

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 30 AUGUST 1864

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

of the census, be paid to the Registrar-General, in consideration of extra work performed." He said the sum of £3,000 had been voted for the collection of the census at the commencement of this year. He found that a portion of it, £300, had not been expended—that the whole cost of collecting the census was £2,700; and it had been suggested to the Government that the services of the Registrar-General should be recognised in connection with this subject, and that he should receive the balance for his extra work. The Government did not think it right that this should be done without bringing the subject before the House. But they thought the officer named was entitled to the money. It was very well known that the duties of his office had very much increased since the Real Property Act came into force; and that he was very much occupied over and above the time included in office hours. In South Australia there were no less than three Registrars-General, and in New South Wales the expense of the Registrar-General's department was three times as much as ours, without so much real property passing through it. The House might, without reference to his salary, grant the sum named to the Registrar-General. By careful economy he had not exceeded the sum voted by Parliament for the census, although it was the same as had been granted for the previous census in 1861; while, in fact, the settled area of the Colony had been greatly extended. He (the Colonial Secretary) had some confidence that the House would recognise the Registrar-General's services.

Mr. R. CRIBB seconded the motion, and was much pleased that the Government had brought it forward; he considered the Registrar-General one of the most valuable public servants the Colony possessed.

Mr. TAYLOR opposed the motion, and looked upon it as an attempt on the part of the Government to increase this gentleman's salary by a side wind. He had been told that the amount was £328 some odd shillings and some odd pence. It ought not to be granted to the Registrar-General, for it would form a bad precedent.

Dr. CHALLINOR, while apprehensive of forming a bad precedent, would vote for the motion.

The question was then put and passed, Mr. Taylor, who had called for a division, being the only member who voted against the motion, against seventeen members who gave their voices in the affirmative. There being no "tellers" on the side of the "Noes," the division could not be taken.

RAILWAY FROM TOOWOOMBA TO WARWICK (RESUMPTION OF DEBATE).

The debate on Mr. McLean's motion,— "That this House will, to-morrow, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of an Address to the Governor, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, 30 August, 1864.

Extra Services of the Registrar-General.—Railway from Toowoomba to Warwick (Resumption of Debate).—Anniversary Regatta.—Additional Salary to Emigration Agent.—Immigrants per "Fortitude" and "Chaseley."—Northern Traffic.—Supreme Court Amendment Bill, read 2^d.—Brisbane Gas Company Bill, read 2^d.

EXTRA SERVICES OF THE REGISTRAR-GENERAL.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved.—"That a sum not exceeding £300, being the unexpended portion of the vote for the collection

to be placed on a Supplementary Loan Estimate for the year 1864, the sum of £329,467 13s., for the making of the railway between Toowoomba and Warwick, (*Interrupted by the adjournment of the House for want of a quorum on the 26th instant*), was resumed.

Dr. CHALLINOR said, as he believed he had possession of the floor of the House when this debate was brought to a termination a few days ago, he would take the opportunity of concluding his remarks. He thought it was very desirable that a line of railway to Warwick should be constructed as soon as possible. The honorable member for West Moreton had spoken of injury to pastoral properties, and of increased working expenses, but he (Dr. Challinor) thought the railway would also increase the value of stock for consumption. He believed the honorable member had taken care to protect himself against any injury by availing himself largely of the pre-emptive right. He congratulated the House upon having members of such a patriotic character, that they were ready to support undertakings which were hostile to their own interests. He thought, too, that those members who had advocated the expenditure of large sums of money for such purposes, should at least afford some latitude to others who had a similar object in view. He felt great pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. EDWARDS rose to oppose the motion. He said when the Railway Act was passed last year, it was understood that when any new line was to be undertaken, the plans and specifications should be laid on the table of the House. He had not seen the plans of the Warwick railway, and there was nothing to guide the House as to the amount of money they would have to vote for the line. It might be a million, or half a million, but they had nothing to guide them. Therefore, he begged to make the previous question.

Mr. BLAKENEY seconded the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS said that when he spoke to the motion on the previous day, he expressed a hope that the Government would decidedly state what their intentions were with regard to this subject.

The SECRETARY FOR LANDS AND WORKS: Hear, hear.

