Weston and Francis Smith. The last-named Administration remained in power from May, 1857 until November, 1860, another Weston Ministry holding office from that date to August, 1861.

Champ's Ministry included the following men -:

W.T.N. Champ = Premier and Colonial Secretary.
T.D. Chapman = Colonial Treasurer.
F. Smith = Attorney-General.
J.W. Rogers = Solicitor-General.
H.E. Anstey = Secretary for Lands and Works.
W.E. Nairn.

This pioneer Administration held office for a period of but four months. It was defeated when, faced with a large deficit on estimated income, attributed by The Examiner to long years of irresponsible rule and extravagant expenditure for Imperial purposes\(^1\), it imposed additional duties on food and clothing, postage and shipping. In addition, the new Budget made spirits and malt liquor, tobacco, tea, sugar and coffee dearer.\(^2\) Liabilities and expenditure for the year 1856 had amounted to £141,000, leaving a deficiency of £81,000.

---

1. \(\text{T.D.N.},\) March 11, 1858.
2. \(\text{T.D.N.},\) Sept. 13, 1856.
So convinced was the Colonial Treasurer of the Colony's dire need of money, that he rushed the Budget through the Lower House and proceeded to implement its provisions before the Legislative Council could deal with the measure. The House had thus by-passed the Council and claimed the right to impose and collect Customs by a mero resolution of the majority without reference to the Upper House.

Popular feeling ran high at the prospect of increased taxation, as people already feeling the pinch after the prosperous gold rush period protested against having to pay more for necessities of life. A public meeting was held on January 12 in the New Market Place, upwards of 5,000 people attending. Speakers included Dr Crowther and Messrs Kilburn and Worley. They condemned the new Budget in no uncertain fashion and adopted resolutions incorporated in a petition presented to the House of Assembly.

The petition of 4,784 persons prayed that, first, a reduction in high officials' salaries should take place before any further taxation; second, that the ways and means of raising money were oppressive on the industrial classes and let the wealthier people and especially the landed class escape their just share of the burden; third, that the increased duties would promote smuggling and stills; fourth, that the levy on cattle and sheep was opposed to the principles of Free Trade. Other protest meetings were scheduled for Launceston, the Huon, O'Brien's Bridge and Evandale.

One reader of The Advertiser was moved to write advocating a tax on bachelors, to the extent of five shillings on those in receipt of £30 per year, and £1 on those who earned £100. Such a measure, he was convinced, would lead to a startling increase in the number of marriages and consequently to a much to be desired addition to the population. To make doubly certain that his aim would be realised, the writer also urged that settlers' daughters be given 50 acres of land upon their marriage. In this way, concluded the writer, Tasmania would become known as a land of heiresses and there would not be ships enough to cope with the flood of new Colonists.1

Despite the presentation of the "Grand Remonstrance", the Colonial Treasurer remained convinced that it was his duty to persevere with the Budget measures and not "pander to the whims of parties out of doors". Members had pledged themselves to support his financial policy, added Chapman; the Treasury was embarrassed and money would have to be raised quickly by some means or another. The House, however, deemed it wise to adjourn discussion of the Budget for a fortnight in the face of fierce public protest.2

The Advertiser did not forget to point out to readers, in case they were not already aware of it, that it was time that the "wool kings" paid their share of the costs of Government: "Even for the purposes of road-making they are assessed at only one penny, whilst the poor man with a small farm has to pay six-pence", said Dr. Gaunt at the Launceston protest meeting. A petition

was adopted, which, one City-proud Launcetonian hoped, would exceed in length that of Robert Town's. The latter's petition was said to be 38 yards long.\[1\]

"The ignorant impatience of taxation"\[2\] to the contrary, the House abandoned the tax on necessities in favour of a loan when it reassembled on February 10. Three days later it was defeated on three different occasions and finally resigned on the success of a motion put by T. C. Gregson that the salary of the Governor and the chief Heads of Departments be reduced.

Precisely why Champ's Cabinet chose to resign caused some discussion in the Colony. The Press noted that it was not necessary for a Government to resign upon a defeat in the House, although Colonial Parliaments looking to the procedure of the House of Commons for guidance perceived that nowadays a defeat on the floor of the British Lower House had come to mean that the resignation of the Government would follow surely. Nonetheless, the old practice of clinging to power was not yet dead and gone. Champ's resignation could be interpreted as a device whereby he meant to ultimately strengthen his power; that is, by surrendering the Premiership and formation of a Cabinet to Gregson, whom he thought would be quite unable to form a workable Cabinet, or govern for any length of time.

Champ calculated that he would be recalled to form another Ministry, strong in the face of Gregson's anticipated incompetence and stormy retirement before Champ's radicalism. But Champ was not recalled to office, and he left the two years in April and May 1857.

---

colonies in 1857, to become Governor of Pentridge Gaol in Victoria.

The influence of public opinion should not be ignored, for the
imposition of taxes had indeed stirred the citizenry to swarm to
public meetings in numbers not seen since the agitation for the
ending of Transportation. Aided, abetted and encouraged by The
Daily News, the proponents of opposition to the new taxes set on
foot a marathon petition-signing project, and remonstrances could
not have failed to impress the Members of Parliament.

Faced with uproar outside the House and an around-the-clock
attack by Gregson, Meredith and Miller inside the House, it may have
been that Champ's Ministry, a little uneasy and flustered, thought
it might be discreet to give Gregson the rope with which he was
expected to hang himself. But from whatever angle the relinquishing
of office is viewed, the resignation of the ministry appears the
act of politicians rather than statesmen.

Gregson's Ministry was composed of the following men:

- T.G. Gregson - Premier and Colonial Secretary.
- C. Meredith - Colonial Treasurer.
- J.C. Gregson - Attorney-General.
- M. Miller.
- Jas. Whyte.
- J.H. Wedge.

Gregson's policy was embodied in the "Gregson Memorandum", placed
before the House on March 25. The Memorandum dealt with the need for
retrenchment before taxation and announced the unpleasant news that
the year's deficit would probably be £76,000. To balance the Budget
Gregson suggested taking the following steps - To offer 160,000
acres of land for sale by expiry of the annual licenses for pastoral
...
purposes, which at an average of £2 per acre might not unreasonably be expected to bring in £320,000, which sum could be employed to make provision for the extinction of the public debt and for compensation to officials now out of employment because of previous retrenchment.

In addition to this, Gregson informed the House that he would press for the renewal of the Imperial Government's original grant of £25,000 in aid of police and gaols; reduce the salaries of the Governor, Colonial Secretary, Attorney General, Colonial Treasurer, and members of Departments such as the Colonial Auditor and Public Works; give the municipalities greater power to raise and spend money; call for an Inter-Colonial Conference.

The Daily News reported that Gregson's programme included also the floating of a ₤55,000 credit vote. This was refused by the House, with the result that the Assembly became the scene of stirring events as Gregson and his friends fought to maintain their Government.

Dubbed the "Gridiron administration" by the Press, the Ministry's greatest handicap was, apart from the position of the Colony's finances, the Premier himself. He was too unruly and rash to lead a Government. "A few speeches on popular topics of the day - some two or three not very creditable attempts at horse-whipping - and one duel - form the principal features in the political life of Gregson," wrote the Editor of one Hobart Town newspaper.

Gregson did not pass among the Opposition with a horse-whip, but he possessed a lashing tongue which had a similar effect.

The period of Press criticism which followed Gregson's assumption of the Colony's leading office, beggars description. With the exception of The Daily News, the Hobart Town Press devoted its leading articles to a damnation of the Premier couched in terms of invective that gave the lie to the fact that there was a law of libel. The Courier headed a leading article about Gregson with: "Government by Intrigue, or Constitutional Government? By a mob in Hobart Town, or by the Parliament of the Colony?" The next day it spoke of Gregson "pouring out foul sarcasms, indecent allusions and shameless 'double entendres' intended to revive against a political opponent the indiscretions of a quarter a century previous".

The Advertiser too opposed Gregson. It wrote of the Premier using the "grossest abuse" and indulging in "the most offensive personal vituperation of even the personal features and the private history of Honourable Members, the most vile imputation of motive"; "vulgar offensiveness of gesture and manner" had been coupled with "incorrigable and reckless profligacy". "No maniac in a strait-jacket or New Zealander in a war dance, ever made more absurd or grotesque grimaces". In the North The Examiner trusted "that a nuisance which stinks in the nostrils of the public may be abated without further delay."

Gregson's behaviour in the House provided copy for newspapers in all the Colonies, and they had a field day reporting his actions in his capacity as Premier. The occasion on which he lay back in

1. H.T.C., April 16, 1857.
2. H.A., April 1 and April 4, 1857.
3. L.V., April 7, 1857.
his seat with his face covered with a handkerchief while he and his policy were cursed by Opposition speakers was described in no small detail by the Colonial Press.

The climax of Gregson's method of dealing with opponents by insulting them on the floor of the House came when 10 members of the assembly got up and walked out, because of constant interruption by interjections and points of order to Innes' motion.

"That the conduct and language of the Honourable the Colonial Secretary in this House on Friday the 27th of March, were such as to interfere with the freedom of Debates - to compromise the reputation of this branch of the Legislature in the estimation of the intelligent and respectable portion of the people of this as well as that of any other community to which its proceedings may become known - to render the calm and efficient discharge of the duties of its Members impossible and to inflict, consequently, the most serious injury upon the moral as well as the material interests of the Colony".

What had happened on the 27th to occasion such an extraordinary motion? On that day the Colonial Treasurer, Meredith, had asked the House to sanction a £55,000 loan. Chapman opposed the proposal. Gregson then spoke and in a withering and insulting speech directed at Chapman accused him of coming out to Van Diemen's Land as a steward on a ship. J.C. Gregson, the Premier's son, defended his father's efforts to raise the loan and was applauded by the Gallery.
Chapman at once drew the attention of the Speaker to this demonstration of support of Gregson, and at Chapman's insistence, the Speaker (Dr Officer) ordered the Gallery to be cleared by the Serjeant-at-Arms. This officer was, understandably, reluctant to move upon the Gallery, but upon it becoming certain that there was no doubt in anyone's mind what he was supposed to do, he made his way to where the public was seated.

Gregson, had, upon hearing the order given to clear the Gallery, cried out to those in that platform, "They dare not do it!", but when he perceived the Serjeant-at-Arms attempting to persuade some of the spectators to move, he raised his hands to the Gallery and again addressed his sympathisers: "I am sorry for you good people, but I cannot help you; you must go out". A fierce altercation had been going all the while, the public shouting to the House that it had better meet behind locked doors and be done with it, that the Spanish Inquisition was as nothing in comparison with the People's House of Tasmania, and describing to the hapless Serjeant the steps they would take if he dared to lay a finger on them. The body of the House was in uproar. ¹ When the spectators had been turned out into the street they stood under the windows of the House and gave three groans for Chapman before dispersing. ¹

These were the events that Innes referred to in the speech he attempted to make. Upon his failing to make his point, Innes, reversing his position, Allison, Chapman, Champ, Weston, Henty, Balfe, Butler, Gibson and Smith left the House. ²

2. T.D.N., April 4, 1857.
Three weeks later the Gregson Cabinet was compelled to resign when it became apparent, even to Gregson, that he would not now be supported by the majority of the House in his plan to raise the £55,000 he needed to tide him over until the projected land sales brought in money. Gregson had been in office for two months.

The new Ministry was led by Weston. His "Ringwood" Administration included in it:-

W. R. Weston — Premier.
F. M. Innes — Colonial Treasurer.
F. Francis Smith — Attorney-General.
T. J. Knight — Solicitor-General.
W. Henty — Colonial Secretary.
R. Q. Kermode.

Imposition of further duties had resulted in the fall of one Ministry, it was thought, so the new Government determined on a policy of retrenchment, land sales, a less light tax on the wealthy by means of duties on certain imports, local self-government, and the projected amendment of the Masters and Servants Act and the Licensed Victuallers Act.¹ Though the Colony was losing money hand over fist², the Government refused to face up to the imposition of a direct tax. The lack of activity in this field is not altogether surprising. The financial position of the Colony and the possibility of a tax was, however, kept before the readers of the Advertiser and surprisingly enough by The Examiner, a paper which in the usual run of things avoided like the plague any discussion favouring the imposition of a wool tax, began to talk of charging it. The tax was popular, there was no doubt of that, the Editor declared; the chief objection concerned only those whose flocks were

depastured on rented lands the property of private individuals, many of whom lived in England and elsewhere. But the handicap of such a tax on tenant farmers would be easily overcome - it could be deducted from the rent, for example.

The Examiner's mild speculation drew predictable replies in its columns from squatters, who employed the arguments usual in discussions of this nature i.e., that they had opened up the country, fought Blacks, Bushrangers, droughts and fires - and were now to be penalised, this being, to say the least, base ingratitude on the part of those who now dwelt in safety. These same landed proprietors, however, could offer no alternative hypothesis of how the Colony was to find the money required to enable the Government to discharge its duties.

A re-shuffle of the Cabinet occurred after the Weston Cabinet had been in office a mere 17 days, hegemony being transferred to Francis Smith: -

Francis Smith - Premier and Attorney-General.
F.M. Innes - Colonial Treasurer.
T.J. Knight - Solicitor General.
W. Henty - Colonial Secretary.
R.Q. Kermode.
W.P. Weston.
John Walker.

The period of turmoil and instability of Government ceased with Smith's accession to power. Looking back on it all 12 months later, The Examiner summarised the reasons as it saw them for the rapid rise and fall of Ministries - Champ's Ministry had resigned because

1. J.E., July 4, 1857.
Parliament had not given it time to develop a policy, and because of the foolish way in which it had attempted to increase the duties; Gregson's Cabinet had been unable to long hold the reins of office because of its leader's impetuosity and its members' lack of experience in public office; and Weston had been demoralised by the rowdy opposition led by Gregson.¹

that Contemporary observers saw this first unstable period as paving the way for a rampaging democracy of low-bred mechanics and artisans to overthrow the forces of law and order, but the newly-enfranchised voters returned Members who, although occasionally liberal in their outlook, were only a small and ineffective force in an unenterprising House. The Mercury's judgement of three year's later was valid for the 20 years after 1856: "It is found impossible even with desperate efforts, to get up a sensation."² The Examiner found itself in agreement: "All is deadness or indifference on the part of the people and Government."³

The truth was that Tasmania, which with New South Wales had retained the old and feeble convicts, lost her industrious population to the Victorian gold-fields. "In 1842 there were 40,767 adult males in the Colony; in 1852, there were only 24,893; two years later there were less - 22,261."⁴ In 1862, The Advertiser observed that there were little over 20,000 male adults in the Colony.⁵

The Colony was left to languish, and her later history was to be

---

1. L.E., March 11, 1858.
2. L.E., Nov. 22, 1860.
3. L.E., Jan. 12, 1860.

³ See Appendix B
characterised by petty squabbling and factionalism in the House of Assembly, where family feuds and alliances were waged at Government level. An effort to increase the franchise of the House proved unsuccessful. The majority of Members looked fearfully at the rapid changes in Ministries on the Mainland, and resolutely turned their back on any alteration of the status quo. The Examiner noted that the extension of the franchise in Victoria and New South Wales "has not been productive of good".\(^1\) It had echoed the same sentiments earlier: "The number of Ministerial combinations /the Colonies/ have got through is astounding"; in Tasmania there were no trained statesmen, the paper maintained, an "sager and factious struggle for place and power"\(^2\) taking their place. Consequently Miller's 1860 Reform Bill for Triennial Parliaments and increased representation was thrown out. The political situation in the other Colonies militated against any chance of its being successful; the present order of things was not to be swept away by opening the flood gates to democracy.

The successful passage through Parliament of a Rural Municipalities Bill was one of the first acts of the Government. It was hoped to cut Government expenditure to some extent by encouraging municipalities to raise and spend money themselves.

The Waste Lands Acts were an attempt in part to increase the Government's income from land sales. This source of revenue had fallen approximately 40\% in three years, from £32,000 to £68,000.\(^3\)

\(^1\) L.E. Jan. 22, 1861.
\(^2\) L.E., March 12, 1858.
\(^3\) See Appendix B.
Accepting the principle of selection before survey, the Administration divided Crown lands "into three classes - town, agricultural and pastoral, and provided for their sale by auction." The idea, comments Coghlana, was to create an "industrious yeomanry"; but the tendency was to the formation of large estates (a result which could be attributed with some truth to the lack of ready money by potential small farmers). In the West, settlement was in anticipation that the district would prove to be auriferous, but little payable gold was found and many of the grants were subsequently abandoned.

The land policy of the Administration had come under fire in the middle of 1857. At the end of June a "workers' meeting" met in the Capital to condemn the manner in which the Colonial Press had slandered Gregson, and to urge the Administration to take steps to "unlock the land", a cry which did not, however, possess the validity it had on the Mainland. In addition, the speakers expressed their dissatisfaction with the practice of supplying the labour market of Tasmanian from Europe.

Had immigration come to an end at once, however, it is doubtful whether the Tasmanian workers would have been much benefitted, since most new settlers went on to the Continent. The Tasmanian Daily News saw that there was little hope of accomplishing any changes that would benefit the industrial class: "The majority of

Members. \(\text{e}^{\text{e}}\lbrack\text{t} \text{largely, deeply concerned in the maintenance of the present land system.}\r
\]

"Eighteen fifty-seven and eighteen fifty-eight saw great changes in the position of the rural areas in the matter of local Government, but its development was not rapid, some areas opposing the expediency of the country districts ever being enthusiastic, although the creation of municipalities was now made an easy and simple matter.

"The 1856 forecast of expenditure was followed by a further decline in exports. Direct taxation was now being mooted in some quarters but The Advertiser, during April, pointed out the difficulties of imposing and collecting this source of revenue, especially since the Government was so reluctant to add to its employeens. It appeared certain that no Government could impose a direct tax or a property tax and remain on the Ministerial benches if the lesson learnt from the preceding administrations had not been taken to heart. Thus the next step in the course of exhausting all the means of raising money to augment the falling credit of the Colony, appeared to some people to be the imposition of heavy duties on goods which could be locally manufactured, and the ushering in of a Protectionist policy. A Joint Committee was set up in September, 1860 to discuss a change in the tariff, but three times did not succeed in obtaining a quorum, and so the matter was shelved.\(\text{as far as parliamentary action went.}^2\) But the Press did

\[1. \text{T.D.N.}, \text{June} \text{25, 1857.}\]
\[2. \text{H.A.}, \text{Sept.} \text{7, 1860.}\]
not allow the question of Protection to drop and it developed into an important issue.

The nature of the composition of Parliament caused some concern to the Ministry. Noting the disunity of the men who were opposed to the Ministry, the paper put its finger on a basic fault of politics in the Island Colony: "We consider it to be an indispensable feature in responsible Government that there should be a constitutionally organised opposition". 1

Cause of the displacement of legitimate political opposition by faction might be said to be two-fold. First, there were not enough occupations represented in Parliament — of the 30 men who were in the Lower House, too many had been elected without opposition and from the one class; and second, much of the tension was instigated by a few men who, dwarfed by the tremendous task of governing in the face of economic depression, turned in frustration to hold private quarrels reaching back to the beginning of the colony. As to the first reason, it may be doubted whether men willing and capable of acting as representatives could be found and induced to come forward, considering the listless and apathetic state of the colony. In any case, there were, in The Mercury's opinion, no great political questions on which a Ministry could stake its existence and stand or fall. 2 This would remain so while country members, an entrenched majority in both the House and the Council, continued to be unable to see past a policy of laissez

1. H.M., Aug. 12, 1858.
2. H.M., Nov. 12, 1858.
As Coghlan states: "The tendency was to divide on the British party lines of Whig and Tory. The squatters were like the British party lines of Whig and Tory. The squatters were like the British Conservatives, and other representatives espoused the democratic interests. But parties became divided by almost imperceptible lines, and the making and unmaking of Ministries was mainly personal."¹ In Tasmania, those who "espoused democratic interests" were pitifully few in the Parliament. Responsible Government was well nigh converted into an oligarchy strengthened by bonds of family relation, little troubled by sporadic and disorganised opposition. This might not have proved so disastrous had the Colony been in a sound financial position, but as it was, the Legislature was called upon to arrest an economic depression that was not easing, a task which the most skilful and able legislators might well have found beyond them; for with the Houses packed with representatives of the "Woolocracy" and merchants, neither a policy of Protection nor a direct tax on the wealthy squatters ever the heads of Ministers. Representatives of the working classes of Hobart Town and Launceston there were, but they were overwhelmingly outnumbered by men who could see little good in upstart devil's advocates who had made their way into the House on the cry of "Tax the wool-kings!" And when it came down to practical politics, the men whose claim it was that they represented the mechanics and

¹ Coghlan, Vol. 1, p. 537.
Neither did not rely on these men for votes, because they had none, and were tough to please on anything. Some thought in the House who apparently favoured a form of direct taxation, although it would have hurt their own pockets. But the men who claimed this opinion, often made it difficult not to believe that they held it more because the Ministry did not than for any other reason.

were confronted with the grim financial position of the Colony; and regarding direct taxation as an attack on the very foundations of the State, it is small wonder that the Assembly Members fell to wrangling among themselves. They refused to recognize the necessity of direct taxation or protection, and so were unable to prevent matters from going from bad to worse. Universal suffrage would doubtless have resulted in the House being at least enlivened, but votes for all was unpalatable and was spoken of as one of the most objectionable features of American republicanism. 1 An Examiner correspondent foresaw that the present situation would continue:

"The curse of the country will be that there will be no consistent decent opposition" - Parliament would be a party affair of Innes', and Henry's friends, and Gregson's friends. 2

The Mercury painted a dismal picture of the contemporary political scene. It reported that many merchants had left the Island for Victoria's superior attractions, with the result that there was no busy speculative spirit in the Colony. 3 "Not a breath

---

1 H.L., April 14, 1859.
2 H.L., June 15, 1861.
3 H.L., May 12, 1859.
has there been to ruffle the surface of the political waters off Tasmania for months past." "The whole fabric of Government is in a deplorably insecure position..." The Electors seemed "extraordinarily indifferent to the exercise of their political privileges and as "the Government has a majority and... that majority is based on interest and held together by private friendship, it will not be likely to be interfered with". The Mercury wistfully compared the Colony with Queensland: "If we could evoke in this very slow Colony a like spirit of youth; the same sense of a future; the same confidence in our latent resources...".

The Governor's Speech upon the opening of the Fifth Session of Parliament on August 4, 1859 was an uninteresting one in which the prospects of discovering gold in the Colony formed the principal item. If it had not been for this and the Austro-French-Sardinian quarrel, the address would have been limited to the question of the eradication of thistles and the introduction of salmon into the Colony.

With imports and exports, land sales, Customs income and coin in the banks decreasing, and emigration exceeding immigration, the history of the first Parliament is a sorry story of uninteresting expediency. The Ministry, unwilling to attempt to withdraw the £15,000 annual State Aid grant to churches, and unable, because

1. H.M., June 11, 1859.
2. H.M., July 12, 1859.
of its reliance for support on the merchants, lawyers and country
members representing the wool-growers, to impose a wool tax or
property tax sufficient to balance the Budget, sought to halt the
falling revenue by increased duties coupled with occasional bursts
of retrenchment. (Yet while the country was in these straits
Rodric O’Connor of Avoca could afford to present the sum of
£10,000 towards the cost of erecting a Roman Catholic cathedral in
Hobart Town). 1

A too-hasty acceptance of a suspiciously tempting tender for an
electric telegraph across Bass Strait resulted in a £40,000 loss the
Colony could ill afford to bear. The Advertiser despaired: “Our
revenues are falling off with a steady and terrible uniformity...
The Ministry like their own marine cable are perfectly useless for
all practical purposes. What a blessing it would be for the Colony
if they were laid down also amongst the rocks in Bass’s Strait!” 2

The subject of Colonial Distillation was for a time the symbol
of the Protection movement, Protectionists being of the opinion that
the successful passage of a Bill legalising local distillation would
be the thin edge of the wedge of wholesale Protection. Then in
1861 the issue became one clearly of Free Trade versus Protection.
But it was only to be expected that the merchants of Hobart Town
and Lemooneston would with alacrity raise objections to any
suggestion of the repeal of the laws prohibiting Colonial
Distillation 3, for the import of large quantities of large quantities.

2. H.M., March 30, 1861.
of spirits received into the Island was a basis of their businesses. The
wholesale traders remained implacably opposed to any alteration
of the ruling tariff in favour of ad valorem duties and the
question of local distillation fused away.

The Government, then, had no alternative but to retrench. But
in August, 1859, the advertiser had commented that further
reduction in Government departments would clearly impair their
efficiency. It almost went openly on the grave condition of the
Colony and the useless nature of the administration, when all that
body had been responsible for was three weary years of retrenchment.

The Southern paper was scornful of the cheese-paring retrenchment
of the Government: "Retrenchment! Why, the public is heartily sick
of the word!" "Was the new financial policy to be ad valorem
duties, or protection to native manufactures? Were our own mechanics
to be shielded in some degree from the paralyzing effects of having
to compete with prison labour of the U.S.? Did Ministers intend
to put the screw on absentees?" The ship of State was hurrying
onto the rocks. "Quarter after quarter to the comparative statements
of revenue and expenditure preach to us the stern lesson that we
are fast retrograding into an incipient bankruptcy." The
Adviser found little to rejoice about— in addition to the
Government's alleged incompetence, it gloomily reported on an
outbreak of murders by ex-Norfolk Island prisoners, general armament
throughout the Continent of Europe and the war between the States in
America.

There was much to be said for Protection as an economic policy for Tasmania, but the dominant merchant-squatter alliance in the Legislature could see nothing wrong with Free Trade. They argued, rightly or wrongly, that Britain had gained her pre-eminent position in the world through a laissez-faire policy. Consequently it should follow that the Island, by following where Britain had led, would also come to be wealthy. The tendency of the land-holders was to preservation of existing conditions, and the rural Members were convinced that Protection would hit them and their constituents hard. The merchants had everything to gain by the continuance of Free Trade. Balfe's motion to restore ad valorem duties drew a cry of protest from men who had been elected on the cry of "retrrenchment before taxation".  

Would Protection have proved a cure-all, as some amateur Colonial Finance Ministers would have led the population to believe? Hardly, because Tasmania received one third to a half of her imports from Victoria, and the danger was that the province across Bass Strait would retaliate by increasing import duties on what goods Tasmania exported to that Colony. Thus by imposing tariffs on imports and making a start on Protection in order to encourage infant industries, keep the Native Youth at home and increase the prosperity of the Colony by industrialisation, Tasmania would only do herself harm, warned some; since Victoria was a much more powerful Colony, the Island would only be cutting off its nose to spite its face if it implemented Protection. But what alternative had the

---
Could hope to manufacture the goods which she was importing at no great a cost from the other Colonies and from the U.S.A. The import trade was the only prosperous one, asserted The Advertiser sarcastically, and listed articles such as furniture, glass and boots which should not have to be shipped into the Colony at all. 1

A great deal of space in the Press was given over to news from the Fingal gold-fields, but they never developed into another Ballarat as people fervently hoped that they would. Victoria's mushroom growth and subsequent prosperity was attributed to its gold-fields, and this explains the longing of Tasmanians for the discovery of a paying roof. Wistfulness is the keynote of the talk concerning gold in the Colony. Press opinion was that if only gold could be found in sufficient quantities, then Tasmania would regain her past prosperity, and all would be well.

At the beginning of 1861, The Mercury saw the impracticability of further retrenchment and baldly asserted, therefore, that a readjustment of the principles of taxation was necessary. It suggested a stamp duty, and did not fail to record bitterly en passant that the Colony had lost £40,000 through the failure of the wretched Bass Strait cable. 2 With an election drawing close, the papers could see but one question at issue, who are the ablest men to

2. H.B.
Finance and the lack of it had been remarked as an all-important subject soon after the 1856 election. "The great battle of the ensuing Session will doubtless be upon the question of finance" ¹, and the leader writer of The Mercury went on to indicate that the people wanted retrenchment. But £300,000 was being drained out of the Colony yearly by absentee land-lords and land-holders, and to that extent there should be a property and absentee tax, stated the writer. But what was the use of talking? - "retrenchment before taxation has been the popular cry since the first inauguration of responsible Government". ² Customs revenue continued to decline with a deadly regularity, this being attributed to the straitened means of the people, who no longer had the money to buy and consume the amount of spirits that they had been in the habit of doing. ³ Duties on liquor had for years provided the Administration with a useful income.

The desirability or otherwise of State Aid to religion was continually brought before the Colony by the Press and public meetings, and in September, 1856, a Bill to abolish the grant was brought forward by Aotioy, the Member for Oatlands, but rejected. Twelve months later there was another attempt to have State Aid abolished, but when the Bill was brought back from Committee the proposals had undergone a metamorphosis. The reason of the country was outraged. ⁴

---

Elaborated and enlarged, the Bill was passed, its instigator still supporting it despite changes that The Examiner claimed now simply made "State endowed Churches" of State aided ones. The Imperial Parliament vetoed the Bill on its conditions for abolition i.e. the substitution of £100,000 in debentures for the payment of annual stipends after January, 1861.

Opinion in the Colony seemed agreed that State aid must go eventually, but there were factors militating against cessation. One was the apparent concern of Members for the welfare of country churches. If the grant was withdrawn all at once, ran the argument, then these places of worship would close and the population would roll back into the immorality and crime characteristic of the recently ended Transportation era. Another factor was the anxiety of the House of Assembly and the Colony at large, that cutting off the grant would result in the loss to the Island of the clergy, an intelligent and well-educated section of the community which it could not afford to lose.

Another subject of some importance during the life of the First Parliament was the steps taken towards the achievement of Federation. Tasmania took a leading part in the agitation for Colonial Union, because it was believed in Government circles that such a coalition could not fail to advance the interests of the Island. However, it is not clear how far Colonial Federation would have aided Tasmania. It was unlikely that it would have resulted in the return of lost population; and had a uniform tariff been adopted

1. L.E., Oct. 11, 1859.
2. H.M., March 12, 1860.
Tasmania would have gained little, for her imports would not be reduced and exports increased until the number of inhabitants grew larger. A swelling of the population was the primary need. Tasmania's first task entailed the inception of an attractive immigration plan which would make conditions of life pleasing enough to dissuade settlers from leaving Tasmanian soil.

The Advertiser favoured Federation and warmly supported the meeting of the General Association of Australian Colonists, chaired by W.C. Wentworth, and its Memorial to the Secretary of State for Colonies for an Enabling Act to allow the meeting of a Colonial Convention with power to create a Federal Assembly.\(^1\) The paper was also moved to raise the question of whether or not Colonial representation in the House of Commons might be practicable. \(^2\)

The end of 1860 found the paper still urging Federation; it gave as reasons for the pressing need of some sort of Union, the instability of Colonial Legislatures, the lack of active Ministerial responsibility, the fact that many people now had the vote who were played upon by demagogues, the lack of well-informed public opinion, and the danger of France under Louis Napoleon. \(^3\)

Feeling was strong on the subject of the cost to the Colony of assisting to maintain "Imperial paupers". It was thought that these people, the old and insane convicts who were costing the hard-pressed Government a pretty penny to house and feed, should be wholly maintained by the Home Government, since it was that body which had

---

despatched them to the Island in the first place. A move was made
to have them shipped bag and baggage back to England after the
Colonial Parliament had received a "cavalier despatch" from Lytton
concerning its appeal against the apparently clear injustice of
supporting convicts in Colonial institutions. Nothing came of this
and the Colony was left still saddled with the cost of keeping men
useless for any purpose. "The number of ex-convicts who were
dependent on public support, apart from those in prisons and
lunatic asylums, was considerable. In 1859, 212 paupers were
maintained by the British Government; these were all convicts
free by servitude. There were also about the same number supported
by Colonial funds, the great majority of these belonged to the same
class".¹ In 1865, £53,000 was spent on penal and charitable
institutions, one sixth of this expenditure from both the General
Revenue and Land Revenues.²

The Legislative Council was not unconnected with the trouble
that the Lower House had in raising sufficient revenue to defray
the cost of government, collisions occurring on the question of
initiating Money Bills.³ A perpetual struggle went on between the
Houses, their smallness being favourable to faction and "productive
of serious inconvenience."⁴

The position of the Council in the Constitution came to a head
in September, 1859, when wholesale resignations by the anti-
Government forces resulted in recently-elected Members having to go
to the country again. Section Nine of the Constitution act

² Tasmanian Statistics, 1866.
³ L.E., March 11, 1858.
⁴ L.E., Nov. 11, 1858.
provided that at the expiration of three years from the date of
the issuing of writs for the first election, the first five men
named on the roll should retire, and so on every three years. If a
new member filled a vacancy then his name was to be placed last
on the Roll. In 1859, in addition to the retirement for election
of the first five men on the Roll, six others resigned as well, for
reasons not clear, causing other members to vacate their seats
before their proper period of retirement had arrived, "an anomaly
unparalleled in the constitution of any country".¹ (The Examiner
in its account of this fantastic situation states that Lowes,
Langdon, Walker, Wedge and Horne ought to have retired, but Lowes,
Wedge, Whyte and Horne resigned and so in consequence Burgess,
Weston, Haina, Cleburne and Sutton had also to retire).² In
September, only four men were in the Council.

The Opposition group after the Council furore had a majority
of one in the Upper House and demonstrated it by throwing out a
Small Debts Bill for "the most pusillanimous reasons".³ The House of
Assembly, however, disallowed an Upper House measure which
endeavoured to repeal the act prohibiting judges from sitting in
the Council⁴ and thereafter the anti-Ministerial clique in the Upper
House dwindled down to nothing. The whole farcical affair
exemplified the doleful irresponsibility of men in vital
Government positions when the Colony needed strong and consistent
leadership.

Steps were taken to prevent such a situation developing again.

¹. C.I. Clark, The Parliament of Tas., pp. 39-40
². L.B., May 12, 1860.
³. L.B., Aug. 21, 1860.
⁴. L.B., Aug. 21, 1860.
A Bill was brought in which provided that each member should hold his seat for six years from the date of his election. A recurrence of the 1859 affair was thus prevented, but at a cost of making the Council even more irresponsible: elections were held in future at irregular intervals and the Colony had no means of control over the House of Review.

The Government took advantage of the absence of opposition to rush through a Bill concerning the ineligibility of Judges to sit in the Upper House. If passed, this would have resulted in Horns being compelled to resign. It was claimed in some quarters that the Government had brought in this legislation wholly and solely to unseat Horns. Another measure, previously mentioned, attempted to have State aid abolished. Both were sent to the House of Commons for confirmation, and it was 10 months before Parliament met again.

This "novel proceeding" was precipitated by the Imperial Parliament's rejection of the State aid Bill. The Government maintained that inadequate provision had been made for the retiring clergy, though Governor Young had said that in his opinion "the Act now forwarded, as reserved for the assent is the most favourable compromise of the question of State aid to Religion which is likely to be obtained in Tasmania, if the question be left with the local Legislature." "Clerical offices are treated as reduced civil offices are treated...also that governing bodies of various churches shall have permanent endowments /to/ supplement those voluntary or self-imposed contributions of the adherents..."1

1. Fox Young to Secy. of State, Oct. 4, 1859.
The measure regarding the right of Judges to sit in the Legislative Council was confirmed, thus necessitating the resignation of Mr Justice Horne. Francis Smith was elevated to the Bench as puisne Judge of the Supreme Court, a gain to the Judiciary but a sad loss to an almost leaderless Colony. The Ministry now composed:

- H. Weston - Premier.
- W. Henty - Colonial Secretary.
- R.J. Thoms - Colonial Treasurer.
- T.J. Knight - Attorney-General.
- W.L. Dobson - Solicitor-General.
- W. Archer.

