

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**FRIDAY, 22 MAY 1874**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Friday, 22 May, 1874.

Question of Privilege.—Reflections upon Members.—Adjournment.

## QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

MR. STEWART said he rose to a question of privilege. He wished to know whether the publisher of a certain newspaper called the *Telegraph* could be called to the bar of the House, to answer for a paragraph which appeared in that paper of last evening, and which tended to bring the Parliament of Queensland into contempt. He thought it was one of those matters which ought to be brought under the notice of the House. It was supposed to be a condensed report of something that had been said in another place, and he thought the good sense of the members of that House would never have allowed such a statement to be made. The words he objected to were put into the mouth of the Honorable Gordon Sandeman, and he would move—

1. That the report, as published in the *Telegraph* newspaper, of certain proceedings in another place, is a scandalous libel, containing matter calculated to bring this House of Assembly into contempt, and that it is a breach of the privilege of this House.

2. That Mr. Charles Mills, publisher of the newspaper called "*The Telegraph*," be called to the bar of the House, to answer for the publication in the *Telegraph* newspaper of 21st instant, of certain statements tended to bring this Assembly into contempt, to wit:—

"The Hon. G. Sandeman wished to point out that it was one of the first duties of the Council to check any innovations on Parliamentary usages. He thought it was most unconstitutional to bring in a Bill to pay members of the present Parliament. If it referred to the next Parliament there might be some reason in it. As it was, some of the members already elected were a disgrace to the position they endeavored to fill, and it was their duty in the Council to see that this state of things was not rendered worse. The Bill offered a premium to those who were anxious to make a trade of politics. Once admit the principle of payment, and it would never be done away with. He should oppose the second reading."

These words having appeared, he thought it was the duty of some member of the House to take the matter in hand. He was sorry it had fallen to the lot of such a young member as himself to do so, but it came under his notice very early, and he would have brought it forward last night if they had not sat until

such a late, or rather an early, hour this morning.

MR. DICKSON seconded the motion.

MR. J. SCOTT said this appeared to him to be a very serious matter, and one which ought not to be dealt with too hurriedly. He happened to be in the place allotted to members of the Assembly in the other Chamber when this discussion was going on, and he heard Mr. Sandeman's speech; and although he did not speak very distinctly, he (Mr. Scott) did not gather from what he said the statement reported in this paper. He appeared to him to be talking, in a general way, and not in reference to any particular Legislature, but to the Legislatures of the different colonies.

THE SPEAKER said the honorable member could not refer to anything he heard in another place, which they had no business to discuss. The question was one of privilege relating to the publication of a certain scandalous libel by a newspaper.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER said he thought the remarks of the honorable member who had just sat down—

THE SPEAKER: I think the honorable member is out of order. If that honorable member cannot refer to what occurred in another place, the honorable the Colonial Treasurer cannot criticise his remarks.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: Well, he supposed he would be in order in speaking to the main question. Of course, every honorable member was aware that the late appointments to another place were the best men who could be found in the community; and he could not, for one moment, imagine that any member of the other Chamber would ever have addressed such remarks—or that he would have been permitted by the President to make such remarks. And he, therefore, thought, when they found a newspaper with a large circulation in this city inventing a statement of the character which had just been read, it was high time for that House to interfere. When these remarks were brought under his notice by the honorable member for Brisbane, he thought he must be reading the report of some debates in a Parliament like that of Fiji, where they knew insolvency was almost a necessary qualification for admission to the Assembly; but when they found that this purported to be a report of the proceedings of the other branch of the Legislature of this colony, and such a statement was disseminated in a newspaper, he thought that House would be wanting in duty if they did not call upon the publisher to give an account of the statement he made. He found that in the Imperial Parliament a general resolution was agreed to in 1790—

"That it is against the law and usage of Parliament, and a high breach of the privilege of this House, to write and publish, or cause to be written or published, any scandalous and libellous reflections on the honor and justice of this House in any of the impeachments or prosecutions in which it is engaged."

He thought this was a case within the scope of that resolution, and that the circulation of a statement throughout the colony, to the effect that members of that House, who were endeavoring to discharge their public duties, were a disgrace to the Assembly, was calculated to render their efforts for the benefit of the country to some extent neutral; and no person ought to be allowed to circulate such statements with impunity. The press, no doubt, had great power, and that power ought not to be abused; and he thought, if there ever was an abuse of that power, it was the editor or reporter concocting a statement of this character. He found, also, on a former occasion, in the House of Commons—

“Mr. Arthur Hall, a member, was imprisoned, *fined*, and expelled, for having printed and published a libel containing matter of infamy of sundry good, particular members of the House, and of the whole state of the House in general, and also of the power and authority of the House.”

This was even a grosser case than that, because it was a general attack on the whole House. The publisher was not satisfied with endeavoring to impugn the character or position of one or two honorable members, but he made an attack on the whole House. He had not the courage to refer to any members in particular, but stated “some members are a disgrace.”

Mr. PALMER: Order.

The COLONIAL TREASURER would like to know in what way he was out of order.

Mr. PALMER said he certainly thought the honorable the Colonial Treasurer was as much out of order as the honorable member for Springsure was.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: He would, of course, bow to the decision of the honorable the Speaker, but he was not going to be put down by the honorable member for Port Curtis.

Mr. PALMER submitted that if the honorable member for Springsure was out of order in referring to what occurred in another place, the honorable the Colonial Treasurer was also out of order.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the honorable member was perfectly entitled to refer to what took place in another House.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he was not referring to what took place in another House; he was referring to what a certain publisher had concocted, and he was perfectly in order. He thought it was quite time they ought to put a stop to indiscriminate attacks upon that House, and he believed it would have a wholesome effect if the publisher of this particular invention was called to the bar of the House to give an account of himself.

Mr. PALMER said he thought this was really making “much ado about nothing.” He thought, if they called this printer to the bar, they would simply make a martyr of

him; it would be the finest thing for him that could possibly happen; and if the House could not stand such attacks as this, it must be of very bad character indeed. He was made by another paper, published in Brisbane, to say, on a recent occasion, that members of that House were a very bad lot, but he never said anything of the sort, and the editor very properly corrected it next day. Why not have brought him up for publishing a much more glaring libel than this? If he (Mr. Palmer) said the members of that House were a bad lot, it would be a very gross libel indeed, coming from him. Every one present at that dinner knew he did not say anything of the kind; and it was acknowledged candidly and honestly to be a mistake of the reporter. He could not see how they could hold the editor responsible for this statement; and he had no doubt he would contradict it as soon as it was pointed out to him. It would be a great mistake on the part of the House to call the printer to the bar, to make a martyr of him; and he thought they ought to be able to stand much worse attacks than anything like that complained of.