Mr. DOUGLAS asked if the Government would state whether they would support the motion or the amendment—that the question be not now put? Nobody doubted that it would be desirable, at the earliest opportunity, to proceed with the Warwick railway, but now that the Loan Bill had been passed, pledging the country to an expenditure of £1,019,000, the House were not in a position to incur further expenditure at present.

Mr. MCLEAN said he had no objection to amend the resolution to meet the views of the honorable member for Port Curtis and other honorable members, and would be perfectly willing in committee to alter it. For instance,

by erasing the word "Supplementary," and making the resolution read "Loan Estimate for 1865," instead of 1864. That would give the Government plenty of time to make their arrangements to carry on the works, and to make the necessary plans and surveys of the line before Parliament met again. After speaking in support of the propriety of early preparing for the line to Warwick, he said that he had a memorandum from the Engineer-in-Chief, which he would read to the House—

"The field work of the surveys is completed, and the line turns out to be not more difficult than anticipated, so that the approximate estimate attached to my report of June, 1863, will be sufficient. The steepest gradient on the line does not exceed 1 in 72; the sharpest curve 8 chains radius; and the deepest cutting 15 feet. Contracts may be entered into for the construction of the line, so that works may be commenced after the wet season, say by the 1st April, 1865; and the line completed simultaneously with that to Dalby, by the 1st January, 1868. The longer the time contractors can be given, the cheaper will the work be done."

It would be in the recollection of the House, that last session there was a tender before the Government for carrying out the line from Ipswich to Toowoomba; and it would be easy for any honorable member to satisfy himself that the Government could have made a better arrangement for carrying out that line than they had made. The greater the extent of line, and the larger the vote, the cheaper the contract. Large contracts were always undertaken at a much lower rate than smaller works, as the contractors were at the same expense in both cases in getting their plant on the ground.

The SECRETARY FOR LANDS AND WORKS said he thought the honorable member for Port Curtis need not have appealed to any member of the Government with regard to the course of action the Government intended to take on this motion. He thought he had sufficiently explained that on Friday last. But the honorable member seemed himself to have got into a dilemma, and wished the Government to take upon their shoulders the responsibility of refusing the Warwick railway. He (the Secretary for Lands and Works) had before stated clearly that the Government had not the plans of the railway to lay before the House for approval, according to law, and that, therefore, they were not in a position to commence the line; yet he could see nothing to preclude a private member, and particularly a member so intimately connected with the railway as the honorable member for the Eastern Downs, from bringing forward a motion for a vote of money for that railway. It might be looked upon as a motion in the abstract. Certainly, if it were passed, the Government would not ask the House again to vote the money; but they could do nothing until the plans and surveys and book of reference were laid on the table, and adopted by the House.

He was not prepared to state whether the Government collectively would support the motion or not; but he would state to the honorable member for Port Curtis that he saw no difficulty about it himself; he saw no harm about voting the money, because the money was not to be obtained at once, and could not be expended until the plans, sections, and book of reference had been approved of by the House. It was his intention to support the motion.

Mr. R. CRIBB supported the motion, and said he thought the extension of the line to Warwick would be a great boon to the Colony, especially to the southern districts.

Mr. WIENHOLT accused the honorable member for Port Curtis of inconsistency in opposing the motion. Not long ago he wanted to increase the price of land in the neighborhood of Warwick. But what was the good of the land unless there was a railway to it?

Mr. DOUGLAS said that, in supporting the previous question, he did not oppose the principle of the motion; he merely affirmed that he considered it was at that time premature.

The previous question was put, "Shall this question be now put?" Upon which the House divided,—

Ayes, 15.	Noes, 3.
Mr. Herbert	Mr. Blakeney
„ Pring	„ Edwards } Tellers.
„ Macalister	„ Douglas }
„ Moffatt	
„ Brookes	
„ B. Cribb	
„ R. Cribb	
„ Lilley	
„ Edmondstone	
„ Royds	
„ Bell	
Dr. Challinor	
Mr. Wienholt	
„ Taylor } Tellers.	
„ McLean }	

The original question was then put and passed.

ANNIVERSARY REGATTA.

