

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

FRIDAY, 16 OCTOBER 1885

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Friday, 16 October, 1885.

Customs Collections at Stanthorpe.—Question.—Separation of Northern Queensland.—Order of Business.—Gratuity to the Widow of the late Denis Murphy.—Noble Estate Enabling Bill—second reading.—Land-Grant System of Immigration.—Returns of Grammar Schools.—Separation of Northern Queensland.—Adjournment.

The SPEAKER took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS AT STANTHORPE.

The COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. J. R. Dickson) said: Mr. Speaker,—I have to ask the House to permit me to make a short personal statement with regard to a matter which was discussed last night in Committee of Supply, and upon which I unintentionally misled hon. gentlemen. It was with regard to the Border Customs Estimates. I then informed the Committee that the amount of revenue received at Stanthorpe amounted to £254, an amount which hon. gentlemen commented upon as being considerably less than the expenditure of the establishment. I may say that I shared in the opinion expressed, and made further inquiries this morning relating to it; the result being that I am induced to trespass upon the time of the House to make this explanation. It appears that the Customs revenue at Stanthorpe is collected in two forms of accounts, and that the amount that was received directly overland, as border customs, did amount to £254. As I have stated, that is the amount which, in the statistics handed to me, was represented as the border customs received at Stanthorpe; but that is, I find, exclusive of a very large revenue derived from the bonded store there. The revenue derived from goods delivered out of that bond amounted last year to no less than £4,828, which alters the complexion of the establishment very considerably. I very much regret that I was not supplied with fuller notes, and should have misled hon. gentlemen with regard to the position of the Customs at Stanthorpe; and it is only due to them that I should take the earliest opportunity of making this explanation.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTION.

Mr. SHERIDAN asked the Minister for Works—

1. If he has received the surveyor's report on the projected line of railway from Maryborough to Gayndah—and, if so, which route has been approved of?

2. If plans and book of reference for said line will be laid upon the table of the House this session?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. Miles) replied—

1. Trial surveys to Gayndah have just been completed and surveyors' reports thereon received; but the alternative routes have not yet been reported upon by the Chief Engineer.

2. The Government will not be in a position to lay plans and book of reference for this line on the table of the House this session.

SEPARATION OF NORTHERN QUEENSLAND.

Mr. BLACK said: Mr. Speaker,—I have a question to put. With the consent of the House, I would like to amend the notice of motion that I gave yesterday—that there be laid upon the table of the House a copy of the letter from the Premier to His Excellency the Governor, regarding the proposed separation of Northern from Southern Queensland. I would like to amend the motion so that it shall read, "Copy of any correspondence

between the Premier and His Excellency the Governor upon the proposed separation of Northern from Southern Queensland," etc. Will the Premier accept the motion without further notice?

The PREMIER: It was my intention to lay some correspondence in connection with the separation question on the table without any motion at all.

The SPEAKER: Do I understand the hon. gentleman to mean that he wishes to give notice of a question?

Mr. BLACK: I wish, with the consent of the House, to amend my motion.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to lay upon the table of the House a copy of certain correspondence on the subject of the separation of the northern portion of Queensland, and move that the paper be printed.

Question put and passed.

Mr. BLACK said: Mr. Speaker,—I would like to have some explanation from the Premier as to his object in calling out "not formal" to my motion, while at the same time he lays the paper asked for on the table of the House. The hon. gentleman complies with my request, and at the same time declares the motion "not formal" in consequence of which I infer the matter will come on again for consideration. If the hon. gentleman wishes the separation question discussed in this House, I am quite prepared and will be most happy to discuss it, which will be the result of calling "not formal" to the motion.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I take it that the hon. member has asked a question. The hon. gentleman wished, as I understood him, that a letter, which late telegrams have stated was published in the *Times* of October 12th, should be laid upon the table of the House. I can only conjecture what that letter was, and the order in its present form could not be complied with until the paper arrived in the colony; but, desiring to comply with the spirit of the hon. member's motion, I have laid on the table of the House the letter to which I presume he refers.

Mr. BLACK said: Mr. Speaker,—I would ask whether, now that a paper has been laid on the table of the House in reply to my question, my notice will stand on the notice-paper for discussion at some future time, it having been declared "not formal" by the Premier?

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I understand that it is desired to allow the hon. member for Bundanba, who has charge of a private Bill which is second among the Orders of the Day, to have precedence to-day. I have been assured that hon. members who have business before that are willing to allow him to do so, and I therefore move that the House now pass to the Orders of the Day.

Question put and passed.

GRATUITY TO THE WIDOW OF THE LATE DENIS MURPHY.

On this Order of the Day being called, the Speaker left the chair and the House went into Committee to further consider an address to the Governor, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be placed on the Supplementary Estimates the sum of £200, to be granted to the widow of the late Denis Murphy, who was killed at the new railway station, Ipswich.

On the motion of Mr. MACFARLANE, the CHAIRMAN left the chair, reported no progress, and asked leave to sit again.

The PREMIER moved that the Committee have leave to sit again at a later hour of the day.

Question put and passed.

NOBLE ESTATE ENABLING BILL—
SECOND READING.

Mr. FOOTE said: Mr. Speaker,—In rising to move the second reading of this Bill I have to thank hon. members for the great courtesy they have extended towards me in allowing this matter to take precedence this afternoon. I should not have asked it under ordinary circumstances, but the Bill is of a pressing nature, and it is necessary that it should pass this House in order that due time may be allowed for its consideration by the other Chamber. The preamble of the Bill sets forth the object of the petitioners, Frederick Henry Browne and Enoch Bostock, of Ipswich, who are trustees in the estate of Ann Eliza Noble. Mrs. Noble left to Mrs. Niquet, who is now a person between sixty and seventy years of age, with a grown-up family, a life interest in certain property at Nundah, being portions 5 and 6, containing some sixty-four acres of land. For a number of years that property returned, as it was, to Mrs. Niquet, the devisee under the will, a rental at the rate of something like £20 per annum, but subsequently, and for two years past, the property has yielded nothing. The fences are broken down, and the land is now a mere waste and commonage. Application has been made to Mrs. Niquet to repair the fence or replace it, but she is not in a position to do so, and there is evidence to show that if she had been in a position to do that, the interest on the money required to erect the fencing would be more than what she could realise by letting the land as a paddock to persons who were disposed to rent it. The property is at Nundah, and has become very valuable for suburban building sites. It is near the Racecourse railway, within something like 800 yards of the line, as will be seen on referring to the evidence taken before the select committee. The devisee, Mrs. Niquet, who has a life interest in this property, is in needy circumstances, and she is old and her husband is old. There is a family grown up; although they are called children in the will, yet the oldest of them is thirty-eight years of age, and I think they are all married with the exception of one—a daughter, nineteen years of age. They are the only parties interested in this Bill. The Bill does not deal with the whole estate of Ann Eliza Noble, but only to that part of it which refers to the life estate of Mrs. Niquet. We have the evidence of one of the trustees, Mr. Bostock, that this land is very valuable. It is within 800 yards of the railway station, and is very suitable ground for suburban building sites. One witness calculates the value at from £100 to £150 an acre, another at £100 or over, and a third at not less than £110 per acre. The object of the Bill is to carry out the spirit and intention of the will of the late Ann Eliza Noble. It was her intention that her daughters should receive an annuity from this land for life, but under existing circumstances that is impossible. In the first place there is no power to grant a lease of the land for any period, and then the rates claimed by the divisional board have accrued to something very considerable. The amount of rates this year, calculated as on unimproved land, is £22 4s., and if the land had been improved it would be £33 odd. The paddock at no time realised more than £20 a year, so that it is not possible to realise from the ground as much as would pay the rates. The evidence shows that the land would realise a considerable sum of money. Mr. Bostock thinks the interest accruing, at a reasonable rate, say 7 per cent., would amount to something over £400 per annum. I may say that all the parties interested in the Bill are consenting parties. The documents attached to the report are all duly attested before commissioners for affidavits or magistrates. The letter

of the law has been fully complied with, and the committee, after giving this matter their diligent consideration, are unanimously in favour of the Bill. I now move the second reading of the Bill.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—This is one of the cases continually cropping up in consequence of the unsatisfactory state of the law in this colony—cases in which testators lock up land so that it becomes absolutely useless. There is now no way of getting over the difficulty except by private Bills; but there is a Bill before Parliament which deals with cases of this kind generally. Here is a case where land worth several thousand pounds is left by a woman in such a way that it is perfectly useless to everybody, and will remain useless for many years unless Parliament steps in. We have no alternative but to accept this Bill at the present time.

Mr. FERGUSON said: Mr. Speaker,—I should like to hear some expression of opinion on this Bill. The hon. member who brought it forward has not told us whether all the people interested in this estate are of age.

Mr. FOOTE: All except one.

Mr. FERGUSON: He has not explained very clearly the nature of the will; perhaps some members of the Committee will explain it more fully, and tell us whether any objection whatever has been raised against this Bill by any party interested, or any relations of the interested parties.

Mr. SMYTH said: Mr. Speaker,—At the meeting of the Committee documentary evidence was brought forward by the solicitor, proving that every person concerned in the will had consented to the Bill. All the parties interested signed documents in order that Mrs. Niquet, who is a very old woman, should receive some benefit during her lifetime. If the property is not realised on, the rates, which now amount to £22 4s. a year, will go on until the divisional board will step in and take advantage of the Act by leasing the land for a certain time. The land has been let to Mr. Zillman for £20 a year, but the fence has been getting very dilapidated, and Mr. Zillman could get no security of tenure. Mrs. Niquet will not fence the land, only having a life interest; and no person is in a position to fence it. If Mrs. Niquet is to receive any benefit from the land during her lifetime, it is our place to pass the Bill and let the old lady receive as much benefit as possible.

Mr. SCOTT said: Mr. Speaker,—It does appear a hard case for this old lady; but I see that under the will her children and grandchildren are to inherit it. There may be a number of these grandchildren. The lands are to go to "such of the children of the said Ann Eliza Niquet as should attain the age of twenty-one years, or should die under that age leaving lawful issue."

The PREMIER: The children are all alive.

Mr. SCOTT: But they may die under twenty-one. This girl of nineteen may die.

Mr. PALMER said: Mr. Speaker,—I have not heard many remarks made on the case before the House, and having been a member of the committee which inquired into the case, and been present at all its sittings, I am anxious for my own sake that the fullest information should be given to the House. I have been solicitous in this case on account of one or two of a similar kind having been discussed in this House before. On those former occasions blame, I fancy, was attached to the committees for not making their inquiries exhaustive. I think we did not leave a stone unturned to get at the rights of this case, and I believe myself that the case is

genuine. The persons concerned are in necessitous circumstances, and the estate at present is utterly valueless to them. By permission being given them to sell, I believe that the lady, Mrs. Niquet, will derive a benefit from the proceeds, whilst she is not likely to reap any benefit from the estate under the present circumstances. In fact, the divisional rates cannot be paid. No rent can come from the estate on account of the fences having completely fallen into ruin. Mr. Zillman, who has rented it for some years and who has paid, out of charity and friendship, the rates hitherto, will now give nothing at all. Moreover, the estate is now rated at £20 more than previously on account of the additional value which has accrued through the progress of settlement—not through any increase of value of the land itself, as from all the evidence it appears to be rather poor. Building allotments are now required in the locality, and the trustees have stated that this is a favourable time to sell. They assessed the value of the land at from £100 to £150 per acre. We inquired as to what the cost would be of making the property worth a rental, and found that it would cost £150 for fencing. Where that £150 was to come from no one could tell, but one thing was evident, and that was that the lady was not in circumstances to improve the estate. As to the proceeds, they are to be properly invested, and the result will be a return of £300 or £400 a year, the property being of the estimated worth of £6,000. Everyone concerned will be benefited by the passing of the Bill. The children—most of them living in South Australia—have all signed affidavits to the effect that they are perfectly willing the estate should be dealt with in this way, and that the proceeds should be placed to the credit of their mother. Taking all the circumstances into consideration, I think the House will be justified in passing this measure.

Mr. ARCHER said: Mr. Speaker,—I am very glad to have heard what has fallen from the hon. member for Burke, but I do not yet understand the arrangement perfectly. Very likely this is owing to my want of information or knowledge, but I do not clearly see how the 4th clause of the Bill will affect the estate. That clause relates to the application of the purchase money. It may be all right, and in any case would be a matter for consideration in committee. I hope, however, that the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government will give it his careful attention.

Mr. BUCKLAND said: Mr. Speaker,—I know something about the property referred to in the Bill, and of its present condition. The rates are unpaid for the last two years, and, under the Divisional Boards Act, unless they are paid very shortly the board can step in and take possession. The fences are almost torn to pieces. In fact you cannot call them fences at all now. In consequence of this, the property is subject to a double rating. I think the House will do the correct thing if they allow this Bill to pass. The property is really becoming more valuable, and the circumstances of the family are such that they urgently require assistance.

Question put and passed.

Mr. FOOTE said: Mr. Speaker,—I move that you do now leave the chair, and that the House resolve itself into committee to consider this Bill. I ask this favour in consequence of the approaching end of the session, and because I am very desirous that time may be given to get the Bill passed by the Upper House. In going into committee at once on the Bill we shall only be reverting to an old custom.

Mr. ARCHER: Is this the correct way of doing it, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER said: It is entirely a matter of practice for the House itself to decide. There is nothing in the Standing Orders to prevent it. For many years in this House it was the custom on non-contentious measures for the House to go into committee at once after the second reading. That is also the practice in New South Wales, and I may add that it is also the practice in the House of Commons and in Canada. It is a pure matter of practice. If it is not deemed desirable to consider a Bill in committee at once, of course an amendment will be moved fixing a day for such consideration. In the House of Commons, also, it is regarded as a mere matter of practice; if the House wishes to go into committee immediately after a second reading it does so; if not, a day is fixed for the purpose. It is for the House to decide whether it will go into committee on this Bill now or fix a future day for considering it in detail.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I should like to say a word about this matter of practice. For some years after I entered the House it was almost an invariable practice to go into committee on a Bill on the same day on which it had been read a second time. This was the case not only with non-contentious Bills but with contentious Bills, and particularly with the latter, because it saved a great deal of time on a subsequent occasion when there might otherwise be a general discussion on the motion to go into committee. That might take place on the first committal, but there can be no debate when the resumption of the committee is the Order of the Day. That practice was discontinued to a great extent some eight or ten years ago. It is entirely a matter of convenience. My own opinion is that that practice was the best. In New South Wales it is almost an invariable practice to go into committee on the same day that a motion for the second reading is carried. In the case of a private Bill like the one before us, this is probably the only Parliament where a question would be raised about it.