Mr. MILES thought that even if the honorable member for Port Curtis did use the words attributed to him, he was entitled to some consideration after his recent defeat.

Mr. PALMER; I never said so.

Mr. MILES: He said even if the honorable member did say so, and he would not be at all surprised if he did say something of the kind. But there was an old proverb that two and two made four; and he had a grievance—not exactly of the same nature as that of the honorable member for Bowen; but he held in his hand a letter signed “Gordon Sandeman,” which reflected—and he took it that it was a breach of privilege for any individual outside the walls of that House to comment on the action of any member in it—

The SPEAKER said the question before the House was in reference to a scandalous libel against members of that House. The honorable member for Carnarvon was referring to another matter, which he considered a libel against himself. He understood that he referred to a letter written by a member of the other Chamber.

Mr. MILES: No; I know nothing at all about the other Chamber.

The SPEAKER: The motion before the House is that moved by the honorable member for Brisbane, respecting a libel alleged to have been published by the printer of the *Telegraph* newspaper.

Mr. MILES said he had no wish to do anything contrary to the ruling of the honorable the Speaker, but he maintained that the matter he referred to was a question of privilege, and if he could not go on with it now he would postpone it for the present.

The SPEAKER: I trust the honorable member will do so. It will be better to dispose

of one question of privilege before another is brought before the House.

Mr. MILES: I will do so.

Mr. PECHÉY said he could not altogether agree with the honorable member for Carnarvon being put down. He thought that honorable member was perfectly entitled to draw a parallel between different cases of breaches of the privileges of that House, and he decidedly wished to hear what matter of privilege he was going to bring forward, because there might be some comparison between the case now before the House, and the one the honorable member for Carnarvon was about to refer to. As far as the resolution was concerned, he should certainly support it, but he did not think the publication of this libel would do very much to injure the House in the opinion of any honest and intelligent person. Of course, a great deal of delicacy was to be observed in touching upon this matter; they had to see that they did not overstep the bounds of parliamentary debate; but he certainly thought, if the expressions made use of in that newspaper were in any way correct, as far as the authority given for them was concerned, it was simply a new phase of the fable of Æsop with regard to the fox and the grapes—that if they could not reach what they desired, some people were likely to throw dirt upon it. He should also wish, before this matter was decided, to hear a little vicarious and sponsorial excuse given for what they were just discussing. When a libel of this kind was published in the press—that honorable members of that House were a disgrace to the position they attempted to fill—it of course carried with it its own condemnation, for every member of the House was, he might say, put in pillory before he entered the House; and if there was any hole to be picked in his coat, he would be perfectly sure to get someone ready to pick that hole. It was therefore rather unfair, after going through that process, that during all the time a member occupied a seat, he should stand to have mud chucked at him by any blackguard who chose to do so.

Mr. PETTIGREW rose to call the honorable member to order; he was, by inuendo, accusing an honorable member of another portion of the Legislature of being a blackguard. He objected—

The SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. PETTIGREW: That is the point of order I wish to have settled.

Mr. PECHÉY thought the honorable member for Stanley had got his shirt out very unnecessarily. He never attempted to call a member of a co-ordinate branch of that Legislature, a blackguard: he was simply speaking of the subject before the House—the libel published by a printer fellow. Now, it was quite possible that this printer fellow was more respectable than the gentleman the honorable member for Stanley was so anxious to protect. As he was pointing out, when he

was rather rudely interrupted by the honorable member for Stanley, they had all gone through a sifting process, and whatever a member's constitution might be, either physically or morally, he must necessarily have a great deal on his mind without others trying to drag him in the dirt throughout the session of Parliament. If there was one question of privilege decided more clearly than another in the House of Commons, it was that the minds and intellects of honorable members should be kept as clear as possible, and that no member's mind should be drawn away from the subjects of legislation more than was necessary, and he considered the publication of this matter in the press of the colony was likely to disturb any honorable member's mind. He was surprised that the honorable member for Darling Downs should laugh, because he was an integral portion of that House, although, perhaps, only a small one; he did not know whether he was not one of the members alluded to in this attack upon the House, and he (Mr. Pechéy) thought he ought to try, along with other honorable members, to keep up the character of that House. They were told, on a previous occasion, that certain honorable members of that House were made to be jumped upon; and he considered if this libel was allowed to go forth to the world unchecked they must come to the conclusion that they were all made to be jumped upon. He thought they must put a stop to this sort of thing, and he would support the resolution of the honorable member for Brisbane. As he said at the commencement of his remarks, this was rather a delicate matter to touch upon, but he thought it was a case of sour grapes; and he also thought the honorable gentleman who was the supposed sponsor of the person named in the resolution should come forward and give some excuse for the actions of his *protégé*.

Mr. PETTIGREW said he thought they would consult their own dignity and their position as representatives of the colony, if they allowed the matter to drop. He thought the first resolution would be quite sufficient to meet all the dignity of every honorable member of the House; and the second merely asked that the printer, or the reporter, or somebody else, who took notes in the matter, should be called to the bar. Now, it was quite possible, and he thought it was very probable, that this was not a fair report of what took place in another portion of the Legislature, and if they were to—

Mr. PECHÉY said he believed the honorable member was out of order.

Mr. PETTIGREW: No: he was never out of order; he had never been out of order since he had had the honor of a seat in that House, and that was more than the honorable member for Aubigny could say; and, what was more, he never would be out of order; he knew how to place his words and his language honestly, straightforwardly, and in order. He was observing that if they were to call the

printer, or the reporter, to the bar, to give an explanation upon the point, why they would require to call him every morning. He could come forward with a similar motion every morning, for he was never correctly reported. What appeared was something like the meaning of what he said, but there was an "if" or a "not," or something wanting that put a very different construction on the sentence. His humble opinion was, that this was merely wasting time; and as for the quotations of the honorable the Colonial Treasurer, he did not believe in them a bit; every politician, with any pretensions worthy of the name, had condemned them. He thought they must not stand too particular on their privileges: they had quite enough of privileges, and the proper thing was to conduct themselves properly, and if they did that, they would be able to stand any amount of insult that could be heaped upon them. He maintained that that Assembly was as honorable and as straightforward—unless subjected to too much Ministerial influence—if not more so, than any Assembly that had yet met in Queensland. He believed there had been less log-rolling than in any previous Parliament; and that he considered was about the greatest sin they could possibly commit; and that it was the greatest iniquity their predecessors had been guilty of. He thought they would consult their own dignity by moving on to the next business, and he begged to move the previous question.