Mr. BLAKENEY moved, pursuant to amended notice,—“That this House will, on Thursday, the 25th instant, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, to consider of an Address to the Governor, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be placed on the Supplementary Estimates for the year 1864, a sum not exceeding the sum of fifty pounds, for the purpose of providing a prize, to be called the ‘Princess Cup,’ to be competed for on the day of the next regatta, to be held at Brisbane, in commemoration of the foundation of the Colony of Queensland.” He said that, as the business paper for the day was so full, he would only trespass upon the time of the House for a few moments, to call attention to the fact that a similar sum was voted last year, which contributed materially to the success of the regatta. As £100 had recently been voted in

favor of the West-end (a laugh) for sporting pursuits, he did not fancy there could be any objection to give half that sum to the East-end.

Mr. EDMONDSTONE seconded the motion.

Dr. CHALLINOR supported the motion on the ground that encouragement to regattas was desirable, in order to raise up a class of hardy boatmen in the Colony.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not intend to oppose the motion; but with some recollection of what happened last year, when the prize cup did not produce such a good race as he thought there might have been, he put it whether or not the money might not be better handed over to the regatta committee, to be used at their discretion for several prizes, and thus to bring out a number of competitors, and to promote the healthful exercise which he, with the honorable member for North Brisbane, should be most happy to see more generally pursued. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. BLAKENEY said he should be most happy to fall in with the views of the honorable member.

The motion was then put and passed.

ADDITIONAL SALARY TO EMIGRATION AGENT.

Mr. BELL moved,—“That this House will, to-morrow, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, to consider of an address to the Governor, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be placed on the Supplementary Estimates for 1864, the sum of £400, as an addition to the salary of the Agent-General for Emigration.” He trusted the House would not consider that he was one of those who were actuated by a desire to expend unduly the public money, and he hoped that his friend, the honorable member for Western Downs, and other economists would not look with jealousy on this motion. The claims of the officer mentioned in the resolution were of a very high character, and it had been admitted, both by the House and the country, that the result of his labors had been highly beneficial to the Colony. Owing to the remarks made by the head of the Government during a recent debate on the Estimates in connection with immigration, the House, and the Government also he believed, labored under a misapprehension as to Mr. Jordan’s views in connection with his present salary. The honorable gentleman at the head of the Government had stated that Mr. Jordan was perfectly contented with his present salary, and had refused to accept the proposition for an increase. But this referred to the state of Mr. Jordan’s feelings at the time when the committee was appointed—feelings which had now passed away. At that time Mr. Jordan believed he had been coldly received by the House, and by the country, and hence he wished to show that he had not been actuated by any desire of reward for his services above the allotted salary, and that he had endeavored to con-

scientifically perform those services. Since that period, however, his position had altered. He had sent in his resignation to the Government, and had in consequence entered into transactions of a private nature which were not then in existence. He was, therefore, in an independent position, and entitled to ask now an additional sum. Mr. Jordan ought to be placed in the receipt of a fair remuneration for those services which had proved so useful and important to the Colony. It had been apparently understood, from statements made in a previous debate, that Mr. Jordan received £500 per annum, in addition to his salary, for travelling expenses. But that was not the case, as, although such a sum was voted, the agent was entitled to draw only for that amount which he actually spent, and had to render a strict account of every item to the Government. He was entitled to draw his travelling expenses out of it only as far as it went. The increase of salary now asked for was little as compared with the advantages which the Colony would derive at home from the advocacy of its claims by Mr. Jordan, who had been proved to be efficient, and who had the advantage of an experience which no new man could possess. It might be urged that the increase asked for would place the agent's salary on a level with that of a Minister of the Crown in this Colony; but this was no valid argument against such increase. He would adopt the line of argument in reply to this which a few evenings ago emanated from the ministerial benches, and say that, because injustice was done to some public officers, this was no excuse for the infliction of injustice on others. If it was considered that the Ministers were badly paid, let a motion be brought forward to increase their salary, and he would be prepared to consider such a motion on its own merits. But this question had nothing to do with the agent's claims to extra salary. If Mr. Jordan returned dissatisfied, it would be to the disadvantage of the Colony. In consideration of that gentleman's hearty services, rendered in the cause of immigration, he (Mr. Bell) trusted that the House would accede to the resolution.