Mr. SCOTT said: Mr. Speaker,—I do not oppose this Bill going into committee, but I hope that if it does it will not be taken as a precedent. The question has been discussed in the House over and over again, and for the last eight or ten years the practice has been that no Bill shall go into committee immediately after the second reading. In many cases the practice is inconvenient, and it is one that might easily be abused by a strong Government.

Mr. STEVENSON said: Mr. Speaker,—I hope this Bill will not go into committee now. The hon. member for Leichhardt says he will not object to its going into committee now, but he hopes that if it does it will not be looked upon as a precedent. Why should it be considered in committee now? The motion for the second reading was taken out of its turn as a special favour, and that, I think, is quite enough for one day. This is the first time I have seen the Bill, and although it may be all right we ought to have some time allowed to consider its details. Several hon. members have come here this afternoon to look after certain widows, and they do not want their time taken up by this Bill. The consideration of the Bill may last a long time, and perhaps the widows may have to wait another week or fortnight before their cases are attended to. I strongly object to the Bill being put into committee now, and I hope the hon. member for Blackall will not allow his motion to be postponed for it.

Mr. NORTON said: Mr. Speaker,—It may be a mere matter of practice, but I would point out to hon. members that this Bill has only been put into our hands since the House met.

The PREMIER: No; it was circulated with the Parliamentary papers a week ago. If you did not read it, it is your own fault.

Mr. NORTON: I must have overlooked it, then, for I certainly never saw it before. With regard to practice, it would not be a fair thing to go into committee on a Bill—I am not referring to this Bill in particular, but to the general question—immediately after it has been read a second time, for many hon members would not by that time be sufficiently acquainted with its details. With regard to this Bill, I do not intend to oppose its going into committee, but I would say that it is a practice fraught with danger to go into committee on a Bill immediately after it has been read a second time.

Question put and passed, and the House went into committee.

Preamble postponed.

Clause 1 passed as printed.

Clause 2 passed with a verbal amendment.

On clause 3—"On special conditions if necessary"—

Mr. NORTON said it was unusual that trustees should be absolved from all responsibility if the estate suffered from the arrangements they made.

Mr. FOOTE said the clause was the same as the clause relating to special conditions in the Pettigrew Estate Enabling Act, and similar measures which had become law.

Clause put and passed.

On clause 4—"Application of purchase money"

Mr. PALMER said that, as the point had been raised, he might state that the trustees were in no way absolved from the conditions of the will; and the select committee, knowing that the trustees would still be responsible, and having evidence that they could dispose of the estate so as to obtain an income of £400 a year, thought it better that the land should be applied to the benefit of those whom it was intended to benefit instead of lying idle.

Clause put and passed.

On clause 5—"Trustees' receipts to be good discharges"—

Mr. MOREHEAD said that, though he objected to lawyers as a rule, he thought it was a mistake to have relegated a Bill to alter the dispositions of a will to a committee consisting wholly of laymen. He would ask the hon. member in charge of the Bill whether it was drafted by a solicitor, and if so, what solicitor? Unless the trustees had taken very good legal advice, it was very likely that the whole affair would be a bungle.

Mr. FOOTE said the matter was a very simple one. Mrs. Niquet had a life interest in two portions of land, containing altogether sixty-four acres, at Eagle Farm Junction. For the last two years the property had yielded no revenue whatever, and in consequence of circumstances it was now a mere common. The amount of rent formerly paid to Mrs. Niquet was £20 per annum, but the paddock was not capable of being let now. It would cost £150 to fence the property, but Mrs. Niquet was not in a position to provide the money, and if she were she would gain nothing from the outlay because the rates amounted to £22 4s., while the rent would be only £20 per annum. If the rates were left unpaid for a few years the divisional board had power to let the property for a certain period, and if the rates remained unpaid for that period they had power to lease it for a further period. It was the intention of Mrs. Ann Eliza Noble that her daughter (Mrs. Niquet) should derive an annuity from the property,

and it had become so valuable that if sold the interest of the money would produce £400 a year. Mr. Zillman valued the land at £100 an acre; Mr. Ballinger at £110 an acre; and Mr. Bostock at £150 an acre; and he was informed that the highest valuation was well within the mark. Mrs. Niquet was in needy circumstances, and it was impossible, under existing circumstances, for her to receive from the property the annuity her mother intended her to receive; therefore it was considered advisable by Mrs. Niquet and her friends that the Bill should be brought in to enable the trustees to deal with the property. The Bill was drawn up by a respectable firm of solicitors in Brisbane—Daly and Hellicar. He knew Mrs. Noble and the family, and he had been asked to get the Bill passed into law.

Mr. MOREHEAD said they were asked to pass a measure modifying, if not interfering with, a testamentary provision relating to certain property. The only witnesses examined were Mr. Cardew, Mr. Bostock, Mr. Zillman, and Mr. Ballinger, and no legal evidence whatsoever was heard as to the construction of the will. He should like hon. gentlemen to glance over the last will and testament of Eliza Ann Noble, because it would puzzle a Philadelphia lawyer to understand what it all meant. What he maintained was that, in cases of that sort, not only should a legal member of the House be a member of the committee, but they should have some information as to who drafted the Bill. He did not think there was any member of the committee who was competent by education, or experience, or legal training to analyse that will and draft a measure such as they had under discussion. Those were matters they should all be very jealous about—matters dealing with property that had been devised under a will. That was to say, they should be very careful in altering or interfering in any way with an instrument of that sort. The fullest information ought to be given to hon. members before such a measure was consented to.

The PREMIER said he agreed that in a measure of that kind there should be a member of the legal profession on the committee, and it was usual to appoint one in such a case. The promoters of a private Bill were expected always to attend the committee, and prove, not only the necessity for the Bill, but the propriety of the proposals. That appeared in the present case to have been done with more care than usual, and he did not think that anyone reading the evidence could come to any other conclusion than that it was necessary, if the tenant for life of that land was to derive any benefit at all from it, to allow the trustees to sell it, invest the proceeds, and give her the income. The hon. gentleman who had just sat down said the will was very complicated. Well, it was very long; but that did not make it complicated. All that related to the land in question was contained in about ten lines, and he thought that a layman, as well as a lawyer, could understand it. There was nothing difficult in it; and the bare fact remained that at the present time the land was said to be worth about £6,000, that it brought in nothing, and could not be made to bring in anything. The alternatives were, that the tenant for life should remain for the rest of her life without getting any income whatever from the land, or that it should be sold. As the children did not wish that their mother should remain all her life in poverty, and as they had given their consent to the proposal to sell the property, he did not think the House need feel any hesitation in consenting to the Bill.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he would again assert that in cases of that sort there should be a lawyer on the committee. He would ask the Premier

whether a certain Bill that had been introduced in another place would deal with cases of the sort before the Committee.

The PREMIER : Of course it would.

Mr. MOREHEAD : Then, if the Government were in earnest in trying to pass that Bill, there was no necessity for the one before them. If the Government really meant to pass that measure, which he held to be a very useful and proper measure, Mrs. Niquet would have to wait a very short time before her rights were settled by Parliament.

The PREMIER said there was a Bill before Parliament which would deal with the matter, but whether it would become law he could not tell, as that depended upon the temper of members of the House. The Government would be very glad to pass the Bill. It had been introduced for the purpose of passing it, but whether hon. members would allow it to be passed he could not say. In the meantime they might let the measure before them go through.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he did not wish to obstruct the passage of the Bill. He had asked for information and had not got it. They had not yet had information as to who drafted the Bill.

Mr. FOOTE said he told the hon. member that it was drafted by a respectable firm of solicitors in this city, Messrs. Daly and Hellicar.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he did not hear the hon. member say so. He now wanted to ascertain from the Premier whether the Government intended to pass the Bill that was before the Upper Chamber. A great amount of time and labour might have been saved to the committee who investigated the matter, if the Premier had informed the member for Bundanba that it was the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill which would deal with cases of that kind. He believed that course would have been more preferable than going about the business in the clumsy and expensive way in which the Bill dealt with it?

The PREMIER said bringing in a Bill was one thing, but passing it was another.

Mr. MOREHEAD : You can do anything like that.

The PREMIER said the Bill was not yet passed by the Upper House, and a suggestion had been made, if he correctly understood, to entirely alter the character of the Bill. He could not tell what might happen. He hoped the Bill would pass very much in the shape in which it was introduced, but it was proposed, as he had said, to entirely alter it. He wanted to point out that whoever drafted the Bill before them had forgotten a very important provision, because, as clause 4 stood, the trustees would have to pay all the expenses of a sale out of their own pockets. That, of course, was not intended, and he would suggest that the Bill be recommitted for the purpose of inserting in clause 4, line 2, after the word "pay," the following words : "the expenses or charges upon any such sale or sales, in the second place to pay." Of course the costs of a sale should be a first charge on the proceeds.

Mr. McMASTER said he happened to know something of the property in question. He had known Mrs. Niquet for twenty-eight years. At the time the property came into her hands it was intended by her mother to be of some advantage to her and assist the family in some slight degree. The land was lying valueless, inasmuch as it was unfenced and could not be leased. Therefore, no rents were accruing from it, and he was very certain that Mrs. Niquet, who had a life interest in the property, was in need of any help that might be given her.

Clause passed as printed.

Preamble passed as printed.

1885—3 Y

On the motion of Mr. FOOTE, the House resumed, and the CHAIRMAN reported the Bill with an amendment.

Mr. FOOTE moved that the Speaker leave the chair, and the House go into committee to further consider clause 4.

Question put and passed.

The PREMIER moved that clause 4 be amended by inserting the following words after the word "pay" in the 2nd line : "the costs, charges, and expenses of any such sale or sales, in the second place to pay."

Mr. NORTON said the necessity for recommending the Bill had shown that it had not received the attention of the Committee, and if there had not been the discussion initiated by the hon. member for Balonne the Premier would not have seen the defect that was now being rectified. The mere fact of the Bill having to be recommitted was sufficient evidence of the danger which was run by taking a Bill into committee in that hurried manner, and he would point out to the hon. gentleman in charge of it that had he brought it forward earlier in the session there would have been no need to ask the House to alter the usual practice in passing it.

Mr. FOOTE said it was only within the last month that the Bill had been handed to him.

Amendment agreed to ; and clause, as amended, put and passed.

The House resumed, and the CHAIRMAN reported the Bill with a further amendment.

The report was adopted, and the third reading of the Bill made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the remainder of the Orders of the Day were postponed until after the consideration of the notices of motion.

LAND-GRANT SYSTEM OF IMMIGRATION.

Mr. JORDAN, in moving—

That in order to save a large part of the present enormous cost of immigration, and to encourage the influx of capital and the settlement of the colony, under the Land Act of 1884, by a farming class, it is expedient and desirable to bring in an Immigration Bill, offering free grants of land, or a remission of rent, to persons paying their own full passages from Europe direct to Queensland, with proper safeguards against the abuse of the system—

said : Mr. Speaker,—When the Land Bill of 1884 was in committee, I proposed certain clauses which embodied the substance contained in the resolution which I have just read to the House. Those clauses were almost a copy, word for word, of an amendment which was proposed by the Premier when the Immigration Act of 1882 was in committee. My intention is not, as I think some hon. gentlemen suppose, to re-establish the land-order system. That system was greatly abused. In the first place the agricultural reserves, which had been set aside for the settlement of persons arriving in the colony, who had paid their own passages, were found to be utterly unsuited for the purpose for which they were intended. The consequence was that such persons, who came from Great Britain intending to settle on the land, finding that that land was worthless, sold their land-orders for whatever they would bring, and they were bought up by persons who speculated with them, and the result was that in that way the system became greatly abused. The intention here is simply the remission of rent or purchase money in favour of persons paying their own passages from England, to the extent of thirty acres for each adult, and that remission should take place

as soon as the conditions had been fulfilled. It would have been wiser if this question had been dealt with in the Land Bill which was before the House last session, as the questions of the settlement of the land and the population of the colony are inseparable. The Land question and the Immigration question are simply one, in this colony at all events. It has been said lately that, because the revenue derived from the land has not realised expectations, the Land Act of 1884 has already proved a failure. But it has been pointed out again and again that Act has not been in force for a whole year yet, and it was not anticipated that any great revenue would be realised under it for the first two or three years. I have myself, I admit, stated in this House that the Act will not prove successful, if we are not very careful indeed in the settlement of an agricultural population upon the land; but I claim for the Land Act of 1884 that it has proved a perfect success in this essential particular—it has released a very large area of land for close settlement. The great impediment that has always existed in the way of the settlement of the land by an agricultural class in this colony on a large scale has been that the land was already occupied. Those who have been in favour of populating the country, or, in other words, of establishing a great agricultural interest in Queensland, have always been met with this objection at the very threshold: that the land was already occupied by the pastoral tenants of the Crown for the purpose of feeding sheep and cattle on the natural grasses of the country. In theory the pastoral tenants of the Crown have had no security of tenure, and for the past twenty-five years they have always been asking for indefeasible leases, or fixity of tenure, as it has been called. Practically, however, the pastoral tenants have had a monopoly of the land of the colony; and this, as I have said, has stood in the way of the agricultural settlement of the country. But by the Land Act of 1884 a great revolution has been quietly effected. The pastoral tenants have, I am informed, elected generally to come under the provisions of the Act, and they have thus voluntarily consented to accept an indefeasible lease and compensation for improvements, and to give up one-half or one-third or one-fourth of the land on their runs for close settlement. Thus, about 100,000,000 acres of land is absolutely set free for more profitable occupation. This is a great achievement; it is a giant stride in the right direction. But this brings us face to face with a great responsibility. There are 100,000,000 acres of land, but where are the people to occupy them? One-half of that land we claim to be fit for agricultural settlement—fit, not only for the growth of artificial grasses, but for the growth also of wheat, maize, potatoes, cotton, arrowroot, vines, fruit-trees, and vegetables, and all that variety of agricultural produce which hitherto has been costing us something like £500,000 sterling per annum for that portion which we are not able to grow ourselves. The other half will no doubt very soon be occupied as small squattages or grazing farms, varying in extent from 2,560 acres to 20,000 acres. Supposing they contained an average of 10,000 acres each, that will provide sufficient land for the settlement of 5,000 families, and supposing each family consists, on an average, of five persons, that makes room for 25,000 people. Supposing an equal number of servants and their children, that gives another 25,000; so that those 50,000,000 acres of land will afford space for an increase to our population of 50,000 persons. Now, suppose the other half of those 100,000,000 acres, or 50,000,000, which is only one-ninth of the 427,000,000 acres of land which this colony contains, is suitable for settlement, as I believe it is, that will be sufficient to settle 2,500,000 persons. I suppose the