Neither of the latter two men had seats in Parliament at the time that they attained Cabinet rank. Archer's sudden rise to power was attributable either to his services in the persecution of Mr Justice Horne, or because of family connections with Weston, said The Advertiser cynically.¹

The introduction of railways was alive issue in the North of the Colony and a question that was to dog every Ministry for years to come. The line from Launceston to Deloraine was the first one projected, and Parliament in July, 1858 appointed a Committee to investigate the possibility of construction.² The Examiner pointed out the usefulness of railways and urged its readers to petition for the line.³ The railway question was revived in May, 1859, when a British firm indicated that it was willing to proceed with the laying down of 40 miles of permanent way. This announcement was

---

¹ H.A., Nov. 7, 1860.
² L.F., Aug. 12, 1858.
³ Ibid.
followed by another one concerning a tramway from Deloraine to the
Mersey River. Nothing appears to have been done about railways,
however, for the time being: Parliamentary measures were at the
dictation "of a wretched expediency," wrote The Examiner. The
editor reproached the older and more affluent Colonists for their
lack of interest in the governing of the Colony and urged them to
wake up for the next election and let the cry be for railways,
progress and retrenchment.

Boyce's report on the Launceston-Deloraine Railway was
furnished to a Parliamentary Committee on that project early in
the year 1861, the Government intimating its willingness to bear the
cost of the survey and plans of the proposed line, provided that
the people in the area would raise the money for the building of
the line. Discussion on the railway question was then broken off
as the Government went to the country for the Colony's second
election. Four and a half years had now passed since the first
wholly-elected House of Assembly had begun to deliberate.
Dissolution of the House was ordered on May 8, 1861.

After the hectic beginning in 1857, the period of tumult and
shouting died down when Smith's Administration came to power and
proceeded to pursue its even tenor of unmasterly inactivity. The
question of the Colony's declining revenue and prestige was not
solved, but loans were floated to raise money to administer the

1. L.H., June 11, 1859.
3. L.H., April 23, 1861.
Colony and pay the trade balance deficit. The advocates of a 
Property and Income Tax saved their breath when they realised the 
impossibility of its imposition by a House in the control of men 
unwilling to tax themselves. The reason was clear to The Cornwall 
Chronicle: "At present the Colony, the Legislature and the 
Government are so completely dominated over and dictated to by 
the Chamber of Commerce - a body of men composed exclusively of 
Importers and Commission agents, that it would be quite hopeless to 
expect that such a Minister as the present Treasurer would attempt 
revision of the tariff as by so doing he might risk a collision 
with those powerful 'camarillas'."  

CHAPTER FOUR

The Election for the House of Assembly in 1861

The Candidates

Fifty-six candidates stood for election in 1861 to the 50 seats in the Lower House. Eleven of the candidates won their way into the Legislature by walk-overs, and 15 took seats for the first time.

Once again, as in 1856, landed proprietors or their representatives filled the majority of the seats, although the greatest election cry, raised by Hobart Town candidates, was for Protection. Because the voice of the Press heard in the land was centred in the Capital and, to a lesser extent in Launceton, much was made of the Protection issue when, in fact, it could result in the election of half a dozen men at the very most.

Since the last election, the number of newspapers published in the Colony had been reduced to four, a lessening of numbers amounting to four, for The Daily News, The People’s Advocate and The Courier had ceased publication, as well as The Colonial Times. Gone were the prosperous years when Van Diemen’s Land had been able to support eight newspapers at once.

The character of the candidates did not differ to any extent from those of 1856. In that year, a number of men had campaigned as champions of the working class, and one of them, Maxwell Miller, probably the only true liberal in the House, had been successful. But what was the value of one man’s vote in a House of 30?
As far as the liberal section of the House went, the absence of Miller and Charles Meredith as candidates, was a sad blow. Both had championed the working class and Meredith had been one of those who had supported Miller's Bill for increased representation. The Protection candidates were the only men who could be expected to take over the near-hopeless fight of liberalism, although Gregson could be counted upon to oppose the Administration, come what might.

There was nothing unusual about the nominees then. Landed proprietors, merchants and lawyers accounted for nearly all of them. An exception was the case of John Davies, the proprietor of The Mercury, who was successful in gaining election for Hobart Town.

That candidates should stand for two seats was not regarded as extraordinary, and several men fell back on a second constituency when they failed to secure the necessary majority of votes in the first.

Those who stood on "Protection Ticket" in the Capital were: Horne, Barrett, Hill, Moriarty and Pilburn. Apart from the Protection-Free Trade election issue, however, the contests for election were in no way remarkable.

1. See page 145
The Issues

The First Parliament had been dissolved through the effluxion of time and not because the Ministry had resigned. Apart from the obvious question of the best means of raising money, there was no specific questions with which it had confronted the Colony. There had been no short session before the final dissolution when the Administration, if it had cared to, could have placed a programme before the electors. The Government had to stand on its record. Issues did emerge as electioneering went ahead, and the amount of discussion concerning Protection in the 12 months or so before the dissolution of Parliament made it certain that Protection would be the chief item in the programmes of candidates opposed to the Smith-Weston Administration.

(i)

The chief issue was that of Protection, the adoption of which was steadily urged by The Advertiser, the organ of the Protectionists. The Cornwall Chronicle was also an opponent of laissez faire, but as there was no contest in Launceston, the paper made no determined attempt to secure the admission of Protectionists into the House. The subject of Free Trade versus Protection did not arise in the North to nearly the extent it did in the South, but The Examiner fought the Protection doctrine tooth and nail, protagonists of Protection in Hobart Town being referred to as "the 'wind-bag' brotherhood". In turn, supporters of the system of protecting and nourishing home industries spoke bitterly of Launceston's
prosperity and the Northern-dominated Cabinet's consequent cry of Free Trade.

An explanation of the situation which gave rise to the demand for Protection was given by Governor Gore Browne in this year:—

"The labouring class generally is very different from that which is to be found in a Colony where the emigrant has always been free.... The landed proprietors and farmers in this Colony suffer more than in other Colonies from the difficulty of procuring efficient labour. At a former period ex-convicts under a modified coercion.... were often excellent labourers, but now.... employers have great difficulty in dealing with them and consequently prefer immigrant labour. It follows that in Hobart Town and Launceston there is often considerable distress, and liberated convicts have great difficulty in obtaining employment."¹

The Protectionists, then, were Southerners and three of the five who nominated succeeded in gaining election. These men based their support of Protection as an economic policy on the recent example of Canada and the U.S.A., especially California. Both States, speakers claimed, had become prosperous through their implementation of Protection. England could also be cited as an example of how Protection benefitted a nation. Pitt had found that country crippled, but after five years or so of Protection had the Union Jack flying over every sea.

Opponents of protection, such as Frederick Waitland Innes, agreed that it would be found to release the burdens of taxation, but would not admit that protection would tend to create revenue, despite the fact that its disciples claimed that their creed did not mean the imposition of a duty on articles the Colony could not produce, but on the imports it could and should produce at home.

Protectionists had a ready reply to this. Free Trade, they argued, had been tried and found wanting. The Colony was still operating at a loss, they declared, so what did it have to lose by giving protection a trial? - an entirely new scheme should and indeed must be introduced. The choice was direct taxation or protection, for "every interest but the pastoral interest is in a depressed and ruinous condition". 1

(ii)

The unstable nature of the Australian Colonial Parliaments in general caused concern to some Tasmanian politicians and to a section of the Press, but not all agreed that the remedy lay in restricting the franchise.

It was the belief of the anti-Government and anti-Free Trade Advertiser that some extension of the representation of the people, plus the introduction of Triennial Parliaments, was the first step towards prosperity. But the Members of the last Cabinet, and

1. H., June 6, 1861.
especially Innes, feared that propertied intelligence would be swamped by "democracy" and the presence in the Legislature of men without means who could, presumably, be bribed at will. Innes was of the opinion that only conservative measures could save Tasmania from the fate of Victoria and New South Wales "where democracy in its unblushing audacity is riding roughshod over the best interests of those communities".

It could be argued that had it not been for the local conviction that the liberal suffrage in the other Colonies had been abused, then the Tasmanian Legislature would have widened the franchise in the Island. As it was, the Parliament agreed in principle to Maxwell Miller's Bill to increase representation, but hung back from implementing it because of the demagogues who had started up on the Mainland.

The Mercury devoted leading articles to the subject of representation and the apparent menace of popular Government. The paper doubted if there were enough competent men to make any enlargement of Parliament successful, and advocated the introduction of electorates of intelligentsia on the lines of the British University seats in order to resist dangerous democratic tendencies.

Other opinion might well have pointed out that unchecked democracy was not cause of political instability in the Colonies. Rather was it the effect of the disinclination to stand for Parliament on the part of those best fitted for the position as

---

1. H.M., June 6, 1861
representatives for their districts. Tasmania was doubly unfortunate in that it had few energetic men available to stand for Parliament in any event. And certainly the number of potential demagogues did not warrant any restriction of the franchise. It might have done the Colony no harm if it had elected one or two fire-brands to the House. There was a lot of dead wood to burn out.

(iii)

Another question on which many men felt deeply, but seemed unable to answer, was the question of the "Imperial paupers", the old and insane convicts left in the Colony as part of the legacy of Transportation.

Candidates and Press agreed that the British Government should bear the cost of their maintenance, the financial state of the Colony being what it was, but no one knew what sort of line to take with Britain to bring her to see the Colonial view-point.

W.L. Dobson, a Member of the late Ministry and a successful, Hobart Town candidate, drew attention to the oppression of great expenditure "unjustly and harshly imposed by Britain". W.R. Allison, sole Campbell Town candidate, also opposed the idea of the Colony having to maintain British convicts, but "we can expect no justice from His Grace the Duke of Newcastle."

1. H.M., May 14, 1861.
2. H.M., May 21, 1861.
Doloraine, Rooke told the constituency that the annual expenditure by the Colonial Government on pauperism had more than doubled in two years. It had been £17,000 in 1858 and £38,000 in 1860.¹

The Imperial Government had pointed out before that the Colony received the advantages of Transportation, such as cheap labour, and now could hardly complain at helping to pay for the upkeep of the men still left in the Colony. The British attitude apparently was that Tasmania had fought for and finally obtained the abolition of Transportation and the granting of self government, and now could stew in its own juice.

(iv)

State Aid to churches and attempts to have it abolished was a cause of constant searching after the achievement of self government, Colonists being torn between their desire to maintain religion by means of the Ecclesiastical Endowment and their equal anxiety to have taxes reduced, this being assumed a consequence of the addition to the Colony's coffers of the £15,000 a year at present given over to State Aid.

Voicing the feelings of the Colonial Press on the subject, The Examiner stated that steps should be taken to reduce church expenditure. Dobson deplored Anti-State Aid sentiment in Hobart Town, noted the Launceston paper, and had made the statement that religion would languish if the grant was cut off.

¹. L.S., May 21, 1861.
The Examiner failed to be convinced that withdrawal of the Endowment to churches would automatically result in a falling off of attendances at places of worship.

There was general agreement among candidates that State Aid must go, but the best means of implementing its demise caused not a little discussion. Previous attempts to abolish the grant had not borne fruit, and candidates were inclined to be cautious when dealing with the subject of the grant; many contented themselves with merely saying that defeasance of the grant must be degrees. Few men considered that the time was ripe for immediate and absolute abolition.

Hill, one of those aiming to enter Parliament on the Protection Ticket, agreed with Dobson that closing churches would not be for the general good: "Even the sight of a church has a humanizing influence on the human mind."¹

At the same time, a more equitable distribution of the grant was thought to be not undesirable, though some candidates pointed out that certain churches of the Anglican faith had incumbents who did not reflect much credit on themselves or their church.

¹ H.A., May 23, 1861.
further imposition of retrenchment was the only way in which the
Administration would be enabled to reduce taxation and still
endow the churches with their annual £15,000 State Aid grant. The
fostering of infant industries might bring prosperity in the long
run, but this was a long term course which the majority of
candidates opposed.

The most popular method of raising revenue advocated was to
tax the wool growers. The proprietor of The Mercury, John Davies,
stood for election in 1861 and he spoke of the desirability of
making the wealthy bear a larger burden of taxation, "to the
extent of requiring an adequate rent for the public lands of which
under present arrangements they make a very profitable use at
a purely nominal charge." He also said that an absentee tax
could well be borne by those land holders drawing an income from
the resources of the Colony and spending nothing in it.\(^1\)

The Ministerial candidate from Morven, Innes, dismissed the
notion of a wool tax in favour of retrenchment\(^2\), and his colleague
Dobson likewise opposed taxation of wool on the grounds that it
would but result in an increase in the price of mutton. He
agreed that some measures against absentee land holders should
be adopted, but was inclined to think that a tax would drive them
away.\(^3\)

(vi)

The question of the introduction of railways was of some
moment in the North but little was heard of it in the South of

---

the Island where the coming of the railway was unlikely in the near future. In Launceston the matter could not become a hustings matter because of the fact that only three men were nominated for Launceston's three seats.

The successful candidates in Devon, Horven, Norfolk Plains, Ringwood, Selby, Cumberland and Glenorchy favoured the introduction of railways; only Westbury's T. W. Field went into the House openly opposed to railways being introduced, but a number of Southern Members had not committed themselves on the question. It was assumed by some Northern Colonists, mistakenly, that this silence was an expression of affirmation.

(vii)

Another issue was the means of land transference. There was in existence a Lands Title Reform Association which agitated for the adoption of the Torrens Act, or some such measure, to simplify the process by which land changed hands, and which would "give relief to the grossest oppression and vilest blackmail tax upon landed property that was ever planned against the public even by lawyers". ¹

A number of candidates took up the question and made the speedy adoption of the Torrens Act a plank in their election platforms. A Member of the Ministry, Archer, promised to amend the obtaining law when Parliament assembled.

Investigation of land titles in 1861 was a complicated and tedious business in which a great deal of time was wasted thumbing

¹. C.C., May 22, 1861.
over original documents. Torrens changed the system by providing, in a Bill that was initially passed in South Australia, what amounted to an index of all previous transactions, thus drastically reducing lawyers' fees which some people had hitherto found prohibitive.
Ministerial Policy.

Of the six men comprising the last Ministry before the dissolution of Parliament, five stood for re-election to the House of Assembly. These five were Henty, the Colonial Secretary; Innes, the Colonial Treasurer; Knight, the Attorney-General to February 4, 1861; Dobson, the Attorney-General from that date; and Archer, a member of the Ministry without a portfolio. Weston, the Premier, was a Member of the Legislative Council.

Smith had been Premier upon the last meeting of Parliament and he was succeeded by Weston during the recess before the dissolution of May 8. Archer had joined the Ministry during the period between the prorogation and dissolution, and Dobson had become Attorney-General when he was not yet a Member of the Legislature. The only two Ministers holding office who were in power when Parliament dispersed, were Innes and Henty.

Although no general Ministerial policy had been allowed to come before the country, the statements of these men, when put together, do give some idea of what policy they would adopt if they were re-elected and again became Members of the Ministry. The Colony was bound to examine with more than usual interest the attitudes of men who had been governing the Colony. The task of discerning some common ground on which these men campaigned is made difficult by reason of the fact that they tended to address their electorates wholly as individual private Members, and not
as members of a Ministry. More often than not they raised the simple issue of whether or not their constituencies had confidence in them personally.

The election manifesto of the Colonial Treasurer drew much attention to the political philosophy of F.M. Innes. In short, the candidate expressed his fears of "democracy" and the danger of it getting out of hand, the moral and economic objections to a wool tax, and the necessity of resisting any movement towards the inauguration of Protection, a chimerical solution to the Colony's problems, in the view of Innes.

In this "tantalising oracle" of "florid verbiage," these statements were negative and undeserving of the title "policy." Innes put forward only two schemes of a constructive nature—the necessity for retrenchment rather than taxation and his conviction that State aid must be ultimately abolished, both assertions which the majority of the Colony was making in any case. Both of them could be challenged, though, on the grounds of practicability.

A man in the position of Innes must undoubtedly have been aware that only unimportant reductions could now be made in the cost of the administration of the Colony; and as regarded the matter of State aid, he must also have known that the Imperial Government would never consent to outright abolition of the grant. Any saving to be made from the cessation of the ecclesiastical

endowment was bound to be only slight at first, if indeed the Colony could escape with anything less than the payment of a huge lump sum to the churches in lieu of the yearly endowment. Colonial politicians could, but did not, argue that cessation of State Aid might well add to the difficulties of the Colonial Treasurer instead of making his task any easier, unless the grant ceased absolutely and made no provision for payment of life interests.

Archer held similar opinions to those of Innes: he too opposed placing imposts on goods coming into the Colony in order to encourage native industry; in Archer's view, the prevailing tariff worked well. He declared also that State Aid must go, though not immediately. The candidate further echoed the fears of Innes when he spoke of the desirability of a Constitutional amendment creating one or more constituencies of professional men. Taking warning from the other Colonies, Tasmania prepared to arm herself against the contingency of a situation of instability allegedly brought about by too much democracy. In New South Wales there had been six ministries in four and a half years, in Victoria the same number in six years, and in South Australia, 15 ministries in 10 years.

Knight, the former attorney-General, differed from his fellow-ministers on the subject of property taxation, for he declared it to be a fair and legitimate charge. In addition, he

1. L.E., June 6, 1861.
went so far as to support the proposition that imported goods be taxed; and opposed the continuance of state aid. 1 Knight was defeated, the only member of the ministry to be overthrown, probably because of his decision to support Protection, and also because of the development of a religious issue in the constituency.

Dobson, standing for Hobart Town, declared himself to be one of those men who doubted the wisdom of Protection, for he feared that Colonial-manufactured goods would prove to be dearer than those at present imported. Respecting the question of a wool tax, the ex-solicitor-general foresaw that it would result in raising the price of meat. Such an occurrence, he thought, would not balance the benefit to the government of the income derived from a wool tax. Dobson also came out as opposed to universal suffrage. 2

The candidate was markedly evasive on the political questions of the day and showed a noticeable reluctance to propound any policy at all. He brought forward objections to the plans of the protectionists readily enough but, in common with many other candidates, and especially those of the country constituencies, he seemed quite content to allow the party of movement to exhaust itself in getting a handful of men elected in the capital, while the supporters of the ministry were assured of being part of a commanding parliamentary majority of squatters and merchants.

The addresses of the government spokesmen amounted to little but an admission that there was contemplated no revision

---

2. N.M., May 28, 1861.
of the Colony's fiscal system. None of the Ministerial candidates had anything to say on what was probably the most important matter of all—how to stimulate immigration. The Colony could hardly expect to prosper unless the population could be substantially increased. Would the Government pay immigrants and then wait for them to revivify the Colony? Or would it bend its energies to establishing industries and making bright the prospect of immigration to Tasmania, the land upon whom Nature had so bountifully showered down gifts? Nobody knew. No one seemed capable of thinking further than six months ahead.
The Elections

(a) Hobart Town. The unexpectedly large number of 14 men received votes in the election in the Capital. Of these 14, five stood as a Party, the Protection Party, composed of Horne, Barrett, Moriarty, Hill and Kilburn. Other candidates included Chapman, Davies and Dobson. The candidature of Davies was not greeted with joy by The Advertiser, as might have been expected: "The candidature of Mr Davies proposes a degradation to the community which will only be averted by his contemptuous rejection." 1 Another man who figured in the voting was Maxwell Miller, but he was proposed against his will and never made any attempt to campaign.

Davies got off to a flying start and advanced his election policy very early. He went on record as advocating lower taxes on essential goods and heavier charges on the wealthy colonists and wool growers. Federation was seen by the candidate to be desirable, if only to secure the admission into Victoria and New South Wales of Tasmanian manufactures. Federation, said Davies, would also be desirable from the point of view of the establishment of one High Court over all the Colonies. 2

Dobson, in his Press address, declared that finance would be the most important subject for the new Parliament, and advocated the imposition of heavier taxes on the wealthy, as well as a lessening of the load borne by the Colony in the matter

of maintaining Imperial paupers.

At this point, however, the battle as yet had not been fairly joined for "the only declared candidates — ignoring as a matter of course 'jeux d'esprit' and importunities — are Mr Davies and Mr Dobson", said Mr Davies' paper.

These "importunities" referred no doubt to the candidatures of S. Prout Hill and B.R. Patey, Protectionists both. The former, referring to the outgoing Cabinet as "mischievous" and "hybrid" strenuously dilated upon Protection as the sole policy that could save the Colony from being visited with final bankruptcy. Patey went further than Hill. In addition to pleading for the ending of State aid and thorough reform to secure Protection of Colonial manufactures, he declared that universal suffrage was a necessary prerequisite for Constitutional government. Patey's Press address was headed —

"To the Working Classes!!! You have been duped by a vacillating, hireling Press!", 2

information that did not endear him to the heart of The Mercury.

The Protectionists furthered their cause at a later meeting of the Protection Association, when the speakers sorrowfully concluded that the "Free Trade Northern Ministry" had played into the hands of squatters and London Commission Agents. One Yates "agreed with Stuart Hill that local manufactures and Protection to trade are sure to constitute a means of success to a new Colony

1. H.K., May 14, 1861.
like ours". The Association proposed an ad valorem duty on imported goods based on the dicta of Mill and McCulloch, and a resolution was moved condemning "the unrestricted importation of Foreign Manufactured Goods, which paralyses every branch of Colonial Industry". Another speaker named Lovell stated bitterly that revenue was supposed to be used for the protection of the life and property of the governed, but since the poor had no property, the present tariff extracted by the Government leviathan was unjust and unsound, for did it not take just as much from the rich as from the poor? Wintle, not a candidate for election himself, nonetheless cautioned the voters at all costs to keep merchants from ever setting foot in the Legislature, as it was in the interests of the people to prevent the development of the resources of the Colony.

The proprietor of The Advertiser, C.W. Hall, had evidently offended some of those at the meeting, for upon arising to speak he was shouted down with cries of "You're a robber!" and "Shun him as you would a scorpion!" William Cuffey, it is recorded, spent 20 minutes in an endeavour to remove Hall from the meeting. Cuffey was right at home at a meeting casting about for ways and means of getting rid of the ruling class and implementing protection and universal suffrage, for he was one of the London Chartists who had been transported to Van Diemen's Land after 1848

2. H.M., May 16, 1861.
and who had taken part in working class meetings before. He arrived in the Colony at the end of 1850 in the ship Adelaide, as a result of his prominence in the Chartists' attempts to obtain reform which included universal suffrage, equal electorates, vote by ballot, annual Parliaments, no property qualifications for Members and payment of representatives in the Legislature. Cuffey had especially distinguished himself in the agitation for the amendment of the Masters and Servants Act and was popular with the industrial class of Hobart Town as he invariably sided with the working men. He was a tailor by trade and was employed during his residence in the Colony by one of the principal shops in Hobart Town.1

Davies did not fail to utilise the columns of his paper for electioneering purposes and, amplifying his previous statements, the candidate blamed the present plight of the Colony and the prevalence of unemployment to the attractions offered by Victoria. In the Island Colony, he said, development must stem from the Government if industries were to be introduced, rather than from private enterprise. These remarks, said "The Advertiser, had been preceded by Davies with "a very lengthy reference to the independence of himself, in purse and person." And, according to the same source of information, Henry Lipscombe Jr rose to his feet during the meeting and expressed "his disgust and contempt at the impudence and audacity of Mr Davies coming forward to obtrude himself upon a Constituency of honest men".2

1. H.M., Aug. 11, 1850.
Another Protectionist standing for election in the city was Barrett. At his first election rally, the speaker suffered the misfortune of having a "herring" thrown at him from the upper end of the hall before he had said more than a few words. Emerging triumphant from the confusion caused by the missile's appearance, Barrett directed the attention of his audience to the necessity for encouraging municipal institutions and the injustice of anyone being called upon to pay, through taxes, for some one else's religion. The candidate favoured protection, and further indicated that he would not stand in the way of an increase in the membership of the Lower House. Barrett was unsuccessful in the election. As the "herring" showed, he had been responsible for something which had offended the voters. Barrett's rejection, according to The Mercury, could have been due to the unpopularity he had earned by his administration of the law as a magistrate. The paper added that he had been nominated and was being supported by a religious voluntary temperance party.

Hill continued on his successful merry way, condemning the Administration in season and out, and telling his listeners that the Colony was governed by a clique. At one of his election assemblies, the speaker introduced the subject of Horne's resignation from the position of President of the Legislative Council. This had been engineered for the sole purpose of

---

compelling the Judge to resign from the Bench, thus making room for Francis Smith, he charged. The affair of Horne's
ineligibility to sit in the House brought much criticism of the Government, one section of the Press denouncing it as being
guilty of sharp practice. The Advertiser rushed to the side of
Horne, especially now that he was standing for election against
representatives of the Administration which had devised ways
and means of getting rid of him. Horne topped the poll in
Hobart Town almost certainly because of three things - his
reputation as a legal man and as Puisne Judge, his position at
head of the Protection Ticket and the sympathy votes given by
electors under the impression that he had been victimised. There
is no record of Horne having propounded an election policy. It is
not impossible that the others who stood with him as Protectionists
perceived that they could hardly do themselves any harm by
linking their names with his, and accordingly jumped on the
bandwagon of Horne's popularity. Horne apparently offered no
objection to being listed as a Protectionist, but it is
at
significant that, the declaration of the poll he could speak of
"unasked votes".

Moriarty was one of the two Protectionists (Barrett being the
other) on the ticket who did not succeed in becoming a member of
the House. He was a lawyer and called upon the Government to
bring immigration to a stop, since the subsidised newcomers were

1. N.A., May 23, 1861.
not staying in the Colony but going on to the other Colonies, and use the money to aid manufactures and undertake public works. Other steps which would need to be taken if Tasmania was to become the England and Sicily of the South, said the candidate, included compulsory education by the State, retrenchment, gradual abolition of State Aid, Colonial Federation, the adoption of the U.S. and Canadian methods of land alienation, an amended tariff incorporating taxation on articles of imported manufacture, the extension of Parliamentary representation to break up cliques, and State-assisted development of resources and manufactures, including creation of a Department of Lands, Works and Manufactures.1

This programme was the most constructive and restrained one placed before any Tasmanian electorate during the election, but the constituency of Hobart Town was not prepared to accept the candidate although, as he had pointed out, few could be depended upon to fight the battle of Protection on the floor of the House.

Another candidate who declared it his intention to support Protection was Adams, though he was not on the Protection Ticket. The candidate sneered at Innes' "Little Reform Bill" i.e. the measures Innes had said he contemplated taking to prevent demagogues gaining control of the Popular House, and stated that he would not consent to abolition of State Aid if it resulted in the churches having to close their doors. On the subject of a wool tax, Adams said he would not lend his support to such a measure, but would agree to a personal tax being placed upon the wool kings themselves.2

1. H.M., May 21, 1861.
2. H.M., May 24, 1861.
Kilburn was another Protectionist who succeeded in his candidature. In addition to opposing continuance of the present tariff, Kilburn was firm in his conviction that the wool growers should be taxed in some way, either on the basis of the value of their annual clip, or on the value of their holdings. The candidate expressed what was evidently the fear of many candidates— that without State Aid, churches might close, especially in the country districts where there were few people to maintain them. Kilburn was also in favour of an increase in the number of Members of Parliament, but would not agree to the idea of them being paid.  

Dobson, at his election meeting, commenced by informing his audience that he could have easily gained election for some country constituency, but had favoured Hobart Town with his candidacy because he had been born and reared in the Capital. The speaker took up a position similar to that of other members of the outgoing Ministry, accusing the Imperial Government of refusing to take her fair share of the cost of supporting the "paupers" and stating it as his belief that it was the duty of a Government to interfere in no way with the commerce of a country further than for the purpose of raising a revenue. Other points mentioned by Dobson included his aversion to universal suffrage and the abolition of State Aid. This last would prove prejudicial to the interests of the industrial class, he argued.

1. H.M., May 27, 1861.
because it would result in the closing of churches, in which case the workers would forget it was the Sabbath. Dobson concluded his speech by admitting that he did not much care what articles were taxed, so long as a revenue was raised. 1

In common with the rest of the Ministry, Dobson had failed to present what might be called a Government policy. Only those who favoured Protection had a constructive programme. Most politicians remained content to drift in their Colonial backwater from expediency to expediency.

The Hobart Town election itself was now immediately preceded by a few boisterous meetings of Protectionists, but by this time the candidates had put their views before the electorate.

The surprise of polling day was the rejection of Chapman, 19 votes behind Kilburn. His defeat and the election of Hill and Kilburn is indicative of the support Protection received in the Capital, and the discredit into which Free Trade had fallen. There can be little doubt that the enfranchised workers of Hobart Town were convinced that Protection could and would give them the employment they were finding it difficult to obtain. Dobson, certainly, polled well, and he was no champion of Protection. But he was native born and any candidate who had been born in the Colony was always looked on favourably by the growing body of Native Youth. Dobson, as well, could count on the support of the conservative elector who thought that any alternative to the policy of the present Government was certain to be revolutionary.

The election of Horne with the greatest number of votes cannot be attributed to an energetic campaign, as he said nothing during the election from the word "go". He owed his election to a fortunate combination of circumstances - he was seen in the eyes of the electorate as a victim of persecution of the most malicious character, and was consequently elevated to a position where he epitomised all opposition to the Administration. In any other electorate except Hobart Town he might not have been so successful, but in the Capital where low wages and extensive unemployment gave numerical weight to the Government opposition, the late Puissance Judge of the Supreme Court was assured of election. The impression certainly prevailed that the Government had taken advantage of the Legislative Council disorganisation on the occasion of the wholesale resignations affair to rush through the measure disqualifying Horne, as a Judge, from retaining his seat in the Council, where he had been President until 1859.

The election of John Davies was made almost certain by the extensive and sympathetic accounts of his election programme and meetings printed in The Mercury, although that paper claimed that his "triumphant election is one of the most demonstrative manifestations of public sentiment that have been witnessed in this Colony".1 Certainly Davies scored a very large number of "plumpers" i.e. single votes recorded when the voter had the right to vote for more than one candidate. The proprietor of The Mercury had recorded for him 229 "plumpers", compared with 13

1. H.M., June 1, 1861.
for Chapman and only sight for Horne, the most popular candidate.\(^1\) The candidate's policy was carefully couched in liberal terms but, in fact, committed him to little; though in that he was not an exception to the rule. The candidate was only lukewarm about Protection, but he no doubt secured votes from the working class by his stated declaration to impose taxes on absentee landlords and reduce the imports on essential goods and replace it by a tax on U.S.-manufactured imports. Yet after the election The Mercur\(y\) could turn around and say that every Member was charged with the prima facie obligation of supporting the Executive!\(^2\)

More than anything else, the election demonstrates the character of Hobart Town. It was a city still heavily impregnated with ex-convicts workers who voted, it would appear, for Protectionists in the hope of a reduction in the cost of essential goods and the inauguration of a policy of starting and subsidising work-providing home industries.\(^3\) But Hobart Town elected two, perhaps three, Protectionists, if Horne is included, and their votes could accomplish little in a House which returned more than half its Members from country constituencies, some of them little more than rotten boroughs, as Dobson himself admitted.\(^*\)

There were 3689 electors on the Hobart Town Rolls for the election and 1575 papers were ballotted.\(^4\) More than half the voters, therefore, did not exercise the franchise; only a little over 40\% of the electors made their way to the polling booths.

---

1. H.H., June 1, 1861.
2. H.H., June 14, 1861.
* See page 121.
4. H.H., Nov. 9, 1866.
(b) Launceston. Only three men were nominated for Launceston's three seats and so there was no contest in the Northern city. Those men nominated and elected were J. Crookes, H. Dowling and R.D. Miller. Dowling was the Mayor of Launceston, and Miller was a lawyer who had been born in London in 1825. He was admitted to the Middle Temple in 1848 and arrived in Tasmania seven years later. He and Maxwell Miller were brothers. Crookes had been a Member for Launceston previously.

The Press gave no reasons for the lack of competition for Launceston's seats in the House of Assembly, and seemed to take the occurrence as a matter of course. It might have been expected that some men would have been nominated as representatives of the working class, as in Hobart Town; but to expect this is to misjudge the character of Launceston. It did not have the numbers of ex-convicts that Hobart Town had and, because of its position nearer to Melbourne, the northern city received more benefit from what trade there was between Victoria and Tasmania. In addition to this, Launceston was situated near the expanding Northern and North Western area, whereas Hobart Town, since the decline of whaling, had lost the thriving appearance of a merchant town. Wegrity was at a low standard because of the presence of incompetent ex-convicts. The dead hand of the past still pressed heavily on Hobart Town.

The Import-Export figures of the two centres demonstrate their relative prosperity. In 1859, for example, Hobart Town imported
£662,000 worth of goods, but exported only £554,000 worth. Launceston, in the same year, imported £501,000 and exported £639,000 worth of goods. The difference remained the same in 1862. In that year imports through Launceston totalled £309,000 and exports £455,000; in Hobart Town, imports were worth £540,000 and exports £460,000.¹

Another illustration of the prosperity of the North is implicit in the increasing population of the electorates. Since 1857, the population of Launceston had increased from 7874 to 10,359, and that of Devon from 3137 to 5416. In the same period the number of people in Hobart Town had increased by only 1190 - from 16,259 to 19,449 - and decreases had occurred in the populations of Glanorochy, Queenborough, Clarence, Sorell, Glamorgan, Morven and Salby. The latter two electorates were grouped as Northern ones, but were in the Midlands area. Increases had taken place in the population of the Northern electorates of Fingal, Norfolk Plains, Westbury, Deloraine. Even more indicative of the retrogression of the South is the loss of male adults: while the Northern electorates, except four, increased in voting power, every Southern constituency lost voters.²

These figures demonstrate that the North was recovering from the set-back that occurred when mass migration to the gold fields took place. In the South, however, the land had been taken up by the squatters for many years and there was not

¹ Statistics of Tasmania, 1857-62.
² See Appendix C.
the area suitable for further selection that could be found in the
North and North West. Thus it was that the discontented working
class population of Hobart Town found an outlet and expression
for their desire for work in electing men who would, so they said,
encourage local manufactures and consequently provide work.
In the North, there were not the numbers of convict-descended
unemployed population to set up such cries as "Tax the wool kings!"
Moreover, what unemployed men there were could, if they cared to,
move into the new areas westward from Launceston.

This difference between the prosperity of the two cities
had already been seized upon and used for political purposes in
the South, some of the candidates speaking with bitterness of the
Northern cry of Free Trade. This was all very well for the North,
said candidates, but Hobart Town was not so prosperous and
needed the implementation of Protection to restore prosperity.
North-South animosity springing from the greater spirit of
speculation and initiative in Launceston was to develop
regarding the railway question in the succeeding years. For the
present, Launceston electors were not to nominate men with radical
notions to the House of Assembly, candidates whom The Examiner
saw as "mad and ignorant men who would abridge freedom".

1. Quoted in H.A., June 6, 1861.
Queenborough. This electorate had 107 voters but on polling day, six men contested its one seat. The Mercury mentions the number of candidates as seven, but Barrett, one of the rejected Hobart Town aspirants for the Assembly, polled no votes at all and apparently was named on the ballot paper by mistake after he had made it clear that he was not seeking election. Until the Hobart Town election, Queenborough had only three candidates - Walker, Backhouse and Lees - but when the result of the contest in the Capital was announced, Chapman, Adams and Moriarty hastily tried the second string on their bows and secured nominations for the down-river constituency.

Early in the election month, two other men, Tarleton and Moir, nominated for Queenborough but Tarleton withdrew, as by standing for election he found that he would be compelled by law to relinquish his post under the Crown. He was a Police Magistrate in Hobart Town. The fate of the other was Moir, a Protectionist, is unknown. He evidently withdrew also as he does not figure in the final list of candidates.

Thus, until the rush for nominations when the Hobart Town election result became known, the contest lay between Lees, Backhouse and Walker. The first-named informed the electorate that he had a large stake in the district, and consequently the electors could not go wrong in voting for him. He did not subscribe to cut-and-out Protection, he stated, but rather was in favour of a sliding scale of duties.¹

¹ H.M., May 28, 1861.
The other man, Backhouse, was a Protectionist Radical, declaring that he was standing as a representative of the working class. He roundly condemned the immigration system and put his faith in a wool tax, the establishment of agricultural societies and the promotion of irrigation. 1

Robert Walker, the third candidate, was a well-known businessman and a miller and brewer. He joined forces with those candidates who thought that further retrenchment would prove beneficial to the Colony; and also was in favour of the adoption of a more lucrative method of Crown land sales. The candidate did not see eye to eye with those men who wanted the early ushering in of a policy of Protection, but he was anxious to see native industry fostered in some way. This he hoped to achieve by taxing imports that could be produced within the Colony. 2

Adams had lain eighth on the Robert Town poll and he lost no time in offering his services to the electors of Queenborough; he came out against the continuance of State aid and the introduction of the Torrens' Act but would not oppose modified Protection. As well, Adams indicated that he would support retrenchment, Colonial distillation, a wool and absentee tax and an increase in the number of members of Parliament. 3

 Moriarty, too, did not allow the grass to grow under his feet in transferring himself to Queenborough. He still stood firm on his Protection and anti-State Aid platform. 4 It was unfortunate

---

for the cause of protection that Moriarty and Backhouse stood in opposition to one another. Only one could be elected in any case, and the similarity of their views made it impossible for either to be victorious. If only one of the two had stood, he would have had his work cut out to win, so strong was the opposition, particularly now that Chapman had been nominated, and so different was the character of the electorate.