Mr. GROOM said he was as convinced as he was standing there, that the publisher of the *Telegraph* had not the slightest intention of reflecting upon members of that House; and he was further convinced that when the matter came to be investigated, it would be found the report in that paper was almost substantially correct. And what was more, he believed the language in the *Telegraph* was couched in an exceedingly mild form compared with the language that was actually used; and he thought it was necessary that some steps should be taken to check the libellous assertions which were continually being made with reference to that House in another place.

Mr. J. SCOTT rose to a point of order. The honorable member was referring to what took place in the other House.

The SPEAKER: I am sure the honorable member for Toowoomba knows the practice of the House and the Standing Orders, and I do not think he will infringe upon them. I hope he will not.

Mr. GROOM said he would be very sorry indeed to infringe upon the Standing Orders or rules of the House, and he observed from "May's Parliamentary Practice"—

"It is obviously unbecoming to permit offensive expressions against the character and conduct of Parliament to be used without rebuke, for they are not only a contempt of that high court, but are calculated to degrade the Legislature in the estimation of the people."

Then a case was given in point:—

"In 1614, Dr. Richard Neile, Bishop of Lincoln, uttered some words which gave offence to the Commons, and they complained of them in a message to the Lords, to which they received an answer that the bishop 'had made solemn protestation, upon his salvation, that he had not spoken anything with an evil intention to that House.'"

He was simply carrying out the precise forms of the Imperial Parliament in a question of this sort. The object of the motion, as he understood it, was, that the publisher of the newspaper in question should be brought to the bar and called upon to explain his conduct, and the House would then be able to know whether the report was a correct or true report of what occurred in another branch of the Legislature. If it were true then, according to the practice of the Imperial Parliament, a message should be sent asking that the offensive words should be withdrawn. He thought they would be perfectly in order in taking that course, and he would vote for the motion of the honorable member for Brisbane on that understanding.

Mr. MACDONALD said he hoped the honorable member for Brisbane would withdraw the motion, because in its present shape he, for one, could not support it. Although he agreed, to some extent, with the first portion of it, he was not prepared to admit that the report complained of was calculated to bring that Assembly into contempt, more especially as he thought the *Telegraph* newspaper was not one on which the people placed much reliance. He felt certain they had fallen into an error and had misreported the remarks of a member of the other House; and he could speak with some authority, as he was told by a person who was present in the House. He could point out, that in the report of the discussion on the Supreme Court Bill, it was stated that the clause compelling suitors against the Government to give security for costs, was carried by a large majority, while the fact was—

Mr. PECHY rose to a point of order. He thought the honorable member was as much out of order as the honorable member for Carnarvon.

Mr. MACDONALD: It was not carried; it was struck out.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it would naturally be expected that on a question of privilege he should make a few observations to the House. He regretted that any cause should have arisen to induce the honorable member for North Brisbane to bring a matter of this kind before the House; but there was no doubt that that House possessed certain privileges, and when those privileges were believed to be invaded, it was not only the right, but, in his opinion, the duty of every honorable member to bring the question before the House. Before saying anything directly on the question of these resolutions, he would endeavor to meet the difficulty that had arisen in the minds of honorable members

with regard to their right to refer to another place. There was no doubt whatever on his mind that if this House was libelled by another branch of the Legislature, they were fully entitled to have the matter examined into; but, of course, in such a case the evidence must be clear and distinct, and there must be no doubt about the fact that the House had been slandered. It was only in such a case as that it would be justifiable on the part of the House to make any distinct reference to another branch of the Legislature; and he thought, therefore, it would be well if honorable members confined their attention to the libel as it appeared in the newspaper. That was what he proposed to do, and he had not the slightest doubt the honorable member for Brisbane adopted this course of referring to the paper, simply because that was the only way in which he could bring it before the House. He did not believe he had the slightest intention of subjecting the printer to any trouble, and he thought his object would be sufficiently gained if the first resolution was adopted by the House. But whether that resolution was carried or not, he thought the very fact of such a statement appearing in a newspaper made it well worthy of discussion in that House. He was not going to refer to the difficulty which had been raised with respect to the honorable member for Carnarvon; he believed the honorable the Speaker was perfectly correct in that case, because, if he understood that honorable member correctly, he intended to bring in a second libel in support of the one now before the House, and he thought anything of that kind would very fairly be brought forward as a substantive motion after this was disposed of. He thought also that the honorable member for Port Curtis made a slight mistake in thinking the House ought to pass over the matter without saying anything about it, and in referring so directly to himself. He thought it would have been very unfeeling on the part of any honorable member to attempt to bring before the House any invasion of its privileges on the part of the honorable member for Port Curtis on the occasion referred to. To make a statement such as the one now complained of was a very different matter indeed, to a statement made at a convivial meeting after ten o'clock at night, and especially when, as the honorable member had stated, it was contradicted on the earliest opportunity. Whether the contradiction made the statement any better was a matter upon which honorable members might entertain different opinions. With regard to the question before the House, unless the House was prepared to defend its privileges, of course those privileges must go to the winds; and if it did not protect itself against libel, it would submit to a degradation which ought not to be attached to it, he did not care where it came from. The libel in this case, it appeared, came from some person of the name of Sandeman, and who this Sande-

man was they were not, of course, supposed to know. He remembered a person of that name being expelled from that House two or three years ago, and he did not suppose that person had been able to get into any higher position than he occupied in that House. He desired to stand on good terms with the other branch of the Legislature, and the Government were desirous of assisting them in every way to defend their just rights and privileges, but no doubt that House had a difficulty sometimes. It was impossible to assert that a black sheep might not have got within its doors, and how could they hold that branch of the Legislature responsible for what a person of that description might say of that House? He, therefore, thought the best course that House could adopt would be to treat the libel with contempt, and if anything of the kind occurred again, no doubt honorable members would be prepared to take up such a position as would be a warning to individuals of that class who committed any breach of its privileges.