best agricultural lands will be set free under the Act of 1884. That, I think, will be the operation of the Act. Then suppose the 50,000,000 acres are divided into agricultural farms of an average area of 100 acres each. That will give farms to 500,000 families. If each family, with children, averages five persons, that will be 2,500,000; allow 500,000 more for servants and their children, and the 50,000,000 divided into agricultural farms of 100 acres gives sufficient land to settle 3,000,000 of people. Where are those people? Until they arrive, this land, by a distinct provision in the Act—the 31st clause—remains in the possession of the pastoral tenant of the Crown. It is nominally released; but until it is actually demanded for settlement by the 31st section of the Act it remains in the hands of the pastoral tenants, and as soon as it is proclaimed open for settlement the rent is reduced by one-third; the pastoral tenant, instead of paying 9s. 1d. per square mile, having only to pay 6s. 1d. per square mile. I say, where are the people—these 3,000,000 people who are wanted to occupy this land? We know where they are. They are not at our doors, certainly, but they are waiting to come to this colony. They are in England, leaving by hundreds and thousands, and they are taking millions of money every year to the United States of America. They would rather come to this colony if they could get here at as little expense, and if we held out the same inducements as are offered to them by the United States of America and Canada. The day after the hon. member for Darling Downs brought forward his motion, in which he proposed that the Government should purchase the Canning Downs and Westbrook Estates for agricultural settlement, I saw a leading article in what is sometimes called the Government organ—that is, the *Telegraph*, though I do not believe that the Government are responsible for all that appears in that paper. It so happened that the article very severely criticised some remarks made, especially by members on this side of the House, and perhaps by members on the other side, who advocated that the Government should take means for the settlement of a large agricultural population on the lands of the colony as speedily as possible. This was alluded to by the leading article as “arrant nonsense.” The whole tenor of the article was that we should be content in this colony with things very much as they are. What do we find for our contentment in this colony, which is twelve times as large as England and Wales put together? We find a small population of 310,000, according to the returns of the Registrar-General for 1884; a debt of £19,000,000 sterling; a taxation to the extent of £4 per head for every man, woman, and child in the colony, including babies; and an expenditure for immigration of £266,000 every year, and that immigration almost entirely an immigration of poor people. I am not content! I do not think we are doing the best we can for the colony—that we are doing our best to develop the rich and varied resources of this great country. I venture to say that with our heavy debt, our small population, this great extent of territory lying waste, and our great treasures of mineral wealth almost wholly undeveloped, the crying necessity of this colony is the importation of capital—a great accession of money-bringing and money-producing people from the old country. And until we adopt some such scheme as that which the Premier tried to get the House to adopt in 1882—a system that would attract a large number of those farmers whom we know are waiting to come here with their capital—a land-grant system of immigration such as I am now advocating, with proper safeguards

against abuses, such as the Premier, with his long experience, assured this House in 1882 would prove effectual—a scheme which would attract a large number of English, Irish, and Scotch farmers, and Germans too, who would bring their money, their experience, and their natural love of the soil, and settle in this colony and occupy those beautiful lands now thrown open by the Land Act of 1884. Until we do that, I believe the Act will prove to a great extent inoperative, and may possibly become the very instrument of frustrating the great object we had in view in passing that Act—of settling a large agricultural population on the land. There is another consideration which strikes me as very important: Without a large increase of population in this colony, and a large accession of capital, and of employers of labour—not mere paupers—the magnificent railway policy of last session will prove abortive. I have no hesitation in saying so. A grand railway system, with a population of a miserable 300,000 or 400,000 people only, will prove a grand failure. I thoroughly believe in the railway policy of the present Government. I believe in railways on our seaboard to connect all our large cities and ports on the eastern coast; I believe in railways throughout the settled districts of the colony, to enable those who have had the courage to settle on the land and contend with all the difficulties of pioneer farming to bring their produce to market; I believe in the extension of the three great trunk lines of railway until they penetrate that vast extent of beautiful pastoral country to the west; I believe in that line of railway the Government have talked of, which is to go from the Gulf of Carpentaria, to open up the rich mineral district of Cloncurry; and I believe in the direct line to Warwick, which will be before long a part of the great highway from Great Britain by the Panama Canal—that will be finished in a few years, two or three short years—and make Brisbane the last port of departure and the first of arrival for ships on that line. The direct and short route through Brisbane, *via* Warwick and St. George, to the southern and western corner of our colony, will be the shortest route between the old world and the new—connecting Europe with the great southern cities of Australia and New Zealand. I believe this line should be pushed on rapidly; that by-and-by it should be a double line; and that it should be on the broad gauge. This is a colossal scheme; but we must remember this is the scheme of the present Government. It will cost a great deal of money; nevertheless, I believe in it, other things being equal—that is, if we get a large accession of population to create a traffic and make it possible that these lines may be made to pay interest on construction before many years are over. Without this, I believe we shall find out that we are making a mistake in borrowing ten millions of money—increasing our debt from £16,000,000 to £26,000,000. I believe we may possibly have to face—I do not like evil prophets, but I am very much afraid we may have to face commercial depression, an exhausted treasury, depressed trade, and a state of things which will justify the wonted boast of the Conservative party, who are accustomed to say that when the patient is suffering from a syncope they are called in at the eleventh hour to save life; or in other words, that when the Liberals have spent all the money they are called in to save the colony from bankruptcy. I do not say that anything of this kind has ever occurred; I do not believe it ever has; but I see danger ahead, and not very far off. I believe the remedy for this—the perfect remedy, or rather the effectual preventive for this state of things,

is a great accession to our population. We should not continue to spend £266,000 a year for only the poorest class of people; but we should lay ourselves out, now we have the land set free for that purpose, to attract the farming class and the better class of labourers of Great Britain. The only objection that has been advanced with any show of reason against that scheme which the Premier advocated in 1882, and which I, following in his steps, ventured to propose to this House last year, is this: that to make a free gift of thirty acres of land to persons paying their own passages from Great Britain to this colony would be an injustice to persons born in the colony or already residing here. Now, that looks very fair at first, but it will not bear examination. The people of this colony are compelled to pay more than a quarter of a million sterling for this kind of immigration of which I have been speaking. Some months ago I got the figures from the Auditor-General, and I found that the average cost of immigration, exclusive of contributions by assisted passengers, was about £240,000 a year; but that was only to the end of December, 1884, and included three and a-half years. I find from the figures of the Treasurer, which I now hold in my hand, that the average annual cost of immigration for the four years ending June, 1885, was no less than £266,825 2s. 7d. That is what it costs every year for this pauper immigration. These poor people are costing us, on an average, £22 15s. 5d. per head annually. The people of this colony were invited by Mr. Griffith, in this amendment he brought forward to the Immigration Bill of 1882, instead of paying £22 15s. 5d. per head for the immigration entirely of the lowest class, to give a £30 land-order—thirty acres—to such persons as would be willing to pay their own passages from Great Britain. That is, in other words, that instead of having an immigration consisting entirely of the labouring class—and some of them the very lowest and most ignorant people—we should adopt a system whereby a proportion of the people would be likely to bring money with them; and, instead of paying £22 15s. 5d. a head, we would have to pay nothing, but give them thirty acres of land instead. What would that land be worth to us?—because the question is, whether this would be an injustice to ourselves. This land—what does it realise? We are letting it to the pastoral tenants in the outside districts, including the country which is called unavailable land, at an average of 9s. 1d. a square mile—about three-quarters of a farthing an acre. Now, thirty times three-quarters of a farthing is 22 farthings; multiply that by 10 to get the capital value, and you have 220 farthings, 55 pence, or 4s. 7d. And it is contended that this would be an injustice to ourselves and the people of the colony—instead of paying in hard cash £22 15s. 5d. a head for mere paupers, to give thirty acres of land to those who would come and cost us nothing. It is very well to make use of such arguments in this House, but they will not bear examination outside. The people of the colony—the great bulk of them being working men—have too much sense to believe there is no difference between £22 15s. 5d. and 4s. 7d. They know the difference between bone and beef, and they are not so easily persuaded that this would be an injustice to the people of this colony. But there is another consideration in this matter: that the people who would be attracted to this colony from Europe by this system I am now advocating would be almost exclusively of the farming class. We are not going to give land-orders, but land to those who would use it and fulfil the conditions; and they would bring money with them

During the three years, 1861-4, it was found that the money brought into the colony by the immigrants who arrived under the land-order system averaged £30,000 to each vessel. In the five and a-half years from the middle of 1861 to December, 1866, 36,000 persons arrived, and rather more than a third of them paid their own full passages—between 12,000 and 13,000. These 36,000 persons were brought in ninety-one vessels, and that would give an average of 396 persons in each vessel, a third of whom would be 132 persons; and this would be equal to 105 adults. Now, divide the £30,000 brought in each ship by the average of 105 adults, and you will find that each of these adults brought into this colony no less than £286. And yet we are told that to adopt such a system as would induce that class of people to come here without costing us a penny, and who bring on the average £200 or £300 in their pockets, would be an injustice to the people of the colony! Those who advance that objection may not have been aware of these facts, or must have taken a superficial view of the whole question. It must be palpable to every one who takes an interest in this question, and an interest in the welfare of the colony, that every man, woman, and child in Queensland would be benefited by such a system as this. This, sir, to my mind is a grand and glorious opportunity which will never recur again. Never in the history of colonisation, I believe, has any Government had a chance of seizing upon so golden an opportunity as this. I do not expect, of course, that squatters of the old school, if there are any such gentlemen now in existence in Australia—there are not many of them I know, because most of them have become converted to a great extent to our own views—but if there should be any such gentlemen remaining, I say that I cannot expect them to admit my arguments, or even to perceive the benefit of establishing such a system in the colony. Rooted in the cradle and educated in the traditions of old squatterdom they are to a certain extent blind to the question. They have never considered the great question of British colonisation in Australia. They look at it from their own standpoint, and hold that the pastoral interest is the great interest. No doubt we are greatly indebted to the first pioneers of the colony, but they never considered Australia's connection with the grand subject of British colonisation. But, with due respect, I do hope that the Premier, with his keen perception and far-seeing wisdom, will be true to his own convictions on this subject, and that he will show to the colony and to the world that he is determined to carry out that grand scheme which he enunciated in 1882 before the largest assemblage ever brought together in Queensland, at the Brisbane Town Hall. It is time, I think, that we should at least put a stop to the present system of taxing the people—the great bulk of whom are working men with their families—at the rate of £266,000 a year for the purpose of bringing out a mere pauper immigration—the importation of mere labourers to compete with those now living in the colony. A very large proportion of the immigrants indeed are of a very low class, and not worthy of being called working men. I think it is time for us to put a stop to that monopoly of old squatterdom which has rested for a quarter of a century as an incubus upon the colony, depressing its vital power and preventing its progress and prosperity. I protest at all events, as an individual member, against this frightfully extravagant system of immigration. I want to see a better system established. It is time we commenced to lay the foundations of this colony equitably, and

on a system which is likely to realise its grand destinies. We want to see our 247,000,000 acres put to the best possible use. I say nothing against the pastoral interest. No man ever heard me utter a word against the pastoral interest or speak of its being unimportant; nor would I do anything to militate against its prosperity. I believe the great pastoral interest would be enormously benefited if 3,000,000 of people were settled on the land. But above and before all I wish to see a great agricultural interest established in this colony. I object to an immigration of all labourers on another ground: we are laying the foundation of a great empire—of a great confederated nation—in Australia, and we have a large part of that duty to perform in Queensland. We should, therefore, take care to get together the very best material in laying that foundation. For the last sixteen or seventeen years we have been expending enormous sums of money in sweeping together—I am speaking of the work of the sub-agents at home, and not of the Agent-General, for I do not think he knows much about it—sweeping together, I say, the poorest of the people of England, and spending an enormous amount of money in bringing them out to this colony. It is high time we set about another system. I protest against the importation of mere labourers, who come in shiploads, month after month and year after year. To that kind of immigration is to be attributed the larrikinism in our streets. And then we are spending £200,000 a year in educating the children of these very people—an education which cannot improve them morally, and which unfits them for the ordinary duties of life. I hold in my hand the report of the Sheriff for 1884, from which it is plain that crime is greatly on the increase. It appears that the people in gaol at Brisbane are 50 per cent. more than they were in 1883; that at Rockhampton they have increased 50 per cent.; that at Roma there is an increase of 25 per cent.; and that there are great increases in several other gaols. I am also told on the best authority that the police of this town know where to find more than 100 persons who are living by their wits and preying on the public, and that a large proportion of them are recent arrivals in the colony. And the colony has paid £22 15s. 5d. for the importation of these scoundrels. Now, sir, I do hope that the Government will bring in a Bill for the establishment of a better system of immigration—a system that will attract people with money. We cannot do without money. We have a vast colony containing enormous wealth, but it requires money to develop it; and we must by some means induce the intelligent farmers who have a few hundred pounds in their pockets to come here, otherwise they will continue to be attracted by the gifts of land in Canada and the United States, to go there instead. I half believe that Sir Thomas McLlwraith;—I wish he had been here; it is a great disappointment to me that he is not;—I am disposed to believe that Sir Thomas McLlwraith thinks pretty much as I do on this question. I remember a speech of his in which he said everything that I have said; but infinitely better. He is reported to have said to the farmers at Allora a short time ago that the farmers of Queensland had a right to the production of all the breadstuffs that were consumed in this colony. Like many other remarks of that hon. gentleman, there is a very great deal of meaning in this. It means a great accession of farmers from somewhere. It does not mean that he is going to put a tax on flour; it means that we ought to have a great many of this class coming into the colony to settle on the land to grow our wheat and all other agricultural produce which now costs

us half-a-million of money every year. I hope we may calculate upon the able advocacy of that hon. gentleman, in order to realise his own grand idea, that all the farm produce consumed in Queensland shall be grown in Queensland. The leader of the Opposition reminded the Premier last session—and this is also a very suggestive remark, of which I took a note at the time—that there was no subject upon which the working men—and when we speak of working men we speak of the great bulk of our population—are so exceedingly touchy as on this subject of immigration. That is true, but why is it true? Because we have been importing mere labourers, or something lower than labourers. The remedy is what I have suggested in this resolution—that a proportion of the people coming out to the colony should cost us nothing, should bring money with them, should be of a superior class, should be possessed of those high virtues and qualities which are generally found to exist in the highest degree in what is called the middle class of England, Ireland, and Scotland. That is the class of people we want to see brought into this colony. And I am satisfied that if such a system as I have here advocated very feebly this afternoon, in connection with our magnificent public estate—about one-tenth of the whole—suitable for agricultural settlement, is carried out, we need never borrow another sixpence from the money-lenders in London.

Mr. ISAMBERT: Hear, hear!