Chapman did not issue another election manifesto upon his nominating for Queenborough and remained quietly confident. His assured expectation was justified and thus he was able to gain a seat at the eleventh hour, polling 34 votes to Walker's 29.

The popularity of Protection in the city could not be matched in Queenborough, an area not saturated with the working class. And as pointed out above, the representatives of that group spoilt their chances by opposing one another. It would have been surprising if a politician of Chapman's calibre and experience had been rejected, and the relatively runaway victory of Protection in the city would have certainly jolted the conservative and easily frightened element in the constituency into voting for a man who could be depended upon to oppose such dangerously advanced notions as Protection and adult suffrage/run on until they assumed real legislative importance.
(d). **Ringwood.** The contest in the wool-growing constituency of Ringwood was between R.Q. Kermode, a figure known throughout the Colony, and F.J. Houghton, the sitting Member. Kermode, as a representative of Campbell Town, had been one of the 16 elected Members of the 1851 Council. One of the most important sheep breeders in the Colony, Kermode was one of the famous "Patriotic Six". His name came closely to be identified with the movement for the cessation of Transportation and the establishment of free institutions. In the view of The Examiner, he was a man of "large property, thorough independence, great intelligence and considerable experience". ¹ The Advertiser's opinion of Kermode was not so flattering: "The violence of his opinions and great excitability prevent him from forming sound opinions on any great public question". ² Nor was The Cornwall Chronicle impressed: "He has no interests with small farmers; as a sheep farmer it is his duty to do away with every small agriculturist", the paper observed. ³

In his first outline of policy presented to the electorate, Kermode was not precise in dealing with the political questions of the day. He expansively stated that he would not tolerate any further taxation; what was needed was a lessening of it. State Aid the candidate opposed, but since there was a division of public opinion on the matter, he left it an open question. ⁴

A few days later Houghton called his first election meeting and put his head in the lion's mouth - his first words to the

---

1. L.E., June 6, 1861.
3. C.C., June 8, 1861.
4. L.E., June 4, 1861.
assembled squatterocracy being: "I come forward to oppose the 'Wool Kings'; I go in for a tax on wool". The speaker went on to indicate that those advocating the local distillation of liquor would receive his support, that he wanted State Aid abolished without delay, and that retrenchment should be carried out in Government offices, beginning at the top.

The candidate was subsequently subjected to close cross-examination by Theodore Bartley, concerning his record in the House, after which no one would propose Houghton as a candidate. Bartley then moved, after a decent interval, that Houghton was "not a fit and proper person to represent Ringwood". This motion was carried after a long speech by its proposer. Kermode was then proposed by William Gibson and seconded by William Dodery, the successful candidate for "Norfolk Plains."

Houghton was not to be beaten however, and held another meeting at Cresby. Here, to some extent, he restored the electorate's faith in his integrity by clearing himself of some of the charges laid by Bartley. The candidate still clung to his conviction that a wool tax was desirable, and could see no sense in Kermode's statement that "his investigation of the science of political economy had led him to the firm conclusion that it was a destructive policy to tax any of the natural products of a country." Houghton proceeded to denounce the Government's

1. L.E., June 6, 1861.
extravagance, and concluded by stating that he had once
offended the Launceston Municipal Council and the "Brisbane
Street Mob", of which Mr Bartley was the local representative.
This, he stated, was the reason for the opposition he was
encountering. ¹

Kernode, as might have been expected, won the seat without
much difficulty by the handsome margin of 92 votes to 42. The
squatters could be certain that in him they had a representative
after their own hearts, one who would not offer for consideration
such pernicious doctrines as a wool tax. Why Houghton chose to
speak out as he did in an electorate which he knew was dominated
by land-holders, is difficult to understand. He would have found
it difficult enough to gain election over Kernode as it was.

¹ L. S., June 11, 1861.
(e). Kingborough. The election at Kingborough between J. Perkins and T.J. Knight, the former Minister, could not have been any closer, as the first-named candidate won the contest by one vote, 106-105.

The election was not conducted on the highest level, Knight breaking into print with a denial of having stated in Parliament in 1857 that he would support every religion but the Roman Catholic. This, Knight declared, was a rumour put about the country by the Rev. Mr Murphy. But "A Catholic Layman", replying at once to Knight's denial, quoted chapter and verse from the Colonial Press to prove that Knight had indeed said he could not accede to extending State Aid to Roman Catholics.

At his chief election meeting meeting, Knight assured his audience that he would be no factious member, but would pursue a high-principled, independent course, the welfare of the Colony his sole consideration. Respecting the tariff matter, the candidate said that the duty on tea and sugar should be reduced, that on liquor increased and certain other imported goods taxed. A property tax, in his opinion, was a fair and legitimate one.

Nothing is said in the Press of the career or station in life of Perkins, but he was also caught up in the religious issue in Kingborough, and strenuously denied Knight's charges that he was a nominee of the Rev. Mr Murphy. Concerning State Aid,

1. H.M., May 20, 1861.
2. H.M., May 21, 1861.
Perkins told his election meeting that the sooner the endowment was abolished the better it would be for the Colony. The subject of education too was dealt with by the candidate. He was one of the few who even recognised its presence in the Colony, and was of the opinion that it should be compulsory and its costs paid by money raised locally. Perkins did not dwell on the subject of protection but he stated that it should not be discounted.¹

Nothing further is mentioned about this election in the Press, except for the bare announcement that Perkins had been successful. The contest was certainly one that was decided by local issues, the predominant one being evidently the subject of Knight's alleged religious intolerance. The accusation of bigotry was probably enough to result in the Roman Catholic element voting down Knight.

¹. H/t A., May 25, 1861.
The contest in the large Devon electorate, one of the Northern constituencies in which population was increasing with some speed, was a lively one between Archer, the Minister, and Capt. E. Dumasresq. Dumasresq had been appointed Surveyor-General of Van Diemen's Land in 1826, and had then occupied the positions of Collector of Internal Revenue, First Member of the Land Board, and Police Magistrate. He had retired in 1835 to Mt Ireh, near Longford, after nine years as a servant of the Crown.

Archer was a politician of long standing for he had been a representative in the old Legislative Council. Since that time he had represented the constituency in the House of Assembly, upon the resignation of the original Member, J. A. Gibson, and had been elevated to Cabinet rank.

In his election address, Archer did not omit to mention that his family had been in the Colony for 50 years and that he had himself been born in Van Diemen's Land, thus being able to proudly call himself a "Native". The candidate stressed the need for a Telegraph line across Bass Strait from Melbourne to George Town, with branch lines to points on the North West coast. In addition, Archer expressed his opposition to premature release of Norfolk Island prisoners, and favoured what he called the "learned professions" sending special Members to the Legislature. As a member of the Ministry, Archer did not surprise anyone when he spoke out against protection, bolstering his case with quotations from McCulloch, the classical economist. At a later
meeting in this electorate of small land holders, the candidate
warned that protection would tell against the farmer directly.\footnote{1}

At introdo, Archer repeated his warnings and after an
appraisal of the financial situa\footnote{tion in which the Colony found
itself, said that State Aid should be abolished but not
immediately. Dumaresq was supposed to be at this meeting, but he
and Judge had become "stuck in the mud somewhere near Doloroine".\footnote{2}

The only hint of where Dumaresq stood on the questions of
the election, comes from a Circular Head meeting, on behalf of
the candidate, addressed by Thomas Clarkson. He declared that
all Archer had ever done was to persecute Horne and side with
Chapman. Dumaresq, said Clarkson, pursuing the matter, was a
man who would see the Colony prosper, not by the imposition of
further taxes, but b. reduction of those charges and the
maintenance of State Aid to religion. Part of the description
of the remainder of the meeting is as follows :-

"The chairman rose and made a frantic effort to be heard,
but was again attacked with spasms in the knees to such an extent
that he fell back into his seat. Mr Clarkson accidentally brought
his eye into contact with a very decayed specimen of an onion,
several of which appeared to be distributing themselves in an
unaccountable manner about the room from all quarters. The chairman
then sang in a high key and to an original melody

"O my name is Sister Tom Carr
I was born here at Circular Head.

\footnote{1}{L.C.C., May 18 and 29, 1861.}\footnote{2}{L.B. , June 1, 1861.}
Mr William Borrodale rose and laid claim to the Chair, asserting that the present occupant was 'screw'd'. After much uproar the Chairman's voice surmounted the din, calling for a nobbler, which was quickly supplied to him by the burlesque hostess.¹

Archer won the election with ease, 127 votes to 50. The ex-member was far more widely known than his opponent, but as always, small electorates made electioneering easy in many ways, as men won on account of their personality and by virtue of the number of friends they had, rather than on what policy they presented to the electorate. Providing that he did not advocate some extraordinary new scheme of government, and had not offended some powerful group in the electorate, the candidates' hope for election lay in how well he was known among the hundred or so electors.

Country elections were similar in that very few candidates, if any at all, were fired with the enthusiasm and fervour for a cause that characterised some of the city candidates. In this particular election, it was the Protectionist candidates who brought forward what they believed to be the panacea for the Colony's ills.

A number of other country constituencies were contested, but enough has been written to form the basis for a summation up of this, Tasmania's second election for the House of Assembly.

¹ L.E., June 18, 1861.
Conclusion

When the last of the elections was over, it was found that about half of the House of Assembly would be composed of new men. But with the exception of the three candidates who were on the Protection Ticket in Hobart Town and won a place in the House, the new Members had given no sign that they would differ in any way in their policies from the men who had before them occupied the benches in the Lower House.

One man, however, would be missed. This was Francis Smith, whose elevation to the Judicial post of Chief Justice had placed him beyond the reach of the people's suffrage. He was a clever man who had brought a rare ability to bear on the conduct of Parliamentary business.

The question of who was to lead the new Government, and who was to form a Ministry, now presented itself. It appeared likely that to either Innes or Chapman would be entrusted the formation of a Ministry, since these two men were, because of their experience and competence, in the eyes of many Colonists the representatives most fitted for this task. It appeared likely that the late Administration would receive the support of the majority of Members of the Legislature, if not in the persons of the last Cabinet, then in those who did not much differ in political thought and action.

The previous Speaker of the House, Captain Fenton, having been defeated in New Norfolk by Sharland, a new occupant of the
Chair would need to be chosen - in all probability the choice would fall on either Dr Officer or Gregson, two of the oldest and most experienced men. Officer was finally the choice of the House.

The chief task confronting the newly assembled Parliament was that of the adjustment of the public income and expenditure - no easy contract. But since the members of the Ministry had not suffered what might be called a defeat, it was most unlikely that it was their intention to propose any fiscal alterations. Of course, any radical change was not to be thought of while the dead weight of squatters and their delegates held a position of dominance in the House and Legislative Council. The Protectionists in the assembly might rail against the iniquities of the old tariff and the unfair method of taxation until they were blue in the face, but they would not make any impression on the solid block of merchants and squatters.

Reform in Parliamentary representation was also in the air, but precisely what form it would take if put before the House, no one knew. From what ministerial spokesmen had said, however, it appeared likely that some way of getting representatives from the "intelligent class" into Parliament would be arrived at. Either this or a reduction in the franchise was what Innes aimed at apparently. There had also been talk of electorates along the lines of the British University seats; as well, it was surmised that Hobart Town and Launceston might be divided into several electorates, rather than remain one at present. The possibility of extended representation and triennial Parliaments was now remote.
Other business likely to come before Parliament might include a Bill to make the Legislative Council dissoluble by the Governor. Since the shameful and by now notorious business of mass resignations, people had come to realise that the Upper Chamber could conceivably become a menace to the proper course of Constitutional Government.

Two other items figuring in the elections just ended, included amendment of the Land Transfer Regulations, and grievances against the Imperial Government on the matter of the maintenance of Imperial Paupers. The first matter could be rectified without much trouble, but the subject of paupers was one that would need to be dealt with cautiously.

The greatest election cry had been for Protection, but the noise had been caused by a few men only. Although there was no chance of Protection being introduced, few Members would disagree with the award of some encouragement in the way of a bounty to the establishment of Colonial manufactures.

But it needed no genius to see that the finances of the Colony could not be managed as of yore and still enable her to carry on without raising more loans. More Government income needed to come from somewhere, and quickly. It was clear also that further retrenchment would react unfavourably on the efficiency of administration. The raising of loans was not a wise move unless the Colony could see its way clear to pay them off in the near future before the interest mounted up.
Tasmania had no immediate prospects of prosperity. Her economy was not expanding. This left only the possibility of taxation, and it was most unlikely that the property owners in Parliament would consent to tax themselves. On this question they would stand as a bloc, although on many other votes in the House, the representatives split into different groups. and Protection, as a possible economic policy, could not be counted on to pay off for some years even if its operation went forward smoothly. This left only one means of raising Revenue open to the Government — more imposts on goods coming into the Colony, although the Press had stated before the election got under way that the country was already over-taxed and could not bear further burdens. Certainly the abolition of State Aid would have given the Colony a breathing space to look out for some other means of balancing the Budget, but everyone knew that the Imperial Parliament would be loath to end the stipends of the Colonial clergy without their future being amply safe-guarded.

All in all then, the election had been favourable to the Ministry, and Chapman's notions of Free Trade; "we may make pretty certain that Northern influences will the rule the Cabinet". In other words, the Protection policy held in favour by the South would not be implemented.

1. H.A., June 18, 1861.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>Dr R. Butler (58) d. Fleming (26), L. Goodwin (16).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence</td>
<td>Edward Abbott.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>F. Syme (74), J. Sibley (72), T.K. Collibrand (32).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>J.T. Balfour (75) d. Graves (73).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glamorgan</td>
<td>J. Herdith.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glamorgancy</td>
<td>Mr Officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingborough</td>
<td>J. Perkins (106) d. T.J. Frith (105).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Norfolk</td>
<td>W.S. Sharland (114) d. P. Fenton (63).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oatlands</td>
<td>J. Maclachlan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenborough</td>
<td>T.D. Chapman (34) d. E. Walker (29), H.P. Adams (15), R. Buckhouse (11), S. Moriarty (3), F.R. Lees (1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>T.O. Gregory (76) d. D. Dickson (56).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorell</td>
<td>W. Hodgson (33) d. A. Potter (24), W.R. Allison (17).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell Town</td>
<td>W.P. Allison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deloraine</td>
<td>J.P. Cooke (96) d. J. Field (63).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>W. Archer (127) d. J. Dunsaresq (50).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fingal</td>
<td>J. Grant Jr (49) d. E.W. Steinlitz (40).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Town</td>
<td>C.B. Henty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launceston</td>
<td>J.C. Crookes, R.B. Miller, H. Dowling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morven</td>
<td>F.H. Innes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electorate</td>
<td>Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Plains</td>
<td>C. Doddy (152) d. J. Matthews (21).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringwood</td>
<td>B. C. Kermode (92) d. F. J. Houghton (40).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selby</td>
<td>I. Sherwin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbury</td>
<td>T. W. Field (111) d. G. Gibson (72).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations of Candidates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbott</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archer</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhouse</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balfy</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>Business man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>Surgeon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crookes</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>Newspaper proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickson</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobson</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodyer</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dowling</td>
<td>Mayor of Launceston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunsarosq</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenton</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field J.</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field W.</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallibrand</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>&quot;W. L. Co. Agent&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glover</td>
<td>Auctioneer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guandon</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griggson</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodgson</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henty</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton</td>
<td>Auctioneer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilburn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kermode</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lees</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macleanschan</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith J.</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moriarty</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller G.</td>
<td>Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller K.B.</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>Surgeon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coke</td>
<td>Landed proprietary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symmett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharland</td>
<td>Landed proprietary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steiglitz</td>
<td>Landed proprietary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwin</td>
<td>Independent Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FIVE

The 15 months between the 1861 election and that of 1862, at the end of the year, saw the financial condition of the Colony show little improvement, despite the imposition of ad valorem duties i.e. duties charged in proportion to the value of articles imported. The events precipitating their imposition, together with the long-standing question of State aid, law regarding the transfer of land, attempted alteration of the Constitution in respect to Parliamentary representation, the cost of maintaining the old and insane convicts, and the position of the Upper House in the Constitution, form the principal issues of the period. Since the Ministry held power for only a short period, the course of Chapman's Administration will be dealt with in terms of outstanding political issues rather than in a chronological fashion.

The Ministry consisted of the following men:-

T. R. Chapman  - premier without office to November 1, 1862, then Premier and Colonial Treasurer to January, 1863.

C. H. Morty  - Colonial Secretary to November 1, 1862.

F. M. Tunes  - Colonial Treasurer to November 1, 1862, then Colonial Secretary to January 23, 1863.

T. E. Robson  - Attorney General.

Robert Officer, the member for Glenorchy, was elected Speaker over Gregson and Her Majesty, the other two men nominated.
Ministerial policy, according to the Governor's Speech opening Parliament, was to include the adoption of measures for ascertaining and utilizing the material resources of the Colony, survey of the proposed Western Railway route from Launceston to Deloraine, an examination of the problem of Imperial paupers and the apparently premature release of criminals, the adoption of the Torrens' Act to facilitate land transfer, amendment of the Constitution as suggested by Innes during the election, and a settlement of the State aid question. Governor Fox Young mentioned nothing about the inauguration of a new economic policy.

Parliament met against a dark background. There was a difference between the estimated revenue and actual revenue from Customs of approximately £132,000, compared with £15,000 in 1860, reported The Examiner, which explained the decline in trade as a "natural reaction of the excitement and exaggeration of the worth of fixed property occasioned by a large amount of the precious metals brought here by successful miners".

Locally grown wheat and oats and Tasmanian flour were competing in Melbourne with the product of South Australia and California, wheat having fallen in price from 7/- to 5/- a bushel. "For the stagnation and well grounded apprehension respecting the future that generally prevails, we are largely indebted to the extravagant conduct and lavish expenditure sanctioned by the Government."

Total debentures outstanding on September 30, 1861, amounted to
£399,000, and £100,000 was likely to be voted over and above the former amount for the "abolition" of the church endowment. 1

At the end of the current year there was likely to be a £70,000 deficit, reported The Mercury. Its proprietor recommended the imposition of stamp duties to bid the Colony over; Horns, another Member, favoured the imposition of an ad valorem protective duty of from 15-30%, Allison, the Campbell Town representative, proposed a uniform ad valorem duty on imports 2, and the Protectionists demanded the inauguration of a vigorous policy of encouragement to local industry. Finally, Chapman decided to take the plunge and impose the ad valorem duties, but he succeeded only in accomplishing his own resignation, as Members simply refused to believe that there was not some alternative to direct taxation as a means of raising a revenue. There was, as matters stood, no alternative, but this was a bitter pill that too few were prepared to swallow.

Chapman had to endure much criticism from the Gregson-led opposition groups. It was charged that at a former period Chapman had held office as Colonial Treasurer, and immediately after retiring from the Ministry, had tendered for Colonial debentures, which were on the point of being issued, at a figure considerably below par. On this allegation was based the charge that he had taken advantage of his position and knowledge to depreciate public securities. However, Gregson's motion to appoint a Committee to investigate the charges was defeated.
The second charge against the Premier arose from a statement by Watt, the Collector of Customs at Launceston. He said that when Chapman was Colonial Treasurer and when it was contemplated to raise the duty on brandy from 12 - to 15 - , he had 70 hogsheads ready to be taken out of bond, all ready assessed, and that his Clerk was stationed on the wharf in a conspicuous place. Watt stated that Chapman was then to make a signal from the House of assembly, when the entries were to be passed and the duty paid, the cheque being already drawn and in possession of the Clerk.

Watt subsequently apologized for his charges and said that Chapman's transactions with the Customs had never been such as to impugn his character.

Parliament had been in session for two months when Chapman introduced a Bill to abolish State Aid once and for all. The provisions of the contemplated legislation ensured that present incumbents were to receive their salaries as long as they lived. As well, $50,000 raised through the issue of debentures was to be distributed among the four participating religions viz. the Churches of England, Scotland, and Rome, and the Wesleyans. The previous Bill to abolish the grant, brought down in 1859 and vetoed by the Home Government, had retired Colonial chaplains on pensions and provided for the apportionment of $100,000 among the churches receiving the ecclesiastical endowment.¹

The Weekly Advertiser stated, in an Editorial on Chapman's measure, that under the present system of distributing State Aid, the Church of England received money amounting to 4/- per head of
its membership, and the Church of Scotland 9/7. But the Church of Rome received only 1/11. This latter injustice would be further aggravated by Chapman's Bill, the paper continued, using the arguments of the Roman Catholic Bishop himself.¹

The Mercury spoke of a division of opinion concerning the Bill. Opposition was likely to spring from a distrust of the voluntary principle, and also because the endowment would amount to "a national profession of atheism".² By the end of the year, it had been decided to postpone for six months a Parliamentary decision on Chapman's Bill. There the matter rested for 10 months.

At the end of that time the Attorney-General, Dobson, introduced another Bill of a similar character. Now the original sum of £15,000 was to be distributed on the basis of the 1861 census. The Church of England was to receive £3,762, compared with the £9,360 it had been granted before, the Church of Scotland £1,592 (£3,070); the Church of Rome £3,465 (£1,610); the Free Church of Scotland £423 (it had received no grant previously); the wesleyans (£1,098) (£600); and Jews £61 (£150).³

The Bill as thus framed passed both Houses of Parliament. The Colony was still saddled with a £15,000 annual expenditure on the maintenance of religion. The Bill received the Governor's

¹. S.M., Sept. 7, 1861.
². E.D., Sept. 21, 1861.
³. L.E., Sept. 23, 1861.
Assent at the same time Parliament was hurried to dissolution by the defeat of the Chapman administration on the tariff issue.

The cost of supporting the Imperial Beuors was a constantly recurring problem, but few Colonists saw any chance of obtaining better settlement of the problem than had been extracted from England on the subject of State Aid.

The examiner, a month after Parliament had first got down to business, reported that a Committee had been set up to go into the matter, following the "painful impression" of the receipt from England of despatches concerning the fate of the Beuors. The expense to the Colony of maintaining drags of the convict system was a "cruel injustice" to a small and not wealthy community", complained "The Mercury. 1

The secretary of state for Colonies, the Duke of Newcastle, was the officer of the Responsible Government to whom Tasmania addressed her grievances about the Beuors, and he said his opinion clear to the new Parliament: "It does not seem unjust that Tasmania, which reaped the material advantages of the presence of convicts, should bear, like every other community, the mixed condition of good and ill belonging to its origin and history". 2 The Colony could do nothing but subside grumbling, and hope that the new Governor, Colonel T. Gore Browne, would prove to be sympathetic to the local point of view.

Another matter dealt with by the Chapman administration was that of Land Transfer. A Bill very much like the Torrens Act went into Committee shortly after Parliament assembled, and at

T. H.M., July 22, 1861.
the beginning of 1862 the Examiner stated that in its opinion the act was worth the work of the whole session.

By July the act was being put into practice. Tarleton, the Recorder of Titles, went to South Australia to see the act in operation and returned with Torrens himself as his temporary adviser. P.C. Crone was placed in charge of the branch for recording the Titles, Transfers and Mortgages.

The Western Railway had long been the subject of discussion, and some action, in the north of the Island, and a survey of the area between Launceston and Deloraine had been proceeding for some months under the direction of the Government Surveyor Boyne, stated the Examiner, a long-time supporter of railways, towards the end of 1861, and by March, 1862, it could speak of this work as being "now fairly afloat". The line was to be 44 miles long and it was estimated that £365,000 would need to be spent to cover the cost of construction. The promoters of the line, said the Northern paper, now had to convince the townsmen and landholders of the area between Launceston and Deloraine that the railway was a worthwhile project from their point of view. The inhabitants accordingly had it pointed out to them that their land would have its value enhanced, and that an estimated £250,000 would be spent by the men working on the permanent way.

Great enthusiasm for the railway was reported. Dry stated that the sum required for the railway would not exceed £400,000.

1. L.N., July 23, 1862.  
2. L.N., March 22, 1862.  
* For an account of the beginnings of the railway movement, see "The Launceston and Western Railway Company: How the Railway Age came to Tasmania" by W.A. Townsley, in Papers and Proceedings of the Tasmanian Historical Research Assoc.; Vol. 3, No. 1.
and it was proposed to procure this amount by asking the
Legislature to authorize the issue of debentures. The Government
would then be requested to guarantee the interest on those so
that English as well as Colonial men with money to lay out
might feel secure in investing part of their wealth in the
undertaking. The inhabitants of the railway districts would be
asked to re-guarantee the Government, if necessary, half of the
interest assured by an assessment on their land.¹

The Launceston Examiner, discussing the likelihood of
Parliament agreeing to this proposal, surmised that "jealousy
will operate to a great extent upon Southern Members".² The
Mercury, although it lent its support to the principle of railway
building, urged Parliament to thoroughly investigate the paying
prospects of the line.³ July saw the Railway Bill brought
before the House of Assembly, and a Committee appointed to go
into the matter. The defeat of the Chapman Administration in
October of the same year, however, resulted in the Committee
being compelled to cease its examination of witnesses. The
enquiry did not begin again until June, 1863, when a Joint
Committee began its investigation.

The question of the franchise and representation had
cropped up more than once during the last election, the Government
spokesmen being inclined to the view that, far from being

¹. L.R., April 22, 1862.
². L.R., June 21, 1862.
³. R.M., June 23, 1862.
restrictive, the present franchise needed narrowing. However, non-Government men made attempts to widen the franchise but all their attempts proved abortive. The first endeavour was made by ex-Judge Horne, who brought down a Bill for an increase in the number of Parliamentary representatives— he wanted a doubling of members in the rural constituencies! The measure was defeated 16-12 on the Second Reading, only one Northerner voted in favour of the Bill and that was Archer.

In the same Session a Petition praying for the repeal of the Constitution Act and its replacement by a Legislative Council of 24, one third to be nominees of the Governor, was received, and printed in The Examiner. It was a sad reflection on the state of the administration that people could wish for a return to the old system of government.

A Government Bill proposing the election of one member of the Upper House and two of the Assembly by an electorate of professional men was brought in but subsequently withdrawn after considerable discussion.

The proposed electorate was to be composed of about 300 men in the professions, said Chapman in introducing the Bill. Ministerial spokesmen argued that in the new electorate, the highly educated class would have direct influence instead of being scattered, that the University seats in Britain gave a precedent for the plan, and that, although it would be a "close" borough, people in Britain were now coming around to the idea that

1. L.R., Oct. 28, 1861.
abolition of those electorates had not been an unqualified success, arguing against the creation of a new electorate. Members of parliament claimed that professional men should no more have special rights than any one else, that the present house was made up chiefly of professional men anyway, and that the representatives of the projected electorate would win their way into Parliament if they were nominated in any ordinary constituency.

The Advertiser felt that it had a duty to consent on these latest moves to alter the hard-won Constitution of the Colony: "Self-sacrifice, virtue and truthfulness in our public men are all that are required to repress the ultra-democratic tendencies of the masses". On the same line of thought, the paper turned its attention to The Examiner, and predicted that its "oligarchical tendencies" would have to be developed to the full in the Ministerial Reform Bill, when doubtless a dastardly attempt would be made to neutralise the democratic spirit, rather than urge competent men to take politics.

Horne, at the end of the session, made another attempt to increase the numbers in the House of Assembly, but once again he was voted down. The difficulty of obtaining enough intelligent men was already being felt, commented The Examiner. But some notice should surely be taken of the voice of the people, said The Mercury - 14 constituencies, representing nearly 4,000 voters, and in the last session presented petitions in favour of

1. n.s., Aug. 17, 1861.
increasing the representation of the members of Parliament, whereas only 55 voters from one constituency, that of Norfolk Plains, had petitioned against increasing representation.\(^1\) It was likely now, said the Southern paper, that a bill to make the registration of voters more satisfactory would become law. Registration of voters would be implemented through the same machinery that was employed to make up the Valuation Rolls.\(^2\)

Previously, notice of claim had to be given to the Clerk of the Peace during the month of April. Claims were then published for possible objections and, if necessary, for a hearing at the Petty Sessions. If any objections were not upheld, the voter's name was added to the Roll, which came into force the following September. Allison had now suggested that the Returning Officer simply copy the names from the Valuation Rolls.\(^3\)

The reason given for the necessity of increasing representation in the Lower House was that of eliminating factionalism and developing a coherent alternative opposition, want of distinct and intelligible political principle; want of tact; offensiveness of demeanour, coarseness of speech, unscrupulous attack; have effectually destroyed everything that once bore the semblance of an 'opposition party' in the House of Assembly'.\(^4\) It was concluded that this situation would never be remedied without an increase in the numbers of representatives in the Lower House. The Advertiser, too, feared from the

---

1. \(\text{A.M.},\ May 23, 1862.\)
2. \(\text{A.M.},\ Sept. 23, 1862.\)
3. \(\text{A.M.},\ Dec. 14, 1861.\)
4. \(\text{A.M.},\ Oct. 23, 1862.\)
beginning of Chapman’s administration about the folly and
disunion of the Opposition.

The evident fear of the Government that democracy would
lead inevitably to chaos in Government is difficult to
understand, for the nature of the population of Tasmania
mitigated against such a happening. It can only be concluded that
happenings in the other Colonies had been such as to ward
Colonial legislators against any further broadening of the
franchise; or that the landed and wealthy class were determined
not to relax their hold on the reins of government. This latter
argument for reactionary moves hardly holds water, for the men
concerned must have realised that, provided there was no sudden
and violent change in the economic and social life of the Colony,
they were assured of control over the country’s destinies for
some years. Such a change could only be brought about by the
discovery of large deposits of some precious metal, and since the
strenuous efforts made to discover such lodes had met with no
success, the status quo of the Colony must necessarily remain
virtually unchanged for some years. From a general impression
received from press comment and Parliamentary debates during the
decade, apart from the preceding reason, there is little doubt
that the Colonial Legislature, or a majority of its members, were
sincerely afraid of democracy. This was the predominant reason
for the refusal to alter the franchise in the interests of the
wage-earners. Another factor which may well have moved representatives
of the landed proprietors was the knowledge that, if the lessons
of history and, more to the point, the Mainland Colonies, were
taken to heart, then the period of their dominance would not go 
on for ever. And rather than remain immovable while the 
inevitable industrialisation crept outwards from the centres of 
population, they may have thought that a reduction in the 
franchise might stave off a little longer than would otherwise 
be the case, the evil day when universal suffrage was adopted. 
Over and above these circumstances, it should be borne in mind 
that the conduct of the augmented Legislative Council in the 
Hampton Case* had cast ridicule on one representative institution 
before total self government had been attained.

It not unnaturally took the Colonists some years to 
consolidate responsible Government, and some Colonists seemed 
afraid of the power of democracy they had unleashed. As has 
been stated, the short duration of the first Tasmanian ministries 
only confirmed the worst fears of men grown used to administration 
under the Governors. But the rapid changes of ministries in the 
other Colonies was not so much due to the extension of the 
franchise, as to high-level intrigues among representatives 
suddenly discovering themselves in possession of power to make 
and unmake Governments. It is not impossible that new Members 
tended to be collar-proud.

The Colonial Press disagreed about nearly everything except 
that the House of Assembly had accomplished nothing. The Mercury 
stated that this was because everybody in the Chamber spoke out 
on every measure, whether he knew what he was talking about or not;

* See Townsley, Page 147.
everything was taken to be the work of everybody and there were
too many long-winded personal attacks. 1

There was another election in Hobart Town late in 1861,
because in October Davies had resigned from the House in
consequence of accepting a Government printing contract after he
was elected. Charles Meredith, a veteran Colonial politician,
opposed the re-election of Davies, whom The Advertiser accused
of betraying the revolution of the working class which had
elected him by joining the supporters of Chapman. Meredith was
able to defeat Davies 356 votes to 401. The proprietor of The
Mercury was back in the House six months later, this time as
the Member for Devon, in which electorate there had been a
vacancy caused by the resignation of Archer. The latter had
resigned his seat because of his conviction that "the present
Constitution of Parliament does not afford to men of neutral
position...the opportunity of rendering any effectual service
to the State". He added that "the objection urged was against
the continuance of the present Ministry in power is chiefly
inspired by personal feeling". 2

There followed a period of intransigence on the part of the
Legislative Council. The Upper Chamber had never subscribed to
the theory that it should be a rubber stamp for Lower House
legislation, and it began now a policy of obstruction.

2. H.I., April 23, 1862.
Government opposition forces in the House followed suit, but with less effectiveness, Horne’s motion of no confidence in the Chapman Ministry being defeated by 16 votes to 12. Those who opposed the continuance of the Administration in office were Horne, Belf, Craigston, C. and J. Meredith, Kilburn, Hodgson, Field, Allison and Barton. When it came to the point, the House preferred the devil it knew to the devil it did not know.

It was reported at the beginning of 1864 that the Legislative Council, in line with its policy of non-cooperation, had refused to accept the appropriation Bill till the Colonial Treasurer had fully expounded what means he intended to use to raise the necessary money. The Lower House agreed to postpone its legislative programme until Innes had made a statement on Ways and Means. Innes told the House that he found there would be a deficit of £30,000 of estimated expenditure over estimated income for the year, and that therefore he proposed a further issue of debentures. And since retrenchment had gone about as far as it could go, and since a surplus was necessary to redeem the debentures that had already been issued, heavier taxation was necessary. Consequently the Treasurer informed the House that ad valorem duties were “an act of necessity”. A Bill to levy these taxes was passed shortly afterwards, together with the appropriation Bill. These measures were agreed to 16 votes to nine in the Lower House, where Chapman held the pistol of dissolution at his
its head, and eight votes to seven (on the President's casting vote) in the Council. The successful passage of the ad valorem duty bill was due to lack of mercantile opposition and representation, and to the fact that the opposition did not realize the need to speak with one voice, commented The Mercury. 1

As if it had suddenly awakened to what it had sanctioned, the Legislative Council carried a vote of no confidence in the Ministry, which took no notice, although the new duties were creating hostility in the government among the merchants who were at loggerheads with the Government valuers. The Legislative Council was determined to make itself a nuisance at least, if not the cause of the Ministry having to succumb. It refused to proceed any further with Parliamentary business and asked the Governor to dismiss the Ministry.

Throughout this period of friction between the houses, The Advertiser applauded the Council for its "spirit and patriotism" 2, but to what extent the attitude of the Upper House reflected the opinion of the Colony it is impossible to say with certainty. There could be no doubt, however, that additional taxation would not prove popular with everyone. The Advertiser noted that "the apostle of Free Trade" had suddenly "become the High Priest of a sort of bastard protection". 3 What else was Chapman to do if he refused to impose direct taxation? 

---

2. W.A., Jan. 18, 1862.
At least two petitions, from Hobart Town and Launceston, were submitted to the Governor protesting against the ad valorem duties, and asserting that the petitioners had no faith in the Government. Speakers at the Hobart Town meeting held to adopt the petition included Maxwell Miller, Elilburn, C. Corrith, Hone and Lodge. The Mercury did not feel itself bound to support the petition, and reported that the remonstrance was being signed by drunkards, women and children. The Advertiser thereupon retaliated by printing an account of a quarrel on the wharf between Davies and one Arbery, who "refreshed Mr. Davies' recollection on some points connected with the cause of his first visit to this Colony....Indeed the 'iron' seemed to enter his soul".