Mr. STEWART said he was bound, in bringing the matter before the House, to move that the printer be called to the bar. Before reading an extract from "May" in support of this, he would point out an error which some honorable members had fallen into in dealing with the question. The honorable member for Port Curtis was not in his place, but he could point out that had the paragraph in question appeared as the editor's own opinion, it would be entitled to be treated very lightly—it would not be consistent with the dignity of the House to take any notice of it; but when the statement was put into the mouth of a member of the other branch of the Legislature, it gained a force it could not otherwise have. When anything of the kind went forth, it ought to be contradicted if untrue. The object he had in view would, he thought, be gained by the discussion that had taken place, and he would, if the House wished it, withdraw it, or the latter portion of it.

The SPEAKER said the matter was now out of the honorable member's hands.

Mr. STEWART: He said he would do so, with the permission of the House. He would now read, from "May," an extract in support of the course he had taken:—

"When a complaint is made of a newspaper, the newspaper must be produced, in order that the paragraphs complained of may be read. It is the present practice, when a complaint is made, to order the person complained of to attend the House; and on his appearance at the bar, he is examined and dealt with, according as the explanations of his conduct are satisfactory or otherwise; or as the contrition expressed by him for his offence conciliates the displeasure of the House. The member who makes a complaint must also be prepared with the names of the printer or publisher; and it is irregular to make such a complaint unless the member intends to follow it up with a motion."

He had followed up the matter with a motion, and he would now leave the House to deal with the matter.

Question—That the question be now put,—put and carried on division :—

Ayes, 21.	Noes, 11.
Mr. Macalister	Mr. Palmer
" MacDevitt	" W. Scott
" Stephens	" Graham
" McIlwraith	" Buzzacott
" Miles	" MacDonald
" Hodgkinson	" Wienholt
" Bailey	" Morehead
" Beattie	" J. Scott
" Groom	" Royds
" Macrossan	" Pettigrew
" Pyrie	" Ivory.
" Peohy	
" Fraser	
" Edmondstone	
" Foote	
" Dickson	
" Stewart	
" Hemmant	
" Morgan	
" Fitzgerald	
" Nind.	

The original question was then put and affirmed upon a division, the names and the numbers being the same as in the preceding lists.

#### REFLECTIONS UPON MEMBERS.

MR. MILES said he had to bring before the House a question of privilege. He should conclude with a motion; and he thought he should move that Gordon Sandeman be brought to the bar of the House. That person should be brought to the bar, and not the publisher of the *Telegraph*. He had not the slightest reason for letting the matter drop which he had before brought forward, as there were facts not easily got over, even by the "explanation" published in the *Courier* newspaper, and signed by Gordon Sandeman, of Burenda. If the circulation of that newspaper was confined to the colony of Queensland, he should not have said one word about it; because he believed thoroughly that ninety per cent. of the inhabitants would believe the explanation to be a libel, a falsehood, a downright scandal; but the paper would be sent home, and he thought it as well that the statements in it should be contradicted; and he would contradict them and give proof that so far as he was concerned his statements had been perfectly correct. The House had been engaged since half-past three o'clock discussing a matter that had taken place elsewhere, and he thought that when he read a portion of the letter from the *Courier*, it would be considered circumstantial evidence that Gordon Sandeman was the same party who had uttered the words which had been complained of, and for which he was blameable :—

"My attention has been directed to the report, as quoted by the only two papers I have by last post had access to—the *Queensland Times* and *Queenslander*—in the debate in Committee of Supply on the 15th instant, in which Messrs. Miles and Groom are reported to have made certain remarks with reference to Mr. Heeney,

who some time ago held the honorary office of Acting Police Magistrate in conjunction with the paid office of Commissioner of Crown Lands at Charleville.

"Although I could well afford to pass over the reported comments of Mr. Groom in particular, whose claim to consistency in one respect I do not for a moment question, a regard for truth induces me to trouble you with these remarks.

"In the quotation referred to, in which Mr. Groom is mentioned as the 'latter' of the 'honorable members' alluded to, he is reported to have said 'that because Mr. Heeney had given a decision adverse to Mr. Gordon Sandeman on a case brought before him under the Masters and Servants Act, that gentleman threatening to soon have him removed, and that a short time afterwards, a late superintendent of Mr. Sandeman's was appointed to the position, and Mr. Heeney simply acted as Land Agent.'

"It is to be regretted in a country where that which all Englishmen so fully appreciate as a most invaluable privilege—the freedom of debate—should so frequently be abused in our colonial Parliaments; and there can be no greater abuse of that privilege than the everyday practice of those who are to a certain extent 'privileged' of making statements which are without foundation.

"In the gist of the statement as quoted above, in which my name has been most unwarrantably brought forward, there is no truth whatever."

#### HONORABLE MEMBERS: Question.

MR. MILES: Honorable members need not try to interrupt him: he would not be put out. Take the two things together, and let honorable members see what they could make of them. What was said about himself, he should not take the slightest notice of; because Gordon Sandeman was not worth it. But it would be well for those who lived in glass houses not to throw stones. It was an extraordinary thing that those who were continually guilty of making mis-statements and casting imputations on others were always the first to cry out. He felt under a great obligation to the honorable member for Brisbane for the action he had taken; but he must say that he thought it was the duty of the Premier to have taken action to defend the privileges of the House. If he had been in the honorable gentleman's place, he should have been manly enough to have stood forward to protect the privileges of the House, and not have left the duty to a private member. However, he did not want anyone to defend him; he had always defended himself heretofore, when he was attacked. He met a party in 1842, named Captain Black, or Blake—captain of a vessel—who was in search of Gordon Sandeman: he supposed, the same as Gordon Sandeman, of Burenda. It appeared that Captain Blake was the guardian of some orphan children, and was entrusted with a considerable sum of money to invest for their support. Mr. Gordon Sandeman, of Burenda, was at that time carrying on commercial pursuits as a merchant in Sydney. The money was entrusted to him, but he, by some means or other, made a mistake and

put it to his own purposes. He shortly afterwards became insolvent, and the orphans were left destitute. The man who entrusted the money to him, the guardian of the orphans, committed suicide; but, if he had found Gordon Sandeman, and he hunted for him all over the country, he would have shot him.