Mr. JORDAN: I want to see our Land Act of last year worked in connection with such an Immigration Act as I should like to see carried, and which, I believe, must be carried before long; and if they are worked honestly together we need never borrow another sixpence after we have spent these ten millions of money which the House has already authorised. I am as firm a believer in the Land Act of 1884 as ever I was; indeed I am a firmer believer in it; but I want to see it worked in connection with an Immigration Act harmonious with it—which should naturally arise out of it—to make it a success. Then this colony will be not only the richest in the Australian group, but the richest and most prosperous colony of the British Crown. I must apologise for keeping the House so long; but what I have said may be summarised in five words: men, women, children, railways, money—this is all we want to make Queensland the richest colony under the British Crown. I move the resolution standing in my name.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I congratulate the hon. gentleman on the speech he has made to the House in introducing this question. It is one we know that he has very much at heart, and no one has had more experience of how a land-order system ought to be worked, or the advantage that may be derived from it than the hon. member himself, who was in charge of the working of the immigration to this colony under a land-order system for some years, during which a surprising number of persons were introduced. The hon. member has referred to a motion I made in this House three years ago, when I proposed an amendment to the Immigration Bill then before Parliament, with the object of reintroducing the land-order system in a modified form—modified, I mean, from the system which used to prevail, and which was open to all kinds of abuses. At that time the introduction of that clause would have done a great deal of good. It would have had the effect of attracting a great many people to the colony. But we must not forget that the land system of the colony then was very different from the present one. Men who took up country lands had then to pay for them, if not in cash,

by instalments extending over not more than ten years. The proposition I submitted then was to make a remission of as much as £30 on the price of land bought in the colony by immigrants who paid their own passages out. The inducements to settle on the land at that time were not satisfactory. Since then we have introduced a new system which has not yet, as we know, come practically into operation. It is beginning to come into operation now, and I hope that in another twelve months it will have come into full operation. When we framed that scheme we considered whether we should introduce a land-order system similar to the one I advocated in 1882. The question arose when the Government were framing the Bill, and also the question whether certain areas should be set apart for immigrants who might come out so that they might have an opportunity of settling together. These questions were very carefully considered, and the Government came to the conclusion at last that it was better not to include them in the Land Bill, for the reason that the inducements for settlement offered by the Bill were such that additional inducements would probably not be required. The importance of attracting agricultural settlers—not labourers, but farmers—to this colony is great. I consider it is one of the most important things we have to do; and we consider that the inducements offered to them under the Land Act of last year are very strong inducements indeed. Those inducements are beginning to be known in England, and I am glad to be able to tell the House that there is a very great demand in the Agent-General's Office for copies of the Act by people of the farming class who wish to come here. They have not been supplied till comparatively recently, because the Act and the regulations did not come into operation till March last. Large numbers have been supplied now to the Agent-General's Office, and I have every reason to anticipate that before long we shall find a very considerable influx of this much-to-be-desired class of immigrants. I look forward to that with every confidence, and I think, on the whole, therefore, that it is not practicable to deal with the subject as the hon. gentleman desires in the present session. Though I hold exactly the same views I held three years ago on the importance of attracting farmers to the colony, I think it is desirable that we should wait at any rate until next session, and see what will be the result of the working of the Land Act. When it has been properly brought under the notice of the people in England—a process which is going on now—when the attention of the farming class has been directed to it, we shall find before very long—probably within the next six or nine months—a considerable number of that class coming into the country. If that be so, I do not know that it is necessary that we should make people coming out here a present of £30 each—because giving a land-order amounts to losing so much of the revenue. It is simply a question which is the most profitable thing for us to do. The people who would come here for land-orders are not the class of people who now come having their passages paid; but the object of the hon. member is not so much to bring labouring people out here as to induce a farming class to bring out a certain amount of capital and settle on the land. I believe the subject of immigration, and the best means of attracting men to this colony, should be brought up from time to time. We cannot know too much about it, and we cannot think too much about it; for whatever means are best calculated to bring them here and induce them to settle on the land will be best adapted to secure the permanent prosperity of the colony. Under present circumstances I

think the hon. gentleman will obtain no practical end by pressing the motion during this session, but I trust that the discussion which will follow may be of advantage.

Mr. ARCHER: I am anxious to hear what the hon. gentleman at the head of the department has to say in reply to the statement of the hon. member for South Brisbane to the effect that the immigrants brought out here are paupers, labourers, and others.

The PREMIER: I did not hear that opinion expressed by the hon. member for South Brisbane, or I should certainly have stated my opinion. I have very good opportunities of knowing what kind of immigrants are brought out now. I read all the reports made by the despatching officers in England; and I am in a position to say that the immigrants selected by the department, whose passages are paid by the Government, are almost exclusively men of the class we desire to get—*bonâ fide* agricultural labourers. By that I mean men who understand how to cultivate the land, and who come here with the intention of going to work upon the land and making their living out of it—first as labourers, and afterwards as owners. Of course there are some few instances where the vigilance of the officers is evaded. The nominated passengers cannot be all of the same class. They are persons nominated by their friends, and who are allowed to have their passages, unless they are physically unfit or are of bad character. We cannot insist upon their being of a certain handicraft or upon their being agricultural labourers. Some of the bounty immigrants are not so good, which is rather disappointing to me, seeing that I had a good deal to do with the introduction of that system; but, as a rule, the immigrants coming here now are, I think, superior to any that have come before during the last few years. Though there are now and then a few black sheep, yet the number is very few. The most careful supervision is exercised, and the class of immigrants coming out now is extremely good. I have no hesitation in stating that as my opinion, after having carefully read all the reports from time to time and having obtained whatever information on the subject is available.

Mr. ARCHER said: Mr. Speaker,—The hon. member for South Brisbane has been complimented on the manner in which he introduced the motion before the House, and I may say that I had a certain amount of pleasure in listening to him. It is always pleasant to hear a man speak on a matter he has thoroughly at heart, and in which he thoroughly believes. There is no man who can be so eloquent as the seer of visions and the dreamer of dreams; but I regret to say that the hon. gentleman is, in my opinion, though a thorough believer in what he says, utterly ignorant of what would be the consequence if we were to introduce a larger number of the farming class than could find openings for themselves gradually; that is to say, if we were to introduce such a number of them, and place them on even the best land in the colony before they had seen whether the country was fitted for getting a living on. Let us examine the thing, not as a vision which one sees in his eye, but according to the facts which are before us. Suppose a large number of farmers came here to settle on the magnificent lands which are to be resumed, half of which the hon. member says are fit for agriculture. He said that 1,000,000 of acres will be resumed, and that half that quantity of land is fit for agriculture. I am certain—and I am not speaking from a squatter's point of view, because, to my cost, I know a great deal about agriculture—I am satisfied that if anyone keeps his eyes open, and sees only the facts, he must

come to the conclusion that instead of one-half of that land being capable of agriculture, not one-tenth is capable. I recently took a trip by rail from here to Ipswich, and I know of nothing more melancholy. I passed places where years ago orange trees were cultivated and gardens and orchards existed, but now I see nothing but the stumps of trees. I am not speaking of special places like the Darling Downs, though they perhaps have suffered enough during the last few years. It must be remembered that this is the first year of drought in the South, because the winter before that which has just passed was most abundant in rain in the southern part of Queensland. I was living here at the time; I attended the House, and stayed till January; and I do not remember a winter so favourable for agriculture as that was. There was almost constant rain; yet one year's drought has reduced this part of the country to such a state that the people on the grand lands of the Darling Downs do not expect to get a crop of wheat this year. I do not wish to exaggerate in any way, nor do I wish to discourage people from becoming farmers, but I wish to discourage people from holding out the hope to English farmers that they can come out here with a little money—say £200—and at once jump into the position occupied by those who have had years of experience of agriculture in Queensland. Let them come out by all means; but advise them to come out and go up to some such place as Rosewood, and if necessary take only 5s. a week, learning in the meantime the way things are done here. Then they can become successful farmers. It is ridiculous to tell men who, in a different climate, have farmed with the assistance of lots of ploughs and horses and men, that they can come out here and do exactly the same as those who have been here for years. That is a fallacy. It is an invention of the hon. gentleman's mind; but it is not natural that such a thing can be done. When you see a thing clearly in your mind's eye it is quite possible to describe it in that way; and that is what the hon. gentleman does. But those who really know what farming is in this country will deprecate any attempt being made to bring English farmers out here with the idea that they will be able to conduct their farms in the way in which they conducted them in the old country. That, of course, is a false picture for the hon. gentleman to paint. I have, of course, nothing to say as to the motion itself. If the Government wish to try the old system of land-grants I think they will make a great mistake. They have introduced a Bill and passed it into law—which has not yet, I am free to admit, come fully into operation—an Act which will allow land to be leased at a very low rental to anyone who chooses to take it up; and perhaps it is as well to wait and see the operation of that Act. I do not believe that when farmers at home hear that a farm can be taken up here for 5d. or 4d. an acre they will care very much about that rent. They pay very high rentals in England, and that rent will be looked upon as nothing. The rental for farms in the old country ranges from £1 per acre to £5 per acre, and that rental of course hangs like a millstone round the necks of the farmers. Therefore, I say, when they come out here they will not care very much whether they get the land for nothing or have to pay 3d. or 4d. an acre rental for it if they have imbibed the belief that they are going to become farmers straight away. No man, in my opinion, who has been a farmer at home can come here and invest his money to the best advantage until he has been in the country for some time, or, better still, until he has gone through the actual experience of a farm labourer in this country. The hon. gentleman refers very frequently to

other things. I must, in justice to the hon. member, say that he is always courteous to his opponents; but he is very fond, in fact, of laying flattery on his friends very thick. He talks about our far-seeing Premier doing this or that or the other thing; but the far-seeing Premier can only do things that are in the power of human beings to do. He cannot alter the natural features of the country, nor can he alter the seasons; but the great thing to impress upon the Premier, and on the Government generally, is the necessity of laying before the House a perfect and efficient system of water conservation. That is a matter that, if the hon. gentleman had collected some data upon, and had made a motion on the subject, laying all the information he had collected before hon. members, would have commanded some attention. If he had done that laboriously, going to the best authorities for his information—not painting a picture from a vision in his own mind, but actually taking the trouble to read up and acquire knowledge upon the subject—his labours would not have been in vain, but might have given the Ministry, who are no doubt anxious to do all they can to conserve water, a hint as to how to proceed. But that would have been a matter that would require care; it would require trouble; it would require really some deep thought in comparing the conditions of this country with the conditions of other countries. Simply speaking, a speech like that which the hon. gentleman has delivered, while it requires a certain amount of preparation in collecting statistics, is really of no practical value. It is easy enough to say all immigrants coming out here now are paupers—that they are a rubbishy lot—but what follows? The hon. member's terms are almost like figures of speech. That is not the way in which we can get anything like practical legislation. We must have facts to go upon; and I deny that the hon. gentleman has said anything that will tend in any way to advance the interest of farmers in this country. If the hon. gentleman had only taken the trouble to collect even the rubbish that has been written about irrigation he would have taken a far better step than he has taken to-day. I have seen the most absurd things written about irrigation as carried on in Queensland. For example, just before the hon. member for Darling Downs introduced his motion for purchasing the Canning Downs Estate, a portion of that estate was purchased by someone, and a letter was written to one of the Toowoomba papers, saying that was a step in the right direction—that they would now have lots of small farmers settled on the land, and they only wanted to adopt the system of Indian irrigation to put Queensland at the head of agricultural countries. Well, of course that is nonsense, for what is Indian irrigation? It is the diverting of fine running rivers over large tracts of land. What is the use of talking in that way in this country? Where are we going to get our rivers from? We must get the water first. That is a subject which, if the hon. gentleman had confined his attention to—not in the pleasing way in which it appears in newspapers, but in a well-considered way—would be of some practical use. Now, I object to one thing the hon. gentleman said. He said that the squatters had been an incubus—that they had stopped the progress of the country—but, further on, he said, “I have nothing to say against the squatters.” He says that they have been an incubus upon the country, and I ask hon. gentlemen what worse he could say? The fact is, that when a person speaks from imagination he is apt very often to say things which are not consistent one with another. The hon. gentleman might have said this with justice: “The squatters are now in possession of a great part of the country, particularly in the

West, and nobody would be in possession of it unless the squatters were.” That would have been true, at any rate; but that they are an incubus, and are stopping the progress of Queensland, is a question that is open to argument. I do not believe that they have been an incubus which has choked Queensland. But if he had said the other thing—that if the squatters had not settled the western country no one else would have been there—he would have said what was true. It would be better if the hon. gentleman had been a little more moderate in his language. He wandered away into saying that the Conservatives boasted that they were always called in to rescue the financial position of the colony—when the Liberals had made a muddle of it, in fact. I am not going to enter into that question. The hon. gentleman ought not to have touched upon it, because if he insists upon having the facts I can show several occasions when the so-called Conservative party have taken office when things have been very much muddled indeed, and left it with a good surplus. These things are facts, as can be easily shown; but it is not worth while to enter into them. It is not a question in point at all. I do not think that there will be any benefit resulting from passing this motion, nor do I think we should try to introduce the land-grant system again, certainly not in its old state, and not even, perhaps, in a new one. I think it would be far better for us if, when informing people in England that we have a large amount of landed estate to lease, we at the same time informed them that in coming out with a little money they ought to think carefully and not expect to find the conditions exactly the same as they are in England; and they ought to wait until they learn the circumstances of the colony, the nature of the climate, and what is possible and what is not possible, before they invest their money, and perhaps ruin themselves. If we give them that information and advise them—not only farmers with capital, but the actual labourers—to come here and work until they are able to gather information as to the means best adapted to the cultivation of the soil, and until they have gathered sufficient means to take up small pieces of their own, I am perfectly satisfied that they will be more successful men and more useful to the colony, and produce more than if they started farming on the English plan. I believe that, after all, the working men are the most valuable, and, surprising as it may seem to the hon. gentleman, who probably looks upon me as one of those “old fogey” squatters who wish to prevent the progress of agriculture in the colony, I am satisfied, from my own experience—and I have learned mine to my bitter cost, and I have cultivated a good deal in this country—I think it is the working man from England, and the farm labourer, who has come here and taken stock until he has earned a little money, who has been the most successful farmer. That is my opinion, and I believe, therefore, that that ought to be made known to those at home who have money. I go further than that. I know that many young gentlemen who came here in the early days, with money, and began as squatters, never did any good until they lost all the money they brought with them, and it will be the same with the farmers if they begin at once as farmers. I have not the slightest doubt that the hon. member for Stanley (Mr. White) will tell this House that a good Northumberland farmer would probably do better than the large tenant farmer who settled down alongside of him. I do not care much whether this motion is carried or not. I do not think it will lead to anything, and I am satisfied that, should there be any attempt to resuscitate the old system of land-orders, it will result in a failure.