The new tariff had been in force for two months, stated The Examiner in March, 1862, and it seemed probable that it would add £30,000 to the revenue. But already Inter-Colonial trade was narrowing; necessities becoming dearer, and the duties consequently more and more unpopular. The Launceston paper was therefore led to conclude that the Colony's first taste of Protection had "proved intolerable, and Free Trade was triumphant."

Feeling among the import merchants began to run high, and it became clear that Chapman would not be allowed to persevere with the duties indefinitely. As might have been expected, there was constant disagreement between the importers and Government

1. T.L., Feb. 15, 1862.
2. L.E., March 22, 1862.
officers concerning the value of goods on which the duties were levied. But upon the opening of the Second Session of Parliament, the Governor stated that his Government would persist with the duties and further retrenchment.

The Estimates were placed before the House in September, and the Government made it clear at once that there was no intention of lifting the duties. The Legislative Council thereupon rejected the Supply Bill until the Treasurer fully committed himself to the continuance of ad valorem duties. Thus the Executive was left with no legal authority to pay Government employees.

The end came in October. In that month the Premier threatened to resign if a Bill brought down by C. Meredith to repeal the duties was carried. A threat of this sort had previously been enough to enable the Ministry to muster a majority, but despite Ministerial assertions that the duties, although unpleasant and opposed to the Government's avowed laissez-faire policy, would have to be continued as a source of revenue, Meredith's motion was finally carried by 17 votes to nine. Chapman determined upon an appeal to the country rather than give up the loss of £30,000 a year without a struggle.

Reviewing an unsatisfactory twelve months of government, The Mercury stated that the duties were reluctantly imposed in

the first place because of the decline in customs revenue from
the old tariff, especially on spirits and tobacco. The duties'
unpopularity stemmed from price increases, complicated
procedure at the Customs House and the difficulty of
bringing Government and importers to any agreement on terms
of valuation. The paper was driven to the conclusion that
the choice now lay between more ad valorem duties and
direct taxation.1

Sixteen Members, including the three from Launceston, were elected unopposed in this election for the House of Assembly. Thirty-nine candidates in all offered themselves for election to the 30 seats to be filled. One candidate, W.N. Allison, stood for three, and two other men - W.S. Gellibrand and John Meredith - for two each. Two candidates only contested for each of eight single Member constituencies, three for one (Queenborough), and eight for Hobart Town. Consequently 15 representatives were elected unopposed.

As far as can be ascertained, of the 39 candidates there were at least 18 squatters, of whom 15 secured seats in the House; and eight lawyers, of whom six were elected. Two newspaper proprietors, John Davies and W.H.L. Murray, and one ex-newspaper proprietor, Maxwell Miller, also gained seats.

The men who campaigned for the Ministry were Chapman, Dobson, Kermode and Butler in the Lower House, and Innes in the Council. Innes had decided not to stand for the popular House again, but to contest the fortuitously vacant Campbell Town seat in the Upper House. The other candidates for the House, sitting Members and opponents, opposed the Government almost to a man. They found nothing praise-worthy in the ad valorem duties, imposition of which had brought down the Chapman Ministry.
Of the nine Members who had voted against the motion of no confidence condemning the duties - Chapman, Innes, Kernode, Dobson, Symonot, Butler, Cooke, Macleanachan and viller (the latter paired off with Sharland) - only the first four defended the Ministry and its record; Symonot and Cooke declined to stand again, and Butler (Brighton) and Macleanachan (Oatlands) were defeated. Chapman alone of the nine was returned to the House. This apparently overwhelming antipathy to the Administration is rather misleading, for many Members who had voted against the Government on the crucial motion had supported the Administration more often than not, and would do so on their return despite protestations to the contrary.
(i) The election was precipitated by the Chapman Government's defeat in the House of Assembly on the ad valorem duties question, and it was fought on the advisability of retaining the administration and its tariff policy.

Newspapers, with the exception of The Examiner, were agreed that the chief issue was that of non-confidence in the Ministry. The Northern paper, for its part, saw the real issue as reduction of expenditure: "The ordinary revenue is ample if extraordinary charges are removed."\(^1\) Steps to be taken, said The Examiner, included discontinuance for the time being of all grants-in-aid, including those to educational institutions and churches, and a recast of all establishments which were framed on Imperial lines. "The real issue is not direct versus indirect taxation, but reduction in expenditure versus an increase in taxation."\(^2\)

The Mercury took the opposite view: "In respect of finance, the question at issue lies between a Customs system, including ad valorem duties, and a property and income tax."\(^3\) The Mercury was nearer the mark, for the Colony's Governments had been retrenching for five years, and reduction had reached its limit.

Two leaders of the opposition group gave their opinion on the issue as they saw it. J.B. Balfie, the Member for Franklin,
saw the true question as not so much the wisdom of imposing ad valorem duties, but whether the Colony was to be governed by "unprincipled men under the influence of landed proprietors". 1 Ex-Judge Horne stated that in his opinion the principal issue was simply one of confidence or no confidence in the Ministry's measures.

The Cornwall Chronicle and The Advertiser opposed the Government fiercely. As far as they could see, the troubles of the Colony had been caused by the strangle-hold that the squatters had on the legislature. Not only did these men control the country, stated The Chronicle, but they did not pay any greater taxes than the mass of consumers. This was clearly unjust, since "every citizen ought to contribute to the support of the State in proportion to the amount of property protected by the State". 1

The Advertiser also inveighed against the Government; it was "a traitorous alliance between wool kings and needy office-holders". "Out with the ministry, and increase the representation, are the watch-words for every true-hearted citizen at the ensuing election." 2

The Examiner, however, consistently defended the wool kings. They deserved their position, it said, because they had braved danger for their wealth while those who now cried out against

1. C.C., Oct. 29, 1862.
them had wasted their time.

The position was that disagreement with the Government's fiscal policy was widespread. The depression prevailing in the Colony, and the Administration had, rightly or wrongly, come to be associated in the minds of the voters. Not only Chapman's Government, but the Administrations of the past five years, was on trial at this election. Because nearly all candidates campaigned against the Ministry, in most cases the election was fought on personal matters within constituencies themselves, the opposing candidates being basically in agreement in their opposition to the Chapman Government.

(ii)

The question of an increase in representation in the Lower House was raised as it had been before, but was of little moment in the election. The Mercury held out for the increase, however, claiming that "it is high time that the Colony should be rescued from the degrading tyranny exercised over it by the two or three men whom its evil genius has put into Parliament." ¹

The Advertiser, also, thought that extension of representation in the House of Assembly would be a step in the right direction. Until the number of Members was increased "we fearlessly maintain that Responsible Government in Tasmania is an imposture and a

¹. H.M., Oct. 25, 1862.
delusion. Faction has enjoyed its rule long enough. ¹ Chapman had few vocal friends and this, together with the factionalism so regrettably apparent in the Legislature, The Advertiser implied was a result of the Premier's "utterly profligate and i.excusable" desertion of the liberal side of the Old Council. "It sprang from a miserable reckless vanity, engendered b. a love of power, and an inordinate craving for office".² This is one of the few references to Chapman's stop in joining the first Ministry under Champ, though The Advertiser did say that Champ and Smith, the representative of the old Imperial system, had caught Chapman with the bait of the Colonial Treasurership.³

The Examiner, on the other hand, tended to blame the opposition group, and especially Gregson, for the "scenes" which had obstructed legislation and given the Parliamentary body a bad name throughout the Colonies. While Charles Meredith, Abbott, Balfe and Allison were sent to back up Gregson, said the Northern daily, the public affairs of the country would not be attended to.⁴

In his retiring address to the Colony, Henty spoke in praise of the Colony's being in advance of the others in such matters as disposal of waste lands, but declared the full operation of what he called "elements of discord" in the Legislature.⁵

There was truth in the assertion that the endless quarrelling in the House had its roots in events that had taken place in the early days of the colony. Opposition to the Governors had held members of the Old Council together, but this force was relaxed by the ending of transportation and the granting of responsible government, and in the face of an economic depression which called for firm government they were incapable of giving, they fell to playing politics eighteenth century style.

(iii)

Apart from the above question, candidates spoke of hardly anything but their opposition to the ad valorem duties. Railways and their advantages, and the desirability of local distillation came into the picture a little, Sir Richard Dry, in a letter to the press, advising his fellow colonials to elect men who favoured the establishment of railways, especially the western line from Launceston to Deloraine.  

Candidates also spoke of retrenchment, but in a vague way. They appeared to have no idea of how far the Government had taken retrenchment, and whether it was wise to reduce any further. Retrenchment as a cure-all was always a good catch-cry.

But these issues were overshadowed by that of the Government's financial policy regarding the ad valorem duties. The Chapman ministry had to stand or fall on its record of imposing ad

---

1. L.S., Nov. 4, 1862.
valorem duties, and the confidence of the Colony in that measure. Retrenchment and the pressing need for it was mouthed by all, but apart from that, candidates propounded no policy, being well pleased to engage in verbal attacks on one another and indicate the patently diabolical nature of the Government.

State aid was for the moment a dead issue, the Redistribution Bill having been passed.

The Imperial Pauper problem had in the past made good political capital, but even that was lost sight of in the general movement to limit policy to attacks on the Government. Candidates apparently expected to be elected solely on destructive criticism of the Administration. The Mercury accused those who had defeated the Ministry of being afraid of advocating a direct tax, since this was, in fact, the only alternative to a programme of continued increased duties and the floating of more loans. As regards The Examiner's constant claim that retrenchment had not been carried to its limits, it is relevant to ask whether the Chapman Administration would have taken the drastic step of laying the ad valorem duties if there had been a less unpopular way of raising money.

It was easy for the anti-Government forces to point to inconvenience to merchants and increased prices as being the outcome of Chapman's tariff policy, but as the Premier had explained at the time of the imposition, the Government had been
very reluctant to put such a programme into effect. Yet it could see no other way of raising enough revenue to pay public servants and meet the interests on loans. There was admittedly the alternative of a direct tax, but a measure that taxed property had little chance of passing either House.

Opposition candidates did not seize an opportunity of attacking the Government's policy, but they brought forward nothing in the way of an alternative course of action. As The Mercury stated, "It is... well understood that the mode of raising a revenue through Customs duties will be persevered in".  

The Ministry and the Election

The policy of the Government was voiced rather confusedly by its Ministers. Chapman, the Premier, left Queenborough, his late electorate, to oppose M.R. Allison in Allison's own home constituency of Campbell Town. Beyond reiterating what he had already said at the beginning of the year regarding the Government's programme i.e. that ad valorem duties were a necessary evil brought about by an economic depression for which the Government could not properly be held responsible, Chapman gave the impression that the Government's programme was still to be one of imposing the duties and carrying retrenchment in the Public Service even further. As well, he stated that the Colony should take care to see that the revenue necessary for the maintenance of its institutions was provided from customs duties on imports. But as the papers were anti-Government in their view, they did not go out of their way to report the Ministers' speeches, and so it is difficult to obtain a fair account of a Government apology.

Another member of the Ministry, W.T. Robson, struck the same note as Chapman: the Administration could not consent to the loss of £30,000 yearly - the sum realised by the duties - without appealing to the country, otherwise property would have to be taxed. 1

In accepting the Campbell Town nomination for the Legislative Council, Tines published an address of a similar character to that

1. L.B., Nov. 11, 1862.
of 1861. It confirmed the worst fears of the Cornwall Chronicle
and The Advertiser. Reaction and a stifling of democracy was
what the Government would implement if returned; Innes wrote that
"It was anticipated that old influences, interests, modes of
thought, and personal ties, would operate with a counter active
or conservative tendency for a time" upon the adoption of self
Government. But "property, mercantile position and moral worth
were unavailing against democratic extravagance and ignominious
truckling to the passions of the the least instructed classes of
voters". The same thing had happened in rural constituencies, he
claimed, where there had been "an annihilation of the influence
of the property classes in elections for the House of Assembly".
The writer wanted "the natural subordinations of society"
maintained.1

No reasons are given in the Press for Innes' reason for
leaving the Lower House to stand for the Council. The election
for the seat he vacated was later than that for Hobart Town and
most other constituencies, and Innes may have been afraid of
defeat in view of the anti-Government decision of Hobart Town.
Another possibility is that he wished to enter the Council in
order to reduce the strength of the opposition there.

The Mercury remarked on the dissimilarity of the addresses
of Menty and Innes, both Ministers. Menty had expressed his faith

1. L.P., Nov. 18, 1862.
in democratic institutions. He thought that the present faults would be remedied by "the growing influence of public opinion within the walls of the Legislature". Tames' address, however, could "hardly be accepted...in any other sense than a ministerial manifesto" in which "he can give place to no idea but that of the dreaded 'democracy'".¹

¹ H.M., Nov. 23, 1862.
The Elections

(a). Hobart Town. Bobson, the representative of the Ministry, again sought election in Hobart Town, where he was one of five lawyers trying for election. Horne, Adams, Canadell and Haggitt were the others. The Advertiser opposed Bobson's election, urging voters not to support any candidate with even suspected ministerial tendencies. His policy was similar to that of Chapman, being a defence of the Government's record. But he was to be defeated, together with the ministerial supporter KerMODE, at the hands of the Hobart Town "lifers", Allison, Horne, Adams, M. Miller and Haggitt. Canadell was the last candidate of the eight.

The Advertiser thought that KerMODE had little chance of getting a seat in the House as a representative of Hobart Town - certainly "the results of the last wool clips at Mona Vale will have to be expended in purchasing the votes of the people of Hobart Town". The Mercury at first was inclined to oppose the election of KerMODE because he was not a merchant - the paper fancied that some one connected with trading interests should stand and be elected for the capital. But a week later it spoke of KerMODE as possessing "one of the largest stakes held by any man in the well-being of the Colony"; he would be a "worthy representative". No hint was given for this changed attitude. Probably The Mercury now thought that if the Capital could not obtain a merchant candidate, then a squatter was the next best thing.

Maxwell Miller, who had been elected on a liberal policy in 1856, only to drop out of politics because of illness, stood again for the city. He entertained no fears for the future of the Colony, he declared in his Press address. The Island's admittedly perilous position simply demanded energy and enterprise, but "the paramount necessity of the present moment is financial reform". Miller wrote further that he would accordingly move, if he was elected, that no merchant be allowed to become Colonial Treasurer.1

Another of the Hobart Town group to oppose the Government, Haggitt proposed the substitution of an Income and Property Tax for customs duties. He also, as J.B. Miller and Murray in Launceston had done, drew attention to the heavy harbour duties.2

Candell, a new arrival in the Colony from England, favoured an extension of representation, as did all the anti-ministerial Hobart Town candidates, but he refused to align himself unequivocally with either group, and was defeated3 with Dobson and Vermode.*

To The Mercury, the decisive defeat in the Capital of the two Government men Dobson and Vermode was manifestly an indication that the electors wanted a change of Government and a policy of direct taxation, though "the only rule acted upon was to strike

* The single "plumper" votes cast were as follows:—Adams 2, Allison 12, Candell 10, Dobson 46, Haggitt 6, Horns 9, Kermode 107, Miller 14. (W.A., Nov. 11, 1862).
out of the ballot the names of the two gentlemen who were supposed to be favourable to the Government, and the name of the other gentleman /Canseel/ whose somewhat obtrusive candidature off the opposition policy, threatened to mar the completeness of the success of the party."

The newspaper was without doubt correct in saying that the result of the election in Hobart Town demonstrated the opposition of the electorate to the Government. The cause of the liberals' victory was, it would appear, dissatisfaction with the administration's actions rather than any constructive policy put forward by the group which opposed the Chapman Ministry. They could well speak of retrenchment and increased representation, and it was true that the gold era had encouraged the Government in heavy spending which resulted in a debt that it was difficult to reduce. But the financial position of the Colony was such that much more than retrenchment was needed to balance the budget. Increased representation might have gone a long way towards eliminating factionalism in the Legislature, and more important still, provide the basis for a new party. The few liberals in the House had no hope of forming a Government while they had to depend on rural Members for support. Gregson had attempted to govern with liberals in the Cabinet, but his administration was doomed from the start because of his own rashness and tactlessness, and because of opposition from those he had antagonised in the past.

1. H.M., Nov. 8, 1862.
The chief impression of the election is that the electors were willing and ready to vote for anyone who opposed the Government.

(b). Launceton. The election in Launceton was not contested. Neither Miller nor Latte presented the electors with a constructive election platform as was customary in the constituencies, but merely pledged themselves to act for the Colony's welfare. Murray, the proprietor of The Cornwall Chronicle, spoke out strongly against the Government and the wool kings, and favoured an extension of representation as well as Protection and local distillation.¹

Miller had supported the Government in the past as Solicitor-General, but had now broken with the Ministry, implying in his election address that it had been too extravagant. The advertiser concluded that all three candidates were opposed to the Government.²

(c). Campbell Town. In standing for the Campbell Town seat in the Lower House, Chapman opposed W.R. Allison, a landed proprietor who had represented the constituency since the first elections, but who was now nominated for Hobart Town and Deloraine as well.

Chapman was strongly criticised by The Examiner on two counts. First, his "plunging the country into debt" by "abolishing" "State Aid; and, second, his repudiation of Free Trade doctrines in favour of ad valorem duties.³

¹. L.B., Nov. 1, 1862.
². J. & J., Nov. 4, 1862.
³. L.B., Nov. 1 and 6, 1862.
Despite this, Chapman defeated Allison, 66 votes to 53; rotten eggs were "freely dispersed" at the declaration of the poll. The Advertiser lost its support to the opposition candidate Allison, stating that since Chapman was an ex-Chairman of the Hobart Town Chamber of Commerce, he was not the best man to be deciding and implementing the Colony's financial policy. The Cornwall Chronicle, noting Allison's defeat on his home ground, put it down to anti-squatter and anti-Roman Catholic sentiment by the Campbell Town Methodists. Allison was a member of the Roman Church and Chapman was a high-ranking member of the Church of England laity.

why Chapman chose to oppose Allison it is difficult to know for sure. The Press does not give any reason, but it was not uncommon for candidates to nominate and be elected for constituencies that were far from their homes. Davies, for example, of Hobart Town, was elected to the North western electorate of Devon, and John Meredith, the late Member for Glamorgan, to Deloraine. Chapman gives no reasons for contesting Campbell Town, and his policy is a defence of the Government's actions over the past 12 months. But none of the papers regarded his victory as a vindication of the Administration's record. The contest was regarded as wholly a conflict of personalities.

1. A.D., Nov. 11, 1862. 3. W.A., Nov. 6, 1862.
(d). Queenborough. There were three candidates – Walker, Gellibrand and Backhouse – for the Southern constituency of Queenborough, which had elected Chapman in 1861 after his last-minute candidature. Both Backhouse and Walker had contested the 1861 election.

Backhouse's policy was one of improving communications, increasing representation and taxing luxury imports. He also said that the Colony, in his opinion, was not in a position to finance railways.¹

Walker, a wealthy brewer, held that there must be an alternative Administration. He objected to the Government's customs duties, on the grounds that there could be a better devised tariff on Protection lines, and opposed a Property and Income Tax. As well, he thought that the number of Members of the House of Assembly should be increased, Colonial distillation made legal and retrenchment carried further.²

The third candidate, Gellibrand, was a nominee of Tarleton's, advised The Mercury, and Tarleton had been a Government nominee in the 1861 election. The paper therefore declined to further the interests of Gellibrand³, although he condemned the ad valorem duties, supported the subsidisation of industries and favoured an improvement in communications.⁴

It is obvious that here, to the electors, the policies of

² ibid.
⁴ M.L.A., Nov. 11, 1862.
the candidates were the same to all intents and purposes. Certainly they did not differ to any significant degree. Tucker, a wealthy man, was the most outspoken critic of the Government among the three men, and this may have been the reason for his section, as well as the fact that he was a man of some standing in the community, being mayor of Cobert Town from 1864 to 1866. He had been second on the poll at the previous election.

(4). Clayton. The election at Clayton was a curious one; for the two candidates were brothers, Charles and John Meredith. John Meredith, for introducing a Bill dealing with the placing of lamps on vehicles, had earned himself the nick-name of "Jack the Lamplighter." He was the sitting Member. "a man we cannot afford to lose," pronounced the "Courier." The "Advertiser" claimed, on the other hand, that he was only elected in the first place because his brother was ill. 2

Charles Meredith had been a member of Greyson's ill-fated Ministry in 1857, and, like the Member for Richmond, was an old politician who did not hesitate to express his opinions forcefully, either in the House or in campaigning. By the time of the election - it was one of the last - John Meredith had already been elected to Parliament once, for Deloraine which, unable to raise a local candidate, had voted him in over the ubiquitous W.R. Allison by

60 votes to 54. Neither candidate could have had any interest in the constituency. Indeed, John Meredith was in New Zealand during the election and Allison never went anywhere near the electorate. The fact that he already represented one constituency probably told against Meredith and he was defeated in Glamorgan 59 votes to 36, his brother dropping thinly veiled hints in his address that John Meredith had supported the Government.¹

Now far this allegation, together with the fact that he was not in the Colony and had already been elected from one electorate, helped in John Meredith's defeat, cannot be known. But in the light of the other elections, it would seem that charges of supporting the Ministry would, in the electors' minds, weigh heavily against him.

(f). Ringwood. Ringwood was another rural constituency. It had been previously represented by W.P. Weston, a man who had twice been premier, and latterly by R.W. Kermod, a squatter.

He initially issued his address to the electors of Ringwood, defending the Ministry from the charges that it need not have gone to the length of exacting ad valorem duties. They were "an inevitable necessity" he contended, and should be supplemented with retrenchment, improved communications and inducements to immigrants to settle.² But a few days later The Cornwall Chronicle announced that Kermod had retired from Ringwood in favour of Clerke, another landed proprietor.³ He was opposed by

¹. H.R., Oct. 28, 1862.
². ibid.
³. C.C., Nov. 1, 1862.
Houghton, whom Kermode and defeated in 1861.

Houghton, supported by The Advertiser, indicated his intention of taxing absentee landholders, as well as exported wool. But he set himself against the ad valorem duties and any notion of a property tax.\(^1\) Clerke opposed the Chapman administration and its works vigorously, and made it known that he was a firm believer in local government, because he thought it brought home to people a sense of responsibility.\(^2\) But he did not think it sound to tax wool, because this smacked of "class legislation."\(^3\)

The result of the election was announced as a tie at first, and the returning officer gave his casting vote to Clerke who thus appeared to have won 71 votes to 70. But the officer, when he announced this, had not received the ballot papers from the other two polling centres, having relied instead on a telegraphic message. Upon a recount being made later, Clerke still won, however, this time by 71 votes to 69.\(^4\)

It is unlikely that Kermode deliberately let Clerke contest the seat knowing that he was so strongly opposed to the Ministry as appeared from Clerke's published statement. But The Examiner states that Kermode left his old constituency because of the unpopularity of his support of the Ministry.\(^5\) He may have been

\(^1\) \(C.C.,\) Nov. 5, 1862.
\(^2\) \(L.R.,\) Nov. 12, 1862.
\(^3\) \(L.R.,\) Nov. 20, 1862.
\(^4\) \(L.A.,\) Nov. 29, 1862.
\(^5\) \(L.E.,\) Nov. 22, 1862.
under the impression that Clerke would support the Government, but both Clerke and his opponent Houghton were in opposition to the Administration's policy. Another possibility is that Kermodo thought that he might find it easier to get elected in the City. But whatever the reason for the change of electorates, any Government supporter, as Kermodo must have known, would have his work cut out getting back into the House. The Ministry had scattered a majority they would not collect again.
Conclusion.

The Chapman Administration was decisively defeated in this election because of its record and the record of its predecessors in being unable to reduce the debt of the colony or restore prosperity. Virtually the same man had been in power since 1856, and in people's minds, there seemed no doubt, the Government and the depression had come to be associated as cause and effect. There was no question in this election of the anti-Government candidates propounding a policy to oust the Ministry. All they had to do was to attack Chapman and his Customs Duties programme and they could be almost certain of getting a seat in the next Parliament. What policy they had was limited to that of retrenchment, extension of representation (in the case of some men), and lower march customs duties.

But candidates such as Horne, Allison, Meredith and R.B. Miller must have known that if Chapman, a merchant himself, had found it necessary to impose ad valorem duties, then they had little hope of defraying the costs of Government, as well as wiping off the Government deficit, by mere retrenchment and more fixed duties. However, the electors wanted a change and were ready to vote into power anyone who opposed Chapman and what he stood for. Until the country was ready to vote in an effective number of men pledged to tax those who could best afford to pay, the Colony could only go on from year to year by raising loans.
while its leaders squabbled over ways and means of adding a few paltry points to the revenue by way of retrenchment. The alliance between the land holders and the merchants would continue to block whatever efforts might be made to tax property. Unless the Government could somehow pass a measure to substantially tax the wealthy men of the Colony, particularly the landed proprietors, then the Colony was doomed to raise loan after loan, unless a mineral deposit of real importance could be found.

The gold rushes had resulted in a great loss of population, both from city and country. But the urban areas did not increase in population as would have been the case if industries had developed, and so it was that the rural areas were able to maintain their position of dominance. Society remained clearly stratified and static with the rural population outnumbering that of the urban areas by two to one. The representatives of the landed interests would not consent to tax themselves and there was not a sufficient number of urban representatives to oust them from their position of control. Even had this been accomplished, the squatters would still have remained entrenched in the Legislative Council, and a perpetual deadlock would likely have ensued till either the Constitution of the Council was reconstructed to make it more representative, or its members underwent a change of heart.

As The Examiner shrewdly pointed out during the election, although the Government had been overthrown in the Popular House,
deep-seated opposition lay in the second chamber, and the

election of a new house of assembly could do nothing to alter
that situation.1 and even the so-called "opposition" group in
the House, an amorphous body at the best of times, was composed
largely of land holders or their representatives who paid only
lip service to the notion of taxing land or income. When it
came to the point, they were just as unwilling as the majority
of members to tax themselves.

1. H.R., Nov. 8, 1862.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>J. Hayes (124) d. A. Butler (102).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence</td>
<td>F. Abbott (75) d. W.S. Collibrand (63).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>J. P. Shurland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>J. T. Balf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glamorgan</td>
<td>C. Meredith (59) d. J. Meredith (36).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenorchy</td>
<td>H. Officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart Town</td>
<td>W.B. Allison (782), T. Horns (778), R.P. Adams (766), W. Miller (713), D. Maggs (594), B.V. Kerms (495), W.J. Dobson (451), Cansaell (263).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingborough</td>
<td>J. Perkins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Norfolk</td>
<td>W.B. Shurland (131) d. P. Fenton (110).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oatlands</td>
<td>J. Lord (114) d. J. Dallamansan (72).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>T.C. Gregson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorell</td>
<td>W. Hodgson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell Town</td>
<td>T.B. Chapman (56) d. W.R. Allison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deorance</td>
<td>J. Meredith (59) d. W.R. Allison (54).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>J. Davies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jingal</td>
<td>J. Grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Town</td>
<td>C.M. Merty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunneston</td>
<td>R.M. Botte, L.B. Miller, W.D.L. Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Alex. Rose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election</td>
<td>Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Plains</td>
<td>W. Toddy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsclere</td>
<td>Alex Clarke (71) d. F. J. Houghton (69).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solway</td>
<td>I. Sharpe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbury</td>
<td>A. Douglas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbott</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beddoes</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckhouse</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolfe</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cansdell</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkes</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>Newspaper proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobson</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodery</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenton</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelligram</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregson</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haggett</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodgson</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrie</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noughton</td>
<td>Auctioneer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kermoda</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Occupations of Candidates**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lette</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>Oaklands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macleansean</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>Oaklands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith G.</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>Glamorgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith J.</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>Glamorgan, Valoraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller L.</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Hobart Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller R.B.</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Newspaper proprietor</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>Glenorchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>Kingborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharland J.P.</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>Norven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharland W.S.</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>Cumberland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwin</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>New Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>Brewer</td>
<td>Selby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Queenborough</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER SEVEN

The Period 1863-1866: C.J. Whyte's Ministry

Whyte's Ministry came to office on January 20, 1863, after Chapman's Administration was defeated in the election of October-November of the previous year. Whyte, Legislative Council Member for Pembroke and "acknowledged leader of the liberal party" had the following men in his Cabinet:

- C.J. Whyte – Colonial Secretary and Premier
- Charles Meredith – Colonial Treasurer
- R.B. Miller – Attorney-General
- J.M. Wilson

Chapman's Government fell because it had imposed ad valorem duties, and Whyte had now to find a substitute, since he needed the additional $120,000 per year that the duties had been bringing in if he was to govern without recourse to loan-raising and prevent increase in the country's debt.

Some system of fixed duties would have to be relied on: "It is our intention," said Whyte, "to propose the substitution for ad valorem duties, of a tariff of fixed duties, imposed on such articles and levied in such a manner as may be found to be most equitable and just, after a careful and dispassionate consideration of the question, and of the absolutely indispensable requirements of the Public Service."

R.B. Miller, the Attorney-General, returning to his electorate

for a vote of confidence upon being appointed a member of the
Cabinet, declared that "a real and determined reduction of
official expenditure to the narrowest limits of official
efficiency" would be implemented by the Administration. But,
he said, "an equitable system of fixed customs duties" was still
needed, and in addition "a large and comprehensive scheme of
reproductive works" would be commenced.¹ Retrenchment,
re-adjustment of taxation and public works were, then, the chief
plans of the Ministry.

All Ministers were re-elected without opposition, and with a
view towards retrenchment and consolidation, a Royal Commission
was appointed to enquire into the best means of remodelling the
Civil Service.

The Advertiser, which consistently championed the cause of
the Administration throughout its term of office when the other
Colonial papers veered to the attack as they perceived that the
Administration was failing to reduce the Colonial debt, now
indicated to its readers that the Byece Ministry would extend
fixed duties, tax certain luxury goods and perhaps resort to
stamp duties.²

The Government started its term, however, in the same way as
previous Administrations, for to meet the immediate necessities
of the Exchequer, debentures would be issued. As well, some
grants-in-aid would be withdrawn, so serious was the plight of

¹ L.C., Jan. 22, 1663.
² W.A., March 23, 1663.
It was a matter of importance that the Colonists were realizing
the country, and retrenchment affected vigorously. It must have
been clear to Whyte that unless he was courageous enough to
suggest direct taxation, he would have to continue to pay the
Colonies’s way by the issue of debentures. In fact, if it is
assumed that the Premier knew at the back of his mind that he
would ultimately be forced to tax property and income in order to
defray the costs of government, then he would have been wise to
attempt such a change at once, while the public apparently
stood behind him, still opposed the Chapman Administration’s
policy. But even so, it is doubtful if a bill imposing such a
tax would have passed Parliament whatever the plight of the
Colony. It was certain though that as long as Whyte had only
retrenchment and public works to offer (increased representation
was a subject which dropped out of sight) then he would have to
resort to Board and increased customs duties, a course which
would lead only to dissatisfaction in the Colony.

In a short Parliamentary Session at the beginning of 1863,
the Administration passed the estimates for the next six months
on the basis of those for the preceding year, and told the House
that the government planned to end the ad valorem duties on June 30.1
Appointments made during this Session were those of Mr Officer to
the position of Speaker, and J.W. Balfour as Chairman of Committees.
The former was elected over T.C. Cragge and the latter was
victorious against Maxwell Miller.

It was a matter of importance that the Commissioners enquiring into the possibility of further retrenchment had found by April that reduction had been carried to its height under previous Administrations. The Commission could not have been expected to find otherwise.

A reduction in the price of Crown land, the Government decided, might result in augmentation of the revenue, and the outcome of this proceeding was an increase in the income from this source. But The Mercury raised its voice to protest against measures such as these: the land was being offered too cheaply, it declared; the people’s estate was being frittered away for the sake of momentary gain. So that as it may, the Administration was ready, and indeed desperate, to arrest the ominously regular drop in revenue.

Parliament met again in June, and in his speech opening the Session, Governor Gore Browne outlined the Government’s programme. Its salient measures included the use of a reserve from the Land Fund for public works, and a change in the education system. In order to lighten the Government’s load, it was proposed that the cost of building schools and paying school masters be borne by the various districts as well as the Government. Municipalities, or school committees where there was no municipal body, were to have the power of appointing teachers and regulating school fees, the

2. Ibid.
...teachers to be certified as competent by the Inspector of Schools. The Chief Executive also intimated that his Government proposed to increase the revenue by stamp duties.

In this same month the Examiner mentioned the Western Railway. The building of this line was to bulk large in the future expenditures, and proposals were made to raise the Parliamentary business for the rest of Whyte's term of office, responsible for the railway for some considerable time to come, and the railway question overshadowed all else for years to come. As primary sources, the Examiner had listed, the Northern paper noted that some landholders were adverse to

...with some clauses that it was to be undertaken after action was taken by the railway company to form part of a security for it, or because it would

...require the person occupying and taking into possession of a not pass through their estates.

The policy of raising the ad valorem duties, the Government now having abolished the ad valorem duties, the Government now increased fixed duties, doubled those on tea and sugar and imposed stamp duties and a Carriage Tax. In addition, it levied a Packet Tax, on the lines of the ad valorem duties, already, then, adopted from Canadian practice. The administration was falling back on the measures that

Charman had been constrained to adopt. The Supplies of 1863, in spite of all the talk of reduction, were but minutely reduced from those of 1862, said the Mercury; the estimates for 1864 had been diminished certainly, it added, but only through reduction of grants-in-aid.

The Examiner had given the administration over six months in which to put the country on the road to recovery, and seeing that the financial state of the Colony was going from bad to worse,

---

1. H.M., June 23, 1863.
2. L.B., June 23, 1863.
it attacked the Government: "In nothing has [Parliament] made progress, save in increasing the number of taxes!" Tasmania, pointed out the paper, alone among the Colonies had stamp, carriage and package taxes. There was furthermore, virtually, no difference in the Chapman and Whyte estimates. But however necessary, was reduction in expenditure, the proposal to make the rural districts responsible for the upkeep of the main North-South road, as well as primary education, was going too far, and The Examiner noted, with satisfaction, that this had been withdrawn after a storm of protest from the areas concerned. The Editorial went on to remind readers that this present Government had come into power on a policy of repealing the ad valorem duties, reducing the expenditure and going on with public works. So far it had repealed the duties, but only to impose more onerous ones.\(^1\) It was only too clear that the Administration would be forced to adopt fresh methods of raising revenue, or else resign.

The Joint Committee on railways appointed during the previous year issued its Report recommending the setting up of a Board of Commissioners,\(^2\), and The Advertiser surmised that Northern Members would discuss the report during the present Session.\(^3\) But the Committee's Report, after being agreed to in the Lower House, was rejected by the Legislative Council. Another Committee was

---

\(^1\) H.A., Sept. 1863.
\(^2\) H.A., Aug. 22, 1863.
\(^3\) H.A., Aug. 21, 1863.
appointed to enquire into the practicability of a Main Line between Hobart-Town and Launceston. This appointment was instigated "with characteristic absurdity"; obj W.R. Allison said. The Examiner, and dismissing the subject, it devoted nearly two pages of close type to an account of the inauguration of the Northern Railway League at a public meeting on the night of the September 18, after an all-day holiday in Launceston. Most Northern Members of Parliament were members of the League, which had as its aim the laying down of the Western Railway from Launceston to Deloraine, a distance of 44 miles. Sir Richard Dry was Chairman of the League, and Henry Dowling, the Secretary.

Formation of the League increased already marked North-South jealousy and particularism was not lessened by the Government's vacillating policy in toying with projects for a North-South line, nor that the want should not have a necessity of two rail. Two other Bills to decrease Government expenditure came before the Parliament during this Session. One, to abolish pensions to future civil servants, was passed; existing private rights were still respected. The other Bill, to reduce the Governor's salary by 21,500 to 25,000 per year, failed to secure the necessary majority in the Legislative Council. Another measure that passed.

into law was one that amended the Lands Act by voting a quarter of the Land Fund towards the building and upkeep of roads. 1

do this little proposal of the Main Line railway side-issue made headway when it was agreed, on a resolution by Allison, that £1500 be given towards a survey of the line, on condition that the public subscribed another £1500. 2 But no quorum of seven could be formed in the Legislative Council to consider the Assembly's resolution, and so the matter was shelved for the time being. 3 The Examiner did not pour oil on already troubled waters when it brought under the notice of its readers the alleged fact that Allison would greatly benefit from the Main Line, since much of it would pass through his extensive holdings. 4 A Main Line Committee was formed in January of 1864 and went ahead with canvassing for subscriptions for the survey. 5 Southern representatives were determined that the North should not have a monopoly of the railways and the welcome prosperity that it was presumed they would bring.