Mr. PALMER: Shame! Disgraceful!

Mr. MILES: Any man who attacked him must stand pretty well if he did not return it. He never made a statement, he never attacked an individual, unless he was justified and could establish it; and Gordon Sandeman never made a greater mistake than when he attacked him. Gordon Sandeman retired for a while; but he turned up again. Now, in the explanation in the newspapers, Mr. Sandeman made it appear that his (Mr. Miles') statements in connection with the case of Mr. Heeney, were entirely false, because Mr. Heeney had applied to Government for additional clerical assistance, and could not do the work. Mr. Heeney was at the time

"the honorary or acting police magistrate and Commissioner of Crown lands—had frequently complained of being over-worked, and it was understood had applied for additional clerical assistance, a 'position' very different from that which Mr. Miles described—."

Now, he (Mr. Miles) should read Mr. Heeney's letter, which would, he thought, refute Gordon Sandeman:—

"Charleville, 4th September, 1873.

"SIR—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 25th ultimo, No. 73,424, wherein you inform me that, with a view of relieving me of my duties as Police Magistrate at Charleville, and in order that I may be enabled to devote my exclusive attention to the office of Commissioner for the Warrego, the Government have decided to combine the offices of Police Magistrate at Charleville and Cunnamulla, and that I am to hand over the records of this office to Mr. Okeden, Police Magistrate at the latter place, whose duties are not sufficient to occupy his time. In connection with the above, I wish to bring under your notice the following circumstances:—

"When I was promoted to the office of Commissioner and Police Magistrate at Charleville, one of the principal advantages that appeared was that I was to hold the office of Police Magistrate. The latter seemed an office of a more permanent nature than that of a Commissioner of an unsettled district, and one that was more likely, owing to the more frequent changes and vacancies that occur, to lead to an ultimate change to the more settled districts, which, of course, is an advantage. I always understood that my predecessor in office here, Mr. Cardew, was looked upon by the Government quite as much in the light of a Police Magistrate as in that of Commissioner, and the fact of his recent removal to Stanthorpe tends to confirm this.

"During several years past the business transacted by the Commissioner for the Warrego has been very small indeed, and was insufficient to

fully occupy his time without the additional duties of Police Magistrate. The offices have both been always held by one person, and, even during the great rush for country in 1864, 1865, 1866, and 1867, one person held the two offices. There can never be such an amount of business to transact in the Crown Lands Office here again, because almost all the available country has been taken up. During the past twelve months there was an increased demand for country, and nearly all that remained fit to occupy has been taken up. The duties of the Commissioner, therefore, instead of increasing will decrease, as in Roma and elsewhere, where the Clerk of Petty Sessions performs the work; and the Commissioner will soon, therefore, be like Mr. Okeden, and not have sufficient work to occupy his time. No doubt there will be some country to survey and inspect, but that will soon be disposed of.

"In point of economy, the proposed change will not be an advantage, as with a good clerk, who could be got for £150 a-year, I would undertake, at my present salary, to do, efficiently, the work of Commissioner as hitherto, and also of Police Magistrate at Charleville and Cunnamulla;—"

Where was the Colonial Secretary? He wished he was in the House, that one of those officers who had nothing to do might be dispensed with by him:—

"or even, after a time, when the business of the Commissioner returns to its normal state, to do, without any assistance except a slight increase in salary, the business of the three officers as has been previously done by Mr. Cardew."

He should not read any more, because there was a flat contradiction of what Mr. Sandeman had stated. The minute by the late Colonial Secretary on that letter, which was addressed to him, was:—

"Mr. Heeney had better reserve his opinions until he is asked for them.—A.H.P."

He should say no more on the matter, nor take up the time of the House. It was not worth while—Mr. Sandeman was not worth it. Mr. Heeney was thoroughly upright in his actions, and he (Mr. Miles) only wished he could say as much for Gordon Sandeman, of Burenda. He would not dispense the law in Mr. Sandeman's Master and Servants cases to suit Mr. Sandeman; but he discharged his public duties honestly and conscientiously. And he (Mr. Miles) had had some little experience of Mr. Sandeman in the police court. If ever there was persecution, he had been persecuted by Mr. Sandeman, and two magistrates who were a disgrace to the Commission of the Peace. He was summoned by the bench, the summons having been served at his residence, forty miles from Condamine, when he was at the House attending to his duties, and the summons was made returnable in twenty-four hours; and the fact was, the bench had no jurisdiction whatever. But, he had been obliged to take up a barrister from Brisbane at a cost of eight guineas. During the hearing of the case, Mr. Sandeman was



in communication, by wire, with Mr. Chubb, the solicitor, at Dalby; and the replies to his questions were received in court. The case, he felt convinced from the first, would go against him, from information he had received from his superintendent that no adjournment would be granted. It did go against him, and an appeal was refused; but Mr. Sandeman sent another telegram to his solicitor, who replied that the bench must grant an appeal. He (Mr. Miles) only wished the matter had been carried a little further and taken into the Supreme Court; he should have taught Gordon Sandeman a lesson.

Mr. PETTIGREW: It had ended in nothing.

Mr. MILES moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. PETTIGREW: "When Greek meets Greek, then comes the tug of war." The time of the House had been occupied since half-past three o'clock to discuss something or other, and to call Mr. Gordon Sandeman, who happened not now to have a seat in the House; and an honorable member had embraced the opportunity and availed himself of the privileges of the House to slander the man, and to rake up things from the dead that might never have had life or animation. If that sort of thing was to go on, where would it stop? He was reminded of a story of an old Highland chief, who lay dying, and who, calling his son to him, said—"Jock, I'm a deeing." "'Deed, are ye?" said the son. "Yes; and the minister tells me I must forgi'e So-and-so or I wont be forgiven. I do forgi'e him; but mind ye, Jock, never you forgi'e him; carry it on." It was the same thing here. Two Celts—Highlanders, if they liked; they were from a little bit over the hills;—they would quarrel together, they would abuse each other, they would get blind fu' together, then kiss together, and they would come to the House together, and quarrel and abuse each other again; and so on. That sort of thing must be put an end to. On principle, he insisted upon its being stopped. Because Gordon Sandeman wrote a letter to the newspaper, he was brought up to the House and his character was to be insulted and his past history raked up. He (Mr. Pettigrew) told the honorable member for Carnarvon that he would not have made that statement, if Gordon Sandeman was a member of the Assembly!

HONORABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. PETTIGREW: That sort of thing was not to go on in the House. A good many of them lived in glass houses; and the honorable member for Carnarvon did, perhaps. He (Mr. Pettigrew) had been warned not to attend a Friday afternoon sitting; and he did not think he should do so again, to listen to a tirade of abuse. It was a sort of holiday arrangement. Business might have been done on Friday mornings, but none was done on Friday afternoons and evenings. With reference to the statement of Mr. Sandeman, whom he knew privately, and for whom he had a

very great respect, he had no hesitation in saying, from inquiries he had made, that he believed Mr. Sandeman had referred to the other colonies.

Mr. STEWART rose to order. The honorable member had no business to refer to a previous debate.

Mr. PETTIGREW: The honorable member was a new member, like himself, and he should not take instruction from him. He protested solemnly against the waste of time by the House being occupied in such discussions as had taken place during the present sitting. The honorable member for Carnarvon had made a very humiliating spectacle of himself. He had said he was not afraid of any man: then let him take a thrashing or write in the papers. If the honorable member wrote a word about him (Mr. Pettigrew), why, he would jump upon him and extinguish him! but to bring the matter before the House was low cowardice.

Mr. PALMER said he was about to address the House, but the honorable member for Stanley had completely demolished the honorable member for Carnarvon; and it would be a pity if he said much more. He hoped that the House would not listen to such charges brought by a member to defend his private character. If Mr. Sandeman had published a letter which the honorable member for Carnarvon objected to, the duty of the latter was plain—either to bring the writer up for libel, or to answer him through the press. Such matters ought not to be brought before the House; and the gross attack which the honorable member for Carnarvon had made under privilege of Parliament was disgraceful, low, mean, cowardly. He durst not say out of the House what he had just said in his place; and he durst not put his speech in print out of the records of the House. He (Mr. Palmer) had known Mr. Sandeman for many years. The Premier, he believed, had alluded to him as a man who had been dismissed from the Assembly. That was no slur on Mr. Sandeman's character, and none was deserved. He had been absent during a short session.

Mr. WIENHOLT: Four days.

Mr. PALMER: That reference by the Premier, perhaps, had induced the honorable member for Carnarvon to make use of the gross language he had used, which was cowardly. The honorable member had risen to privilege, and said he would call Mr. Sandeman to the bar; and he ended with a motion for adjournment. What did he mean? It was merely an expression of his spleen and malice. The honorable member had talked of persecution. The persecution, he (Mr. Palmer) believed, was on the other side. He knew the whole circumstances; they arose out of a case of travelling sheep. Surely, honorable members could settle their quarrels outside the House, and not make use of parliamentary privileges to utter libels. As to the appointment of Mr. Okedon in

place of Mr. Heeney, the statement of the honorable member for Carnarvon would imply censure on both the present and late Governments. He (Mr. Palmer) appointed Mr. Okeden without Mr. Sandeman knowing anything at all about it. The present Government made a change, and when it was properly represented to them, they found that the arrangement of the previous Government was a good one, and they revoked their action. He hardly knew Mr. Okeden, except as an efficient officer.

Mr. FRYAR rose to protest against the pretensions of the honorable member for Stanley, who treated the House to speeches of considerable length and exercised his Herculean strength in endeavoring to amuse honorable members, after which it was always peculiarly necessary to go on with the business;—nothing more was to be said, after that honorable member had spoken, but to follow the advice with which he always finished his very long speeches—go on with the business! If the honorable member would act upon it himself, the House would the sooner get to business. He (Mr. Fryar) was obliged to the honorable member for Carnarvon for bringing the matter before the House. Some light had been thrown upon two or three questions, and upon one appointment at least, that had been under discussion before. Notwithstanding what had been said by the honorable member for Port Curtis, the course taken by the honorable member for Carnarvon was the proper one to pursue. The letter complained of was not a reflection upon the honorable members for Carnarvon and Toowoomba, whose statements were called into question, it was a reflection upon the whole House; but he was afraid it would be impossible to reach the honorable gentleman who had written it. There was a divinity that hedged a king; and there was a spirit of another description that took care of his own, in the Colonial House of Lords. If there was any way of bringing the honorable gentleman to book, he should have been glad to have helped the honorable member for Carnarvon, who had done good service in bringing the matter forward.

Mr. J. SCOTT, referring to the observations of the Premier, about Mr. Sandeman's having been expelled from the Assembly, said it would have been only fair on the part of the honorable gentleman to have stated the manner in which Mr. Sandeman had been expelled. The question was simply this—A short session commenced on the 26th April, and ended on the 4th May, 1870. By the Standing Orders of the House, an honorable member was not allowed to absent himself for more than fourteen days without express leave. Mr. Sandeman did not attend during that short session. On the 5th July following—

“Mr. Macalister, adverting—as a question of privilege—to the presence in the House of Mr. Sandeman, moved, That a writ be issued for the

election of a member to serve in this House for the electoral district of Leichhardt, in the room of Gordon Sandeman, Esquire, whose seat has become vacant by reason of his having, for one whole session of the legislature, without the permission of this House entered upon its journals, failed to give his attendance in the said House.

“The Speaker thereupon said, ‘It appears to me that this is no more a Question of Privilege than that of a member taking his seat and voting whose return has been questioned and petitioned against, who, we all know, can sit and vote until his seat has been declared vacant by report of the Elections and Qualifications Committee. The honorable member for Leichhardt was returned for that district, and has sat and voted in the House, and it seems to me that he has as much right to do so as any member of this House, until a Resolution of the House—of which notice must be given—shall declare his seat vacant;—more especially so when it is seen, by the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown, in England, on the clause of ‘*The Constitution Act*’ which refers to the matter stated, that absence during one whole session does not necessarily render a seat vacant. Besides, if honorable members will look at No. 18 of the Standing Orders, they will see that a member may be absent fourteen days without leave of the House.’”

In spite of that opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown, Mr. Gordon Sandeman's seat was declared vacant by order of the House.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That action of the House was approved of by the Attorney-General of England.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That very question of declaring the seat vacant had been referred home by a late Government to the Imperial Crown Law Officers, and their reports were in the records of the House, that the action of the House was decidedly correct in declaring Mr. Sandeman's seat vacant.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Really, the honorable member was out of order in referring to the proceedings of the House, to reflect upon them.