Mr. MACFARLANE said: Mr. Speaker,—I think that the hon. member for South Brisbane, who introduced this motion, has shown that he thoroughly understands the subject upon which he has been talking. The hon. member for Blackall has said that the hon. gentlemen seemed to be “a seer of visions and a dreamer of dreams,” but I think the hon. member for South Brisbane foresaw twenty years ago what Queensland would be at the present time, and, I believe, greatly through his own efforts, his dreams and visions have to a great extent been realised. I think in this case also the hon. gentleman sees a vision, and he is justified in looking at it. He is looking over the past, and he is thinking of the successes that have attended his labours, which have been testified to by very many persons who came out at that time. The class of men sent out twenty years ago was of a very different character from those who have come out during the few past years. Many of those men brought out by the hon. member, who, as he said himself, had a little money when they came out, have proved the foundation of the colony. I know a great number who came out at about that time, and I do not know very many who have cause to regret that they did so. I have known farmers, even in the district that the hon. member for Stanley represents, who came out from the old country and took up land immediately, who have been successful farmers from the first. What does this prove? It proves that it is not the kind of men who come out, but the kind of land they are provided with. Let us provide them with the best agricultural land and farming will be a success. But it cannot be a success in such places as have been described by the hon. member for Blackall; we do not expect to see successful farmers in the Blackall district.

Mr. ARCHER: Does the hon. gentleman know where the Blackall district is?

Mr. MACFARLANE: I am referring to the land about Rockhampton, and I say we do not expect to see great crops there or successful farmers, nor do we even expect to see them along the railway line from Brisbane to Ipswich; but we can see them wherever proper land has been selected and parcelled out to them—the lands in the Fassifern district and Rosewood Scrub, and Laidley, and in the Warwick district. Most farmers in those districts have been really successful, and the reason is that they have had good land allotted to them. What made immigration in the early days so unsuccessful was that the men who came out found that the land which was open for selection by them consisted of barren ridges and waterless plains with which they could do no good. In order to ensure the success of the farmer he must be supplied with the best agricultural land. I believe that under the Act passed by this House last session good land will in future be provided for all who are able to settle on the land, and that it is the sincere wish of the Government to promote settlement and give farmers the best land possible. As the Land Act at present stands, it will be much improved by adopting such a motion as that which we have under consideration, as the scheme proposed is likely to induce people to come and settle in the colony. We are now bringing out people, many of whom, if they have sufficient funds to carry them out of the colony, leave shortly after their arrival. But if certain inducements are held out to them for the acquisition of land, and they are allowed sufficient time to secure the title of their holdings, whatever those holdings may be, these men will settle *bonâ fide* on the land and work with a view to future success. If the plan proposed in this motion be adopted it will be the

means of reducing the immigration vote. The Premier incidentally remarked, in the course of his speech, that the bounty system has to a certain extent been a failure; and I can easily imagine that it has. That system holds out inducements to parents who want to get quit of renegade sons, and those are not the kind of people it is desirable to introduce into the colony. But the system suggested in this motion would, I think, secure a better class of farmers, reduce the immigration vote, and generally tend to the advancement of the colony; and on those grounds I shall heartily support the proposal of the hon. member for South Brisbane. The hon. member for Blackall spoke of the hon. member for South Brisbane as saying that all the immigrants under the present system were paupers. I do not think the hon. member for South Brisbane made that statement; I heard him say that under the present system, until lately, a great number of people had been brought out, and many of them were almost worse than paupers; he did not say they were all paupers by any means. I shall support this resolution, with the sincere hope that it will be carried by the House.

Mr. CHUBB said: Mr. Speaker,—I would like to say a few words on this question; it is one, no doubt, of very great importance. No subject can have more interest for hon. members than one which has for its object the desire of populating this colony in the best manner. The question, although somewhat of an abstract nature, no doubt, in the future, may bear fruit. I believe in the land-order system, if it can be properly introduced and worked, and the abuses which might arise under it be prevented. One good effect the introduction of a scheme of this kind would have, which has not been touched upon by previous speakers, is this: It has been asserted, and I believe with considerable truth, that a great many of the immigrants who have come out during the past few years have really not come to Queensland in the sense of intending to remain here, but have availed themselves of our liberal conditions to get to Victoria, New South Wales, and the other colonies. They make use of Queensland as a means of getting to the older colonies. Now, sir, if we can induce a great many of our immigrants to pay their own passages, and receive in return an order entitling them to occupy so much land free of rent for so many years, or if the scheme can be so moulded as to bring it into accord with the land law of the colony, we should at once have a very effective check on the evasion of the Immigration Act. The evil of paying the passage of many people here on the way to Sydney would be avoided; and we should get a number of people of a very desirable class to settle here. It has also been said that the immigrants have not been of a good class; but I think that taking one year with another the immigrants are pretty much the same. No doubt a certain number of them are not a desirable class; but in introducing as many as we do, it follows as a necessary consequence that there must be some of them whom we should be better without. I cannot quite agree with the hon. member for South Brisbane that those 100 persons whom the police have put their fingers on as living by their wits are immigrants. I believe the greater part of them are members of the criminal class from the other colonies who have gravitated here. They have found Victoria or New South Wales too hot to hold them, and have come here for a change. I am satisfied, from my own observation, that the majority of the habitual criminals and the worst larrikins who are here are from the other colonies. Even if I am wrong, it ought not to be charged to the immigration system; it is

an incident of a large city. Brisbane is now becoming a very large city indeed, and in all large communities where people congregate together there will be found a class of this kind who live on their wits or by the earnings of women of bad character. There will always be found a substratum of that kind, do what you will, and it is not fair to blame it on the immigration system or say it is the result of laxity of supervision. I believe the Agent-General's Office exercises the best possible supervision over the emigrants who come here. That they are taken advantage of occasionally I believe to be natural; it is impossible to avoid that. I do not know that there is very much more to be said on this question. The hon. member for South Brisbane exhausted it very thoroughly in introducing the motion. I agree with the principle of it, and shall vote for it. I believe any scheme having for its object the prosperity and welfare of this colony, and the improvement of its inhabitants, is one that ought to receive the consideration and the hearty support of hon. members of this House.

Mr. KATES said: Mr. Speaker,—I agree with the hon. member who has just sat down, that after the able speech of the hon. gentleman who introduced the motion there is very little to say on it. It is my intention to vote for this motion because it will tend to increase the farming population and advance the agricultural interests of the colony. At the same time I wish to say a few words on what fell from the hon. member for Blackall. I can assure you, sir, I was very much grieved at the speech made by that hon. member. According to him farming appears to be played out in this colony. Last night we heard the sugar industry was dying; we know that the pastoral interest is also failing, and now if farmers are played out, what will become of the colony? But I have a better opinion of the farmers. I believe this will be a great home for farmers from all parts of Europe. The hon. member for Blackall asked what the farmers would do with their produce if we get so many in the country? If he will consider that we are now sending away £500,000 or £600,000 every year to the other colonies for the necessaries of life, he must admit there is room for a good many farmers here yet. The hon. member told us he had not been a successful farmer—that he had lost money by farming. That is not the class of farmer the hon. member for South Brisbane wishes to introduce into this colony—men like the hon. member for Blackall. What I believe the hon. member wishes to introduce are men with families—large families, if possible—every one of whom can put their shoulders to the wheel and assist in the farming—men who can work for themselves, and not hire others to do their work. Such men I have known in this country to be very successful. I know a great many people who came here fifteen or twenty years ago who had not the value of a little pig, and now they have horses and cattle, money in the savings bank, and live comfortably. Those are the people we wish to come to this country, and we are likely to get them if we adopt the system recommended by the hon. member for South Brisbane. If the hon. member for Blackall would just take the trouble to go up to some parts of the Downs—say Swan Creek or Spring Creek, or Freestone Creek—he would see two-story brick buildings belonging to the farmers, comfortably located, and he would see most of the farmers driving in their buggies into town.

Mr. ARCHER: I have no doubt they were working men.

Mr. KATES: They were working men. These farmers are very comfortable, and I would

like to see thousands of the same kind of men coming to this colony. The hon. member for Blackall appears to have very contracted notions of what a farmer is. He says that the growing of wheat or maize is all that comes within the province of a farmer. I maintain that we can grow more than wheat and maize in this colony.

We can grow in the tropics and in the semi-tropics a variety of things which we have not yet introduced. We can grow sugar as well as wheat; we can grow rice, tobacco, maize, lucerne, and all varieties of agricultural produce. We find that even the greatest squatters on the Darling Downs are becoming the greatest farmers. Some of them have gone into cultivation to a large extent, having from 1,000 to 1,500 acres producing grasses and lucerne. When anything is grown by the tillage of the soil I call that farming. The hon. member for Blackall said if the hon. member for South Brisbane had introduced a motion for the conservation of water he would have done much better, but I think a question of that kind should be introduced, not by a private member, but by the Government. It is not to be expected that a private member could go to all the trouble and expense of gathering information from all parts of the world for the purpose of submitting a water conservation scheme to this House. I was glad the other evening to hear the Premier promise that during the early part of next session he will introduce a scheme for the preservation and storage of water. And in respect to the question of irrigation, the hon. member for Blackall, if he will take the trouble to visit the Darling Downs, will see that a system of irrigation has been already introduced there with the greatest success. One gentleman there has 100 acres under irrigation alongside King's Creek, and the oats are from 3 feet to 4 feet high. He is also producing other kinds of grasses which he could not have produced this year without irrigation. I find there is more water to be got underneath our feet in this colony than the people imagine. A man sinking for water the other day at Goomburra found it in considerable quantity at a depth of 22 feet. From what the hon. member for South Brisbane said, I understand that the intention is not to introduce the land-order system here, but to get people out here who will be willing and in earnest to settle on the land. His proposition is that at the expiration of ten years, by which time they will have shown their *bona fide* intention of residing amongst us, we should give them a remission of rent or of purchase money. No hon. member can reasonably object to such a motion as the hon. member has introduced. On the question of the agricultural industry itself I want to say a few words. It appears that all farmers here are like orphans. They have neither a father nor a mother in this colony. They have here no special department to fly to or communicate with in case they require information. What we require is a bureau of agriculture, such as is established in other parts of the world—a special department of agriculture, somewhat similar to what is to be found in the United States of America, or even in Victoria, and such as is established in all parts of the Continent. The special bureau in the United States of America distributed last year 22,000 packages of seeds and new plants amongst the agricultural population. There is nothing of that kind here, and our agricultural industry would certainly be very much benefited if such a department was created in this colony to give information as to analysis of soil, as to the character of the various districts of the colony, and as to what can be produced in the South and in the North. There are many hundreds and thousands of things that could be produced

in this colony if they were only tried. We can produce in the North spices, coffee, and other things if a little encouragement is given by the Government, or by such a department as the one I have suggested. As I said before, it is my intention to support the motion. I believe it will have a good effect. It will bring to our shores men of the right stamp. Our immigration system hitherto has been, to my mind, a failure. As has been pointed out, we are expending on it £270,000 annually, and I maintain we have got no value for our money. I do not wish to condemn all our immigrants. Some good people have been imported, but a great many of them had better have stayed where they were, for to import such as they are at the expense of the State is not desirable and should not be encouraged. I hope the motion will be carried. It is certainly very moderate, and I do not think the Government can go against it. I am sure it will be followed by nothing but good results.

Mr. PALMER said: Mr. Speaker, — This is but a formal proposition, as I take it, and nothing will come of it at the present time except discussion. The discussion, however, will be of some advantage, especially in connection with the immigration vote. The hon. member who introduced the motion has been complimented on his speech, and justly so. It was a very forcible one, but he would have added more force to it if he had told us how many of the immigrants who had received land-orders in early years used those orders for the cultivation of the soil and are now making use of them for that purpose. I am afraid there are not a score or even a dozen of them who are now successful cultivators of the soil. Indeed, I suppose the hon. member has sufficient colonial experience by this time to know that if you put a freshly arrived immigrant on the soil of this country to cultivate it the experiment will only end in his utter ruin. Until he has had two, three, or five years of colonial experience—has become acclimatised, and knows how to work the soil in this country—he must be a failure. It is evident that his home knowledge, however useful it may be in some respects, is not sufficient to make him a successful farmer immediately after his arrival in the colony. I must admit that the most successful farmers in this colony are the German immigrants. There are no men who take so kindly to the soil and become such successful cultivators as the Germans. I suppose the reason is to be found in their bringing up—that they are taught to look upon the cultivation of the soil as not being the meanest occupation in the land. The reason why our own race look upon agriculture with disfavour is that they have come to look upon it from a very different point of view; and indeed the labour returns show that farming is the poorest paid work of any in the colony. There were of course many men who went into farming who did not succeed because they were unfitted for it, and the hon. member for Stanley (Mr. White) spoke telling words the other evening when he said that only those who had the true ring of the metal in them came triumphantly out of the ordeal. He was very near the mark when he said that, because for one who succeeds half-a-dozen fail. It is a pleasure to see those German immigrants taking so kindly to the soil and making themselves homes. It has already been pointed out that the men who do come out to this colony were not cultivators of the soil at home. Many of them come from manufacturing towns, and know little or nothing about agriculture. I have noticed, both here and in New South Wales, that men of the real farming class are always in demand. I never saw the time in New South Wales when a farming or labouring man could not get good wages, while at

the same time the towns were flooded with scores of the unemployed of other classes. The hon. member (Mr. Jordan), who knows something about immigration matters, informed us that the cost of each adult immigrant was £22 15s., and that there were enormous expenses connected with the system. I notice, in the Auditor-General's report, that the amount paid for contingencies at home is no less than £39,000. That seems an outrageous sum for mere contingencies. There must be a vast amount of money spent needlessly when contingencies in the London office cost £39,000 out of a total expenditure of £266,000. I cannot help remarking a little on the inconsistency of the hon. member, although I admire his proposition. Yesterday he helped to condemn an industry in the North—the sugar industry—to what I am afraid will be utter extinction, whilst admitting that he had never been in the North and knew nothing whatever of the conditions under which sugar was produced. To-day he is offering free grants of land to immigrants. When the Minister for Lands introduced his Land Bill last year he had not a more fervent admirer than the hon. member who moved this motion; and the leading principle of that measure was directly opposed to free grants of land. The hon. member must have relinquished a good portion of his belief in the principle of the Land Act before he could advocate the giving away of land as an inducement to immigrants. Nothing will induce people to settle on the soil faster than to allow them to acquire the freehold of the country in as easy a manner as possible; and if this motion will only lead to some inquiry into the whole question of immigration, and the class of people who are coming out, it will have a very good effect. The people coming out are not altogether the class we require; they need more sorting, weeding out, and culling than they get at home. I notice in the report of the lunatic asylum the enormous numbers of fresh arrivals who are in that institution. Some of them have been in the colony only a month, others two months, and several under six months. The proportion of new arrivals that are treated there is quite astonishing. That is a proof that the people who come out want a little revising at home. The hon. gentleman deserves credit for his motion, and I trust that the discussion on it will result in good.