At the end of the Whyte's Government's first year in office, The Mercury drew attention to what every Colonist knew — the Government had done nothing to reduce the large Colonial debt. Indeed, the Ministry had not hesitated to increase it by borrowing. 6

---

Thus the year concluded as had most years for the past decade - the Government was still in the habit of increasing the revenue from customs duties, with little prospect of diminution as the interest on more and more public debt and the little revenue from the annual current expenses was spent.

At the beginning of 1864 the Director of Public Works furnished a favourable report on the possibility of building a tramway from Deloraine to the Mersey River, a survey having been conducted by J.H. Dooley. The avowed aim of the Company which was formed for this work, was to construct an iron tramway or railroad, to be worked by horses, between Deloraine and the Mersey, with branches to Cheshunt, Chadleigh and Kentish Plains. The Secretary of this body was named Edward Allen, of Latrobe. A prospectus had been issued in March calling for £50,000, the project appearing to be wholly a private speculation, not depending on the Government for assistance.

The Administration made great use of this precedent later when refusing financial aid to the Western Railway Company. At this particular time Whyte, the Secretary, had been on a tour of the North and to the Government said that the company had not been bad to the administration, railway enthusiasts in those areas took the opportunity to wait on the Ministers. But Whyte could not agree with the deputations that a western Railway would prove beneficial enough to justify the expenditure of public money on it; it was a local project, he said, and so the administration could not foot the Bill.

---

2. Ibid., March 24, 1864.
The Examiner was sure that it was a waste of time appealing to the Government: "We are firmly persuaded that the country will never get a railway till the present Ministry is turned out of office." The Advertiser regretted that North-South particularism was, being fostered by the railway issue, "threatened to complicate our domestic politics with a permanent antipathy of North and South."  

The next move came from the Railway League in the person of the chairman, Sir Richard Dry. His proposal was that the Government raise a £400,000 loan, secured on the General Revenue under a guarantee from the districts through which the railway would pass to provide for interest by local taxation. It was thought that the sum of £400,000 would be adequate to complete the line.

The Ministry refused to listen to Dry. The League "may count on the most earnest opposition from the Government," stated The Mercury, which because of its determined opposition to the Government and the fact that Davies was Member for Devon, was compelled to give lukewarm support to the Western Railway. The Advertiser, however, expressed Southern opposition to the line - it would have "the ultimate effect of saddling the Colony with a sum equal to double its present debt, for the sake of supplying a mere section of the country with some 30 miles of a strictly local railroad."  

Dr. Chapman retired from politics in consequence of "commercial embarrassments" in June, and his seat was taken over by W. L. Dobson.

Parliament met again in the same month and the Treasurer, Charles Meredith, apparently confounded his critics when he informed the House that he estimated a budget surplus of £25,000 at the end of the year. This was amazing, but unfortunately was not a true indication of the financial position of the Colony: £20,000 of the surplus was a windfall in the shape of deferred payments from pre-emptive right property holders under the relevant regulations of 1851.

Railways again figured prominently in Parliamentary business, Allison's Main Line project receiving an early setback when a motion to vote £2,000 for initial survey was defeated.

The Northern League had, meanwhile, determined on renewed exertions to obtain a Railway Bill, and Adye Douglas was appointed to bring the matter of the Western Railway before the House of Assembly, with a view to thrashing out the question and preparing the ground for legislation.

An Enabling Act regarding the Mersey-Deloraine Tramway passed the Legislature in August. The Bill authorised the building of the line by a company of shareholders, and it now only awaited the amendment of the Waste Lands Act so that the

---

3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
Company could claim, and be granted, half a mile of property on each side of the line where it passed through Crown land. The Mersey and Deloraine Company asked for no money from the Government, and consequently its Railway Bills were not visited with minority support.

Again, the Northern Members were unsuccessful in their endeavour to introduce a Railway Bill, though it had not escaped their attention that the Government had helped the Mersey and Deloraine Tramway Company, if not by money, then by land grants.

"The treachery of some Northern Members and the hostility of Southern Members have defeated the promoters of the Western Railway in this Session," explained The Examiner.

The League next operated again through Dry who anointed the wounds of Southern Members by carrying through a Bill providing a sum of £3,000 to be donated by the Government for a Main Line survey, if the public raised £2,000.

Attributing the huge Colonial debt to provision for arrears machinations of previous regimes, The Advertiser greeted the Administration's new public works programme as the long sought remedy for the Colony's sickness. The Governor's Speech embraced roads, bridges and tramways, and the public work proposals were recommended by a Select Committee and passed in the shape of an Appropriation and Loan Bill without a dissenting voice. The measure involved an expenditure of £36,000, £26,000

to come from the Land Fund and $56,000 from a debenture loan, were secured on the Land Revenue. "Although the Bill meant money," he spent it in the Colony; it was rejected by the Legislative Council. "Dry's interested and factious obstruction" was unhappily seconded by the begotten prejudice and stolid indifference of other Members to general advancement of prosperity of the Colony". The Advertiser added that nearly all those who opposed the Public Works programme were already served by good, well supported, by a yearly appropriation from the General Revenue, and possessed land which had been granted to them from the disp! The Advertiser bitterly criticised Dry's opposition to what he had termed an "horribly expensive, utterly useless and impracticable project"; but the paper took heart from the fact that at least the Mersey and Deloraine Tramway Bill "establishes a precedent, which must prove fatal to the preposterous claims of the Deloraine Railway promoters." The same paper attributed the defeat of the Government's public works programme to the machinations of the Railway League: its members in Parliament, unable to secure the passage of a railway bill, had turned around and spitefully prevented the Government passing its cherished public works scheme.

Certainly in the prevailing atmosphere of suspicion and North-South animosity, the Advertiser did not have to look far for people to agree with its editorials. Balfe, when in the North the

---

2. Ibid., Sept. 24, 1864.
following year, 1865, went on record as saying that, concerning
the importance of the Government's public works scheme and the
Western Railway, "If the North was resolved to have a railroad,
was it fair to deny the Huon common roads?"

in the Mercury could stay silent no longer - Parliament had sat
for nearly three months, and the result of its deliberations had
been "utterly fruitless and abortive for all practical purposes".
With the exception of the Attorney-General, went on the Southern
daily, the Ministers were destitute of the training "ordinarily
held to be indispensable to fitness for public life." Risking the
displeasure of its readers, the Mercury declared that it was
clear that responsible government had been conferred a little
before the proper time; it could not be expected to thrive in
a Colony which had an urban population of 30,000 and a rural
one of double that number; there were too few people for free,
institutions to function with any chance of success.

The Mersey Trainway's share list was filling up by October,
but in Hobart Town little progress had been made towards raising
by public subscription the necessary £2,000 needed to enable a
survey of the Main Line to be undertaken. The Mercury thought
that the public was reluctant to subscribe the money because it
was to be paid into the Treasury first of all. This, however,
would scarcely have prevented Hobart Town citizens opening their
purses if they thought that they had anything to gain from the line.

Interest in gold mining was revived when Hargraves, the man whose discoveries on the mainland had brought about the gold rushes, was brought to Tasmania under the sponsorship of a Northern Committee to search for gold.\(^1\) He had no success in the Colony and the country was forced to resign itself to the fact that there were no large quantities of gold in the island. The anticipated discovery of the precious metal, however, had been a narcotic too long. There seemed no easy way out of the financial difficulties of the Colony.

The railway movement was dying out in the South, reported The Mercury early in the New Year, but not in the North, where the League was still negotiating with the Government. The Advertiser had no high opinion of the League: it "has pursued its avowed object with absolute disregard of every other consideration save the dictatorial will of one or two insolent clique dictators, who have contrived to establish a sort of reign of terrorism in Launceston, under which no man daren't doubt Sir Richard Dry's statistics, or dispute Mr Dowling's facts".\(^2\)

The Government still refused to unbend and treat with the League: publication of correspondence between the Northern body and the Administration revealed that the League had been asking the Ministry to cooperate in shaping a joint railway scheme that would give satisfaction to both parties. The Cabinet had replied shortly, speaking of "an irresponsible and self-constituted

---

1. H.M., Nov. 23, 1864.
2. W.A., Feb. 21, 1865.
organisation", and indicated plainly that it was resolved not to sacrifice the interests of the whole Colony for a section of it.\textsuperscript{1}

The Advertiser applauded the Government's answer and stood amazed at the temerity of the League in asking the Administration to submit a plan to it.\textsuperscript{2}

The Examiner, on the other hand, could not see how the Government could hold the opinion that the Western Railway would need to be built privately, independent of Government aid. Colonial capital, stated a leading article, was inadequate to undertake such a work with advantage, and if foreign money had to be employed, then the Government was obviously in the best position for securing satisfactory terms. "The points cannot be disputed so...it must devolve upon the Government to construct the line."\textsuperscript{3}

A new development in the railway field was the somewhat mysterious appearance of the prospectus of a "direct western Railway Company", which also proposed to build a line from Launceston to Deloraine. This body was to have a capital of £125,000, "to be raised by a subsidy from the Government, either in money or land, and by shares of £5 each." The Advertiser could see no reasonable objection to this second railway scheme, asking as it did only such aid from the Treasury as was sanctioned in the case of the Mersey-Deloraine line.\textsuperscript{4} Wedge, a Government supporter, headed the list of provisional directors, reported The Mercury.\textsuperscript{5}

The Examiner's reaction to this diversion was not altogether unexpected: "The use of this movement is to ask Parliament for a
further delay.¹

Consequently there were now four railway lines under
discussion: the Launceston—Deloraine line sponsored by the Northern
Railway League; a similar line, possibly Government sponsored,
and called the Direct Western Railway Company; the Jersey—
Deloraine Tramway, a private undertaking; and the Main Line, upon
which no definite action had as yet been taken. Of these lines,
only that from the Jersey to Deloraine appeared likely to be
started in the near future.

The appearance of a rival railway Company in the North
caused the League to redouble its efforts to come to an agreement
with the Government. The Examiner reported one of a number of plans
submitted to Ministers by the Northern railway body in an effort
to secure Government approval for the Western Line. The report
stated that a Company had been formed to lease and work the
Western Railway when it was completed. This Company was to have
a nominal capital of £100,000. A large number of shares had
already been taken up. The proposal was to lease the line for
50 years, the Company to pay 5% on the cost of construction for
10 years, and 6½% for the remaining period. Thus, said The
Examiner, the Government would be rid of all liability for interest,
and at the end of the term a fund would be provided nearly sufficient
to pay off the principal. The plan had the additional advantage
that landholders would escape assessment in the event of a deficiency.²

¹ L.E., April 22, 1865.
² Ibid.
But North-South jealousy was still a factor in preventing agreement on the railway question. It was, asserted The Examiner, exploited to the full in a Hobart Town Legislative Council election when A. Kennerley, the Ministerial candidate, defeated Hopkins, styled an "independent" by 226 votes to 159.  

"Every artifice was tried by the friends of Ministers to secure their result"; the jealousy of the South was stirred up and the bogey of a Northern Administration held up before them e.g. Hobart Town's 800 empty houses would be increased by the drain of labour; "the capital of Tasmania would be transferred from the broad estuary of the Derwent to the narrow and tortuous mud flats of the Tamar". 2 Envy played an important part in the League's struggle to secure the Western Railway but the Administration proceeded cautiously; it was only too conscious of the already dangerously large debt of the country. Its attitude was not altogether governed, as the North evidently thought, by a childish opposition to something it had not had the brains to originate. Nevertheless, the enterprise of the North should have been given some encouragement.

Parliament met again in July, 1865, and in his speech the Governor spoke of the economic depression under which the Colonies were labouring. Tasmania must develop local industries, he asserted, voicing the Government's conviction, but improved communications were the primary need. It was proposed in the forthcoming Session to consolidate the scattered Bills on municipalities and police.

1. H.M., June 23, 1865.
Notices of motion were given concerning a Railway Bill and Immigration. The Speech opening Parliament made no mention of the Western Railway, a fact which did not escape the attention of The Examiner. It continued to carry the torch for the Northern League.

Negotiations by correspondence between the League and the Ministry were broken off and Dry himself went to the Capital to confer with the Colonial Secretary in person. The result of these talks was an agreement by which the Government expressed its willingness to authorise the formation of a Company with £100,000 capital, and to authorise the issue of railway bonds for £300,000, with the interest guaranteed at 6%, the Government to have a lien on the railway plant and revenues, with power to levy a rate on the railway district for any deficiency. The Company had to raise the £100,000 before it could borrow the £300,000 on railway bonds.

Agreement to this proposal was reached at a public meeting of the League in Launceston, though The Examiner pointed out that land holders would have to be polled to determine their willingness to be subjected to a rate if necessary. 1

What had caused the Colonial Secretary to modify his views and come to an agreement with Dry? There can be little doubt that the sine qua non of Whyte's agreement with Dry's railway plan was Dry's support of the Public Works Bill. Certainly that delayed measure authorising the raising and expenditure of £106,000 passed both Houses surprisingly quickly after agreement had been reached on the permanent way.

Outlining the Administration's financial measures, The Advertiser noted that to meet the deficiency in 1864, £26,000 was to be temporarily transferred from the Land Fund to the General Revenue. To cover Government expenses during the current year, a £17,000 issue of debentures had been sanctioned by the House, and for 1866 an extension of Stamp and Succession Duties was thought to be necessary. In addition, £9,500 was to be withheld from Road Trusts and transferred from the Land Fund to the General Revenue. But after opposition in Parliament and petitions from outside, the Government withdrew this proposal.¹ These measures amply demonstrated the Ministry's plight.

The Jersey and Deloraine Railway Company began construction work in July and by September, reported The Mercury, had prevailed upon the Government to double the land grant: the cost of building the line had been found to be double the estimate.² The Company was now to receive a mile, instead of half a mile, of land on each side of the line, to be allotted as the line progressed - 15,360 acres (24 square miles) would be granted on the completion of the first 12 miles of the line, which happened to run through Crown Land.³ The Main Line survey plan had now evidently fallen through.

According to a report in The Advertiser, a surprising change of attitude occurred in the Legislative Council towards the end of the year. There was a general admission of the necessity

¹ L.Z., Sept. 23, 1865.
² H.M., Sept. 23, 1865.
³ Ibid.
for fiscal changes in the direction of a property tax. Some Councillors even desired the ending of Customs Duties, the whole expense of government to be paid by direct taxation. But before any drastic changes of this nature were brought before Parliament, commented The Advertiser, suddenly cautious, the country at large needed to be consulted.\(^1\)

The Advertiser, beginning in October, came under the management of W. D. J. Murray, the proprietor of its like-minded northern contemporary The Cornwall Chronicle. The name of the Hobart Town newspaper was changed to The Tasmanian Morning Herald, and it announced its political leanings to be at once "Liberal and Unsectarian".\(^2\)

November of 1865 saw the formation of a "Railway Progress Association" in Hobart Town\(^3\), and also, in the North, the appointment of six men to take the railway poll. They included the "wardens of Longford, Westbury and Deloraine.\(^4\)

The poll was taken on December 16, the scale of voting adopted allowing land holders assessed at £10 and under £50 a year one vote, and one vote for each additional £50 up to £450, with a maximum of 10 votes. More than the requisite two thirds majority of land owners pledged themselves for the repayment of any expense to which the country might be put by the railway loan, 2,230 votes favouring the measure and 564 opposing it.

---

1. T.H., Sept. 23, 1865.  
4. Ibid.
The Examiner printed a comprehensive account of the day's voting on blue paper, the flag of the Railway League being blue, and hailed the result as a signal triumph of good sense: the result of the poll was the "harbinger of incalculable good to this Colony".\(^1\) The Tasmanian Morning Herald took a different view, remarking that the Railway League had "got their elephant. We shall now see how far they are able to feed him".\(^2\)

But this was only the beginning. A Company needed to be formed and £100,000 raised by shares. Only half of this amount was subscribed and a move was under way in Parliament to enable a Company to assume shape with paid up shares amounting to £50,000, when the White Administration went to the country on the question of an Income and Property Tax.

A hint of what was to come was contained in the pro-Government Herald early in 1866, the paper noting that the only way out of the Colony's financial difficulties seemed to be the imposition of an Income Tax.\(^3\) The Mercury berated the Government for not fulfilling its election promises to put the Colony's finances on a sound footing. The Southern paper pointed out that revenue fell short of the expenditure in 1863 by £6,000, was £26,000 short in 1864, and likely to be greater for 1865, the year just passed.\(^4\)

The Examiner declared that the Government had reached the end of its tether: duty on tea had been increased from threepence to sixpence a pound, raw sugar from three shillings to six

---

2. T.M.H., Dec. 23, 1865.  
3. T.M.H., Jan. 23, 1866.  
4. H.M., Feb. 21, 1866.
shillings, refined sugar from six shillings to eight shillings per hundredweight, cigars and snuff from three shillings to four shillings a pound, malt liquor in wood from threepence to sixpence a gallon. Even these increases had proved inadequate to cover the expenditure, so the Administration in desperation charged a package duty of two shillings per cubic foot. 1

The ministry by March, 1866, had said nothing of the proposals with which it intended to approach Parliament at the next Session, though The Examiner had detected a rumour that the Whyte Administration might try to tax property and radically change the tariff at present in force. 2 Apart from this there was nothing fresh in Colonial politics till July 21, when the new Parliamentary Session was opened. The Governor told the assembled House and Council that his Government proposed to bring forward Bills to make the port free, remove duties from everything but beer, spirits, and tobacco, and substitute a Property and Income Tax of one shilling and a penny in the £ on all incomes over £80 a year.

Meredith estimated that the Property Tax, to be assessed on the basis of the annual value of properties, would yield £38,000, and the Income Tax £70,300. Such a programme, stated the Administration, "will not only place the revenue on a sure foundation, but will give a healthy stimulus to national industry, and invite trade, commerce and population...." 3

1. L.E., Feb. 20, 1866.
So at last it had come. The Government, having taxed nearly everything else, had taken its courage in its hands and proposed a tax on Property and Income. But still a majority of Members of Parliament clung to the belief that there must be alternative means of defraying the costs of government. The Income and Property Tax was a revolutionary plan for any Australian Colony; indeed, such too revolutionary for Tasmania.

The Mercury did not lend its support to the Government plan to place the Colony's finances on something approaching a permanent footing: "The Treasurer's proposition was to give up between £70,000 and £80,000 certain for an uncertainty of between £100,000 and £110,000. "What our friends in England will think, when they come to hear of it, is not of small moment to us".1

The Examiner reported that public meetings at Westbury, Evandale, Longford, and Carrick had protested against the Income Tax, and in an Editorial the Launceston paper claimed that land holders did not clear 5½ yearly on the value of their properties and so would rather sell out than pay the projected Property Tax.2 The measure was doomed even before a vote was taken in the House.

When the Property and Income Tax Bill came before a committee of the full House of Assembly in due course, it was apparent that both Government supporters, or erstwhile supporters, and opponents of the administration, were bent on mischief. Meredith, in bringing forward his Tax Bill, had bestowed the kiss of death on the Ministry.
The Government proposals were quickly pared down, the tax rate being reduced to $2.5%, for one year only, thus compelling the Government to impose some Customs Duties to make up the deficit. Douglas then moved that the House consider the Customs Bill before the Income Tax Bill was introduced. The Government narrowly averted defeat by 15 votes to 13, and the attorney-General secured a postponement of the discussion. But when members met again on September 4, Dobson moved that the Chairman leave the chair, "with the view of the final overthrow of the measures".

Those who voted for Dobson's motion were:—Davies, Adams, Lett, Sherwin, Bodery, Sharland, Perkins, Rose, Scott, Walker, Meredith and Dobson. The men who supported the Government were:—the Colonial Treasurer (C. Meredith), the Attorney-General (R.B. Miller), Murray, Horne, Gregson, Sibley, DeGraves, Hayas, Lewis, Hodgson, J. Lord. Swan and J. Lord, and Douglas and Cansdell paired off. Grant was not in the House but would have almost certainly voted in the affirmative.

Dobson's motion was thus carried by 12 votes to 11. Meredith thereupon moved the adjournment of the Chamber and advised Governor Gore Browne to a prorogue the House. The Third Parliament of the Colony was accordingly dissolved on September 13, 1866. The time had not yet come when the House would consent to a Property and Income Tax. The Colony was destined to become bankrupt unless minerals were discovered, or unless Parliament acquiesced in measures to tax the valuable land of the Island.

1. H.M., Sept. 25, 1866.
CHAPTER EIGHT

The Election of 1866

The Candidates.

Forty-six men contested the election, 14 competing for Hobart Town's seats and five for Launceston's. No other constituency had more than two candidates, and 14 of the remaining 22 electorates elected representatives unopposed.

The usual large number of landed proprietors were nominated and elected to the House. Thirteen of the new Members had not been elected in the last election - J. Crookes, J. Scott, D. Lewis, W. Barnes, W. Sibley, W.L. Dobson, W. Archer, J. Swan, J.W. Cleadow, George Gibson, W.L. Crowther, H.S. Barrett and G. Salier. But of these men, Crookes, Dobson and Archer had been elected in the 1861 election. Consequently 10 Members of the new House of Assembly were fresh to the task of Government.

The Member for Glenorchy, Dr Robert Officer, was again elected unopposed to become Speaker of the Assembly.

All the experienced politicians who nominated were re-elected, with the exception of Horne, who polled last but one in Hobart Town. Such policy-makers as Douglas, Gregson, W.L. Dobson, C. Meredith, Chapman and R.B. Miller succeeded in securing seats, though only Douglas and Gregson were returned for their old constituencies. Chapman was returned for Hobart Town - Campbell Town had been his constituency in 1862. Dobson

* See page 263.
and Charles Meredith and R.B. Miller were all three defeated on their first candidature and only gained election upon a second attempt. Other well known figures returned included Ralph, Hodgson, Dodery, R. Walker, J. Meredith, Davies and Sharland.

Eleven men had voted against Dobson's motion on September 4 that the Chairman of the House Committee leave the chair. Of these men - C. Meredith, R.B. Miller, Murray, Horne, Gregson, Sibley, Degraves, Hayes, Lewis, Hodgson and Lord - only Murray, Degraves and Hayes were not returned and the latter two men did not stand for election again.
The Issues

The years 1865 and 1866 were very bad years for Tasmania. Trade reached a new low. It is against a background of stagnant commerce and lack of enterprise that the election was contested. Few people in the Colony were capable of advocating the adoption of a long term plan to place the Colony back on its feet. Minor issues became increasingly important in the minds of legislators as the number of men of vision became smaller.

Especially in the South was the depression felt. The Colony, and Robert Town in particular, noticed the effects of its penal origin in no uncertain way. The low standards of workmanship brought about by ex-convict workmen seemed to spread from the South throughout the Island. Everywhere the mentality and lack of initiative and speculation of a prison labourer was apparent. Tasmanians now looked upon the Colony's position as hopeless. The adoption of Protection by Victoria was the last straw. It was illustrative of the prevailing restricted view that the expanding population of New South Wales was not seen as a possible buyer of Tasmanian goods.

In addition, the great decrease in demand for timber made the task of the new settler more difficult than it had been previously when he could look forward to paying some of the expenses of clearing land by selling timber/he found standing so thickly on his selection. Now it was merely burnt.
The election had one predominant issue, confidence or non-confidence in the Whyte Ministry's Income and Property Tax measure. The customary personal matters played a part in the individual constituencies as they were bound to do with so few men exercising the franchise, but it was agreed on all sides that the tax question was the issue to be decided at the polls.

The question of whether the Government should subsidise the building of the Western Railway had, in the past, excited considerable North-South animosity, which was not altogether forgotten even in the joint opposition of both ends of the Island to the Whyte Government's Property and Income Tax proposal. But The Mercury saw the issue as not that of North versus South, but of Income Tax or no Income Tax. "Let an income tax be once imposed on this country, and that tendency to decadence, against which it has been so long struggling, will acquire an impetus which nothing can arrest... Capitalists will leave the Colony and capital flow out of it. Where then would employment be found for working men"? 1

The Mercury had no need to use the future tense. Figures quoted by R.B. Miller during the Launceston election told a grim tale. Customs revenue had declined from £171,100 in 1859 to £117,000 in 1860. It had risen to £130,000 in 1862 with

1. H.M., Sept. 29, 1866.
the imposition of the ad valorem duties, but when package

duties were introduced and the tax on tea and sugar doubled the

following year, the income from that source had dropped to

£135,000. It had fallen again, when duties were increased in

1864, to £127,000, and in 1865 had touched bottom with £119,000.¹

The Examiner, for its part, also opposed the inauguration

of an Income and Property Tax, not so much because it would, as

many candidates feared, drive capital from the Colony, but

because in the paper's opinion there was still room for extensive

retrenchment, from £377,000 per year government expenditure

to £160,000.² Any increase in taxation was thus to be deplored.

How the Examiner justified this contention, in the light of the

Royal Commission Report on reduction in 1863³, it is difficult

to see.

The Tasmanian Morning Herald remained faithful to the

Ministry and saw the issue as simply one of faith in the

Ministry's measures. It was better "to strike out a new path to

prosperity, rather than trust to what has proved so very broken

a read."⁴

The Premier Whyte, as a Member of the Legislative Council,

was not compelled to go to the country, and the task of voicing

Ministerial policy fell to Charles Meredith. He pointed out to

the electors of Kingborough, upon his second attempt to gain

1. L.V., Sept. 2, 1866.
2. L.V., Sept. 23, 1866
election, the imperative necessity of imposing the Income and Property Tax. To the Colonial Treasurer, the Government's direct taxation measure, and its wisdom, was the issue on which he was prepared to fight the election. The attorney-General, Miller, was also content to stand or fall on the Income and Property Tax question. ¹

W.L. Dobson, who had once been attorney-General in Chapman's saw Cabinet, also the principal question at issue as the Income and Property Tax Bill, but to him "the principles of ministerial policy are objectionable in the highest degree". ² The ex-Premier Chapman was of like mind, opposing the tax scheme and, in common with most opponents of the plan, desiring in its place more retrenchment. ³

The direct tax, then, was the chief election issue, but coupled with it was the old cry of further retrenchment.

(ii)

The Examiner, although acknowledging the importance of the tax question, still asserted that the issue would never have arisen in the first place if the administration had retrenched firmly. The Northern paper asserted that all pensions to public servants should be abolished for a start. Then could follow reduction of the Governor's salary. "The successful

¹ L.E., Oct. 2, 1866.
² H.M., Sept. 28, 1866.
³ H.M., Oct. 9, 1866.
statesman in our case will be the man who will bring down the expenditure to below the normal income which can be raised without injuring any interest or interference with the progress of the country". "The greatest mistake made by every Ministry since the occasion of responsible government has been to try to bring up the revenue to the expenditure, instead of reducing the expenditure to the revenue."¹

The Mercury thought it unlikely that Government expenditure could be reduced from £300,000 to £100,000, as The Examiner confidently held. England governed its people at a cost of £2 per head a year, and Victoria at almost £5, went on the paper, and in the light of these figures, the Tasmanian Government could not expect to administer at £1 per head. The Mercury declared, in conclusion, that retrenchment could be effected.² It neglected to say where.

The Tasmanian Morning Herald and The Cornwall Chronicle both supported the Minister in this election, but made little balanced comment in their editorial columns on the issues involved. The Chronicle in particular degenerated to the point where it did little but throw mud at the squattocracy and report in wearisome detail the election meetings of its proprietor W.D.L. Murray.

The Ministers pointed to the 1863 Commission's Report as conclusive evidence that their assertion was correct that additional retrenchment could do only harm to the Colony. But

¹. L.E., Oct. 3 and 8, 1866.
². H.M., Oct. 1, 1866.
opposition candidates were convinced, or so they said, that as far as retrenchment was concerned, where there was a will there was a way. Again and again they give the clear impression that retrenchment must be practicable because it is the only alternative to direct taxation, a devilish device. At their wits' end then, opponents of the Government's taxation scheme simply ignored the Royal Commission's report. They were unable to say precisely where or how retrenchment could be carried into effect, except for withdrawal of municipal and other grants-in-aid, but were firmly convinced that reduction on a large scale could be accomplished. John Meredith, for example, was sure that retrenchment could be carried out to the extent of thousands of pounds.¹ W.L. Dobson was of a similar opinion but he was a little less sweeping—he too believed that retrenchment had not been implemented to the uttermost, but he realised that as well as this, "a readjustment of the burden of taxation", was also a prerequisite to the withdrawal of direct taxation schemes.²

Government supporters pointed out bitterly that "retrenchment or ruin" was the false banner under which the landed proprietors marshalled their forces. But the voice of reason went unheeded. Retrenchment was brought up by so large a number of candidates opposing the Government's measures, that it must have convinced many electors that reduction had not been carried out as they would have wished. The cry from the squatters for more retrenchment was a retaliatory and necessary consequence of the direct tax which Whyte's Administration aimed at them.

¹ H.M., Sept. 25, 1866.  ² H.M., Sept. 28, 1866.
The question of railways occupied Parliament's attention a long time, but the Property and Income Tax reduced it to a minor issue in this election. Chapman, for instance, only mentioned railways casually, and then merely to say that he would support their introduction when the finances of the Colony were put in order. Clearly, to him the railway question could be settled when direct taxation had been dealt with. In Hobart Town, Horne told the electors that he would not run the country into debt for railways; R.P. Miller opposed the building of a North-South railway if it was to proceed on the lines of the Western project i.e. in the hands of a private body, and Barrett, also, in the Capital, told a meeting of electors that retrenchment must come before any thought of railways. In the North, the importance of the Western railway was a tomatically emphasised by all successful candidates.

Another facet of the railway question was the degree to which it had provoked animosity between North and South. The League was identified by some Hobart Town citizens as a instrument whereby the North could obtain its railway and at the same time transfer the wealth and population of the Colony to the North. The Mercury did not believe that the election centred around any question of possible Northern dominance, but it did accuse J.H. Wilson, a member of Whyte's Cabinet of raising the bogey of

---

a Northern Ministry constituted of Dry, Hermode, Douglas and Archer. The Tasmanian Herald, however, warned its readers in the south of the consequences of a Government defeat - there would be formed an incompetent Northern Ministry slavishly devoted to the interests of the Railway League.

The generally-recognised position was, that pro-railway feeling was so strong in the North that unqualified support of the League was essential if a candidate wished to have a hope of election.

1. H.M., Sept. 26, 1866.
2. T.M.H., Oct. 6, 1866.
The Elections

(c). Hobart Town. The Hobart Town election was one of the last. The Mercury interpreting the late issue of the writ as a device whereby rejected ministerial candidates from all over the Colony would be enabled at the last moment to gain election by deceiving the electors of the Capital. 1 Certainly the paper's prophecy was partially fulfilled when R.B. Miller and Murray fell back on Hobart Town in an endeavour, successful in Miller's case, to secure a seat. All but five men—Reck, Moriarty, O'Reilly, Horne and Murray—of the 14 candidates for the Southern constituency polled over 500 votes. W.L. Growther topped the poll with 957 votes. Others elected were Chapman, R.B. Miller, Barrett and Salier.

Growther was one of the first in the field for Hobart Town. He opposed the Government's Property and Income Tax for reasons which had been reiterated ad nauseam throughout the Island during the campaign—that the tax would ultimately bring distress to the working classes whom it was alleged to aid, and "lead to the retrocession of every important interest in the country". In Growther's opinion, colonial unemployment was the main problem to be faced, and this could be alleviated by moderate protection calculated to give new life to industry. 2

The man who came second in the Hobart Town voting was Chapman who, like Growther, resisted the Government's tax

1. H.N., Oct. 8, 1866.
scheme and approved of retrenchment. He said, as well, that
some revision of the tariff was necessary and that overtures
should be made to the Government's of the other Colonies on the
mainland, and New Zealand, with a view to inducing them to
admit free of duties such Tasmanian produce as timber and grain,
on condition that their exports to Tasmania be treated likewise.

Another successful candidate was H. S. Barrett. He too
expressed opposition to the proposed Property and Income Tax for
any except local or railway purposes, giving as his reasons the
fear he held that such a measure would drive capital from the
Colony and consequently inflict hardship on the industrial
classes who would find themselves without anyone to employ them.

Barrett further stated that overtures should be made with the Governments
of the other Australian Colonies and New Zealand to induce them to admit duty free such
Tasmanian produce as timber and grain, on condition that their
similar products be treated likewise. Chapman also urged that
more encouragement be given to potential settlers. He stated that

1. H.M., Oct. 9, 1866.
he would support the introduction of railroads, but only when the
finances of the Colony allowed it.¹

The semblance of an anti-Government group already discernible
became clearer towards the middle of the month when Crowther,
Chapman, Adams and Barrett joined forces to address the electorate.
Crowther spoke first at this combined meeting, but on his
appearance a man made his way to the steps at the bottom of the
platform and requested payment of an account. This man Crowther
referred to some one else. An egg was then thrown, bespattering
the newspaper reporters' table. Crowther then addressed his
audience on the unnecessary nature of the Income and Property
Tax - before such a plan was embodied in an Act of Parliament, he
said, retrenchment should be enforced more vigorously than at
present, cheap land sales abolished, the tariff revised and
municipal grants withdrawn.

To judge from The Mercury’s report of this meeting,
Crowther evidently convinced his hearers that abundant
multiplicity of alternatives was, in fact, practicable.

Chapman, when his turn came to speak, apparently fell a
victim to the "planned interruptions" of which The Mercury spoke,
for when he had offered the usual objection to the direct tax,
"the roughs became very impatient and an egg was aimed at Mr
Chapman and missed. Mr Chapman asked if that was an Englishman".
An attempt was then made to turn out the assailant and in the
Issuing chaos the speaker was compelled to stand on a table to
bring his speech to a close.
Adams was the only one of the four to be defeated in the Capital, and to judge from the nature of his reception, it may have been personal unpopularity rather than disagreement with his policy that led to his defeat. He was greeted with "laughter and cheers followed by tremendous confusion," Mr. Adams insisted upon remaining "to reenact with the meeting." A number of eggs was thrown at the speaker but most of them "very wide . . . and without effect". Adams retired from the rostrum then, several eggs being pelted after him when he had voiced his opposition to the projected Ministerial tax, and recommended a greater degree of self sufficiency by the municipalities.

Barrett was the fourth speaker and he received a good hearing, opposing the Government tax measure as had the previous speakers.

Another successful candidate was G. Salier, who, was made the fifth man on the anti-Ministerial ticket. It is difficult to find a reason for his election: he publicised a policy in which he said, evasively that he would "support measures as will enable the Government to bring the expenditure within the income." He was, however, a Director of the Main Line Company, and it could be that he voted in on the strength of his determination not to let the North outdo the South in the matter of railroads. But another Hobart Town candidate, Moriarty, at an election meeting "showed the necessity of encouraging the Main Line of railway to prevent the Northern party from having all their own way", 2

1. N. W., Oct. 16, 1866.
2. N. W., Oct. 20, 1866.
and polled very poorly. The supporters of the Government in Hobart Town were R.B. Millen, J.L. Lord, Pock and Raffe; reported "The Mercury." 1 Lord, although "a man of large property," nevertheless supported the Income and Property Tax. The Morning Herald was pleased to be able to report. It went on to note that Pock was a railway advocate, and Raffe the author of a pamphlet which had suggested the Land Bill of the last session to the Attorney-General. 2

Protection was still a live issue in Hobart Town and a meeting composed chiefly of the artisan and mechanic class moved that this meeting view with alarm the great decrease which has taken place in our artisan population within the last few years, and consider that the only remedy to prevent a still further downward tendency is by adoption of such measures as will tend to encourage the establishment of manufactures, so that the youth of the Colony may find employment instead of being driven to seek it in the neighbouring Colonies. 3

Cansdell, Horne and Murray were left out in the cold, and all three paid the penalty of political isolation by being defeated, although Cansdell, who supported the Income and Property Tax 4, was only 43 votes behind Salier, the fifth Hobart Town Member.