Mr. J. SCOTT: The honorable member himself was out of order in making such a statement.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The honorable member had no right, according to the Standing Orders, and according to parliamentary rule, to condemn the House for having done anything. The House had declared the seat of a person named Sandeman vacant, and the proceedings were all referred to the Imperial Government; and if the honorable member would only look to the records, he would find that the action of the House was approved by the Attorney and Solicitor Generals of England, whose opinion was that the House was the judge of its own privileges.

Mr. GROOM said, as one of the persons whose statements were challenged by Mr. Gordon Sandeman, in the letter which that gentleman had published in the newspaper, he was, he thought, entitled to say a few words. The statements he had made in the

House were based on information supplied to him by persons living in the district whom he believed to be perfectly disinterested; and they were strongly supported by Mr. Sandeman's letter—because that gentleman said he had applied

“for redress to the local Bench at Charleville, and, considering that justice had not been done by the decision of the Bench—of which Mr. Heeney was the *ex officio* chairman, and whose conduct in the cases in question, and in others, had, in the opinion of many, been obstructive to the course of justice and propriety—I had intended placing the particulars before the Attorney-General.”

The information he (Mr. Groom) had received from Charleville was, that Mr. Sandeman had stated in the court-house—and the honorable gentleman had not contradicted it—that he would take care that Mr. Heeney was removed. Since Mr. Sandeman had challenged his statement, he (Mr. Groom) had made further inquiries, and he was still corroborated. The threat was made in the court-house. Mr. Sandeman said in his letter, that he did not apply to the Attorney-General, because Mr. Heeney was removed before he could do so. He (Mr. Groom) believed he did make one mistake: there were two Messrs. Okedon in the district, father and son; it was the father who was late superintendent to Mr. Sandeman; it was the son who was appointed to be magistrate. He had letters in his possession which, if they were true, showed that Mr. Okeden was utterly unfit for a police magistrate, whether appointed by the late or the present Government. He did not regret that he had drawn attention to the matter. Mr. Sandeman was nothing to him more than any other individual; and he was not to be deterred from bringing forward anything by an attack in the newspapers. At one time he was sensitive, and used to answer every little snarling cur that chose to bite at his heels; but he had got over that, and he now took little notice of attacks upon himself. His information was from an authentic source; it was corroborated by Mr. Sandeman's letter; and he really firmly believed, from his knowledge of the man, that he did make the threat in the court-house, no doubt in the warmth of his irritation, that he would get Mr. Heeney removed. Speaking from his knowledge of Mr. Heeney, when land agent at Toowoomba, where he might have been corrupted—and it was not his fault that he had not been—he was quite incapable of doing anything wrong wilfully; he was an upright man, and he had discharged his duty faithfully and with credit to himself and to the colony. On the bench at Charleville, his decisions did not please Mr. Sandeman, and therefore he made him his enemy. Mr. Sandeman might write, but he (Mr. Groom) should take no notice of him.

Question put and negatived.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. STEWART said, that as it was near the dinner hour, and as there was a probability that in consequence of the late sitting last night, there would not be a House at seven o'clock, and as there seemed to be a disposition to clear out, it would be best to come to some arrangement about adjourning. He should move—

That this House do now adjourn.

He understood that the honorable member for Mitchell had given notice of a motion for adjournment until Wednesday, which would, doubtless, be brought forward as an amendment.

Mr. PETTIGREW expressed his astonishment at the honorable member for Brisbane, who, with others who lived in Brisbane, wanted to go home to the bosom of his family. He was prepared to sit until twelve o'clock to do business, of which there was plenty on the paper. There was a week's adjournment a week back, and now another adjournment was asked for, to postpone or to stop legislation. It was preposterous, monstrous absurdity that the House should now adjourn.

Mr. GRAHAM: The honorable member could scarcely be serious in proposing the adjournment. The House had done no business whatever. He did not think it was necessary to detain the House with any lengthened remarks, but he certainly considered that the motion for adjournment came with very bad grace from the honorable member for Brisbane, who had been the cause of the House sitting for three hours to discuss a motion of his own. He thought it was a farce to meet and then adjourn without doing any business; for certainly the debate which had taken place that afternoon could not be termed business.

Mr. HODGKINSON trusted the honorable member would not press the motion for adjournment, as it was a great tax upon honorable members who had to come a long distance from the North to attend to their duties, to have constant adjournments.

Mr. MOREHEAD said that he quite sympathised with the remarks of the honorable member who had just sat down; but he had been rather amused at the honorable member for Stanley speaking so vehemently on the subject, as that honorable member had not been very conspicuous by his attendance. He had also been rather surprised at the remarks of the honorable member for Clermont, who had been absent on many important occasions; but he was, above all, peculiarly amused at the honorable member for the Burnett saying “Hear, hear,” to the motion for adjournment, as that honorable member had been most conspicuous in urging the Friday evening sittings. Yet that honorable member, and the honorable member for Bowen, who also supported Friday's sittings, had been absent

on the very first evening under the new arrangement. He did not, himself, think that the country would gain much by those sittings, but that the Friday morning sittings were the best after all. As he said before, he was peculiarly pleased with the honorable member for the Burnett, who had not said anything, but had positively applauded, on the present occasion, sentiments which he had formerly opposed. The honorable member for Rockhampton also made a great noise, and yet that honorable member had been absent when a measure of the most material importance to his constituents was discussed. He had that day seen that, at Rockhampton, an indignation meeting was to be held, about that very measure. He did not know whether the people who called it were going to invoke divine assistance or the assistance of the Upper House, to have the vote of the Assembly rescinded, or what—

Mr. HODGKINSON rose to a point of order; the honorable member was not speaking to the question of adjournment.

Mr. SPEAKER said the honorable member was in order.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he was speaking to objectionable remarks made by honorable members in reference to the adjournment, and contended that they came with bad grace from those honorable members. He would proceed to deal a little further with the honorable member for Rockhampton, and say that that honorable member had had no right to be absent from his place when the great question of the residence of the northern judge was under discussion, and that in so doing he had neglected his duty. He would point out that it was highly improper for those honorable members to whom he had referred, to endeavor to shift the opprobrium on to the shoulders of the honorable member for Brisbane, who had always been most assiduous in attending to his duties in that House.