Mr. ISAMBERT said: Mr. Speaker,—I must also add my tribute of praise to the hon. member who introduced this motion; he is to be congratulated on the manner in which he brought it forward. The hon. member for Blackall speaks of him as a man who “sees visions and dreams dreams.” But that has been said of every great benefactor of mankind who had the welfare of his fellows at heart, and instead of that being derogatory to the hon. member, it is rather an additional compliment. He was as eloquent as only a man can be who is speaking on a subject which he has really at heart, and the hon. gentleman has this additional advantage: that he has had more experience in matters of immigration than any other member of the House. It must be accepted as a fact that under the land-order system a large number of immigrants did come out of the most useful class. But it is also a fact that very few of them actually settled on the land by virtue of those land-orders. In fact, so many of them sold their land-orders that the buying of them was one of the most profitable industries of the time. By means of those land orders the Darling Downs was rendered as good as a desert. Instead of being the granary of Queensland, it has been converted into a sheep-walk, and sheep have walked over it for such a length of time, and so many thousands and

thousands of tons of substance have been taken from it to make wool, tallow, and horns, that it will hardly grow anything now but weeds. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that a system which was good in many respects also had its defects. To some extent I share the pessimist views of the hon. member for Blackall. It must be borne in mind that the immigrants we have in the colony are not all fit for one occupation—are not all agriculturists, however desirable such a class may be; and it was owing to this that many arrived with land-orders who were not adapted to agricultural pursuits, and they were only anxious to sell their land-orders as quickly as possible. Many of those who did settle on the land by means of those land-orders came to grief, as well as those who arrived here with plenty of money in their pockets and embarked in agriculture. Even if they understood it at home, they were comparative strangers to the new conditions of climate and seasons here, and by the time they had gained their experience they were almost ruined. As a rule those who came out first as labourers are now the most successful farmers. Whenever I have been asked by new arrivals with money, and anxious to settle on the land, what they should do, I have advised them to put their money into the savings bank, and, as if they were without a single shilling, go to work and gain experience of the ways of the colony. Then the money they earned, together with what they had put into the savings bank, would stand them in good stead, and give them a successful start when they were in a position to settle on the land. That has been my advice, and I believe it coincides with what fell from the hon. member for Blackall. I have heard it mentioned that the Premier has thrown cold water on the motion. So he has. What will be the effect of this motion? Does the hon. gentleman intend to settle people on areas of 2,000 or 3,000 acres? His idea is to settle farmers on small areas—on homesteads of 160 acres. Now we come to a remark made by the Premier. As far as homesteads are concerned, the Land Act, defective as it may be, in some ways is as liberal as any previous Act; and the Act has been amended so that there may be no mistake. Homesteads may be acquired at 2s. 6d. per acre. Suppose an immigrant pays his own passage and gets a homestead free of charge under these conditions: it would amount to only £20, which he has not to pay all at once. And what is £20 to a farmer when once fairly settled on the land? It is nothing; the chief difficulty is in the beginning, when he cannot afford to lay out much money in farming; and under the existing Land Act only small annual instalments have to be paid. That is the reason why the owners of scrub farms are so successful. They only need an axe, a cross-cut saw, and a hoe; they can cut down the scrub, hoe up the rich loose soil, which is free from weeds, and go in for cultivation without the aid of expensive machinery, horses, and ploughs, for a few years. After a few years they stump the ground and buy horses, ploughs, and machinery, and become successful farmers. Considering this, the Premier is correct. With our liberal Land Act, defective as it is in some respects, the motion of the hon. member for South Brisbane will not have such a great effect as he fancies. We must look at these matters from both sides; and it strikes me that before long there will have to be a change. Just as before a storm we see little whirling clouds going round which are of the same nature as the great storm which also is moving with a rotatory motion, so the remarks of hon. members go round and round the motion. We have heard that two of the industries which have been the mainstay

of the colony in the past—the pastoral industry and the agricultural industry so far as it is comprised in the sugar industry—are almost ruined by virtue of the lowering of prices. It is not the black labour question, but the lowering of the prices of sugar and of pastoral produce—wool, tallow, and hides—that has caused this; and those who have the interests of the colony at heart ought to know that we cannot go on much longer in this way, and that the millions that are lost to the colony by the lowering of the price of the produce cannot be counterbalanced by any amount of money which we borrow, but do not get in the colony. This shows that the policy of borrowing needs reform. The hon. member for South Brisbane says he believes in men, women, and children, profitably employed and with plenty of money, so that we shall have no necessity for any more borrowing. Those are the objects which the hon. member desires, and they also are my aspirations; and I nail my colours to the mast on the question. I only wish I had sufficient power of language to adequately express my views on this momentous question in the manner it deserves; and I can assure you I would keep the House spellbound for the rest of the evening. We spend £270,000 a year on immigration, and what do we get for it? What have we got for the millions that have already been spent? We could have attracted as many immigrants—perhaps more of a better class—with such an expenditure. It has been done before—chiefly through the instrumentality of the hon. member for South Brisbane, Mr. Jordan—and I believe it can be done again; but I do not quite agree with him as to the means. I am at one with him in his aspirations; but I believe the same object could be attained by a different method—by reforming our policy so as to protect our industries and attract immigrants from Europe. We cannot all be farmers, or tradesmen, or merchants; and we must not put all our eggs into one basket. We must not depend on the squatting industry or the sugar industry; we must put our eggs into smaller baskets and have more of them, and then if a crisis should come it will not be so hard on the colony. Whilst one class will be suffering the other will not be suffering, and others again may be prosperous. Where the hon. gentleman was wrong was that he confounded cause with effect. Now, the settlement of the people upon the land, and making them happy and prosperous, cannot be effected by painting such glowing pictures as have been painted by the hon. member for South Brisbane. We ought to attract people so that when they do come here they can at once profitably employ their own skill and labour and money, and not let them run the gauntlet of losing everything. We ought to make the colony prosperous by adopting such a system as will make it prosperous, and then the prosperity of the colony will make every colonist or citizen an immigration agent. If that system were adopted, all we should require would be good shipping clerks in England and on the Continent, and see that only good immigrants came out. If such immigrants came out they would at once be taken in hand by their friends, and profitably employed in the way in which German immigrants are. I have taken the trouble to make inquiries where the German immigrants go—and it is known that thirty or forty families arrive here in some of the immigrant ships, and within twenty-four hours they are out of the depot and away. They are taken away by their friends, and in a few weeks or months they are placed upon pieces of land which are all ready for them; or, with the money they bring out, they are enabled to buy property and become productive colonists. They

are at once the cheapest labourers we can get. I have been lately in conversation with a friend who said that the farmers in the southern parts of the colony were always successful, because they employed the cheapest labour. I said, "What labour?" he replied, "Their own, which is the cheapest labour they can get." We want farmers to settle upon the land with families, every member of which helps to work up to independence and comfort. Ten years ago I remember listening to a lecture delivered in the Ipswich School of Arts, in which it was said that Queensland was not fit for sugar plantations but for sugar-farming, and that prediction seems to have proved true. I will not delay the House any longer, but to give effect to my views I will move an amendment on the motion of the hon. member for South Brisbane. I move that all the words after the word "desirable," on the 3rd line, be omitted, with a view of inserting the following words: "to adopt such a policy as will do away with the necessity of borrowing money, very little of which the colony of Queensland ever actually receives, and at the same time would encourage the establishment and development of native industries, and thereby render Queensland prosperous and attractive to intending industrious European immigrants."

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the question—put.

Mr. BAILEY said: Mr. Speaker,—I would ask your opinion as to whether that amendment can be put? It is irrelevant to the question.

The SPEAKER: I think the amendment can be put.

Mr. BAILEY said: I must frankly confess that I was quite unable to follow the discursive though eloquent speech of the hon. member for Rosewood. It is the second eloquent speech which we have heard this evening on the same question, but I hope the House will take a more practical view of the subject than the hon. member for South Brisbane or the hon. member for Rosewood. To my mind the question is a very simple one. I myself came to Queensland with the intention of settling upon the land at the time Mr. Jordan was Immigration Agent at home for the colony. I had not the pleasure of his acquaintance. I was not one of his "lambs," in fact, but I came out with the idea of settling on the land, and I may say this: that if I had trusted to his glowing lectures, or placed any faith in his oratorical flights, I should have done as many others have done—I should have bitterly cursed Mr. Jordan in my heart and with my mouth. I have heard men who were brought out under this land-order system and settled upon the land; I have heard those men, after they had suffered misery, deprivation, poverty, and hardship through coming here to a business of which they knew little or nothing—coming to a country, the surroundings of which were foreign to them, and to seasons of which they knew less than nothing—I have heard those men—hard-working men who had sacrificed their money and their health in trying to make a living in a new land, curse the system that ever forced them, in an untimely way, into what is called "settling upon the land." A greater delusion there never was. Some men have the idea that you can bring men out from England, farmers or no farmers, and put them upon the land and tell them to get their living. They will lose every sixpence and get into a state of poverty, and sell their land. The gentlemen who are in favour of a motion of this kind are the class of men who are waiting to grab the lands of these farmers. In nineteen cases out of twenty the lands occupied by those people who were decoyed into the colony have fallen into the hands of land agents and large landholders, who hold

them to this day. I think it is cruel and unjust on the part of the people of this country, with the knowledge we have now, to hold out false hopes to the English people to come out with their £200 or £300. If we were to say, "Come out to earn wages, and when you have saved money we will make you a liberal offer of land wherever and whenever you please," it would be quite another thing altogether. But to induce men to come from England by saying, "If you pay your passage money, and have £200 in your pocket, we will give you so much land and force you to settle upon it, and do what you cannot do," as we know very well indeed we shall make them lose every sixpence they have, and bring themselves and their families to destitution—and then, who will hold the land afterwards? On the Darling Downs you can see who holds it. I object to any Government—as a mere fad, a matter of sentiment, being led away by the eloquence of the hon. member for South Brisbane or the hon. member for Rosewood—giving away their practical knowledge as it were, and misleading and luring people of a certain class in England to their certain destruction. It is possible that one in twenty may escape. There may be one man, as said by the hon. member for Stanley, Mr. White, who has the ring of true metal about him. Nothing but the most dogged obstinacy and almost stupidity on my part enabled me to hold my land until this day; and God forbid that any man should go through what I did in those early times. I would be very sorry to see any man go through it. To put a man upon land in the unsettled parts of the colony, away from all the comforts and most of the necessities of life, and force him to struggle for a living, is a rank cruelty.

Mr. ANNEAR said: Mr. Speaker,—I have listened to many empty speeches, but I think the most empty one I have ever listened to was that just delivered by the hon. member for Wide Bay, Mr. Bailey. On many occasions I have heard the hon. gentleman who so ably introduced this motion lecture in England, and I have never heard any of those misstatements that have been referred to by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. I may say that one of Mr. Jordan's lectures that I listened to so convinced me that I decided to make Queensland my home. The hon. gentleman spoke about farmers not being successful in this colony. I do not wonder at farmers not being successful, or any other man who takes up land and settles down upon it and does nothing to it. But, sir, I could go alongside the hon. member for Wide Bay and point out scores of farmers on the Mary River who are in the position referred to by the hon. member for Darling Downs this evening, who are in a prosperous condition, and have their buggies and pairs of horses and drive to market and to church with their families on Sundays. That is the class of men that was introduced into this colony by the hon. member for South Brisbane—some men who have made their fortunes and are now enjoying them in the old country—some of them my most intimate acquaintances. There never was a motion introduced into this House that could have a better effect in settling people in this colony than that introduced by the hon. gentleman if it is carried out. We are told we expend between £260,000 and £270,000 in introducing immigrants into this colony from England; but by the system proposed by the hon. gentleman we shall be able to do away with one-half of that expenditure. If I understand aright, people will have to be settled on their land for five or ten years before they get these land-grants or get one farthing from the State, and that will be sufficient to prove whether they intend to be *bonâ fide* settlers of the country. The hon. member for Burke, Mr.

Palmer, asked how many of those who had received land-orders had settled upon the lands of the colony. When I left home I thought that the land-order was of not much value; but I paid my passage. I think the hon. member, Mr. Jordan, gave me one land-order before I left the Clyde, in Scotland, and when I had been in the colony for two years I received another. I sold them, because the law at that time permitted me to do so; but under the system that the hon. gentleman wishes to introduce there will be no selling allowed at all. I believe I speak correctly when I say that the hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Macfarlane, and some other hon. members, came out under the same system as I did. We are not farmers, but I hope we are members of the community who have tried, in some way, to do something to make this colony what it has now become. The countries that are wealthy are those that are producing countries. What do we see at the present time on the wharves, not in Brisbane alone, but at Rockhampton, Maryborough, and other places in the North? We see scores of thousands of pounds' worth of produce brought from Victoria and New South Wales every year. I am always receiving lessons, and I received a very good one the other day from the hon. member for Darling Downs, Mr. Kates. I was travelling with that hon. gentleman in the train from Toowoomba to Warwick, and he asked me to take notice of the settlers on both sides of the line and said, "Wherever you see a farm there is a beautiful green spot; you will see lucerne growing and maize growing, and full and plenty at each place, with cattle and horses, and everything in a flourishing condition." From Toowoomba to Warwick, wherever there is a farm, everything is green and flourishing; but the hon. gentleman said, "Where you see those barren wastes, that land belongs to the squatters; it does not belong to the farmer at all, but to the squatter, and that land is used for raising sheep." We have millions of acres of land in this colony that will raise sheep. Sheep and cattle must be raised, but by this motion of the hon. member for South Brisbane, if we get 3,000,000 people into this colony, that land will be utilised, and become as those nice farms that I have faintly tried to describe. I think it is a very serious attack to make upon the hon. member for South Brisbane. I do not believe that any gentleman who was ever employed in the service of this colony did so much good to the State as that hon. gentleman did when he was the servant of the people of Queensland. I have heard that hon. gentleman in Plymouth as well as in Falmouth, and I never heard him make, to my knowledge, an exaggerated statement. I was very glad to get information from him, and very glad I came to Queensland, because I know I have made for myself a position here that I should never have made had I remained in the old country.