Upon his rejection by Launceston, E.B. Miller stood for

---

Hobart Town and, it would seem, secured a seat by a masterly
two and a half hour harangue to the Hobart Town electors.

Attributing his Northern defeat to the fact that he refused in

to surrender unconditionally to the League, a disciplined
minority which had triumphed over an undisciplined majority, the
Attorney-General launched into his main thesis — that further
retrenchment was impossible, as the Royal Commission had shown.
What the Government desired, went on the speaker, was Free Trade.
If the port was to be made free, then the general revenue
derived from Customs would need to be made up elsewhere. And
where better but from a Property and Income Tax on those
wealthy men who paid little more than nothing into the revenue,
what little the Government received affecting their means not at
all? Miller expanded his theme, pointing out the injustice of
Duties which compelled a man with a family to pay more than the
rich person who, to pile injustice on injustice, had received in
many cases a free grant of land, and then went about the country
telling people not to speak of class war. The sheep industry
was flourishing, declared Miller — a tax would not drive away
the land-grabbing woolocracy. 1

This speech by Miller infuriated The Mercury, which
redoubled its already strenuous efforts to effect the defeat
of Miller and Charles Meredith. They were subjected to a double
column of editorial abuse day in day out for nearly the whole

election period, Miller had been similarly treated by The Examiner during the Launceston election, that paper accusing him, among other things, of having "the conscience of a rat" in getting out of the Chapman Ministry and into the next. 1

In his policy address in The Tasmanian Morning Herald, Rolfe, a Colonist from New South Wales, supported the Government, predicting to put his pamphlet, "The Nationalisation of the Public Lands of Tasmania, and Free Trade with the world", into practice in connection with a system of direct taxation, free ports and abolition of customs duties throughout the Colony.

Peck, too, approved of the Government's policy; he was "an ardent friend of Railways and Progress". But linking the Government and enthusiasm for railways could hardly be expected to raise the electorate's opinion of the candidate's intelligence.

No reason is apparent for the omission of Horne from the Ministerial Ticket. He had topped the poll in 1861 when he stood for Hobart Town, and now supported the Government in its move to tax income and property. But in view of the few number of votes he polled, it is clear that he had offended his supporters in some way.

At an election meeting, Horne drew attention to the fact that debentures had been issued so far by Tasmanian governments for £2½ million, for which the annual interest was £40,000, a

2. L.B., Oct. 15, 1866.
sizeable sum to be paid out of an annual income from General Revenue of £371,000. The source of prosperity was population, declined acreage, and to encourage immigration or repeated giving to new settlers 10 to 20 acres of land or certain conditions, subject thereto. If necessary, the land could be taxed at a rate of something like two shillings an acre. Turning to the subject of retrenchment, the speaker failed to see in what way the Colony could reduce expenditure; an Income and Property Tax was inevitable, but Horne did not agree with the Government's proposed complete and immediate abolition of customs duties; he wanted a return to moderate duties. The Examiner felt called upon to speak its mind concerning the Hobart Town Government supporters. Horne, Lord and Beveridge (although Beveridge was not standing): "Generally they are...connected with the white-tereditary administration by personal obligations, by family ties, or by the influence of social intercourse, male and female, which have been so insensibly cultivated and so much relied on by that administration." It was unfortunate that the Examiner did give further details of family modifications in the Government.

Another of the unsuccessful candidates was Morintry, a prominent protectionist who had been elected to Parliament in the Southern Railway in a by-election the year before. He appealed to the electorate, and especially the working class, on the grounds that he was a native-born Tasmanian, and made

1. H.R., Oct. 11, 1866.
protection the chief plank of his election platform. Protection was the cure for the Colony's ills, Moriarty asserted: subsidies to manufactures and expenditure on public works would proper

The final voting, however, returned Crowther, Chapman, Miller, Barrett and Salier. The Mercury published an analysis of the voting and it is from this that the following statistics have been drawn. There were 2,890 electors on the Hobart Town Rolls, compared with 3,689 in 1861. About 4,400 men in the constituency were over 21 years of age and of the 2,890 voters, 1,826 exercised the franchise. Of the 14 candidates, four had represented Hobart Town in the last Parliament viz. Adams, Cansdell, Horne and Lord. Chapman had formerly represented Hobart Town, and subsequently Queenborough and Campbell Town. Neither of the remaining seven candidates had been in Parliament before, although Barrett and Moriarty had been candidates at a previous election.

The combination of votes, according to the analysis made by The Mercury from statistics returned by the returning officer, showed that "Many electors gave their suffrages without regard to a principle; candidates of all shades of political sentiment being ballotted for by the same voter. In respect however, to the different tickets, the opposition ticket was voted for by 489 electors out of the 1,673, giving 2,445 votes out of the total number of 7,819. The Ministerial ticket as such was only

2. See Appendix.
recognised by 17 voters, but 356 voted for that ticket, with the addition of Danedell for a fifth; 17 voted for the ministerial ticket with the addition of one of the opposition ticket, and 21 for that ticket, taking one of the independent candidates for a fifth.

Votes to the extent of 4,045 out of the total of 7,819 were given to the "opposition" men, the votes to the "ministerial" men were 2,612, and those to the "independent" candidates amounted altogether to 1,152, clearly a verdict in favour of the "opposition" independent.

It would appear then, that the electors of Hobart Town gave a strong anti-Government decision, electing as they four men - Crowther, Chapman, Barrett and Salier - opposed to the Government's Income and Property Tax Scheme, and committed to extensive of a strong anti-Government decision, electing as they four men - Crowther, Chapman, Barrett and Salier - opposed to the Government's income and Property Tax Scheme, and committed to extensive retrenchment. The electors' reasons for rejecting Government candidates could hardly lay in the fact that only those with incomes of over £30 a year would be liable for taxation because even skilled artisans earned only a little over that sum. The chief factor in the opposition candidates' victory most probably lay in the fear men had that employers would be driven from the Colony and thus leave the working classes worse off than they were already. The £10 householder would not be hit hard by a direct tax and would, with everyone, welcome the lowered prices which would result from the Government's plan to eliminate duties on everything but beer, spirits and tobacco. But the argument of the anti-Government forces that such a tax would compel employers

1. W.M., Nov. 9, 1866.
to leave the Colony was not answered by anyone, and it is unlikely that this factor did not weigh heavily against the Government of the day. Miller was elected on a policy of property and Income Tax, and an unequivocal one at that. If it is said that the Hobart Town electors were opposed to this tax, then the reasons for Miller's election could have been the electorate's realisation of his experience in Government. Probably more important still was his indictment of the Northern Railway League as the organisation which defeated him because he would not surrender his independence to it. Such an attack on the alleged undue influence wielded by the League was bound to find no disfavour in the South, where jealousy of the North was still apparent. And the Miller shrewdly indicated that he would support the construction of a Main Line of railway, although he added the proviso that the line should cost less than £500,000 and not be in the hands of the League-like organisation which at present contemplated laying it down. As well as these factors, Miller's personality should be taken into account, for if the wide Press coverage of his candidature is any indication, he spoke fluently and was always master of the situation. Despite Miller's election as a Member for the Capital, the fact remains that Hobart Town gave a decisive decision against the Government and the policy on which it went to the country.

(b), Launcestone. There were five candidates in Launceston and the election in the Northern city resulted in an unmistakeable defeat for the Government, in the persons of Miller and Murray.
But here it would seem that the electorate's verdict was one that
favoured railway construction more than it actually went against
the Government, although the cry for more retrenchment raised by
opponents of the Administration played a not unimportant part.

The men who opposed the Government and supported the
establishment of railways, were Letts, Crookes and Scott.
All went to the electorate with this same policy: the Western
Railway was indispensable, retrenchment was a necessity and the
Property and Income Tax unwise—because it would drive capital and
capitalists from the Colony. Crookes himself indicated that
nothing had shaken his belief that fixed duties were adequate to
raise all the revenue the country needed.\(^1\) However, none of the
Levenston candidates, so far as can be discovered, went to the
electorate with The Examiner's argument that government of the
Colony had come to such a pass that responsible government should
be relinquished in favour of a semi-elective single Chamber, as
was the Legislature before 1856.\(^2\)

Miller asserted that he was a staunch supporter of the
western Railway and had entered Cabinet on the understanding
that he could go his own way on the matter. That he was heart and
soul behind the railway movement, he illustrated by reference to
the 1863 Land Law and the clause that ensured grants of land in
proportion to the extent of operations to promoters of railways
and similar works.

---

1. L.E., Sept. 22, 1866.
2. L.E., Sept. 28, 1866.
Pursuing the subject of retrenchment, Miller Government pressed on those who claimed that retrenchment was still possible: "Sherwin, one of the Members of the Commission which he had found no room for reduction, now had the audacity to turn around and tell Selby electorate that retrenchment could be made! Furthermore, said the speaker, as regards the withdrawal of municipal aid as a means of reducing Government expenditure, he had in 1864 introduced a Bill to accomplish this, but it had been "scouted as tyrannical to the last degree.""

An Income and Property Tax was the only true remedy for the Colony, concluded Miller, for "the great items of expenditure are unassailable without the consent of the Imperial Government." (Miller was referring to State Aid, the Colony's share in the support of pauper establishments and the Governor's salary).

Dowling, the Secretary of the Railway League, then spoke in opposition to Miller. He brought up the subject of a Debenture Bill, by which the Executive would have been able to levy taxes on every free-hold to make up any deficiency that might arise in the Land Fund in providing for the interest and sinking fund of debentures issued by the Government. Furthermore, asserted Dowling, Miller's Government had made the Railway Bill unworkable by stipulating public subscription to the extent of £100,000. A motion by the speaker that Miller was not a fit and proper person to represent Launceston was carried by the overwhelming majority of 500 votes to 150, according to The Examiner's estimate.

1. L.B., Sept. 26, 1866.
The other Launceston candidate identified with the Government was D.F.Wilkie Murray, proprietor of The Cornwall Chronicle. At his first election meeting, reported The Examiner, he "entered into a most elaborate enumeration of the many benefits he had conferred on the public since he became a Member", and supported the Government's argument concerning retrenchment which, he stated, was the cry of the rich against the poor. At another meeting he reaffirmed his intention to support State Aid, the introduction of railways and aid to municipalities.

But in a railway-conscious electorate, Murray was daunted in the eyes of the Launceston electors because of his opposition, while in the House, to a clause of the Railway Bill. He did not make up lost ground by supporting the Property and Income Tax measure because "it was fairer to the poorer classes".

Polling day in Launceston was an unruly one, reported The Examiner. The railway trio standing for election displayed anti-Government posters which were, however, torn down by a mob early in the day. Fighting broke out at several points, the Chairman at one last minute meeting becoming "sufficiently inflamed with excitement to put a respectable citizen forcibly on the ground". But the demonstrations by Government sympathisers evidently had little effect, for the railway supporters Lette, Crookes and Scott were carried triumphantly into power by a large majority, Crookes attributing the result to "that grand organisation

---

1. L.E., Sept. 28, 1866.
3. O.C., Oct. 25, 1866.
5. See Page
the "Railway League". 1

the Public feeling in Launceston regarding the Western Railway was very decided if judged from this election. But although it explained Murray's defeat, pro-railway sentiment does not altogether explain Miller's rejection by the electorate. He was an able and well-known man, and it would not have been surprising to see him gain third place on the poll. But evidently his association with an Administration which had the reputation of being reluctant to build railways, together with his forthright support of the Income and Property Tax Bill, was too much for the Launceston electors to stomach. In addition to this, personal matters must have counted for something in such a small electorate; if he had given cause for the city property holders, say, to dislike him, then Miller had an uphill fight. There is no evidence that this was so, but in this as in many another election before and after, it seems from Press comment that personal quarrels might well play a part out of proportion to their actual importance. This was only to be expected in a backward Colony of small constituencies.

The anti-Government decision was, on the face of it, more marked in the North than in the South, but was of a different character. In the South, the men campaigning against the Government could speak only of retrenchment as an alternative to Property and Income tax and withdrawal of duties, and found

themselves able to defeat the Government on that issue. "But in

certainly, the North the opposition candidates had a much stronger case
for the introduction of railways than the Southern opposition
had for retrenchment. According to a statement in The Examiner,
the supporters of Murray and Miller voted "unwisely" for "Murray" and
received 181 single votes. The next largest number of "plumpers"
was 37, received by Miller. If Miller and Murray had campaigned
together on the one ticket, one of them would have had a greater
chance of being elected. But as it was, the Railway League had
won the day, though the election was fought more on the tax
issue than the Western Railway.

(c). Glamorgan. Glamorgan was contested by Charles Morodith,
the Colonial Treasurer, and his brother John, an opponent of the
Government who left Beloraie, the electorate for which he had
been elected in 1862. The election in Glamorgan was looked on by
the Colonial Press as a decisive one because, it was argued, if
the Colonial Treasurer's home electorate rejected him, then there
was in that judgement a sure indication that his tax scheme was
not looked on favourably by the rest of the Colony.

Charles Morodith's Press address to the electors of
Glamorgan was a reasoned attempt to justify the whyte Government's
financial policy. He/She by showing that the Government had
indeed retrenched as far as it dared by repeal of the Pension
Bill, the consolidation and abolition of offices, the closing of
Oaklands Gaol and by "strict economy throughout the public service".

1 L. H. S., Oct. 5, 1866.
Certainly, said the Treasurer, the revenue could be further augmented by increased Customs Duties, but for the already highly taxed industrial classes, this would be a dismal prospect indeed. Again, the issues of debentures for revenue purposes would only add to the Colony's difficulties, because the more debentures that were issued, the greater became the interest. This was a dead-end policy. Thus Meredith concluded that a Property and Income Tax was the only possibility, "the fairest of all taxes". People would pay according to their means, the finances of the country would be placed on a sound footing and the snow-balling national debt arrested.

Meredith included in his policy, to demonstrate the Government's desire to confer lasting benefits on the Colony, a paper on public works, showing the manner and place of expenditure, both projected and completed.1

John Meredith took the usual anti-Government line used in this election. He was convinced that the deficiency in the revenue could be made up without recourse to the Income and Property Tax which would but serve to drive out capital and capitalists, to the ultimate injury of all, especially the working class. Retrenchment, he asserted, could be carried out to the extent of thousands of pounds. As well, the Government needed to encourage agriculture and Colonial manufactures, and build roads to make cheap and easy communication possible.2

1. T.M.H., Sept. 24, 1866.
2. T.M.H., Sept. 25, 1866.
The Mercury opposed the re-election of Charles Meredith with bitterness and implacability. It took exception to Meredith's list, in his electoral address, of the roads and bridges contemplated; this in the Mercury's view was tantamount to bribery. The paper opposed him unfavourably with his brother John, who had "nothing to sustain him but public principle".

Whereas Charles Meredith entered on the election with his hands full of offers of roads and bridges, it was known the same paper nearly had a fit when it realised that the Glamorgan and Campbell Town elections were to be held on the same day. Here indeed was ample proof of the Government's perfidy, for this arrangement would prevent those electors with property in such constituency from recording their vote for W.L. Dobson (Campbell Town), and at the same time voting against Charles Meredith in the neighbouring constituency of Glamorgan. The Mercury urged the new Parliament to amend the electoral Act so that an elector would not find himself disfranchised for a district in which he was entitled to vote.

Not content with arranging matters thus, went on the Hobart Town Daily, the Government was tolerating Whyte's canvassing on behalf of Charles Meredith. Whyte should be impeached for this action, said the Mercury, if it was only possible. He had abandoned his post in Hobart Town and was stooping Charles Meredith on the electors. The paper still chided not finished with Meredith, and it continued to assail him.

2. C.M.I., Oct. 1, 1866.
3. C.M.I., Oct. 1, 1866.
in Editorial after Editorial. In its eyes Whyte and the Colonial Treasurer had now, by summoning "Government officers from all parts of the Island to vote with them", reached the lowest depths of political unscrupulousness. The Editor urged other non-resident voters to make their way to Glamorgan on polling day and cancel out the influence of these interlopers. This course, reported the paper after the election, was followed, but the object of the anti-Government voters must have been known for "during the night some ruffians took the wheels off their dog cart, and the nuts off the bolts". But The Mercury rejoiced in the fact that, despite all the alleged trickery of the Ministry and its minions, Charles Meredith had suffered defeat by 60 votes to 46. 1

The declaration of the poll followed three days later, John Meredith pointing out that he had campaigned against the Government because of its excessive expenditure, and because reduction could be effected, no matter what the Administration said to the contrary. For himself, Charles Meredith could only repeat that an Income and Property Tax would be found necessary in the long run no matter what Government came to power, and he attributed his defeat, in part, to the alleged fact that The Mercury had been paid to write him down. 2

The Examiner quoted figures which proved to its satisfaction that the Treasurer had been defeated fairly and squarely even without the votes of non-resident electors. Charles Meredith

had had six Government officers from outside vote for him,  

plus 36 residents and four outsiders not Government employees,  

a total of 46. John Meredith had received support from 47  

residents and 13 outsiders, making 50 votes in all. Excluding all  

outsiders then, John Meredith had received a majority of 11  

votes.  

and on the  

The rejection of Charles Meredith was a crippling blow to  

the Government party, though the Treasurer did secure a seat in  

the House of Assembly for Kingborough, an electorate which was,  

fortunately for him, looking out for a representative. But with  

Both Miller and Meredith now rebuffed by their home constituencies,  

the Government had lost whatever case it might have had for  

continuing to govern.  

Especially significant was Meredith's defeat, for it was he  

who had introduced the Income and Property Tax measure, the once  

which had brought the Government to its knees. From accounts of  

the Glamorgan contest given in the Colonial Press, one can only  

attribute Charles Meredith's defeat to the unpopularity of his  

direct taxation programme and withdrawal of Customs Duties.  

Certainly his opponent had only the conviction that more  

retrenchment was possible to put up against the Treasurer's  

policy. John Meredith had little that was positive in his  

programme. A factor which almost certainly did not further  

Meredith's cause was the strong opposition of The Mercury. This  

paper never let its readers forget that Meredith was being  

\[1, \text{ L.E., Oct. 16, 1866.}\]
assisted in canvassing by Whyte. Even the act of canvassing by

a candidate was regarded by some people as unethical, and for a

candidate to be aided by a fellow Member of the Government and

Cabinet, a man who was Premier was, thought The Mercury, an

election, there can be little doubt that at that time an illustration of the methods the Government was prepared to adopt

and an insult to the intelligence of the electors.

Another factor which possibly helped defeat Charles Meredith

was the constant statements that he had brought

Government officers from all over the Island to the district

to vote for him as non-resident electors. There was nothing

illegal in either this or canvassing, but to the Mercury

these practices left a nasty taste in the mouth, and were not

in keeping with the spirit of the ballot. Similar, though much

milder opposition to canvassing had been expressed in previous

elections in the Colony, and it is certain that the electioneering

methods reported to have been adopted by Meredith would not find

favour with all voters. John Meredith insisted that the Whyte

Government had not retrenched to the extent that it should have,

but it seems incredible that electors, in the face of Charles

Meredith's Press address, would believe that additional

appreciable retrenchment could be effected. As in the great

majority of these elections, repugnance to the idea of an Income

and Property Tax blinded electors to facts.

In an electorate the size of Glamorgan, the personal factor

was of no little importance. Both candidates must have been

neighbours to most of the land-holding voters, who would be
hardly likely to change loyalties. Any "floating vote" must have been very small. The Press, however, mentions no local matter which might have turned a majority of the constituency against Charles Gedrich; and so, taking a line from other elections, there can be little reasonable doubt that the Treasurer was defeated on his Income and Property Tax measure. The seriousness of the Colony's financial position would have to be brought home to the voting Colonists much more forcibly before they gave their consent to anything so radical as a direct tax. If the squatters had felt the effects of the economic depression to any extent, they were not yet willing to accept a Property and Income Tax as an alternative.

1. (d). Oatlands. The election at Oatlands was the closest one of the series. It was won by J. Lord from G. Wilson by 110 votes to 109.

Wilson in a short Press address opposed the Ministry's Income and Property Tax1 and the sitting Member, James Lord, in a statement that must set some sort of record for vagueness declared that he would do all he could "for the general good of my adopted country".2

At a public meeting a few days later, however, Wilson enlarged on his programme: he opposed the Government because the proposed direct tax would drive out capital, especially

British capital, Farmers and small tradesmen, prophesied. Wilson, would find the country swamped with cheap foreign imports, with which local producers would be unable to compete. Thus, the tax would fall heaviest on the working man. Having thus dealt with the Government's tax scheme, the speaker complained that the district had received no benefit from the Public Works Bill.

He further proposed retrenchment by reduction of salaries and reduction of the education grant, and spoke of the practicability of a Main Line of Railway.

Lord, if he held any public meetings to address the electors, did not have them reported. But he still managed to defeat Wilson by one vote. Little was written in the Colonial Press of this contest, and thus any analysis is necessarily guess-work for the most part.

The lack of any report of Lord's statements is, possibly, explained by the fact that he was a Government supporter. There being no account of his speeches, then, it can only be assumed that he took the line of Miller, and pointed out the impracticability of direct taxation.

It seems a strange contradiction that a Government supporter could be returned in one rural electorate, and the Treasurer himself rejected in his home constituency, a neighbouring one.

Unless Rose was a luke-warm Government supporter, then the only way to explain the set of circumstances is by reference to possible

1. Hill, Oct. 6, 1866.
personal feelings—were against and the electorate, that way, have caused him to be looked on favourably with his constituents; on the other hand, Wilson may have afforded the voters in some way, funds and family quarrels would assume great importance, in country, constituencies dominated by one or two families. This is amply illustrated in this election.

1. (q), Campbell Town. W.J. Dobson secured an easy victory, 92 votes to 49, over a.J. Johnson in Campbell Town. He expressed himself as in no uncertain opposition to the Administration;

"The principles of Ministerial policy are objectionable in the highest degree", Dobson also declared that by retrenchment and readjustment of the burden of taxation, the necessity for resorting to an Income and Property Tax could be averted. As well, he was of the opinion that the Land Fund revenue could be spent more wisely. ¹ How this was to be done he did not say.

Johnson, Dobson's opponent, tended to support the Government, but he did not display much enthusiasm in standing, protesting that his chief object in so doing was to prevent the electorate becoming a pocket borough. He could not see how the Government could retrench much further, he stated, and added that no would support the Income and Property Tax measure if all else failed. As well, he indicated his support for railways and public works, and urged a revision of property values, asserting that the large estates were ridiculously undervalued. ²

¹. H.J., Oct. 28, 1866.
². C.C., Oct. 3, 1866.
The election result was as could have been expected — Dobson, a well-known Colonial politician opposing the new direct tax, defeated the Government sympathiser Johnson. The election seems to have been decided, if not through interest available for a clear enough indication that the voters of Campbell Town opposed the Government's new tax scheme.

The returning officer Dobson, in his address to the electorate, opposed the Government's new tax scheme.

(f). Selby. In this electorate both candidates, J.R. Scott and I. Sherwin, the sitting Member, found themselves at variance with the Government.

Selby, in his address to the electorate, opposed centralisation and told the electors that he was certain that retrenchment could be carried further. His opponent, J.R. Scott, a landed proprietor, pointed out that, in his opinion, an Income and Property Tax would press heavily on the small farmers and land holders and be of no benefit to the workers. He would, if elected, reduce Government expenditure by extending municipal Government, abolishing grants-in-aid, and placing schools under the local municipalities. Scott also recorded his support for the Launceston-Deloraine railway.

The Examiner opposed Scott, however, on the grounds that he was a Ministerial nominee — though he professed to be in favour of the Western line, "his associations are amongst those who are its most bitter opponents". The Launceston paper further informed its readers that Scott was scarcely a fit man to represent Selby, because he had so little interest in the electorate as to have arranged to be at the Colonial Exhibition on election day.

But notwithstanding The Examiner's resistance to his candidature, Scott was elected by 159 votes to 132.¹

There is scarcely enough information available for a discussion on the why's and wherefore's of Scott's election over the retiring member Sherwin, but was an example of a typically contested rural election. Both candidates opposed the Government and had, to all intents and purposes, identical policies. No reason is given in the Colonial Press for Sherwin's rejection in favour of Scott, but the most probably reason is simply that Scott had a larger personal following than Sherwin in the district.

¹ L.E., Oct. 21, 1866.
has been shown, the Whyte-Merrith administration was decisively defeated, both members of the Cabinet trying for re-election being defeated in their home constituencies, and only gaining election upon a second attempt. From having a majority of members upon whom it could rely for support in the old House, the Government could now depend on but eight members, and count upon the opposition of 21, according to the Mercury's running up of the election.

The Tasmanian voters, then, decisively rejected the Government's efforts to impose direct taxation on income and property. The Colony preferred to place its trust in further loan-raising as a means of defraying the expenses of government and paying off previous issues of debentures. In the eyes of the voters, direct taxation was a measure fraught with evil.

The impression gained from reading the election programmes propounded during this and previous elections during the first years of responsible government, is that the candidates thought the financial plight of the Colony could never really become serious enough to warrant the imposition of direct tax on income and property. Anything was preferable to such a step, was their argument - something was bound to turn up, a mineral discovery. Such was their aversion to direct taxes that they were only too ready to believe the many assurances they received that the day could yet be saved - by retrenchment. In the teeth of the Commission's report to the contrary, candidates told the voters
that a saving of vast sums of money could be made in Government expenditure.

It is surely illustrative of the opposition the Property and Income Tax ran into that candidates, nearly all of whom were property holders of some sort or another, could and would deceive the voters into believing that direct taxation was as yet unnecessary. Perhaps it is being too harsh to say "deceive", for some of the candidates may have believed that previous governments had been too incompetent to balance the budget. Certainly candidates did not all possess the necessary ability to assist the Colony through the economic crisis. But while property owners still remained in their dominant position in the politics of the Colony, any Administration would need to hope for a miracle if it wished to introduce direct taxation. The grip of the property holders could only be broken by an extension of the franchise to all adults, and an appreciable increase in the urban population of the Colony.

The influence in the North of The Examiner was considerable, for the paper had been circulating through the North of the Island since 1842. The journal had a reputation for conservativeness and consistency, though its Editors did not shrink from commenting in an outspoken manner. The Examiner was recognised as the voice of the North. The Cornwall Chronicle also was published in Launceston, but its influence would be much less: the paper was of a "popular"
character and in all likelihood found most of its readers among those who were not entitled to vote. The land-owning and politically-conscious class of the North were far more likely to subscribe to The Times than The News of the World.

This conclusion is borne out by a secret despatch from the Colonial Secretary, Bicheno, in 1847, to Denison in response to a request from the Secretary of State for Colonies, Earl Grey, for information concerning the Colonial Press. The character of the papers had not changed to any extent during the years. Of The Cornwall Chronicle, the able Bicheno wrote: "The Cornwall Chronicle is has usually been an extremely scurrilous paper, and does not possess much influence amongst the more respectable classes of society; but it is extensively circulated amongst the Licensed Victuallers, and read by many who love personalities..." The Examiner, stated the Colonial Secretary, "is supported by the Independents, Wesleyans, and Church of Scotland people; and is occasionally assisted by literary contributions from their Ministers. It is a very respectable paper and its circulation is good, especially amongst the better sort of persons on the Northern side..."¹

¹ Bicheno to Denison, File 806, Feb 9, 1847.
capital. Innes, a few years earlier, had warned against this, and spoken of the desirability of the "natural subordination" of one class. Now more arguments of the same water were being put forward. No good would come from a Property and Income Tax, it could result only in equality of misery, warned press and politicians.

A number of candidates deplored the Income and Property Tax because it would create class consciousness; talk of the enviable position occupied by squatters in the community might well have serious consequences, Colonists were warned. As the sole candidate for the New Norfolk seat, W. S. Sharland, said in an injured tone, he disapproved of class division and thought it "morally wrong to set gentlemen against poor men"; whatever was his interest as an employer of workmen was necessarily their interest too.1

The hopes of those who wished to charge a Property and Income Tax were dashed in this election. The decisive rejection of the Ministry's plan accomplished this effectively. The question of railways had been bulking larger in the last few years and it was now to overshadow all else as Tasmania entered a period of railway diplomacy,

Summary of Election Results

Brighton  Dr H. Butler
Clarence   D. Lewis
Cumberland W. Sibley
Franklin  W. Crooke
Glamorgan J. Meredith (69) d. G. Meredith (46)
Glenorchy  Dr R. Officer
Hobart Town W.L. Crowther (957), T.J. Chapman (872),
             B.B. Miller (773), K.S. Barrett (771),
             G. Salier (747); Cansdell (704), R.P. Adams (698),
             J. Lord (665), J. Ralfe (665), J. Peck (509),
             S. Moriarty (159), P. O'Reilly (151), T. Horne (11
             D.W.L. Murray (36).
Kingborough C. Meredith (284) d. A. Wright (60).
New Norfolk W.S. Sharland
Oatlands   J. Lord (110) d. G. Wilson (109)
Queennsborough H. Walker
Richmond  T.G. Gregson (79) d. B. Dickson (50)
Sorell    W. Hodgson
Campbell Town W.L. Dobson (92) d. A.H. Johnson (49)
Deloraine W. Archer
Devon     J. Davies (167) d. T.W. Field (83)
Fingal    J. Swan
George Town W. Barnes
Launceston H.E. Leete (621), J. Crookes (620), J. Scott (607);
            D.W.L. Murray (376), R.B. Miller (269).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Competitor 1</th>
<th>Competitor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morven</td>
<td>J.W. Gleadow (114)</td>
<td>Alex. Rose (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Plains</td>
<td>W. Dodery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringwood</td>
<td>George Gibson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selby</td>
<td>J.R. Scott (159)</td>
<td>I. Sherwin (132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbury</td>
<td>A. Douglas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Hobart Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archer</td>
<td>Landed proprietor Deloraine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halfo</td>
<td>Landed proprietor Franklin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes</td>
<td></td>
<td>George Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Hobart Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>Surgeon</td>
<td>Brighton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadell</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Hobart Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>Hobart Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crookes</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowther</td>
<td>Surgeon</td>
<td>Hobart Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>Newspaper propr.</td>
<td>Devon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickson</td>
<td>Landed proprietor Richmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobson</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Campbell Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodery</td>
<td>Landed proprietor Norfolk Plains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Westbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Landed proprietor Devon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>V.D.L. Co. agent</td>
<td>Ringwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Morven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregson</td>
<td>Landed proprietor Richmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodgson</td>
<td>Landed proprietor Sorell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Hobart Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Campbell Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lette</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clarence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord</td>
<td>Landed proprietor Oatlands and Hobart Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith C.</td>
<td>Landed proprietor Glamorgan and Hobart Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith J.</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>Glamorgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Launceston and Hobart Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moriarty</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Hobart Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>Newspaper propr.</td>
<td>Launceston and Hobart Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>Glenorchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Reilly</td>
<td>Clothier</td>
<td>Hobart Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peck</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hobart Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralfe</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Hobart Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>Morven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salier</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hobart Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott J.R.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Selby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott John</td>
<td></td>
<td>Launceston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharland W.S.</td>
<td>Landed proprietor</td>
<td>New Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwin</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Selby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cumberland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fingal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>Queenborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oatlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kingborough</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The history of the period 1866-71 is a story chiefly of railway politics—the efforts of the Northern railway League to secure favourable terms from the Government to enable it to lay down the western line, and agitation from the South to begin a main North-South permanent way from Hobart Town to Launceston. A line from Deloraine to the Mersey was also commenced but this project was to prove abortive.

Further moves were made with regard to State aid and a quick settlement of that vexed question in view of the Colony's financial plight; and agitation for a readjustment of the franchise was led by The Tasmanian Times.

Cutting across all these movements was the question of how to equalise the revenue and expenditure. The monthly Customs returns were scrutinised minutely by the Press, ever hopeful of discovering some sign that the Colony had at last turned the corner towards the prosperity Tasmania had known 15 years before.

There was still disagreement in the Colony concerning the wisdom of Free Trade, and the administration of Wilson twice attempted to bring the Australian Colonies together in a Zollverein. A Bill to bring about reciprocity in trade among the Colonies was disallowed by the Home Government, however, and an Inter-Colonial Conference called by Tasmania to consider economic union failed.
when Victoria and New South Wales refused to modify their policies of protection and Free Trade respectively. Nothing could be done till the premier Colonies agreed, and so Tasmania was compelled reluctantly to let the matter drop, although the Island Legislature went ahead to pass a local measure calling for Colonial conventions respecting reciprocal Free Trade.

A Ministry led by Sir Richard Dry came to office on November 24, 1866, following the sound defeat of the Whyte-Meredith administration. The new Ministry consisted of

Sir Richard Dry Colonial Secretary and Premier.
T. B. Chapman Colonial Treasurer.
W. L. Dobson Attorney-General.

The newly-appointed Ministers accordingly went back to their electorates for a vote of confidence in their new appointments. Chapman found himself opposed in Hobart Town by J. Lord, and he was defeated 1,390 votes to 660 in a campaign on which vast sums of money were spent, according to The Examiner, by Lord's supporters, the ex-Treasurer, Charles Meredith, and the ex-Attorney-General, W. B. Miller. The upshot of this was that Scott, a Launceston Member, offered to resign his seat, and let Chapman occupy his place. Chapman accepted the offer and was consequently returned unopposed for Launceston.

Another early change in the new Parliament was occasioned by Crowther's resignation and his replacement by J. C. Pratt. The Examiner declared that Crowther had withdrawn from politics in

a bluff because he had not been made Premier, or a Cabinet Minister at least, as recognition of his place at head of the poll in Hobart Town.\footnote{L.E., Dec. 25, 1866.}

The task ahead of the new Government was the same one that had confronted every ministry since 1856—how to equalise the revenue and expenditure. The Ministry had been elected on its assurance that sweeping retrenchment could be implemented, but soon it became apparent that any so-called "retrenchment" would be chiefly in the shape of withdrawal of the grants-in-aid to municipalities, a sum of about £20,000. Although it had supported the members of the present administration in the recent election, The Examiner nevertheless felt that the ministry had now gone too far for "It would be disastrous were the reductions of the session just terminated to be regarded in other light than that of urgent temporary expedients." \"There is a danger lest the merit of sacrifices should become a substitute for better, more statesmanlike, comprehensive and lasting measures.\"\footnote{L.E., Feb. 23, 1867.}

Retrenchment in offices amounted to only one quarter of the £26,000 reduction in expenditure; the rest consisted of the amount withdrawn from the municipal grants, and it was this cut in funds allocated to the municipalities on which The Examiner was commenting.

Chapman, within one month, had been compelled to fall back on the issue of debentures; he recommended the issue of £35,000
in bonds to meet the interest which was about to fall due on
debentures issued by previous administrations.

The new Ministry could not be said to have made a fresh
start, but those Colonists who realised that retrenchment,
spoken of so airily by candidates in the 1866 election, was out
of the question, could not have been much surprised at the steps
taken by the Dry Administration, although admittedly it had
consolidated some offices and cut the salaries of the Executive
from £900 to £700 a year.

The subject of railways and their introduction was continually
to occupy Parliament's attention during the next five years.

with Dry, a prominent member of the Railway League, as Premier,
the Western Railway soon came up for discussion in the
Legislature, and early in the New Year the Railway Act was
amended: the Company had now to find £50,000 instead of £100,000
in order to issue railway bonds to raise the additional
£300,000 needed, according to Doyne's estimate, to lay down the
permanent way from Launceston to Beloeaine. The amending Act
further provided that the line was to be commenced before January
1868, and in addition it stipulated that a three-man Commission
be appointed by Parliament to protect the interest of the public.

The Bill passed both Houses, though in the Legislative Council
it had a bare majority only. T.Y. Lawes, the Member for
Buckingham, made clear his attitude to the measure by first
spitting on the Bill and then trampling it underfoot.

1. L.E., Jan. 26, 1867.
2. L.E., Feb. 23, 1867.
During the Session a Free Trade Bill was also passed. This measure authorised the duty-free admission of certain goods, excluding spirits and tobacco, from the mainland Colonies and New Zealand, provided that they fell in with Tasmania's plan and established reciprocity.