Mr. TAYLOR seconded the motion. He said when the emigration agent's salary was before the House on a previous occasion he had been led to make objections, but since then he had learned that Mr. Jordan had had to render a strict account of all his travelling expenses, which did not exceed twenty-six shillings per day. Of course Mr. Jordan had to take private rooms at hotels, in order to be able to receive deputations, and that was expensive. It was stated that this gentleman at home kept up a fine establishment; but this did credit to the Colony, and proved that people who came out here without too much capital could, in a short time, go home again and become influential personages. He hoped that when Mr. Jordan went home again, he would drive four horses instead of two. (Laughter.) He still maintained his

original objections to Mr. Jordan's unauthorised return to the Colony, but when this afternoon they had given that petted officer, the Registrar-General, £900 per annum, he (Mr. Taylor) could not object to an increase to the salary of the emigration agent, whose services had been twice as valuable to the Colony.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he should oppose the motion, and would reserve any observations upon this increase until the House went into committee. He would, however, make an observation at this stage of the discussion, although he knew that he was liable to misrepresentation in so doing, from those friends of Mr. Jordan who alleged that he (Mr. Herbert) desired to starve the agent's mission, and to prevent him from having a fair allowance. It would appear, from the language of the mover of the resolution, that Mr. Jordan had been limited to the £500 set down for travelling expenses. If the honorable member got his information from Mr. Jordan he would only state that he had been wrongly informed. Mr. Jordan in no respect had ever been stinted by the Government in travelling expenses. The sum of twenty-five or twenty-six shillings per diem for this purpose enabled a man in Great Britain to travel in the first-class. If Mr. Jordan had sent in any claim above the £500 for expenses it would have been at once assented to by the Government, if it had been proved to be correct.

The resolution was then put and passed.

IMMIGRANTS PER "FORTITUDE" AND "CHASELEY."

Mr. PUGH moved,—(1.) That, in the opinion of this House, such of the immigrants who arrived in this Colony by the ships "Fortitude" and "Chaseley," in the year 1849, who are possessed of the land orders issued to them by the Rev. Dr. Lang, or who can satisfactorily prove that such land orders were granted to them, have an equitable claim upon the consideration of the Government, the said land orders not having been satisfied, although those granted to the immigrants per "Lima" (the third of Dr. Lang's vessels) were honored by the Government of New South Wales. (2.) That this House is also of opinion, that the Queensland Government would only be performing an act of justice in granting to the beforementioned immigrants, either the amount of land to which they were entitled according to the orders given them by Dr. Lang, and on the strength of which they emigrated to this Colony, or an equivalent in the shape of land orders as at present issued by the Government." He said that in bringing forward this resolution he only asked the House to perform an act of justice. In the session of 1860 the claims of Dr. Lang were brought under the notice of the House; and these claims which he (Mr. Pugh) now brought forward were to some extent mixed up with those of the

reverend gentleman. A select committee was appointed to enquire into the matter, and in the following session, a petition was presented to the House by some of Dr. Lang's immigrants, after the committee had reported on Dr. Lang's claim. The petitioners in that instance, as in this case, were in the position of having received land orders from Dr. Lang, which proved to be valueless up to the present time. The immigrants who came out under these circumstances, did not petition the House on the ground of a legal claim—they merely considered that under the circumstances they had an equitable title to consideration at the hands of the Government. (The honorable member here read a certain stamped receipt issued to the immigrants in London by Dr. Lang, and purporting to be signed by him as Provisional Secretary of the Cooksland Colonisation Company.) It proved then the money was paid for the purchase of land, and not for passage money. The *Courier* of the 30th April, 1849, alluded to these immigrants as being of a superior class, and regretted that owing to official routine and delay, they had not received their just claims. He (Mr. Pugh) believed that Dr. Lang fully expected at the time that he would be able to carry out his promises, and he was certainly instrumental in introducing a first-rate class of immigrants. The immigrants mentioned were those who came out in the "Fortitude," the "Chaseley," and the "Lima." The immigrants by the "Lima" were the only ones who received land grants—and if these immigrants by the other two vessels who now petitioned had their claims recognised, and received their grants, they would still be in a worse position than the "Lima" immigrants, owing to the fact that much of the land granted years ago to the passengers by that vessel, had increased in value to an extent which could not have been anticipated by any one. The "Lima" immigrants, from the fact that the money for their passages was paid in to the authorities at home, and owing to their pertinacity, had their claims preferred. Many of the persons alluded to in the resolutions had come here in preference to Canada, whither they were about to emigrate—they came to "Cooksland," as Dr. Lang then termed this portion of Australia, on the faith of certain representations and promises, and they now advanced their claim on the Government to make good those promises, as a matter of grace and justice rather than of right. Owing to the state of society here at the time, and to the condition of the Colony, these immigrants had to endure great hardships. Some, it was true, had done very well, but others had lost. The motion was not intended to interfere with that of Dr. Lang, but involved a separate question. He trusted the House would assent to it.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that the honorable member who had moved the resolutions had made out as good a case as he could on behalf of the immigrants in question, but