Mr. McMASTER said: Mr. Speaker,—I must say that in one sense I was rather surprised to hear the statement made by the hon. member for Wide Bay, and yet he made some very truthful remarks. The hon. member stated that we ought not to encourage the people of England to come out here and settle upon the land when they know nothing about farming. I believe that that is the class of farmers who fail in the colony—men such as the hon. member for Wide Bay himself, who come out and settle on the land without knowing anything about farming or tilling the soil. But that is not the class of people the hon. member for South Brisbane wishes to bring to Queensland. There are two classes of farmers who ought not to be encouraged, or rather two classes of people who ought not to be encouraged to settle on the land. The first is the man who knows nothing at all

about farming, and the second is the gentleman farmer. Both these classes are almost sure to fail. The hon. member for South Brisbane desires to secure a middle class of farmers. I have had some experience in farming myself, and am therefore able to speak on this matter from personal knowledge. I am quite sure that a man who comes out thinking that he will succeed, because he happens to have a few hundred or, perhaps, a few thousand pounds, and goes farming on the same scale and on the same plan he has carried out, or seen carried out, in the old country—either England or Scotland—will fail unless he puts his own hand to the plough. The gentleman farmer usually spends his time in the city, or, at any rate, away from home, and does not see what is going on; and it is possible too that, having had no experience in farming, he does not know when the work is properly done or when a ploughman does a day's work. The consequence of this is that, in all probability, his men take advantage of him. The failure of the other man who settles upon the land, knowing nothing about farming, causes me no surprise. Every man to his trade—a farmer to farming. I am quite sure the hon. member for Wide Bay was never intended for a farmer. He seems to have been intended for a politician; he is in his right place now, and does very much better in the House than on a farm. I know farmers who have come here and settled on the land without any money; all they had was skill—they knew how to till their farms, and have prospered. I know one man, whom I have in my mind at the present time, who told me himself that when he commenced farming he had not a coat to his back, but he had a good flannel shirt, a pair of trousers, an axe, and a cross-cut saw; and he succeeded, and is now lending out money by the hundred. He is living on some of that land between here and Ipswich which we heard described this afternoon by the hon. member for Blackall, I think, as desolate-looking country. I also know other farmers who have settled on their farms with very little capital—some with none—and who have succeeded, and are now living comfortably on the interest of their money. I never had the pleasure of hearing the hon. member, Mr. Jordan, lecture in England—I came here many years before he went home—but I have gone among a large number of those whom he induced to come out here, and so far as my experience goes I must say that a better class of immigrants never came to this colony than those sent out by the hon. member for South Brisbane when he was Agent-General in England. The class of men he wants to see coming here are those who have had some experience at home. I have known a farmer at home who had done well and was in a comfortable position. One of his sons would plough all day, another would be threshing in the barn—I have seen them threshing with flails, as mills were not so plentiful in those days—the daughter looking after the household and out in the morning milking the cows, and the father going about from place to place, superintending everything and seeing that all was going on well. This is the class of people who succeed and live comfortably, and, as we have heard they do in this colony, go to church on a Sunday. You will see an English farmer of this kind tilling a farm of fifty or sixty acres, and living comfortably. If such people came out here they would be little dukes in the place, comparatively speaking; and it is such a class, as I understand the matter, that the hon. member for South Brisbane wishes to introduce into Queensland. There is no doubt that the land-order system, like all other systems when they are new, was taken advantage of

by many, and possibly it was a very great loss to the colony. The law of the land allowed immigrants to sell their land-orders, and some of them did sell them, as was done by the hon. member for Maryborough; but I would not allow any land-order to be transferred, but would insist upon the person who obtained one settling upon the soil, and would allow him the price of his land-order either in rent or in purchase of the fee-simple. I believe if we adopted a course of that kind we should encourage a class of people to come here who would eventually be the bone and sinew of the colony. A great deal has been said about this colony not being fit for farming. It is many years ago since that statement was first made. It is many years since I heard of a member of the House stating that the Darling Downs could not grow a cabbage; but now, as we have been informed by the hon. member for that district, the Darling Downs is the granary of Queensland. But not one-twentieth part of the lands in that part of the colony are settled as they ought to be. I think we ought to look round and see whether we cannot do something to keep in the country the large amount of capital that is going to the southern colonies from this colony for produce which we can grow ourselves. Let us encourage the class of men to come out here who know something about farming—at all events, something more than the hon. member for Wide Bay. I am afraid that the system of introducing immigrants to come out here is a bad one. I never believed in those immigration agents who collected men and got paid a commission for their work. What do they care whether the class of men they send out are worth £20 to the colony, or whether we shall have to keep them in gaol or somewhere else after they arrive? So long as they get their commission the agents care nothing at all about the class of men sent out. If responsible agents were fixed in the agricultural districts of England, Ireland, and Scotland we should have a class of people sent out who would be the bone and sinew of the colony, and who would soon be able, as the hon. member for Maryborough has said, after they had a little experience in practical management, to teach others how to till the soil. I intend to vote for this motion, although I do not see that much good can come of it this session. I believe, however, that it will do good, and I hope that the Government will see their way to do something next session to get a better class of immigrants than are now arriving in the colony. I am not going to say that the whole of the immigrants, or half of them, are paupers, or men unsuitable for the colony; but there is no doubt that any person who has any knowledge of agriculture, or of what agricultural labourers are, must see that a large number of the immigrants coming here are not altogether of the kind which we desire to see introduced into the colony. They do not know anything about manual labour in any shape or form, and they do not want to know. That is not the class of people we want; we want men to settle on the soil, and very soon after they do settle they will employ others.

Mr. FRASER said: Mr. Speaker,—If my hon. colleague has no cause to congratulate himself that anything else has resulted from his motion, he may congratulate himself on having opened up a very animated and very interesting discussion. Now, sir, the question before us is the amendment of the hon. member for Rosewood. When listening to that hon. member I am always reminded of a celebrated Liverpool merchant, the late Sir William Brown. On whatever occasion and for whatever purpose he came on a public platform—

it did not matter what his speech was or where he began—he was sure to end on one subject—the decimal system. That was to reform the world, commercially and otherwise. Now, sir, the hon. member for Rosewood may begin with immigration, or may begin with anything else, but he is certain to end on one subject—protection. That is the panacea for all the ills and shortcomings and aillings to which this wretched country is subject. However, sir, I rose principally to express my sympathy with the views expressed by my hon. colleague. He, in common with the hon. member for Rosewood, has a hobby, but it is a notorious fact, which we must all recognise, that it is the men who have a hobby, and who ride it almost to death, who ultimately succeed in achieving any great result. Now, sir, I do not know that any great practical result can come of the hon. member's motion this evening, but I think it will have this effect—it has given hon. members an opportunity of expressing their opinion, and of showing to the world what that opinion is. I think we are all agreed upon one thing—that a country can be neither successful nor great without a population, and a population of the right sort. The hon. member for Wide Bay would give one the impression that we have no right to invite people out here until we have prepared the country for them—until we have their farms ready, the land cleared, and every convenience for them to settle down and become prosperous. He may have heard, as I have, men denouncing the hon. member for South Brisbane for having been the means of inducing them to come to this colony; and I remember—I think I have told the story before—coming once across from South Brisbane in the same boat with a good old Irish lady, who, in the broadest vernacular, expressed a wish that she had Mr. Jordan there and then, that she might give him a ducking. I am happy to say I have lived long enough to see her thankful to Mr. Jordan for inducing her and her family to come to Queensland. The hon. member for Burke asks how many of these people who have settled on the land were helped by the land-order system to do so. I am in a position to tell that hon. gentleman that I can count them by the score with whom I am very well acquainted. It is true the system was abused—it was made use of to get hold of some of the finest land in the colony; that was the weak point in the system—but it had its advantages, and of those advantages hundreds in this colony are reaping the benefit at the present time. I have perhaps, as extensive an acquaintance with the farming population of this part of the colony as any man in this House; and I venture to say, without fear of contradiction or challenge, that there is no class in the community at this moment, bad as the times are, in so comfortable a position as the agricultural section of the community in Southern Queensland. I can also bear out what fell from the hon. member for Rosewood. I know men who have told me they landed without a pound they could call their own, and who are now not only comfortable, but are lending money—I have done it for them—to their poorer neighbours and helping them to attain the position they themselves have acquired. We are asked what we get for the money we spend on our immigration system. We have got the greater part of the population of the colony at the present time. Every immigrant costs us £22, but why should we not value the immigrant as highly as they do in America? The calculation is, that every immigrant who lands on the shores of America is worth to the country, at the least, something like £100. If we can get £100 for £22, I think we are getting an ample consideration. Neither do I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the immigrants have been of the character described

by hon. members to-night. I thoroughly agree with the views expressed by the hon. member for Bowen, and the best proof is this: We get immigrants by vessel after vessel, and if you go to the immigration dépôt a week or two after a vessel arrives, how many are remaining there? Comparatively few. Necessarily, amongst the large number of immigrants, there are some not in every respect suitable, but we cannot help that. I know we have an excellent lecturer in England now. I do not know that he is quite so enthusiastic as my hon. friend, Mr. Jordan; but he is a thorough enthusiast in the matter, and he does not gather immigrants from the cities and towns. He devotes his time entirely to bringing this colony and its advantages under the notice of the purely agricultural labourers—the population of the agricultural districts of England; and I may add, from my own knowledge, that he is eminently successful. I have seen a large number of those whom he has been the means of sending, and I have no doubt that in a few years we shall find them proving an unspeakable advantage to the colony, as well as conferring benefit upon themselves. I had not intended to speak on this matter, but felt stirred on the subject during the discussion. I also desired to take an opportunity of alluding to a remark which I made on a former occasion on a question affecting the farmers of this colony. An unfair advantage has been taken of the remark to which I refer. When a question brought forward by the hon. member for Darling Downs was under consideration, I alluded to an attempt that was being made to coddle the farmer. The hon. member and you yourself, Mr. Speaker, inferred, I think, that I meant that the farmers of this colony had been coddled. I never meant anything of the kind. That was not what I said. At all events, it was not what I meant. What I meant to say was, that the attempt being made by the hon. member for Darling Downs was one to coddle the farmers of that district—to furnish them with crutches, instead of letting them fight their own battles, and casting them upon their own resources. I have been a member of Parliament for a very long time, and I am sure no one would believe that I would say anything of the kind attributed to me. Further, sir, I am quite sure that we are all agreed on one thing, and that is, that we should in every form possible give the greatest encouragement to the producing industries in the colony. I will not enlarge on this point, because it might lead me to touch upon another industry which is not before the House at the present time. Even if we carry this motion, it is too late in the session to give it practical effect. I am in hopes that when the Land Act of 1884 has been fully and adequately brought under the notice of intending immigrants in England and elsewhere, and when it has had an opportunity of being brought into operation, and is fairly administered, we shall see a result that will be gratifying and satisfactory to the whole of us.

Mr. BUCKLAND said: Mr. Speaker,—Like other hon. members, I must congratulate the hon. member for South Brisbane on the very able and lucid manner in which he introduced this motion. I have always believed in the land-order system, as introduced in 1861 by the hon. member who has brought this motion forward. I happened to be at that time in England, and in visiting a large number of farm-houses in the south of England I found that the principal topic of conversation was “Mr. Jordan and the land-order system of immigration.” It was principally on account of what I heard of the hon. member, Mr. Jordan’s, lecture that I came to Queensland shortly afterwards. Everyone must admit that a large number of abuses crept in under that system,

but there were good reasons why the people who came out did not settle on the lands. At that time the land open for selection was, in most instances, of the worst character, and totally unsuited for agricultural purposes; and those who came here with land-orders, and knew anything of good land, sold their orders and left the colony in disgust. That is a fact that many hon. members can vouch for, and it was the principal reason why the land-order system was not the success that the hon. member who introduced the measure hoped for. In giving my support to this motion I do so because in the system, as attempted to be introduced, the land-orders to be given are not to be transferable, although they can be used for the payment of rent or the purchase of a freehold under the new Land Act of 1884. I was rather surprised at what fell from the Premier. I was in hopes that the Ministry would support this motion from the fact that when the Immigration Bill was passing, in 1882, the present Premier, who was at that time leader of the Opposition, proposed a somewhat similar system. Part of his proposal was as follows:—

“Every such warrant shall entitle the person named therein, as the person to whom it is issued, to receive at any time within six months after the first arrival in the Australian colonies, a land-order in the form of the schedule hereto, of the nominal value of £30 for himself, and for such member of his family above the age of twelve years, in respect to whom such warrant was issued, and a land-order at the nominal value of £15 for each member of his family between the ages of one and twelve years.”

I hope that in the face of the fact that the present Premier once proposed a resolution to that effect we shall now have the support of the Government to the present motion. And bear in mind that the class of men we would induce to come out are men who can pay their own passages; and men who can do that are the very class we want to settle on the valuable lands which are now being thrown open. The hon. member for Wide Bay has asserted that it is a delusion and a snare to induce people to come to this colony to farm. But I have proof every day in my business that farmers, when they are steady and know their business, are acquiring wealth and have money to lend. During the last week I have in more than one instance handed farmers—men who came here under the Jordan land-order system—their quarterly interest for capital invested on mortgage. And this occurs almost every week. The hon. member for South Brisbane, Mr. Fraser, will, I think, bear me out in that remark. It is a fact well known to everyone that the early settlers on the Brisbane River and on Oxley Creek, who had to struggle with great difficulties twenty or twenty-two years ago, have now become wealthy and rich through having first-class land and through the increase of value of such land. I make these remarks, because I intend to vote for the motion, and I hope that early next session the matter will be taken up and carried into effect.