The Examiner poured scorn on the Bill. The Government's first task was to reduce expenditure to the existing revenue, it declared. As the paper had already cast doubts on the wisdom of retrenchment by the method of cutting off municipal funds, it is difficult to know where it meant the administration to reduce. The Mercury, on the other hand, approved of Tasmania's initiative in Free Trade; in the other Colonies the local Bill had given rise to discussion of "a friendly and approving character." Twelve months later, some disappointment was felt at the decision of the British Secretary of State, the Duke of Buckingham, to disallow the Free Trade Bill. This was done on the grounds of the provisions of 13 and 14 Vict. Cap. 59, which provided for differential duties in the Colonies. The Mercury claimed that the Home Government had allowed the act to be overridden with impunity in Victoria and New South Wales. The Examiner, however, was not displeased that this "one-sided" compact had been vetoed.

Work on the Mersey-Delorsaine Line proceeded, but The Examiner predicted happily that the project would prove abortive.

1. "L.E., Feb. 23, 1867."
2. "H.M., March 25, 1867."
3. "H.M., April 23, 1868."
4. "L.E., March 28, 1868."
since, the paper said, it was only undertaken in order that the
line might be played off against the Northern railway. The
manner in which the work was pursued could lead only to failure,
state the paper; the terminus should have been at Port Frederick,
but the line unaccountably commenced four miles from Latrobe, and
materials had thus to be drawn that distance by horses. 1 Chief
agents financing the work on the line were J. Foster, elected
Legislative Council member for Huon in 1868 to replace Wedge, and
Askin Morrison, a Hobart Town merchant. 2

Parliament met again in August, the Colony living in hopes
of a matured acceptable financial policy being laid before the
House by the Executive. In the eyes of The Examiner, this should
include the abolition of the Succession Duties Act, the Stamp
Act and the Carriage and Package duties, and the substitution
of a tariff on spirits, beer, tobacco, tea and sugar. 3 The
Mercury was able to report in October, 1868, that the Succession
Duties Act had been repealed in favour of duties on Probates and
Letters of Administration. 4

State Aid was still an unsettled question to some and a
deputation approached the Premier prior to the Second Session to
express its opposition to the continuance of the endowment. The
deputation took high ground and was told flatly that outright
abolition would never succeed; a compromise in the shape of
payment of a lump sum of £100,000 to the churches concerned,

1. N.E., March 3, 1867.
3. N.E., May 25, 1867.
plus life interests to the present incumbents, was the best that could be hoped for.\textsuperscript{1}  Any proposal to abolish State aid needed to have the support of the anglican Church. It would also need to safeguard the life interests of the clergy in order for an Abolition Bill to pass the local House and the House of Commons. The Colony was fated to pay out a large sum to support religion for many years.

Meanwhile, Doyne was engaged on a new survey of the Western Line and The Mercury announced that the Company would soon be in a position to commence operations.\textsuperscript{2}  Another step towards the realisation of the Company's aims was taken when the Government announced the appointment of the three Commissioners - F.M. Innes, a prominent Colonial politician; T.B. Bartley, a well-known Northern settler; and S.V. Kemp, an experienced engineer formerly with the Victorian railways.\textsuperscript{3}  With the interests of the Government thus protected, or so it fancied, there was only Doyne's re-survey to be completed before tenders for the contract could be called.

But the principal measure passed upon Parliament's meeting was more "retrenchment" by way of reduction of the municipal grant from £15,000 to £6,000.\textsuperscript{4}  The examiner was annoyed at the Government's failure to lower the expenditure by other means than reduction of Local Government grants. In an editorial it acknowledged that T.G. Gregson had been correct when he said

\textsuperscript{1}  L.E., June 25, 1867.  
\textsuperscript{2}  H.X., July 25, 1867.  
\textsuperscript{3}  L.E., Aug. 24, 1867.  
\textsuperscript{4}  T.T., Sept. 24, 1867.
that "The Ministry got into power on the cry of retrenchment. It was a cry of rogues, to gull fools". And Chapman's reputation was not improved in the estimation of the Northern paper when he was reported as having dismissed his own election battle-cry of "Retrenchment or ruin" as "a parcel of electioneering nonsense". The Mercury, too, took exception to the failure of the Administration to fulfil promises respecting retrenchment: "For all practical purposes, revenue and expenditure are left just as they were; and the Government gave grounds to Kennerley's indictment of it as "nothing but a Deloraine railway ministry" when it declined to vote £5,000 for a Parliamentary survey of the projected Main Line.

There was in the North a strong feeling that the Government ought to have been ready to concede the same terms to those interested in the Main Line as were conceded to the Western Line promoters. This intensified Northern opposition to the Main Line which would continue as long as the Government failed to duplicate the policy that had been adopted with the Launceston-Deloraine line. Nevertheless, the Main Line project was not scotched completely in the Legislature because Cuddell initiated legislation which set up a Royal Commission on railways in general and the Main Line in particular.

The Session was also marked by an attempt on the part of Adye Douglas to bring down a Bill to abolish State aid, with life

1. L.E., Sept. 24, 1867.
5. T.T., Sept. 24, 1867.
interests to incumbents still guaranteed, but the measure was abandoned in Committee. 1

Parliament was prorogued on October 11, and for the next three months the visit of Prince Alfred, Duke of Edinburgh, engrossed the attention of all. He turned the first sod of the Western Railway on January 15, 1868.

The beginning of the Western Railway and the successful sale in London of the Government debentures was thought to be a turning point in the history of the Colony. Northern Colonists thought that fresh life would be infused by the establishment of the Launceston-Deloraine Line. But some opinion differed. The newly-formed and liberal Tasmanian Times asserted that nothing short of a radical revision of the financial system could meet the exigencies of the country. 2 (The Tasmanian Times had taken over the plant of The Tasmanian Morning Herald and now was the only paper to offer opposition to the powerful Mercury.)

Certainly there seemed little prospect of an improvement as matters stood. The Mercury attributing the grave decline in revenue during the past 10 years to the reduction of the timber trade from £444,000 in 1853 to £45,000 in 1866, and a diminution in the export of breadstuffs also. The demand for timber from Victoria had fallen away because fewer temporary erections were being built, and the Victorian railways could supply from the Colony's

1. H.M., Sept. 25, 1867.
2. T.T.s., May 21, 1868.
own forests what rough timber was needed. The export of wheat 
and flour had fallen from £133,000 in 1857 to £40,000 in 1866; 
oats and barley from £158,000 to £59,000 in the same period.
Prices had declined here as well as in the timber trade.¹

The ease with which the Western Railway loan was floated - it 
was taken up at 102½ exclusive of interest - encouraged The 
Tasmanian Times to throw out the suggestion that the time was 
now ripe for the inauguration of a national railway policy, 
although it would entail doubling the national debt to two 
million pounds.² A public meeting, called by the five Hobart 
Town bank managers, was then held to "consider the advisability 
or otherwise of petitioning the Executive and Legislature to take 
the necessary steps for connecting Hobart Town and Launceston 
by railway". There was an attendance of 1,500 people at this 
meeting, chaired by the Mayor, J.C. Wilson, R.I.C. Speakers 
included P.O. Fysh, J. Kennerley and C.S. Gundlach. Meetings of 
a similar character were conducted at Sandy Bay and Campbell 
Town, and others appointed for Queenborough and Ratlands.³

Petitions were adopted and forwarded to the Governor and both 
Houses.

The Examiner expressed its gratification at the enthusiasm 
for the Main Line shown at the Hobart Town meetings, but 
pityingly dismissed the speeches as vacuous. The paper gave a 
hint of what was to come, however, when it declared that if the

¹ A.R., Jan. 31, 1863.
² T.T., June 13, 1863.
³ T.T., July 16, 1863.
midlands were to get a railway, then it should be on the same terms as the North i.e. by re-guarantee of interest on the part of property holders. The failure of the Government to adopt a Main Line policy similar to that applied in the North was destined to create great annoyance among those who had worked so long to make the Launceston and Deloraine Railway Line a reality. The Examiner also noted that Hobart Town had not even been able to subscribe the £2,000 that Parliament said was necessary in order to receive the £3,000 grant to conduct the survey.¹

After tenders for the construction of the western line closed, it was revealed that the successful tender was that of Overend and Robb, of Melbourne, for £200,000. It was signed on July 16, and about 500 local men enrolled for work.²

The Examiner was still not friendly to the efforts of the Nericon and Deloraine Company to complete its line, for, the Northern paper reiterated, it had been formed in mid-1864 with the express purpose of hindering the building of the western line. At present 10½ miles of line were fit for traffic, but there was in existence, for no apparent reason, an intermediate section with a town terminus at neither end. The Company, however, had put in a claim for 15,360 acres in accordance with the terms of the amended Act, which awarded that body a mile of land on either side of the line where it passed through Crown property.³

¹. T.T., July 16, 1868.
². L.E., Aug. 13, 1868.
³. Ibid.
At the beginning of 1869, The Examiner was able to report that work on the Derwent and Deloraine Line had ceased — nothing had been done for nearly two years except to build a bridge. What line there was ended three miles from Latrobe and five miles from Kentish Plains. The Tasmanian Times noted that it was understood in the Colony that the line was practically owned by only two Directors, with whose capital the construction of the line had been prosecuted for some time past. These men were evidently Foster and Morrison.

But, when all was said and done, wealth from railways was only prospective, and the Legislature at last took steps to end the annual State aid grant. Parliament had opened on July 28, 1868, and one of the Government's chief proposals was a State aid Commutation Bill, introduced principally at the suggestion of the synod and leading Church of England clergy. The proposed measure reserved the rights of all clergy scheduled in the Distribution Act, and bestowed debentures of £100,000, payable in the Colony, upon the governing bodies of state paid sects.

The sum was apportioned as follows:

- Church of England: £58,466 13s. 4d.
- Church of Rome: 23,106 13 4
- Church of Scotland: 7,556 13 4
- Wesleyan Church: 7,333 6 6
- Free Church of Scotland: 2,606 13 4
- Jewish Church: 420 0 0

The Bill was introduced by Robson, the Attorney General, who

1. i.e., Jan. 2, 1869.
2. T.T., Jan. 2, 1869.
was supported by Chapman. It passed the House of Assembly by a majority of one vote and the Legislative Council by eight votes to five.

Those favouring the outright abolition of State aid objected, however, to the Commutation Act because, first, they claimed that the Colony was under no moral obligation to do more than continue to award the present stipends to the incumbents; and second, that the bill perpetuated, by what was virtually endowment, the system of supporting by contributions a variety of rival and conflicting creeds.

"The gods deprive those of reason whom they intend to destroy", commented the examiner bitterly at this increase of the national debt. "The population has been swindled out of £100,000 in the prostituted name of religion".

Worse was to come. In his financial statement, the Treasurer assumed that there would be a £16,000 deficiency for 1868, which he proposed to cover by the not unprecedented expedient of increasing duties — package and import duties were to be doubled to realise an estimated £12,000; stamps, £3,000; and probate in lieu of succession duties, £5,000. Public meetings opposed the imposition of these new duties, but the bill passed the House by 18 votes to seven. Opposition to the Government had all but disappeared, and nothing approaching an alternative.

2. L.S., Sept. 10, 1868.
administration could be discerned. The future of the Colony was an inglorious uncertainty.

The examiner still insisted that the only remedy for the Colony's financial disorder was renewed immigration and the reduction of expenditure to income, not the raising of revenue to meet expenditure, the step which had just been taken. The paper asserted that the legitimate functions of government were quite clear and simple - to prevent one man taking the life or property of another, and to punish him if he did so. Every other kind of interference with the community was mischievous. The sooner the Colony returned to Government by a single two-thirds elective House, the better, asserted the Northern Paper.1

The Report of the Commission on railways tabled during the session estimated the cost of the main line at between £700,000 and £800,000.2 The personnel of the Commission were C.S. Connell, R.O. Fysh, W. Vernerley, D. Lewis and J.M. Wilson, and the examiner commented freely on the work of these Southerners: "...In no other paper in the world are there so many crudities, absurdities, blunders, mis-statements and unfounded assumptions crowded into the same space".

The Examiner's grounds for this indictment of the Commission's report was based on the Launceston paper's contention that ninetenths of British engineers favoured a five foot three inch gauge which had been adopted in Ireland, Victoria, South Australia and

1. 1 M., Sept. 10, 1868.
2. 1 M., Sept. 10, 1868.
New Zealand and recommended for New South Wales. The report
favoured four feet eight and a half inches. Despite the fact that
Hobart Town had not raised the £1,000, the condition of
Parliament's offer of £2,000, action was taken on the basis of
the report and the assembly passed a survey bill which authorised
the raising of £6,000 to complete a survey and estimate. Boyne,
Major and Willett were to make the survey from Catlins to Hobart. 2
Completion of it was expected by May or June, reported The
Mercury, and it was proposed to invite tenders for construction
and maintenance of the line, the Government guaranteeing a
certain amount of interest on the capital expended. 3

In this session also the 1863 waste lands act was amended to
make the terms of land purchase easier for the new settler.
Under the provisions of the old act, for 100 acres the selector
had to pay £24 deposit at the time of purchase, £5 during the second
year, £5 during the next year and £10 per year for the succeeding
12 years. 4

It had not crossed the mind of the legislature that another
Colony might seize the opportunity afforded by Tasmania's
desperate financial position, to step in and make attractive the
prospect of a surrender of sovereignty and the national debt.
But a suggestion by a Melbourne paper that Victoria should
annex Tasmania was "decidedly objectionable", wrote The
Mercury towards the end of the year: the success of Victorian

1. L.F., Sept. 10, 1866.
3. H.M., Nov. 9, 1866.
Imperialism would not benefit the Island. want of individual enterprise was the bane of the Colony, continued the paper.

There was a large class of poor people with no means, and those Colonists with individual fortunes would "not stake their present comfort against further accumulations". The Hobart Town daily looked with horror on the prospect of union with the provinces across Bass Strait, for democracy was clearly running riot in the Continental Colony which, furthermore, had a national debt of £9 million and taxed its population £4-12-0 per head, as compared with Tasmania's £2-11-0.¹

The Administration was convinced that the sweeping away of Colonial Customs barriers would open up markets presently denied to Tasmania; and The Mercury in December supported the reported agitation for an Inter-Colonial Customs Union. Inter-Colonial trade between Tasmania and the other Colonies had fallen from £594,000 to £499,000 in the last four years, and the paper attributed this almost entirely to the conflicting tariffs employed by the Colonies. The 1867 Free Trade Bill had been refused by the Home Government because it was at variance with an Imperial Statute. In addition, certain clauses of the Constitution acts of New South Wales and Victoria stood in the way of any arrangement except by Federal Union preceded by a change in the clauses of those acts affecting the question. The Secretary of State for Colonies had made his view of the matter clear by saying that "to impose a general duty by one act, and then remit it in

¹ A.M., Nov. 7, 1868.
...favour of certain neighbouring Colonies by or by virtue of another Act, is a violation of the spirit, even if not the letter, of the above quoted provision."\(^1\)

At the beginning of 1869, also, the Examiner welcomed the proposed unification of Australian tariffs and took credit for the idea of establishing uniform Customs duties throughout the Colonies, stating that it had first brought the subject under notice in March, 1866, when it had advocated Free Trade which would tend to bind the Colonies and facilitate the combination which must come "for mutual protection and advancement".\(^2\) The Mercury blamed the restrictive duties imposed by "some neighbouring Colonies" for the paralysis of several local industries; and the handicapping\(^3\) by curtailed expenditure and the imposition of crippling duties.

It was now seen why the North had opposed Government expenditure on the Main Line. The Mercury giving the first hint that all was not well with the Western Railway. It stated that the Company might need an additional £100,000 to complete the line. The cost had apparently been underestimated. Nothing break the news that the line would cost more money that had been intended, the paper \textit{wrote} into the attack and urged the abandonment of the whole Main Line project. It would

---

2. H.M., March 22, 1866.
not pay, assorted the paper, because not enough people of
promising for a coal move not much. The administration
produce would be carried. The Examiner went on to discuss a
sore point with the North - that the Main Line survey had been
all paid for by the public, through Parliament, whereas the
Western Line promoters had been compelled to bear half the charge
of their survey. It seemed to the embattled north that the
path to railway construction in the South was being made
suspiciously smooth. The Mercury noted what it called "active
agitation" in the north against the Main Line, and spoke of the
"Tasmanian Railway and Progress Association".

This body, under the presidency of A. Kennerley, M.L.C., was
mentioned as existing in October, 1868, and appears to have been
modelled on the lines of the Northern Railway League. Another
and earlier reference was made to a similar organisation by The
Examiner on March 22, 1866. S. Moriarty was named as the
Secretary, and the aim of the Association was "the furtherance of
railways, agriculture, manufactures and other public improvements
in "Tasmania". It is probable that this organisation was re-formed
into the later "Tasmanian Railway and Progress Association". It
never approached the effectiveness of the Northern League, however,
whether through lack of public interest in railways, or because of
less effective organisation, it is difficult to say. But it did
not receive the wide publicity given by The Examiner to the
Northern League. In any case, the need for a public organisation

2. H.M., Feb. 27, 1869.
pressing for a main line was not great— if the Administration 
pursued its present course, the line would be a Government concern.

The Launceston and Deloraine Railway Company in April, 1869, 
finally admitted the fact that it needed £50,000 over and above 
the original estimate in order to complete the line. The Mercury 
had a field day, and comments such as "a reckless system of 
conducting business", and "public confidence shaken" filled its 
editorial columns. "Parliament will have to stipulate for full 
control over the construction and general business of the 
Railway", the paper warned.¹

The admission by the Company of error in estimation gave 
added strength to the arguments of the advocates of a national 
railway policy. The Tasmanian Times spoke out strongly on the 
subject - the half yearly report recommending the extra £50,000 
showed "the grossest mismanagement and deception on the part of 
the Directors, Engineers and Government Commissioners", it 
declared. The nature of the report, added the paper, appeared 
to indicate that the cost of the works had been largely and 
purposely underestimated.²

These compromising statements were the grounds for a 
charge of libel, brought against D. MacMillan, the proprietor, 
by Doyne, Major and Willett, the Western Line contractors. The 
case was heard before the Puisset Judge of the Colony, Sir Francis

¹ T.T., April 22, 1869.
² T.T., May 26, 1869.
Smith and the jury returned a verdict for the defendant.

As could confidently have been predicted, The Examiner acted as apologist for the request for more money. Noting that the impression was abroad that the miscalculation was the fault of the engineers, the paper pointed out that Doyne had, in fact, originally estimated for £400,000, but when Parliament insisted that the work had to be done for £350,000, he reduced the estimate to that amount: " Principally by reducing earthworks and rolling stock (the price of iron being low at the time) he succeeded in bringing the cost down to £350,000."

The news of the request by the Western Company for £50,000 was pushed into the background by what was actually a much less important matter: Britain announced that she intended to withdraw Imperial troops from the Colony unless Tasmania was prepared to refund the cost of their maintenance, about £40 each. This intimation by the Home Government was followed by the withdrawal of one Company in May, a month later.

The Mercury considered the British Government's action reprehensible and called to the attention of its readers Newcastle's despatch of 1863, which allotted Tasmania three Companies of troops while the effects of convictism still prevailed. In the paper's view, the effects of convictism did still exist, and so the Colony needed a garrison. 

1. T.T., Nov. 6, 1869.
2. L.R., May 20, 1869.
3. H.M., April 22 and May 20, 1869.
At the same time, the Imperial Government was also considering the discontinuance of its annual grant of £6,000 in aid of police and gaols, reported The Examiner, which added that an 1859 despatch had acknowledged the right of the Colony to the claim "for some years". The paper went on to quote "the ministerial journal" (The Mercury) as stating that should the grant-in-aid be totally withdrawn "we shall have to throw Port Arthur, with all its inmates, on the Home Government for support, from sheer inability to pay for them". But Gladstone was warranted in threatening the withdrawal of the £6,000, said The Examiner, when he saw the Government throw away £100,000 to "abolish" State Aid.1

News that the Imperial troops stationed in the Colony were to be withdrawn, for permitted to remain only if the Colony paid for their maintenance, was reported widely in the Press. This decision, coupled with the projected withdrawal of the Imperial grant-in-aid to police and gaols, was reluctantly acquiesced in by the Press. The Tasmanian Times sadly saw the departure of the last British troops, in August, 1870, as "the historical complement" to the withdrawal of the Roman Legions from Colonial Britain.2

Another break with the Mother country came the following year when it was announced that the Colonial Government was to take over the control of Port Arthur on May 1.3 However, the Imperial Government decided to continue its grant of £6,000 per year for police purposes for another 12 months.4

1. L.E., June 17, 1869.  
2. T.T., Aug. 11, 1870.  
3. H.M., March 25  
4. H.M., May 18,
The western railway question resurfaced after all the wild talk of sending convicts back to England, and took a new turn with the refusal of the Commissioners Kemp and Innes to approve the monthly payments to the contractors. For some time Kemp, the engineer of the three men, had been dissatisfied with the certificates given by the Engineers of the Company stating the amount of work executed. He also had a personal grievance, this being his stated need for a staff to assist him in his duties and calculations. He had now talked Innes into joining him in refusing to sign the cheques to the contractors.

Kemp contended for the adoption of the same form of certificate as that used in Victoria, but O'Byrne objected to this because the principles of the contract were opposite: in Victoria the amount payable to the contractor depended on the amount of work done according to the schedule of prices. But in Tasmania, the contract for the western line was a lump sum.

Work on the line came to a standstill. Two months of instalments, amounting to £1700, were due and unpaid, and the Company appointed a deputation - Button, Grubb, Green, J. Bowring, Douglas and O'Byrne - to wait on the Executive. The Government refused to step in. It did say, however, that if no satisfactory adjustment could be made, then the Governor in Council would be advised.

The North was overwhelmed with amazement and grief by this inaction and it was prophesied that work on the line would likely
stop, the company be wound up and the country saddled with a law suit, for compensation to the contractors, involving thousands of pounds.

But by July, negotiations had resulted in the deadlock being resolved. The company directors agreed, under government pressure, that the professional commissioner should be furnished with such assistance as was necessary to enable KEMP to inspect documents in the engineer's office and to satisfy himself respecting the progress payments, certified from time to time by the company's engineers.¹ One more obstacle in the way of the construction of the eastern line had been overcome.

Attention now turned to the main line project. The report by Boyce, major and Killett accompanied the commission report of August, 1868, and the engineers reported that a permanent way with a gauge of five feet three inches from ROBERT TOWN to Longford, a distance of 127 miles, could be laid done for £550,000. They recommended in addition that the work be done in three sections under three separate contracts.²

The examiner was, with some justification, incensed by what it termed "Government partiality to the south". It pointed out that in the north the promoters had been compelled to provide a parliamentary survey, collect traffic statistics and, in all, spend large sums before even getting a hearing. But now the government had turned around and not only paid for a parliamentary survey of the midland line and employed an officer to collect information

¹ L.B., H.M., T.T., June 17 and July 15, 1869.
² H.M. and T.T., July 15, 1869.
concerning traffic, but to sum it all up, printed the papers of the
Robert Town Railways and Progress Association at public expense.
The Northern opposed strongly the laying down of the Midland Line;
Owen, the Western Railway might conceivably make no profits for a
few years, so a Main Line had no hope at all of holding its own even.

The Southern Association riposted with a manifesto, "pledging
itself to the Main Line as a national work... The Association
believes that a Main Line of Railway should be essentially a
national work, constructed by the Government, and not by a
Company under any form or principle of guarantee." 2

Speculating prior to the opening of Parliament, The
Tasmanian Times decided that there would probably be two groups
of members: the advocates of national railways and a Main
Line who would object to further aid to the Launceston and
Deloraine Company unless it was nationalised; and those who
favoured more assistance to the Western Line. This latter group
would, it was surmised, probably withhold their cooperation from
the Southern proposers of a national railway policy. 3

The Premier, Sir Richard Dry, died suddenly on August 1,
1869, and in consequence of the death of "perhaps the most
popular statesman Tasmania ever possessed" 4, a new ministry was
formed:

J. W. Wilson - Premier and Colonial Secretary
T. D. Chapman - Colonial Treasurer
W. L. Dobson - Attorney General
J. A. Dunn
Dr H. Butler

1. L.T., July 15, 1869.
2. T.T., July 15, 1869.
3. Ibid.
Parliament assembled on August 24 and the measures promised
on its opening included readjustment of Parliamentary representation
because of alterations in property value brought about by the
economic depression, the laying down of a main line of railway,
and consolidation of the Department of Lands and Works under a
Minister of the Crown. The Executive was also empowered to
conclude terms with the Home Government for taking over the
Imperial convicts, paupers and lunatics at Fort Arthur.

As well, in the most important piece of business accomplished,
the Government was authorized to contract with a British
Company for the construction and working of a Main Line of
railway. The Company was to receive from the Colony a sum of
£300,000 in three instalments, or £25,000 a year for 20 years. Thus the national handling of railway construction was acknowledged
as a fact.

Following the Northern Company's request for more money to
enable it to complete the Sourceron-Galevime Line, a Joint
Parliamentary Committee had been appointed to enquire into the
matter. The Committee's Report stated imputed deception to the
Engineer-in-Chief and the Secretary and deplored the
unsatisfactory manner in which the business of the Company had
been carried on. The Committee, however, recommended that
additional powers be given to the Commissioners, and that the
amount of money required to open the line be granted to Parliament.

1. H.R., Sept. 9, 1869.
2. L.R., Oct. 9, 1869.
which thereupon sanctioned the raising of a sum not exceeding £100,000. Despite the initial underestimation, the Northern Company was enabled to proceed with the building of the line from Dalhousie to Launceston.

There was nothing respecting the Main Line in the Colonial Press at the end of the year, except a Mercury report that the Main Line question was in abeyance pending news of Captain Audley Coote. Coote was to be heard of again and again during the negotiations connected with building the line. He was the representative of a British Company which had been making overtures to the Government concerning the building of a main line, and had gone to England to consult the British capitalists whom he represented about the Railway Bill passed during the last session of the local Parliament. This Bill had instructed the Government to send to London the necessary instructions for placing the Colony's proposals before the London money markets, but the Ministry had entered on negotiations with Coote. It later came in for some criticism because of the confining of negotiations to the one body, represented in the Colony by its hard-riding courier, Coote.

The Chief Justice, Sir Valentine Fleming, retired from the Colonial Judiciary on December 31, 1869, with the result that Sir Francis Smith became the Chief Justice, W.L. Dobson Puisne Judge and W.E. Giblin the attorney-General. The last-

1. H.R., Nov. 6, 1869.
named was a keen advocate of the Main Line and Vice-president of the Main Line Association. He was to become a most important figure in the Colony. The question of National income and expenditure was most important. A small island, Victoria, was to become the most important of the States.

But negotiations concerning the construction of a new line were not increasing Government revenue, and the Administration turned, like its predecessors, to grapple with the difficult question of National income and expenditure. Some sort of Colonial Customs Union was thought to be desirable, and an Inter-Colonial Conference with respect to the establishment of an Australian Commercial Federation was suggested by Wilson in March. The Union he proposed in a Circular to the Governments of the mainland Colonies and New Zealand was to be on the basis of a "Customs Union with Inter-Colonial Free Trade and a free exchange of all products and commodities". Duties collected throughout the Union were to be periodically distributed amongst the Colonies according to population. If adopted, the Tasmanian plan would, if the claim, simplify existing tariffs and pave the way for political federation, which was looked on as inevitable and desirable. As far as the distribution of money collected was concerned, Tasmania would benefit, but Queensland and New Zealand would be serious losers because of the high average contribution per head of Customs Duties in those Colonies.1

The three Tasmanian papers devoted much space to discussion of the plan but only The Tasmanian Times actively followed up the

1. T.T., L.E., March 26, 1870.
scheme, and was disappointed when the projected meeting was
hampered by a change of Ministry in Victoria, the "intractable
assembly" of New South Wales and the dissolution of the South
Australian Parliament.1

The Conference was ultimately convened at Melbourne and
represented by delegates from Tasmania, New South Wales, Victoria
and South Australia. Queensland was unrepresented because of
ministerial changes, and New Zealand because of the absence of
any federal legislation to alter or amend findings as the occasion
might require. The Tasmanian delegates were Wilson and Chapman.

The Tasmanian Times, in an account of the meeting published in
July, 1879, stated that the delegates had recognised the
desirability of Australian commercial federation, but the
conference had broken down when Victoria insisted on retaining
her policy of protection at all costs. This spirit of
antipathy towards a union of Free Trade Colonies effectively
prevented its realisation. The delegates dealt with questions
of reduction of inter-Colonial postage and telegraph charges,
just action in the matter of extradition of short-ixed offenders
against trademarks, immigration to the Fiji Protectorate, Colonial
diseases, Australian silver strike, and the postal system and
uniform statistics.2 Put because of the basic difference
between the economic policies of Victoria and New South Wales,
the conference could go no further with the question of Federation.

1. "T.T., April 27, 1879.
The Tasmanian delegates returned disappointed and discouraged. Their plan had foundered on the rock of Victoria-New South Wales differences. A Tasmanian Inter-Colonial Free Trade Bill passed by September, two months after the Conference. This Bill sought to remove the obstructions which impeded Inter-Colonial commerce by reciprocal Free Trade (except spirits and tobacco) agreements with other Colonies, and provided for arrangements, in the nature of conventions, between the Governments of the Colonies, by which products might be reciprocally exchanged, duty free. But Tasmania was only anointing her own wounds. The Bill was reserved for the consideration of the Crown, Governor Du Cane telling members in his speech proroguing Parliament that there had been concurrent measures in South Australia and New Zealand. 1

So sooner had this Bill passed both houses than the Treasurer in his Budget Speech disclosed a deficiency of £12,000 in the estimates for the General Revenue. This had to be met, he declared, by reduction of expenditure and increased taxation. But little or no retrenchment was now possible, and the Colony knew it. Thus the only thing to do, apart from floating more loans secured on the General Revenue, was to impose additional Duties. Accordingly taxes were placed on the items most likely to realise money - imported stock and wheat, flour, grain, coals, stationery and printed paper. The Government also, stated The Mercury, intended such a duty as a "retaliatory measure"

for duty imposed by Victoria on Tasmanian jams, wheat and flour.\(^1\)

The Government announced two reasons for the imposition, observed The Tasmanian Times: first, it was compelled to raise revenue somehow; and second, the Colony would be in a position to say to Victoria that Tasmania had something to give up, as well as receive, in consenting to a common tariff and a division of Customs revenue on a population basis. In the eyes of The Mercury, the Colony was between the devil and the deep sea: "The unfriendly tariff adopted by Victoria in 1865 had gradually operated to our prejudice more and more, and masters have not been improved by the incidental Protection which we owe to the Treasurer of Tasmania."\(^2\) The Protectionist nature of these Duties put an end to all the hopes expressed in the Tasmanian Inter-Colonial Free Trade Bill, concluded The Mercury mournfully.\(^3\)

Negotiations regarding the Main Line continued. The Mercury reported that an assurance had been received from Coots, now in Britain, that he expected to succeed in finalising such an arrangement as the Legislature had agreed would need to be made.\(^4\) (Parliament had sanctioned the payment of one third of £900,000 to any Company willing to lay down the line and operate it.)

Coots was back in Melbourne by May and the Island Press, with the exception of The Examiner, noted with satisfaction that he was acting now as the representative of "The Tasmanian Main Line Railway Company", a British organisation said to have a capital of one million pounds.\(^5\) This Company's offer was for a four foot

---

1. H.M., May 18, 1871.  
2. Ibid.  
3. H.M., Nov. 5, 1870.  
4. H.M., April 21, 1870.  
5. T.T., May 19, 1870.
eight and a half inch line costing £650,000. The Government was asked to guarantee the Company a net income of 5% for 35 years and, if the profits of the line exceeded 5%, then the Colony would receive half the surplus. The Administration was given the option of purchasing the line at a valuation at any time within 10 years of the opening of the line.¹ This proposition, if accepted, would have had the Government acting ultra vires of the act, so any action had to wait on the assembling of Parliament on August 23.

But Coote shifted his ground and before Parliament was convened he proposed a line with a gauge of three feet six inches, to cost £650,000 as before, the Government guaranteeing 5% per year for 35 years, and dividing with the Company any profits over 6%. If the cost of the line ran to more than the £650,000, no further guarantee would be required.²

Upon the opening of Parliament, it was reported that the terms now agreed on by the Government and the Main Line Company, and which Parliament accordingly would be asked to sanction, were:— a line with a gauge of three feet six inches, interest of 5% on the cost not exceeding £650,000; and, on the Company's capital, a similar amount. If the profit was less than 5%, the Government guarantee was only to be to the extent of the difference between such profit and 5% on the cost of construction. Profits in excess of 6% were to be shared between the Government and the

¹. P.P., H.R., July 14, 1870.
². H.R., Aug. 11, 1870.
Company; until the Government had repaid out of such profit, the amount of money paid by it in respect of the guarantee. The six months of Government was to be at liberty to buy, upon giving 12 months notice, the railway. The measure, when thus discussed, brought before the House. The measure guaranteed "interest at the rate of 5% per annum during construction, such period,... not to exceed four years from the date of the final contract; and for a period of 30 years thereafter, upon the actual cost of a railway to connect Hobart Town and Launceston,... up to; and not exceeding, the sum of £650,000, to any person or Company that will undertake to construct, maintain and work such railway, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon between the Governor-in-Council and such persons or Company.2

This Bill was ultimately passed but only after several hair's-breadth escapes in the Legislative Council and four Joint House Conferences. The Government had secured very favourable terms for the line.

The Launceston Examiner did not wax enthusiastic when the Bill was passed: "We have, on previous occasions, shown that such a railway cannot pay"; furthermore, "the people of the Northern and "Hallid districts do not wish for it". But a railway mania had swept the South and a railway was demanded.3

1. T.T., H.L., L.E., Sept. 8, 1870.
3. L.E., Oct. 9, 1870.
Sir of the Legislative Councillors recorded their protests against the passage of the Bill. The Examiner looked on the six favourably! "The gentlemen who signed the protest have done their duty to their country". The men concerned in this dissension were Alex. Clarke, D. Cameron, J. Aikenhead, W. Grubb, W. Langdon and J. Archer. Northern men who claimed that the proposed scheme opened no new country and was unnecessary, because a macadamised road already ran through the area, because Ministers had failed to show that the traffic, such as it was, required a Main Line, because the Colony could not afford a liability of £32,000 per year for 30 years, because the Hill was only passed to appease clamour in Hobart Town, and because it was a breach of faith to the western Railway district to alter the terms of railway construction.

While the main line Hill was thus being concluded, the western line was opened to traffic on February 10, 1870. Within a month the Examiner was able to say that the returns far exceeded "the most sanguine expectations". So the Northern Railway at last became a reality. How far it would tap and stimulate the production of the rich area it traversed remained to be seen.

At the same time, The Mercury reported that the Tasmanian Main Line Company had irrevocably ratified Coote's proposals, suggesting a contract embodying the terms of the provisional

1. L.E., Nov. 5, 1870.
2. L.E., March 25, 1871.
contract as modified by 31 Vic. 11. This ratification thus
pre-supposed that the Company and satisfied itself that the line
could be constructed, rolling-stock provided and all expenses
met for 165,000, upon the guaranteed rate for 30 years of 5% on
the capital raised.

But all was not yet plain sailing. The Company changed its
mind and Coote was instructed to inform the Colonial Government
that at so low a rate as 5%, it might be found impossible to
float the Company’s capital at par. If the stock did happen to
be sold at a discount, he was instructed by his employers to
secure the Government’s consent to that discount being calculated
as part of the cost of construction, but so that the total cost
on which the Government should give to pay interest would not
exceed the stipulated cost of 165,000. The Company evidently
saw that it had made a poor bargain and tried to alter the terms
it had agreed to, but the Tasmanian Government was not going to
give an inch if it could help it. For its part, the administration
decided to agree to pay any interest beyond that on money
actually spent in building the line, except to the sum of
£20,000 allowed for preliminary expenses.

There the matter rested, with the Government having driven
a hard bargain with the main line Company. A month later the
Wilson ministry let it be known that if the Tasmanian Main
Line Railway Company did not send engineers by the end of
August, the Government would regard the negotiations as abandoned
and have no hesitation in proposing the construction of the line as a national undertaking. ¹

This ultimatum brought the Company to its knees and crie, one of its engineers, arrived to conduct a survey of the line. The route he proposed differed from that of Doyne, major and Willett in that it would pass through oatlands and be 21 miles shorter. ² At that point, however, further developments were halted by the onset of the 1871 election, brought about by the Government's determination to broaden the franchise.