he had failed to show any reason why the House should set aside the report of the select committee, appointed during the session of the first Parliament. That committee came to the conclusion that these persons had no claim on the Government of the Colony, and that if they possessed any claim at all it was upon the Rev. Dr. Lang. He congratulated the gentlemen spoken of by the previous speaker upon having selected this Colony as a field for emigration instead of Canada. If they had gone there, they would not have done so well, as the experience of persons who had emigrated there from Great Britain proved. If any proposal were entertained, that which he recommended was to give the Rev. Dr. Lang a grant of land which would meet all these claims in a most equitable manner. If Dr. Lang received a grant of land, he would be placed in a position to hand over a portion of this land to those immigrants who he (Dr. Lang) might consider had a *bonâ fide* claim upon him. From one of the documents read by the honorable member, he should be inclined to recommend that the land be granted on the Clarence River, for as the document ran,—“on the Brisbane or Clarence,” and some of the immigrants had already received land on the Brisbane, it was but just that the remainder should settle on the Clarence. (A laugh.) He did not think the House could well take any other view of the question than they had taken in the first instance.

Dr. CHALLINOR said that as he was one of the persons concerned in the resolution he had no right to vote upon it. He, however, confirmed the statement of the honorable member for North Brisbane (Mr. Pugh) that the parties mentioned in the petition had come out under the belief that their claims to land were well founded. He, for one, was not only to get land, but also to be paid for his professional services during the voyage. He had received nothing at all on either claim. The emigrants to the Clarence, alluded to by the Colonial Secretary, received their land orders for the Clarence, and were not included amongst the present petitioners. He believed Queensland had derived great benefit from the immigrants who came in the three ships introduced by Dr. Lang. It was owing to their exertions that the Colony was not permitted to continue as a penal settlement. He however, considered it useless to press the claims of these people as embodied in the resolution.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the point the House had to decide was, whether any equitable claim advanced by these immigrants should be against the Legislature of Queensland or Dr. Lang. The House, he conceived, ought not to take the responsibility of assuming that their claim was just, and of awarding compensation. A motion was placed lower down on the business paper which involved the question now before the House. That resolution was to the effect that the

House resolve itself into committee in order to give a grant of money or land to Dr. Lang for his efforts for the benefit of this Colony. He agreed with neither the present motion nor with that which at a subsequent stage would come on for discussion. In 1860 a select committee was appointed upon Dr. Lang's case, and that of the immigrants who came out under his auspices and made claims for grants of land. That committee came to the conclusion that these immigrants had no claim on the Queensland Government for grants of land, and also that Dr. Lang had no claim for loss. Here was the solemn declaration of a committee of that House appointed at the instance of Dr. Lang's own friends. Individually he did not believe that Dr. Lang had been much worse off than many who came here before separation, owing to their labors in the cause of colonization. Dr. Lang's scheme would have been profitable to himself if his anticipations had been realised. His immigration scheme and that of the Queensland Immigration Society were analogous, and the promoters of each, could they have carried out their ideas, would have sustained certainly no loss. He (the Colonial Treasurer) further objected to the resolution, because it was too vague, and he could not tell to what extent the revenue would be pledged by it. One honorable member had said that he considered Dr. Lang's claims to amount to £30,000. If it were stated in the resolution that the claim now advanced would not amount to more than £500 or £5,000, there would be some basis by which to judge. He should oppose the motion relating to Dr. Lang's claim just as strenuously as he intends to oppose the present motion. The select committee previously appointed had decided that neither Dr. Lang nor his immigrants had any claims for compensation. It appeared that Dr. Lang signed these receipts, and he was therefore obviously the party responsible to the immigrants. If sums of money had been duly placed in the Bank of England for the passages of the immigrants by the "Chaseley" and "Fortitude," as in the case of the "Lima," these passengers would have received their grants of land. He contended that any claims advanced could only be between Dr. Lang and his immigrants, and that the Queensland Government should not be called upon to interfere in the matter.