Mr. GRAHAM explained that he had never been absent from the House during the whole of any one evening; he had occasionally left the House for a few hours only.

Mr. DICKSON said he had been as regular an attendant of that House as any honorable member, and although he had intended to support the motion for adjournment, yet, after the very courteous speech of the honorable member for Clermont, he was quite willing to remain and assist in transacting any business. At the same time, he was very doubtful, after the experience they had had that afternoon, whether the House was in a humor to proceed with work.

Mr. BUZACOTT said it was not often he occupied the time of the House, and if some other honorable members would remain so long quietly in their seats as he did, he thought business would go on a great deal more satisfactorily. He would not attempt to reply to the statements of the honorable member for the Mitchell, as he preferred to

leave his constituents to judge his conduct. He might mention, however, that he had been absent in the evening referred to by that honorable member solely through an accident to the steamer. So far as the adjournment was concerned, as he could perceive that honorable members had no serious intention of proceeding with business, he thought it was of no use their remaining there. He must say, however, that he considered that the House had been much humiliated by the scandalous debate they had had that evening.

Mr. IVORY said that he was truly pleased that he had afforded the honorable member for the Mitchell such an amount of amusement—of peculiar amusement, as the honorable member termed it. That honorable member usually spoke in a sort of melodramatic or rather farcical style, and only a few evenings ago, had presumed to accuse the honorable member for Oxley of a desire to constitute himself the lecturer of the House; but the honorable member was in the unfortunate position of throwing stones when he himself lived in a glass house. The honorable member should recollect that he was, after all, a very young man—although he, no doubt, considered himself an old member—and had a great deal to learn. He would advise the honorable member to take those remarks to heart, and, when he rose to address the House, not to be so free with his personal advice to other and older honorable members. He could not understand why the honorable member should have said that he (Mr. Ivory) was prepared to advocate views he had formerly opposed; but he thought he would always be found consistent; at any rate, he was not prepared to allow the honorable member the gratification of judging him, as he preferred to leave that to his constituents. He had been absent on one occasion only, and would be glad to hear that the honorable member for the Mitchell could say the same.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL thought there was a great deal more time consumed in discussing the simple matter of adjournment than there was any necessity for; and he thought it would be better for honorable members to make up their minds at once, instead of referring to matters which had no object whatever.

Mr. ROYDS said that, if it was competent for him to do so, he would move as an amendment, that the House adjourn until Wednesday next. It was well known what was to take place on Tuesday afternoon, and it would be only fair to the honorable the Speaker and to the officers of the House not to bring them down whilst, in all probability, honorable members would be enjoying themselves at the races.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that, on the part of the Government, he could not consent to an adjournment until Wednesday. There was no doubt that there had been an adjournment for the previous week; but he did not think they should have adjournments

every two or three weeks, especially as the Government had some very important business on the paper which they were most anxious to proceed with. He felt it was only due and just to honorable members coming from a distance that he should oppose the motion.

Mr. PALMER said the House had adjourned the previous week for the Ipswich Agricultural Show and races, and as the Brisbane races came on next week, he thought they should adjourn for them until Wednesday. At the same time, he was quite willing to propose as a compromise, that if the Government consented to that adjournment, they should have Friday evening for their Government business; if they did as much then as had been done that afternoon, it would not benefit them much. He had always been of opinion that Friday evening sittings would not be productive of much good, and the experience they had already had proved that he had been correct.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he would be quite willing to accept the suggestion of the honorable member for Port Curtis; at the same time, he did not exactly entertain the same opinion with him as regarded the Friday sittings. On the present occasion, they had met after a very heavy sitting, and he thought honorable members would not feel themselves in a position to go on with business. Although he must, in justice to other honorable members, protest against the adjournment until Wednesday, still he understood that there were matters coming on on Tuesday evening in another place, which would jeopardise their having a meeting of that House.

Mr. PETTIGREW wished to know whether, in the event of an adjournment until Wednesday, it was the intention of the Government to proceed with the Land Bill on that day.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes.

Mr. BAILEY protested against the proposed adjournment, and thought that next they would be wanting to adjourn for the Maryborough and Rockhampton races.

Mr. STEWART said that reference had been made to an adjournment for the races; but he thought, although he was not a sporting man, that if they adjourned for a whole week for the Ipswich races, they might very well adjourn until Wednesday for the Brisbane races. He thought that if they did not adjourn, the Government might be deprived of a day, and as they had some very important business, he was in favor of the suggestion of the honorable member for Port Curtis; especially, also, as it was very hard to expect the officers of the House to be in attendance on Tuesday when there was not likely to be a House.

Mr. HODGKINSON said that the difference between the officers and the members of the House was, that the former were paid to attend, and the latter had to pay. He should object to all adjournments on principle, and

to show the country those honorable members who were anxious to attend to their business.

Mr. FRYAR opposed the motion on the ground that too much time had been lost already.

The motion, as amended, was put, and the House divided with the following result:—

Ayes, 9.	Noes, 21.
Mr. Palmer	Mr. MacDevitt
" J. Scott	" McIlwraith
" Morehead	" Macalister
" Royds	" Graham
" Wienholt	" Stephens
" Pettigrew	" Foote
" W. Scott	" Fitzgerald
" Stewart	" Bailey
" Beattie.	" Buzacott
	" Griffith
	" Hemmant
	" Ivory
	" Fryar
	" Groom
	" MacDonald
	" Pechey
	" Miles
	" Edmondstone
	" Hodgkinson
	" Dickson
	" Fraser.]

Some misconception having arisen amongst honorable members as to the exact wording of the motion, whether it was intended to apply to an adjournment until Wednesday, or not, it was, after some discussion, put again, when the House again divided, as follows:—

Ayes, 17.	Noes, 14.
Mr. Palmer	Mr. Macalister
" Dickson	" Hemmant
" Fraser	" MacDevitt
" Royds	" Pechey
" McIlwraith	" Morgan
" W. Scott	" Buzacott
" Morehead	" Griffith
" Wienholt	" Fitzgerald
" J. Scott	" MacDonald
" Nind	" Fryar
" Graham	" Stephens
" Miles	" Ivory
" Pettigrew	" Bailey
" Edmondstone	" Hodgkinson.
" Groom	
" Beattie	
" Foote.	