Reference to this readjustment of the franchise had been made at the opening of Parliament in 1869, when the marked alteration in property values had been put forward as the reason for re-enfranchising those who had lost the vote through the depreciation of property values. Property and house values had decreased by over 50% in some cases. Accordingly, a Corridor Bill was passed. It provided for a meeting early in 1870 to supply the basis for revision of the existing system of representation.

The Examiner noted that an increase in the number of members of the House was also mooted, but stated that any such move would reflect little credit on the Administration: "To increase the number of representatives would be positive destruction to the Colony". "Parliament has more important work to do than tinkering with the Constitution."³ The Examiner, over the years,

¹. L.E., June 19, 1871.
². L.E., July 13 and Aug. 10, 1871.
³. L.E., Aug. 11 and Sept. 3, 1870.
had always stood out for a narrow franchise, and the reduction of house values was accomplishing this without the necessity of legislation.

The Tasmanian Times had agitated for revision of the franchise in 1867, when it pointed out that land house values had decreased to such an extent that many voters were losing the franchise by the new assessments: house properties in the towns had decreased in value by as much as a third. It was a fact that several constituencies were nothing but pocket boroughs, and several large electorates had not the voting power of the small ones. Denon, for example, would need to return three members to be on a par with some southern constituencies. The concessions demanded, then, would simply restore the situation as it had existed when responsible government was first granted, unless the boundaries of the electorates were re-drawn.

A suggestion to divide Hobart Town into five electoral divisions with one Member each was bitterly opposed by the Tasmanian Times. This scheme, declared that paper, "aimed directly at an increase of the influence of property at the expense of members." The 110 occupants would record but one vote in the division where they might reside, whereas the owner of house property or land could vote as a free holder in every division. Plurality of voting had been known in the rural constituencies from the first election. In 1861, "Mr James Gibson recorded his vote at Avoca for Singal; in the afternoon he voted at Balornoke

1. T.T., June 25, 1867.
2. T.T., Aug. 24, 1867.
for that district, having ridden 70 miles in five hours."\(^1\)

During the New Norfolk election in the following year, it is recorded that "The 'Ban' has been chartered to carry up such of 'a Maryland'\'s supporters as are resident in town."\(^2\)

Nothing further regarding readjustment of the franchise was said in the Colonial Press until February, 1869, when the editor of The Times suggested the adoption of household suffrage.

"The fact has long been patent that the governing classes in this Colony are totally distinct in every way from the bulk of the community. Our electoral system practically disfranchises the great bulk of the adult male population." Unless household suffrage was introduced "the Government of the country will be concentrated in the hands of an oligarchical faction - the pliant nominees of the pastoral and moneyed interests of the Colon\'s.\(^3\)

It was a fact that until 1870, only 11,571 men were able to vote i.e. 42.08\% of adult males in the Colony. This left 37,326 male citizens over 21 disfranchised because their incomes were less than $80 per year, or because they did not own a house to the clear annual value of $10,\(^4\) an indication of the extent of the economic depression.

At the opening of the fifth session of the Fourth Parliament, on August 23, 1870, the Governor in his speech promised Parliamentary reform, and a Bill \(x\) to amend the Constitution.

---

1. L.T., June 22, 1861.
2. H.M., Nov. 11, 1862.
3. T.T., Feb. 29, 1869.
Act was accordingly laid before Parliament. The Bill proposed an increase of one in the membership of the Legislative Council and of two in the Lower House. Devon was to return three Members instead of one to the Assembly, and a new representative to the Council. As well, the property qualification was to be reduced from £50 to £30 in the Legislative Council, and the franchise for that Chamber extended to persons having leasehold estate to the annual value of £270, held under lease for a term of not less than five years; and also to those who were paid a salary of £30 per year.

In the House of Assembly, the freehold estate qualification was reduced from £100 to £50, the qualification by reason of occupancy of any building or leasehold estate from £10 to £7, and the salary qualification from £100 to £50. The qualification arising out of the holding of a licence to depasture lands was struck out and in its place the right to vote was given to every occupier of land purchased on credit from the Crown, and on which instalments amounting to £50 had been paid. 1

In addition, it was decided to allow the plurality of voting feared by the Tasmanian Times, and Robert Town and Launceston were split up into five and three electoral districts respectively. In 1871, there were 31 electors on the Rolls who had from two to five votes, one in each electoral district where they held property; 217 had votes for two districts, 70 for three, 28 for four, and four for five. Six years later, there were still 209 such

1. L.e., Sept. 8, 1876.
electors, 215 having the vote for two districts, 63 for three, 19 for four and two for five.¹

The subject of the payment of members was introduced by Balfour, but The Examiner still retained a little faith in the Legislature: "We do not imagine Parliament degraded enough to countenance it".² The paper's estimate of the House proved correct and Balfour withdrew his proposal.

The Constitution Amendment Bill was received for the Queen's consideration and received the Royal Assent in March 1871, becoming law as 34 Vic. No. 42. An election was not anticipated before September as the preparation of the Electoral Rolls and Polling Lists would occupy some months.

The widened franchise was not a decisive step towards full democratic government. As The Mercury pointed out: "Literally a new franchise has been created, though virtually it is but a restoration of it to those who had been deprived of it by the depreciation in the value of property".³ Nonetheless, an entirely new class - the occupiers of 'red purchase' on credit from the Crown - had been given the vote.⁴

¹ House of Assembly Papers, No. 117 of 1871, quoted by Clark, Page 41.
² L.E., Sept. 8, 1870.
³ L.R., March 25, 1871.
⁴ L.R., March 25, 1871.
CONCLUSION

The period reviewed is a clear cut one in the history of Tasmania. Although the years from 1856 to the '70's were years of acute and tragic depression, the politicians of the day were, in many cases, most colourful personalities.

The economic depression was a grim business for those who remained in the island but it was not, as some have assumed, an uninteresting time. It saw the last days in the Legislature of a number of men who had dominated and voiced the opinion of the settlers since the day when Colonel George Arthur first set foot in the Colony of Van Diemen's Land and commenced his cold administration of the penal Colony. The men who sat in the first Parliament could remember, some of them, the strange governments of Sorell and "Mad Tom" D'arcy, when, under Sorell, land grants were distributed left, right and centre. Sorell was understandably a popular man among the settlers, and his free and easy policy made the task of Arthur more difficult than it might have been.

By the year of 1856, however, men such as Gregson, Try, Fenton and Kermede had won the battle they had joined with Arthur, Wilmot and Denison — the fight for the ending of Transportation and the granting of responsible government. But when they had accomplished this, their necessary union dissolved. The economic depression was not sufficient to
bring them together in the face of that which was relentlessly reducing the country to bankruptcy.

The intangible nature of the depression that spread its inescapable paralysis throughout the thriving Colony which the Members of the Legislature had known, was not a foe that voiced its opinion in the person of the Crown's representative. Baffled, puzzled and angered to some extent by the creeping malady of Lethargy and dullness of mind that beset the people of the Colony as the level of initiative was decreased by the emigration of the better type of settler and ex-convict, the representatives squabbled in the Legislature when they should have pursued a vigorous policy to put the Colony back on its feet.

The unchallengeable position of the landed proprietors in the Legislature of the Colony is the vital factor in an assessment of Tasmania's development after the granting of self government. The land holders were content during the years of the economic depression to allow the finances of the Colony to go from bad to worse to critical. With the exception of Meredith's radical proposition to tax land and income, and Gregson's plan for the sale of great areas of land, the Administrations demonstrated a fatal paucity of initiative and lack of imagination, although Wilson was to be lauded for his attempt to establish a Zollverein. With only one or two exceptions, the men in Parliament cried poverty for the Colony, but did nothing constructive to change the existing situation.
Consequently the Administrations of the Island were constantly faced with the perplexing task of equalising the expenditure and the revenue. As the inflated prices of the gold rush period decreased, the Colony realised that it no longer was the home of a sufficient number of people to defray the high costs of government which had become customary during the gold rushes. The chief income of the Administration was from Customs Duties, and the reduced male population of the Island, as well as the slump in prices, militated against, there being an increase in income from that source.

Financial trouble was constant, and throughout the period the Governments concerned themselves a great deal with retrenchment, in an effort to reduce the costs of government. But within a short time, reduction had been carried as far as possible, although many candidates were elected on the cry of "Retrenchment or ruin".

In addition to retrenchment, strenuous efforts were made to abolish the annual grant of £15,000 for State Aid to churches, and to compel Britain to pay more for the upkeep of the Imperial paupers, the old and infirm convicts who were a costly legacy of the past. Both plans to reduce costs in this way were unsuccessful. Although State Aid was "abolished", in fact the Colony had still to pay out a large sum, for the Queen would not consent to abolition of the ecclesiastical endowment without the life interests of the clergy being guaranteed. In the case of the Imperial paupers, the British Government made it clear that
Tasmania had received, in the past, the advantages of cheap labour and had now to tolerate some of the disadvantages of transportation.

The position was that the Island's Legislature was prepared to leave no stone unturned in an effort to balance the Budget without resorting to a direct tax on those best able to pay it—the landed proprietors and other wealthy Colonists. The reason for the unwillingness to tax property and income was clear: the squatters and their representatives dominated the Legislature throughout the years of the economic depression, and continued to do so until the development of secondary industries resulted in the growth of an extensive urban population.

It is not difficult to understand, and to sympathise with the members of the Government to some degree. Responsible government was a novel and interesting experience, an innovation for which the struggle had been long and bitter. Now it had been achieved and the consequences were economic depression and all its attendants. The longer the depression continued and the Administrations failed to better the lot of the Colony, then the more firmly did people come to associate the Government and the bad times as cause and effect. The plan of Innes and other Members of Parliament to suspend the Constitution and revert to a single Chamber only partially elective, can be understood to some extent in the light of their acrimony when the expected benefits of self government did not eventuate.
There were no convincing arguments advanced for the non-application of direct taxation; the Colonial Press revealed only that the landed proprietors resisted direct charges on their property and incomes on the grounds that this was no reward for their trouble and risk in braving natural and physical enemies to open up the wilderness of Van Diemen's Land. Another argument employed stated that direct taxation could not be afforded by the landed proprietors and employers: it would result in their being driven from the Colony by economic necessity. Who then would there be to employ the men who were demanding imposte on income and land? But if the men who were threatening to depart had decided against leaving Tasmanian soil during the period when the great emigration occurred, then it was unlikely that the 1/14 in the £ tax that Meredith ultimately proposed would have that effect. By nature, the landed proprietors were conservative men. The more enterprising and energetic of them, such as W.J.T. Clarke, had taken up land in Port Phillip when they perceived the advantages of that settlement. In the same way as the gold rushes lost to Tasmanian the men of initiative among her working class and potential middle class, the superior attractions of the province across Bass Strait resulted in the Island being deprived of the landed proprietors most likely to prove an advantage to the Colony politically.

The situation which developed brought the Colony to a state much resembling that of England in the eighteenth century or, for
The talk of further industrialisation, to say the least, that energy that countries before the Industrial Revolution. In other words, there was in existence a landed governing class - the original settlers and their descendants - and the ex-military and naval officers. Together, these two groups formed a social hierarchy that persisted strongly in the Island down the years and which still has an influence in the less prosperous areas of Tasmania.

There was another partner to this Axis in the merchant element of Hobart Town and Launceston. Economic necessity has in history brought merchants and landed proprietors together at the threshold of industrialisation, and so it proved in Tasmania. The merchants were not large in number in the Colony but they were far from unimportant in a Colony that needed so many imports. In addition to the landed proprietors and merchants, there was a large body of lawyers in the Legislature and, as is their wont, the men who followed the legal profession did not throw up a large number of radical politicians.

It is small wonder then that the House of Assembly of Tasmania gave short shrift to proposals to alter the existing order by taxing directly the income and property of the men best able to pay it.

Even if it is allowed that a Property and Income Tax would have had, in some way, a deleterious effect upon the Colony, there could be no excuse for the lack of activity in the matter of immigration. Certainly the Colony's Governments must have been of
cynical of any talk of further immigration, since so many British settlers had left the Colony for the Mainland, making use of Tasmania merely as a resting place, before moving on to increase the wealth of the more attractive provinces on the Continent. Money could profitably have been laid out in a fresh immigration scheme that made it worth the while of the new settler to stay in Tasmania.

The decline of the South of the Island, in population and wealth, and the increasing importance of the North and North West to the prosperity of Tasmania, is plain in the history of the period from 1856.

The decrease in the number of male adults in the Southern constituencies and the steady gain by the electorates in the North tells its own story. The redistribution of representation in 1871 was long overdue and did not go nearly far enough. And the undue influence of country Members, which was not needed for them to continue to dominate the Legislature, can be shown by the fact that in 1867 Hobart Town and Launceston had 4,336 voters who returned eight Members to the Lower House. In the same year, a similar number of representatives was returned by 2,503 electors in the constituencies of Brighton, Clarence, Cumberland, Franklin, Glenorchy, Kingborough and New Norfolk.

The discrepancies in representation between Northern and Southern electorates, not widespread in 1856 when the boundaries were laid down, were amazing by 1867. In that year the electorate of Devon, for example, with 853 voters, was represented by one man
in the House of Assembly. At the same time, one Member was returned in Glamorgan by 147 voters. Westbury was also grossly under-represented. That electorate had registered 527 voters. Clarence in the South, with 190 voters, returned one Member, the same as the Northern constituency.

The fact of the matter was that in 1867, the 11 Northern constituencies returned 13 Members of Parliament to the House. The voting population of the North was 5,565. The Southern constituencies, on the other hand, were 13 in number and returned 17 Members from a voting population of 6,169. In other words, each Northern Member represented 437 voters, and each Southern Member represented 363.

But no alteration of the electoral boundaries could change the fact that the two city electorates totalled but 4,366 voters out of a total Colonial vote of 12,054. The urban dwellers would be outnumbered in the House by three to one even if they received representation in proportion to the population of their constituencies.

But what of Tasmania after 1871? Discovery of minerals proved the salvation of the Island. Exports increased from £648,000 in 1870 to £1,132,000 in 1875. During the same six year period, imports increased from £798,000 to £1,333,000 and revenue from £270,000 to £327,000. The population increased by only 5,000, but in the next six years it jumped by 17,000.
The growth of the North West, the development of the North West, brought about by mineral discoveries, the discovery of Mt Bischoff's fabulous deposit of tin, and finally the opening of the West Coast put Tasmania back on the map. The development of mineral deposits incidentally hastened the already startling development of the North West from a huge virgin forest to an area where land was steadily cleared and farms started from Devonport to Wynyard.

Emigration from Tasmania to the Mainland, especially Victoria, began with the discovery of gold and continued all through the period from 1856. The emigration of young Tasmanians that began in the years of the gold rush, continued during the depression. This population movement has gone on, except for the years when the mining centres of the West Coast were at their heyday, over the years, and undoubtedly has been one reason, if not the chief one, for the conservative nature of Tasmania during the 30 years from the establishment of responsible government, and, taking an overall picture, the conservatism of the Tasmanian people down the years. Some most revealing statistics are quoted in a valuable article already written on population movements in Tasmania*, and the writer concludes his article thus:--

"In Australian history, no interstate drift of population

has been so consistent and so damaging as the trek from Tasmania to the land of opportunity across the water. Ever since the Island’s pastoralists penned their sheep on the docks of little ketches and sailed to occupy the rolling downs of Western Victoria, emigration has been a Tasmanian tradition. As most unemployed workmen crossed to the Mainland instead of flooding the labour market at home, the social question hardly disturbed the political scene until the early 1890’s, when the Mainland, especially Victoria, was even more depressed than Tasmania. Is it possibly significant that the first rumblings of the radical’s protest and the new Labour League should arise at the very time when the traditional escape route for unemployed Tasmanians was blocked for probably the first time in 40 years? Was emigration the continual “safety valve” for the Island’s discontent? Does it help to explain the political conservatism and the absence of any radical movement before the 1890’s?

The field covered from 1856 indicates that emigration certainly explains the absence of successful radical movements, for there were groups of people who were radical. But they lacked the strength to carry any weight in the Legislature. There can be no question that in the first election Maxwell Miller in Hobart Town and Moore and Matthews in Launceston went to the people with a clear radical programme. The success of Miller illustrates the fact that there were a large number of men of the character who would vote for a radical in the City. The same
situation did not arise in Launceston for the reasons - first, because that City did not possess the large number of working men that Hobart Town did, and second, because the Northern Electorates were more prosperous than Hobart Town and consequently the people were discontented.

In the electorates in the country there cannot be discerned one movement that approaches the nature of the popular movements in the cities. The land holding families remained in absolute control of the constituencies. Gregson was one of the few men returned from the country who did not join forces, on issues threatening their supremacy, with the landed aristocrats. His brand of radicalism is difficult to analyze. Often he appeared to be carried away by the flow of his own rhetoric, and instead of concluding a speech by proposing a new financial scheme for the Colony, he would end by hurling insults and references to the occasion of their coming to the Colony, at his opponents.

Gregson, however, during the period that he was Premier could not hope to govern while he depended on the spasmodic support of men influenced in their voting by personal prejudices, and who were, in fact, merely toying with him.

Maxwell Miller was more a radical in the accepted sense of the word than was Gregson, as has been shown by his election campaign in 1856, and by his willingness to appear at workers' meetings. But he was one man out of 50, of whom 20 or more were squatters or merchants or lawyers.
The radical movements, such as they were, could not hope to grow while the men who would normally swell their ranks were leaving the Colony. Certainly some men stayed in Tasmania and, for the most part, drifted about Hobart Town, but the impression remains that these were not the people who would add drive to radical movements. The potential leaders of popular movements, the men of initiative and those with imagination and a clear idea of their aims, were the very ones who left the Island, not unnaturally, for the greener pastures and better prospects of Victoria.

Sir Charles Dilke says in his book "Greater Britain", written after a tour of the world in 1865 and 1867, that "Tasmania has never been able to rid herself of the convict population to any great degree, for the free colonies have always kept a jealous watch upon her emigrants....."

It is doubtful, however, if any power could have prevented large numbers of ex-convicts from going to Victoria when the gold rushes started. Certainly the huge influx of people to that province would have militated against the apprehension of Tasmanian "bidders". But it may well be that the proportion of convicts who remained in the Island was larger than is generally supposed. Certain it is that the effects of both the convict origin of Tasmania, and the continual emigration to the Mainland, have left their mark on the Island, particularly in the South, where many convicts stayed behind.
The position was that the landed proprietors remained not only in a legislative majority but also a numerical majority, since some town voters must have been land owners as well, and even assuming every voter in the towns was not a land holder, the population of the rural constituencies was still greater than that of the urban ones. And what other class was there in the Colony, apart from the land and holders? This question can better be answered by asking another one—what class was absent from the Colony? A study of the period of the economic depression gives the answer. There was almost no middle class at all, and what there was of it left was so depressed that it was unrecognisable. On the one hand there was the alliance of land holders and merchants and lawyers, and on the other a hotch-potch of free settlers, ex-convicts, small farmers and tenant farmers, and artisans. Outside this group stood men such as Gregson and Miller, who opposed the monopoly of the land holders but were unable to gain an effective following from the rest of the population because the rest of the population was not large enough.

As Sir Charles Dilke says in his book, "Tasmanian society is cast in a more aristocratic shape than is that of Queensland; with this exception the most oligarchical of all our Colonies".

The writer has a word to say also on the lethargy that characterised the Colony in these years, "The curse of the country
is the indolence of its lotus-eating population, who, like all
dwellers in climates cool but winterless, are content to dream
away their lives in drowsiness to which the habits of a hotter but
less equable clime... are energy itself. In addition, however,
to this natural cause of decline, Van Diemen's Land is not yet
free from all traces of the convict blood, nor from the evil
effects of reliance on forced labour. It is indeed, but a few
years since the Island was one great gaol, and in 1853 there were
still 20,000 actual convicts in the country. The old free
settlers will tell you that the deadly shade of slave labour has not
blighted Jamaica more thoroughly than that of convict labour has
Van Diemen's Land."

It was Tasmania's double tragedy that she suffered from the
convict taint and at the same time lost the best of her settlers
because of huge emigration that followed the gold discoveries.
### Appendix A

#### Tasmanian Statistics - 1855 to 1882

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Registered Voters</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total Adults</th>
<th>Land.</th>
<th>Coin in</th>
<th>Import</th>
<th>Export</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>290,000</td>
<td>323,000</td>
<td>82,900</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>665,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>87,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>271,000</td>
<td>301,000</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>133,000</td>
<td>440,000</td>
<td>482,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>93,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>263,000</td>
<td>293,000</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td>290,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>97,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>253,000</td>
<td>283,000</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>128,000</td>
<td>276,000</td>
<td>165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>255,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>199,000</td>
<td>857,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>102,000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>273,000</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>89,000</td>
<td>127,000</td>
<td>271,000</td>
<td>167,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>99,000</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>253,000</td>
<td>128,000</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>128,000</td>
<td>276,000</td>
<td>165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>104,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>255,000</td>
<td>131,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>174,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>255,000</td>
<td>131,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>174,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>106,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>174,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>107,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>174,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>108,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>174,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>109,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>174,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>174,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>111,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>174,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>112,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>174,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>113,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>174,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>114,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>174,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>174,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>116,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>174,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>117,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>174,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>174,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>119,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>174,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>174,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>121,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>174,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>122,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>174,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>123,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>174,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The population figures underlined indicate emigration.

---

**Table:**

- Land: Revenue Sales, Customs, Export, Banks
- Coin in: Imports, Export
### Appendix B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>1856</th>
<th>1857</th>
<th>1858</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1862</th>
<th>1870</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Voters on Roll</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Adults</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>1870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Brighton**: 312, 311, 319, 994, 900, 893
- **Lancaster**: 215, 190, 163, 187, 586, 462, 329
- **Aberdeen**: 1356, 361, 1358, 347, 1104, 970, 819
- **Franklin**: 302, 211, 331, 371, 955, 822, 771
- **Glamorgan**: 128, 147, 149, 114, 438, 368, 238
- **Glenorchy**: 415, 458, 457, 421, 952, 731, 818
- **Hobart Town**: 3927, 21757, 3858, 3854, 5220, 5126, 4215
- **Kingborough**: 402, 504, 565, 636, 1308, 1095, 923
- **New Norfolk**: 273, 273, 334, 299, 953, 788, 811
- **Oatlands**: 243, 308, 371, 450, 900, 893, 975
- **Queensborough**: 215, 313, 342, 358, 615, 460, 525
- **Richmond**: 279, 234, 217, 251, 612, 524, 364
- **Sorell**: 343, 438, 389, 529, 2095, 1920, 1508
- **Campbell Town**: 274, 258, 271, 309, 961, 900, 711
- **Beloraine**: 288, 445, 511, 527, 745, 1106, 937
- **Devon**: 395, 853, 825, 1299, 1100, 1826, 1704
- **Fingal**: 154, 169, 257, 533, 585, 669, 674
- **George Town**: 138, 157, 163, 242, 530, 461, 428
- **Launceston**: 1409, 1271, 2192, 2486, 2322, 2791, 2322
- **Horven**: 250, 265, 296, 271, 1270, 967, 969
- **Norfolk Plains**: 381, 402, 433, 367, 809, 1053, 1021
- **Ringwood**: 153, 402, 174, 168, 698, 853, 833
- **Selby**: 579, 446, 537, 759, 1386, 886, 908
- **Westbury**: 337, 527, 644, 601, 1408, 1550, 1933
- **Wellington**: 378, 707

**Note**: *Devon was at this point made two electorates.

Wellington electorate took in the area West of the Blythe River,
and included the now tin mining area.
### Appendix C

**Population of electorates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>1857</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1870</th>
<th>1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>2,751</td>
<td>2,808</td>
<td>3,097</td>
<td>2,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence</td>
<td>2,612</td>
<td>1,552</td>
<td>1,602</td>
<td>1,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>2,591</td>
<td>2,794</td>
<td>2,915</td>
<td>3,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>2,351</td>
<td>2,579</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td>3,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glamorgan</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>1,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glamorgancy</td>
<td>3,639</td>
<td>3,345</td>
<td>3,521</td>
<td>3,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart Town</td>
<td>18,258</td>
<td>19,449</td>
<td>19,092</td>
<td>20,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringborough</td>
<td>3,144</td>
<td>3,454</td>
<td>3,688</td>
<td>4,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Norfolk</td>
<td>2,641</td>
<td>2,690</td>
<td>2,952</td>
<td>3,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaklands</td>
<td>2,236</td>
<td>2,333</td>
<td>3,053</td>
<td>3,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenborough</td>
<td>2,317</td>
<td>1,979</td>
<td>2,391</td>
<td>2,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>1,731</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>1,667</td>
<td>1,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorell</td>
<td>3,072</td>
<td>4,111</td>
<td>4,055</td>
<td>3,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell Town</td>
<td>2,533</td>
<td>2,549</td>
<td>2,464</td>
<td>2,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Lormine</td>
<td>1,983</td>
<td>3,114</td>
<td>3,679</td>
<td>4,126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Devon              | 3,137| 5,416| 3,826| 9,100* (*2 districts
| Fingal             | 1,430| 1,956| 2,261| 3,960|
| George Town        | 1,323| 1,350| 1,623| 4,399|
| Launceston         | 7,874| 10,359| 10,668| 12,686|
| Saracen            | 3,164| 2,638| 2,370| 2,473|
| Norfolk Plains     | 2,209| 3,385| 3,633| 3,166|
| Ringwood           | 1,505| 1,974| 2,060| 2,016|

(continued)
### Appendix C (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>1857</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1870</th>
<th>1881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selby</td>
<td>3,643</td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td>3,468</td>
<td>5,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbury</td>
<td>3,433</td>
<td>4,585</td>
<td>5,339</td>
<td>4,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,733</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Prominent Tasmanian members of Parliament


James Aikenhead: born Montrose, Scotland, June, 1815; died aged 72. Received commercial and legal training. Came to V.D.L. in 1834 on "Janet". In 1841 helped establish Cornwall Fire and Marine Insurance Co., of which he was Secty. Started The Launceston Examiner in 1842 with W. St and J.S. Waddell. Editor till 1869, then Wm. Aikenhead. One of founders of Launceston Savings Bank in 1835, and associated with est. Launceston Chamber of Commerce and Mechanics Institute. A director of local branch of Commercial Bank and Mt Bischoff Tin Mining Co. Legislative Councillor for Tamar 1870-85, when retired. (L.E., July 11, 1887).
J. D. Balfe: Born Co. Meath in 1816; "possessor of those qualities for which the true-born Irishman is proverbial." Prominent member of Repeal Assoc., under O'Connell. Author of letters on Landlord and Tenant question. Married in 1850 and came to V.D.L. Took up selection at Port Cygnet. App'td. Assistant Comptroller-General of Convicts, but resigned after three years. Author of letters directing attention to wants of Tuan, and opposition to aims of Anti-Transportation League, under name "Dion". Conductor of several Tasmanian papers, writing in Liberal interest. (H.M., Dec. 14, 1860).

Dr H. Butler: Born 1821 in London. Father arrived in 1823 and founded Butler, McIntyre and Butler. Member of old L.Col., distinguished himself by his opposition to Clergy Pensions Act of 1854, though passed into law. Chairman of Committees in 1861; arrived in Colony in '40's. Member of first Parl and served with two years intermission till 1885. Minister of Lands 1869-72. Member Central Education Board in 1854; its function to establish schools. Two Boards after 1856, and Board member and Chairman of Southern Board till 1862 when management amalgamated into one body. Member of Royal Commission of 1867 which resulted in Public Schools Act of 1868 and was mainly instrumental in getting compulsory clauses of Act passed. Was one of Commissioners whose 1860 report resulted in establishment of Tas. scholarship and Assoc. of Arts Degree. Rep. of Brighton for 31 years from 1854 except for short period when John Hayes had seat. Succeeded in carrying through waste Lands Act of 1870. An early supporter of Main Railway Line.
T.D. Chapman: Born in Co. Bedford; died 1834 aged 69. One of the 16 elected to Denison's Council in 1851; a liberal in favour of responsible govt. and abolition of Transportation. President of anti-Transportation League; active in opposition to Denison; recognised leader of Liberal party. Gave offence to many by joining Champ's Ministry in 1856. Col Treas 1866-72: longest unbroken period. Premier once, Treasurer twice, Col. Sec. once, President of L.C. for two years. In business at Hobart Town as merchant. (H.M., Feb. 18, 1884).

W.L. Crowthor: Born in April, 1817 in England. Came to V.D.L. when seven. Studied medicine in Colony and Eng., returning in 1842. Commenced active career as politician under auspices of "Retrenchment or ruin" cry of 1846. Resigned on not being apptd. to Cabinet. Engaged in various enterprises connected with whaling, timber and guano trade. Only Fellow of Royal College of Surgeons in Colony. (H.M., 13 April, 1885.)

W.T.N. Champ: Arrived in Colony in 1829 as a Lieutenant in charge of a detachment guarding convicts; took up land. Went to N.S.W.; returned to V.D.L. and appointed Civil Commandant of Port Arthur after O'Hara Booth. To Victoria in 1857 where became Governor of Pentridge Gaol. (The above information was acquired from the Wayne Index in the Tasmanian Archives, Hobart.)
John Davies: had long experience with Press in India and neighbouring Colonies. Represented Devon 1862-72 and was strenuous advocate for Main Line. Took active part in Colonial journalism. Died in 1872 aged 58. (H.M., June 12, 1872).


William Dodery: Born 1819 in Clonmel, Ireland. Arrived in E.S.W. in 1825. Schooled in Sydney; came to Launceston in 1831 - mercantile pursuits. Hotel keeper at Longford (Blenheim Hotel) from 1846-53. Then devoted attention to agricultural pursuits and sheep breeding; large land owner. Represented Norfolk Plains for nearly 10 years from 1861. Chairman of Committees for number of years. (Cyclopaedia of Tasmania).
Adye Douglas: Born in Norfolk in 1815, admitted as a solicitor in 1838 in England. Came to V.D.L. in 1839 and admitted to bar in Hobart Town same year. Went to Van following year; squatter for two years. Returned to Launceston. In 1855 proposed survey of Launceston-Hobart Town railway line. His part in fight against Transportation. Launceston alderman from 1853 to 1864; Mayor for five years. A Tasmanian representative at 1863 Inter-Colonial Tariff Conference. (Cyclopaedia of Tasmania).

T.C. Gregson: Died 1874 aged 75. As far back as Arthur's time was conspicuous, being one of his most active and enterprising opponents. Fluent and incisive speaker. But in House lacked self-control and moderation. During his Ministry he violently attacked those who opposed him and often defied Speaker. During Wilmot's time, he was a staunch opponent of some Govt. measures and moved rejection of Bill to raise Duties on sugars, tea and foreign goods from 5% to 15%, adopting as motto "No taxation without repn." Wilmot reproached "Opposition" for having exhibited spirit "more radical and even Jacobinical" than had ever been in Parl. factions. Gregson repelled reproaches and contended that in resisting unjust exactions for convict purposes, was promoting real interests of Colonial govt. One of "Patriotic Six". Gregson's part in mixed Col. Scarceley any select cttee he was not in, notably cttee to prepare draft 2 of Bill for new Const...

R.W. Kermode: Died in 1870 aged 58. One of 16 elected Members under Denison. Represented Campbell Town, and also Ringwood. One of most important sheep breeders in the Colony. Exhibited wool in Paris Exhibition as early as 1855. Name permanently identified with movements for cessation of Transportation and establishment of free institutions. Occasional faults of temper. (H.M., May 5, 1870).

R.B. Miller: Born London in 1825; son of London barrister who numbered among his friends the leading lawyers, literary men and artists of the day. Educated at King's College, London; admitted to Middle Temple in 1848. Arrived in Hobart Town in 1855; then to Launceston where lived except for three years in Victoria, 1868 (?)-71. Regarded as one of the leading criminal lawyers of the day. Resigned in 1863 concerning the ad valorem duties question. (Cyclopaedia of Tasmania).


Dr Robert Officer: Born in Montrose, Scotland, in 1800. Arrived in V.D.L. in 1821. Graduated M.A. at University of Aberdeen; diploma from Royal College of Surgeons. Appointed by Sorell as Govt. medical officer for New Norfolk and adjacent areas. Returned from Buckingham in 1853; for Glenorchy in 1856. Speaker from 1861-77. Died July 3, 1879. (Cyclopaedia of Tasmania).


original proprietors of The Daily News; retained interest until it sold to The Mercury, attached to Presbyterian Church. At death was last surviving member of first Legislative Sel of Tas. Parl. Crossed to Port Phillip when 17, settled on station at Portland Bay. Among pioneers of Colacaine. Returned to Y.D.L. in 1853, having made money at gold mining - Port Phillip gold mine discovered on a station at Clunes of which he was part owner. Elected for Pembroke in 1856; oamzaf (H.M., Aug. 22, 1882).

Note: The above sketches are by no means comprehensive and have been culled from only The Examiner (L.E.), The Mercury (H.M.), The Encyclopaedia of Tasmania, and the Wayne Index in the Tasmanian Archives, Hobart.)
Appendix B

Ministries Since the Introduction of Responsible Government

Champ’s Ministry, from November 1, 1856 to February 25, 1857.

w.T.H. Champ, Colonial Secretary and Premier; T.D. Chapman, Colonial Treasurer; F. Smith, Attorney-General; J.W. Rogers, Solicitor-General, sworn in December 15, 1856; H.F. Austey, Secretary Lands and Works; W.E. Mairn, without office.

Gregson’s Ministry, from Feb. 26 to April 25, 1857.

T.O. Gregson, Colonial Secretary and Premier; C. Meredith, Colonial Treasurer; J.C. Gregson, Attorney-General; James Whyte, without office; J.H. Wedge, without office; Maxwell Miller, without office.

Weston’s Ministry, from April 25 to May 12, 1857.

W.P. Weston, Premier, without office; W.M. Innes, Colonial Treasurer; T. Smith, Attorney-General; T.J. Knight, Solicitor-General; W. Henty, Colonial Secretary; R.C. Kermsd, without office.

Smith’s Ministry, from May 12, 1857 to November 1, 1860.

F. Smith, Attorney-General and Premier; W.M. Innes, Colonial Treasurer; T.J. Knight, Solicitor-General; W. Henty, Colonial Secretary; R.C. Kermsd, without office; W.P. Weston, without office; Walker, without office.
Weston's Ministry, November 1, 1860 to August 2, 1861.
W.P. Weston, Premier, without office, to July 22, 1861, when he resigned; W. Henty, Colonial Secretary; F.M. Innes, Colonial Treasurer; T.J. Knight, Attorney-General to February 4, 1861; W.L. Dobson, Attorney-General from February 5, 1861; W. Archer, without office, from November 2, 1860.

Chapman's Ministry, from August 2, 1861, to January 20, 1863.
T.D. Chapman, Premier, without office, to November 1, 1862, then Premier and Colonial Treasurer to January 20, 1863; W. Henty, Colonial Secretary to November 1, 1862; F.M. Innes, Colonial Treasurer to November 1, 1862, then Colonial Secretary to January 20, 1863; W.L. Dobson, Attorney-General.

Whyte's Ministry, from January 20, 1863 to November 24, 1866.
J. Whyte, Colonial Secretary and Premier; C. Meredith, Colonial Treasurer; R.E. Miller, Attorney-General; J.M. Wilson, without office.

Sir Richard Dry's Ministry, from November 24, 1866 to August 4, 1872.
Sir Richard Dry, Colonial Secretary and Premier, to August 1, 1869, when he died; T.D. Chapman, Colonial Treasurer; W.L. Dobson, Attorney-General.

Wilson's Ministry, from August 4, 1869 to November 4, 1872.
J. M. Wilson, Colonial Secretary and Premier; T.D. Chapman, Colonial Treasurer; W.L. Dobson, Attorney-General till February 5, 1870, when appointed Puisne Judge; W.R. Giblin, Attorney-General from February 5, 1870; H. Butler, without office, from August 5 to October 27, 1869, then Minister of Lands and Works; J.A. Dunn,