Mr. R. CRIBB supported the resolution, at the same time he believed that but few of the immigrants referred to would avail themselves of the grant of land. Some, however, might do so, and it was but just that they should have the chance. The resolutions, if passed, would show that the Government of the present day recognised the good done by the introduction of the immigrants referred to at that time.

Mr. BROOKES expressed his concurrence in the views expressed by the Colonial Secretary with regard to the claims of these particular immigrants, and he trusted it would be the

last time that this motion would be brought before the House. He did not agree with the first resolution, which asserted an equitable claim against the present Government on the part of these immigrants. On that point he was as blind as a bat. It would be dangerous to establish a precedent that parties who had come out to this Colony on the representations of private individuals, which might have but a shadowy foundation, should be countenanced in coming upon the Government for compensation. No doubt, had Dr. Lang paid in the proper amount of money in all these cases, the passengers would have received their proper amount of land. The scheme was one of which that House could not take cognizance. He regretted that these resolutions had been brought forward at this time, as they might interfere with the proposition to recognise Dr. Lang's services by a good grant of land, with which proposition he cordially concurred, as he believed those services to have been of the highest value. The House would but perform an act of grace by giving Dr. Lang sufficient land to meet all demands made against him by any of these immigrants—at the same time the House could not recognise the immigrants in the matter. The immigrants had virtually got the value for their money in their passages, and it was absurd for them sixteen years afterwards to come forward and ask the Queensland Government for compensation. He should certainly oppose the motion.

Mr. TAYLOR said he should also vote against the motion. He had been one of the members of the select committee who had taken this subject into consideration, and he could state that the claims of the petitioners had been very carefully gone into and declined. If the immigrants were so wise and shrewd as was stated, they would never have expected to receive their land under the documents which passed between them and Dr. Lang. It was strange that they should allow themselves to be duped by Dr. Lang, by whom they had been taken in as much as any person had ever been taken in in his life. It was singular that they had never sued Dr. Lang for the value of their passage money or land. If this resolution were acceded to, it would open the door to speculators who chose to embark in any undertaking of a similar character. He trusted this would be the last claim of such a nature which would be brought before the House.

Mr. PUGH, in reply, said he had no objection to the suggestion which had been made, that Dr. Lang should receive a grant of land out of which he could satisfy the claims of these immigrants. He had ascertained that there were about four hundred immigrants brought out by Dr. Lang, and supposing eighteen acres were given to each immigrant, it would come to 7,200 acres. But the claims of all the immigrants together would not come up to 2,000 acres, so that there would be a handsome surplus for Dr. Lang. He affirmed that none

of the immigrants had been sent to the Clarence River by Dr. Lang. There were two distinct companies, one the Cooksland Company, and the other the Clarence or Port Phillip Company. He denied that the subject to which the resolutions referred had ever been brought before the House in this way. In 1860, some of the immigrants by the "Chaseley" sent in a petition on their own account, quite independently of the action taken by Dr. Lang, to which the immigrants by the "Fortitude" were not consenting parties. And when, afterwards, in 1861, a petition was presented by the immigrants whose interests he was now advocating, a select committee was asked for to consider the whole question, which was thrown out. The petition only contained twenty-nine signatures, and as all the persons who signed it would not be entitled to eighteen acres, the amount of their claims would not be very large. The persons referred to in the resolutions were generally friendly to Dr. Lang. They simply desired to present to the Government a claim which they considered to be equitable. It had been said that it was in the power of the immigrants to sue Dr. Lang in the Supreme Court; but even those most hostile to him were not in a position to enter into an action of doubtful result, which would involve costs of perhaps a thousand pounds. If a grant of land were voted for Dr. Lang, he believed it should be with the condition that he should meet those claims which were really just, as it was just possible that he might claim the benefit of the statute of limitation. (No, no.)

The question was then put and negatived on division, as follows:—

Ayes, 6.		Noes, 11.	
Mr. Stephens	} Tellers.	Mr. Pring	} Tellers.
" Coxen		" Herbert	
" Blakeney		" Macalister	
" Lilley		" Brookes	
" R. Cribb		" Douglas	
" Pugh		" Taylor	
	" Royds		
	" Wienholt		
	" Edwards		
	" Moffatt		
	" McLean		

NORTHERN TRAFFIC.

Mr. DOUGLAS moved,—“That an address be presented to the Governor, praying that his Excellency will cause a return to be kept of all dutiable commodities, not being bonded stores, which may leave the port of Brisbane for each of the northern ports.” He explained that many of the supplies for the north came *via* Brisbane, and therefore the customs returns, as at present published, scarcely showed a fair relative value of the trade of the two ports as far as affected their contributions to the general revenue.

Mr. R. CRIBB suggested that the motion should be amended, so as to include a return of the goods brought from the northern ports to Brisbane.

The COLONIAL TREASURER stated that he would not oppose the motion, but he desired it to be amended so as to include the returns from Ipswich.

Mr. DOUGLAS assented to the two suggestions, and amended the resolution accordingly. It was then put and passed.

SUPREME COURT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. BLAKENEY moved the second reading of this Bill, and explained that it was designed to enlarge the powers of commissioners at certain of the ports of the Colony to the northward, so as to enable them to issue writs of *ca. re.*, and otherwise carry out legal processes, which were at present out of their power. The commissioners would have, under this Act, power to issue writs of summons, and take bail; and due care was taken that no frivolous action should be entered into, as it was necessary for the parties setting the commissioner in motion to lodge a sum of money in his hands. The same Act was in force in New South Wales, as regarded the commissioner at the port of Newcastle.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL believed that the honorable member who had moved the second reading of the Bill was quite right in alluding to the inconvenience experienced in the seaport towns, by the absence of a power to issue writs; great inconvenience had been experienced by suitors, and Rockhampton and other towns were in the same position with regard to Brisbane, as Newcastle had been with regard to Sydney, in former times. He would support the second reading of the Bill.

The Bill was then read a second time, and passed through committee, its short title being altered to that of the “Common Law Process Extension Act.”

BRISBANE GAS COMPANY BILL.

Mr. McLEAN moved the second reading of the Brisbane Gas Company Bill. The honorable member briefly referred to the advantages of lighting the city. He had reason to believe the company was a *bonâ fide* company, including many wealthy colonists, who were well able to do what they had undertaken. A great number of the citizens of Paris had petitioned the Government to shut out the light of the sun to show the perfection to which they had brought all sorts of artificial lights. He had no doubt that the good citizens of Brisbane would be equally delighted with the gas; and honorable members would, in a very short time have an opportunity of going home, after deliberating upon the business of the country, without breaking their shins, with the beautiful gas to guide them. The advantage would be appreciated by every intelligent member of the House, and the company; and the gas would show the beauties of the city at night, as the sun showed them by day.

The question was put and passed, and the Bill was read a second time.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Wednesday, 31 August, 1864.

Reform of Aborigines.

REFORM OF ABORIGINES.

The Hon. J. BRAMSTON moved the adoption of the resolutions of the Assembly relative to a grant of land to responsible persons who desired to effect the reform of the aborigines. He explained the circumstances which led to this motion being introduced. Bishop Patterson, a missionary from one of the islands of the Pacific, desired to found an institution for the reclamation of some of the young inhabitants of the particular islands in which he was interested. Missionaries were at work there, but the climate was not so suited as this to the European constitution, and it was also thought desirable to take the youth for purposes of education from their old associations. In conjunction with this scheme, the Bishop of Melanesia had offered to attempt the reclamation of some of our own aborigines if a grant of land were offered. The object was of such a character that he anticipated no opposition from the House.

The Hon. R. J. SMITH had no objection to the motion, but thought that the House should be informed of the amount of land to be given and its situation.

The Hon. F. N. ISAAC rose to express his entire concurrence in the motion. Although the labors of those who desired to ameliorate the condition of the aborigines had hitherto not been so successful as could be wished, yet it would be uncharitable to desist from these attempts on that account. He was not amongst those who believed that no benefit could be conferred upon the aborigines, as he was aware, from observation, that an institution for the reform of the aborigines at St. George's Sound, in South Australia, had been very successful in its mission.

The question was then put and passed.