Mr. KELLETT said: Mr. Speaker,—I do not intend to say much on this motion, because I am afraid it has been brought on too late in the session to have any effect. I am very sorry the hon. member for South Brisbane did not bring it on earlier, as I think, from the tone of the House, it would have been well supported and brought to a successful issue during the present year. I myself know a good deal about the farming population, and have seen, from the remarks of some hon. members, that they do not know much about them. One hon. member said that men who came from the old country as farmers are entirely unsuited for farming in this country. Now, I have found that such men can get into farming as soon as they like, if they have a little common sense to ask their neighbours and friends what are

the proper crops to plant at the particular season of the year. They can plough the land and till it, and all they have to find out is the suitable crop to sow. I know some farmers who arrived a few years ago with a few hundred pounds, and they went on the land, tilled the soil, and turned out crops very soon after their arrival. They are turning out very successful farmers indeed. Only those fail who have never really learned the trade of farming. Some people seem to think that any man can till the soil and grow crops that will pay; but farming is a trade that must be learnt just as much as any other trade or profession, and I know a good number of them who have worked from a very little upwards, and who are now very successful farmers indeed. In spite of one or two not very favourable seasons the farmers in the Southern district are as successful, and more than as successful, as any other class in the community. The mistake made by those farmers who did not succeed was that they had too little money for the quantity of land they took up—they took up more land than they could possibly manage to work. After spending money on fencing and other improvements, when a bad season came upon them they got into straits and difficulties. Luckily most of them were assisted by the storekeepers and others, and it is within my knowledge that now very few of them are in the hands of the storekeepers; most of them have got comfortable homes, good houses, good implements, and a banking account of their own, and in every way they are becoming more successful. There are a lot of immigrants who come out and say they are farmers. I have hired many of them and sent them into the country on their own representations that they were farmers, and in a few days I have generally got a note something like this: "What kind of men have you sent us? They do not know how to handle a plough, and I do not think they have ever seen one before." I know a case of a new arrival who was engaged as a ploughman. The farmer asked him if he understood ploughing with a pair of horses, and he replied that he did. He gave the man a pair of quiet horses, sent him down to the field, told him where he would find the plough, and to get to work, and that he would come afterwards and see how he was getting on. The farmer went in the course of the morning, and saw a sight which he could not understand. There was the man with the reins in his teeth. The farmer said, "What! you call yourself a ploughman, and take the reins in your teeth." "Where else could I hold them," the man replied, "when both my hands are full." This is the kind of men who come out at the expense of the colony, and call themselves farm labourers. I can quite understand that farming in the hands of such men will not be a success. With regard to the land-order system, the present proposal is quite different from the former one. There will be no chance for the land-sharks, for there will be no buying and selling the land-orders. It means simply that a man who has paid his passage and settled down on a farm for a certain number of years shall be entitled to a certain grant of land or remission of rent. I do not see how any Liberal Ministry can object to the motion, nor do I think the present Ministry do, only they consider they have given very good facilities already to homestead selectors in the Land Act. But you cannot give this class of immigrants too much encouragement. One great reason for the failure of the old land-order system was that the worst lands in the colony were set apart for farmers. Farmers were not wanted, because the men who ruled in those days were afraid their own land would be taken up. They would not grow a bit of hay for their horses, lest people should see that it could be

grown there, and farmers might go alongside of them. All the best land was taken up for other purposes, and farming was kept back. But it has got a fair start now; nothing can keep it back, and every assistance the Government can give to help them will benefit the country as well as the farmers themselves.

Mr. WHITE said: Mr. Speaker,—I cannot avoid saying something on this question. If I had the ability of some hon. members I would bore the House on this theme. The hon. member for Blackall has a great practical knowledge of colonial life, and his warnings are of some importance to new-comers. But there are new-comers with means who have been successful as farmers. I will give an instance which came under my own notice of new-chum farmers being successful in this country. When I left England three years ago, two young farmers who were neighbours gave up their farms, sold their stock and crops, and came out in the same ship with me. Two young men, farmers' sons, came with them. They paid their own passages in an Orient liner to Sydney, and from Sydney to Queensland. The two young farmers were not many weeks in the colony before they bought a farm at a very high price, and they engaged the two young men who came with them at wages. That was three years ago; and if you have any taste for farming, Mr. Speaker, how your heart would glow with pleasure to see the fat horses and the big loads of produce they send to the railway. The young men who worked for them have each bought a farm since at a high price, and their relatives have come out and also bought land at a high figure. They went into farming straight away, and no doubt will be successful likewise. With regard to the immigrants, I have gone down to the depot, time after time, during the last three years, looking for men, and I am sorry to say that I very rarely saw any farming men amongst them. Farming men are country men, and we can tell them at a glance. There is no need to ask them what they are. There are plenty amongst the rubbish that come out who will declare that they are farm labourers, but the farmer has no difficulty in spotting them at once whether they are country men or not. My experience is that the farmer who has not a good active man as leader, and cannot lead the men himself, and has to depend on the immigrants to work his farm, will be ruined in spite of himself. How is it that we get only a stray countryman now and then? Plenty of people come from public collieries and places where there are great public works; but there is only a stray country man or two. I went home eleven years ago, and my experience has been that though the men sent from the colony as lecturers are able men, and desirous to do their duty, they are actually too good to go into the country. They delight in exhibiting themselves in a large hall to a great audience; but instead of that they should go into the villages and canvass there.

The PREMIER: So they do.

Mr. WHITE: I have never heard of it yet. There are markets held in places where as many as 150 farmers and farmers' men come with their horses and carts. There is a certain open space where the men congregate; but the lecturers never go there to speak to them; they wait till the evening to deliver a lecture, but the country men have to go home with their carts before then and hear nothing about the lecture. Then there are old established hirings in the country districts, but no lecturer or canvasser ever goes there to induce countrymen to come here; if they do it now, it is the first time.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear! They go into the country now.

Mr. WHITE: We do not expect them to go into all the country places, but they might appoint the proper class of men to go among the farming classes. A man so appointed might go to a village, stay at a public-house all night and talk with the men around the village, and appoint a night for a lecture. That is the only way to induce the country men to come here; and if it is being done now it will be a blessing to the country. I shall support the motion of the hon. member for South Brisbane, providing that the amount to be given back to the person who pays his own passage shall be deducted from the rent he should pay, or from the purchase money that may be due when he fulfils his conditions.

Mr. SHERIDAN said: Mr. Speaker,—The subject under discussion is one of such great importance that every hon. member should, as far as he is capable of so doing, express his thoughts on the question. There is scarcely one person who has had so much experience in immigration as myself. The reason is that I was immigration agent and a member of the Immigration Board at Maryborough for nearly all the years I was there, particularly during the period the land-order system carried out by the hon. member for South Brisbane, Mr. Jordan, was in vogue. All the land-orders which were received by the immigrants who arrived in Maryborough passed through my hands, and therefore I know full well how they were disposed of. No doubt they had their uses; but there is no doubt that they also had their very serious abuses. It is quite certain that it was by the purchase of land-orders from new arrivals at a very cheap rate that the large estates have been accumulated or purchased on the Darling Downs and in other parts of the colony. It is also quite certain—so easily was the law evaded, and so regular had the habit of transferring land-orders become—that Queensland became, as it were, a vast immigration agency for the southern colonies. Men sold their land-orders for just as much as would take them to New South Wales or Victoria; and I have no doubt that under such circumstances Queensland lost a very great number of very valuable men; and also, I am happy to think, a great number of men that we could do very well without. Of this I am certain: that on the River Mary the most thriving and successful farmers are men who came out under Mr. Jordan's system—who paid for their land with land-orders. In fact those men who commenced upon no other capital than their strong arms and strong wills, and determined to subdue the wilderness, have made a position for themselves, while men who came out with thousands of pounds and started large sugar plantations, I am sorry to say, have gone to the wall. The poor farmer has been, as he ought to be, eminently successful. The system which the hon. member for South Brisbane has propounded to this House deserves the serious consideration of everybody, and I sincerely hope that his views will be carried out, because he has fenced himself in properly, so as to prevent these land-orders being made use of by anyone except the persons in whose names they are issued. With regard to the immigration system generally, great care, I have no doubt, is taken in the selection of immigrants in England, Ireland, and Scotland, and they are most carefully watched, attended, and looked after during the voyage out. Matrons, constables—male and female—doctors, and everything that can keep them happy and strong is provided, and every possible care of their characters and morals is exercised during the voyage out. But what is the case when they come to Queensland? When they come alongside the wharf here all

care ends. They are brought ashore like so many bales of goods and put into a depôt which is a disgrace to the whole of the colony. It has improved lately certainly; but some eighteen months or two years ago it became a portion of my duty to visit the immigration depôt, and I never saw a place where I thought it was more cruel to place a human being. The ordinary rules of decency even were not observed in the slightest. The persons were allowed to do exactly as they liked. Some were hired from the depôt, and some left it; but what became of them nobody seemed to care. With regard to a class of immigrants that have been mentioned here this evening—the Germans—I can only say that from my own observation they have proved to be a most useful class of men. Their first thought is to get some land—as much as they can—but they will take even a little piece to begin with—and I have seen these men, after working hard all day in sawmills and manufactories, and perhaps as farm labourers, working by the light of the moon, or by the light of a lamp held by their children when it was dark, and planting trees and cultivating their gardens after working hard all day. It is impossible that men of that kind should not succeed, and it also proves that men of such industrious habits are always very good members of the community. They are law-abiding, they are industrious, and set a good example to those around them. Such is my experience of Germans, and I only regret that there should be at this moment any attempt whatever made—even though made by the great Prince Bismarck himself—towards preventing Germans coming to this colony. I have nothing more to say, and shall cordially support the motion.

Mr. MIDGLEY said: I have very little to say on this subject; but I should like to say what I think. I feel assured that in missing the speech of the hon. member for South Brisbane I missed a treat, because when he speaks on the subject he speaks as one well informed. This resolution has been in the hands of hon. members for some time, and I have read it and thought over it, and while being disposed to do almost anything to encourage immigration to this colony, I think that the proposal of the hon. member will be found to be beset with practical difficulties when brought into operation. I cannot, in the first place, see clearly where the saving would come in, because while it is proposed to induce people to come to the colony requiring them to pay their own passage here, we propose to give them something in return, which we regard now as a valuable asset—something on which we are going to depend more than we have ever depended as a source of revenue. It has been generally understood by hon. gentlemen that in going in for the last very large loan, and the consequent large national undertakings, we were to depend upon the payment of the interest by means of land revenue. Now, as I said before, there are practical difficulties in the way of putting such a resolution as this into effect. First of all, where would be the saving? It would be taking money out of one pocket and putting it into another; for while we are inducing these people to pay their own passage money to Queensland when they come here, we give them our land which otherwise we would expect them to buy. Supposing the system is very largely availed of by immigrants, and supposing that every agricultural immigrant avails himself of this system, we shall then be deprived of the revenue which we expect to receive from the leasing or sale of our agricultural land, and we shall thus interfere with the operation of the Land Act, from which we expect so much. I am perfectly certain, from what I know of

agriculturists in the colony, who have not had advantages such as it is proposed to give to new immigrants, that they will not be content to be placed in such an invidious position as this; and that in another session we shall have further resolutions, further amendments, further demands upon the House for an interference with the present law. I cannot see, though I represent an agricultural constituency, the fairness or justice, in a colony like this, of granting such a concession to simply one class of immigrants. While I believe it is of the highest importance that we should have a stream of agriculturists coming to this colony, I do not lose sight of the fact that agriculture is only one of our resources—at the present time it is not the principal resource—and where would be the fairness, seeing that the colony needs and will need all its resources to maintain its prosperity—where would be the fairness, I say, in allowing these privileges to one class of immigrants and not allowing them to miners, labourers, and artisans? Where would be the fairness of granting a concession of this kind simply and solely to one class of men engaged in one particular industry? I am quite sure other immigrants would resist this, and expect to have the same concession made to them, and the same concession being made to them would still further interfere with the operation of the Land Act we passed last session, and the revenue we expect to get from it. I hold the opinion that in a colony like this, where the seasons are so uncertain, and where the resources of the land are so precarious, it is every bit as much our duty to foster the mineral wealth of the land as to foster the agricultural wealth; and the granting of this concession to agriculturists only would be unfair in its nature, and would not be found to work satisfactorily. A return to the old system of granting land-orders to all immigrants, letting them do what they please with them, would, I think, be preferable. I do not think the system we have had in operation in years gone by has been found to work mischievously in this respect, and, while I would pay the utmost deference to the views of the hon. member for South Brisbane, and if the question came to a vote might vote for the resolution, still I think the system will be surrounded with difficulties, and it will be found that if we once give concessions of this kind there will be no end to them.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the question—put, and the House divided:—

AYES, 29.

Messrs. Griffith, Miles, Dickson, Dutton, Moreton, Sheridan, Norton, Foote, Fraser, Foxton, Annear, White, Lumley Hill, Jordan, Archer, Buckland, McMaster, Mellor, Wakefield, Kates, Bailey, Salkeld, Macfarlane, Black, Kellett, Midgley, Palmer, Ferguson, and Chubb.

NOES, 2.

Messrs. Isambert and Hamilton.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. JORDAN, in reply, said: Mr. Speaker,—I do not want to take up more than a few minutes. I may say that I am fully satisfied with the result of the debate, and I think there is a general feeling in the House that our immigration system wants amending. In the first place, we are paying a great deal too much money for it, and are not getting the quality of immigrants commensurate with the expense we are incurring. I was very glad to hear the speech made by the Premier. We know how much hinges upon what he determines to do. He certainly has not promised to support my motion, but he said it was too late to introduce such a question during the present session, and I shall be quite satisfied if he will introduce it next session, when, I am sure it will be carried. I

wish to say a word in reference to a remark made by the hon. member for Blackall. I am sure he did not intend to do me any injustice. I never had occasion to complain of any remarks made by him; and he knows a good deal about immigration because he was Agent-General himself. After I held the office of Agent-General for Immigration he was appointed, and knew pretty well what was the effect of my work in England. But some of his remarks appear to imply, although I do not think he intended it so, that I had indulged in visionary representations and drawn beautiful pictures of an El Dorado in Australia to induce persons to come to this colony. It is a fact that during the first year I was at home 5,888 persons came out during the first full year and paid their own passage money. At that time there were two gentlemen acting as immigration commissioners from New South Wales, and they proclaimed throughout the length and breadth of Great Britain the wonderful scheme which had become law there, of free selection before survey. They thought that if that were made known to the emigrating public of about 200,000 or 300,000 every year, it would send whole crowds of them to New South Wales. It was the very same argument that the Premier had inadvertently made use of to-night—that we have now a new Land Act, very different from the last, and one that would be more successful as an inducement to persons to come from the old country. Was there ever any scheme devised in any other British colony which appeared so attractive as free selection before survey? Never! And yet, though they sent home two of their ablest men, Mr. Parkes and Mr. Dalley, and they advocated it all over the United Kingdom—I sometimes following and sometimes preceding them—and though they used their utmost endeavours to persuade people to go to that colony they never sent out a shipload. Why? Because they had no land to offer. That was the charm that made my feeble labours, as compared with theirs, successful, whereas theirs were utterly barren. The inducements of the present Land Act of this colony are talked of by the Premier just as the hon. member for Blackall talked about the inducements of the Act of 1868 when he introduced that measure many years ago. That gentleman then drew a very beautiful picture of what the result would be under that wonderfully liberal Act, under which persons could take up 10,000 acres of land at 5s. an acre and were allowed ten years to pay it in. That was to be made known throughout the length and breadth of Great Britain, and was to bring hundreds and thousands of the younger sons of the gentry and farmers besides, but it was not successful. And no Act passed by any legislature in the world will be successful in attracting a farming class; but the moment you send an accredited agent to tell them that they shall have a gift of land, that moment you will succeed, and that was the secret of my success in sending out 5,888 full paying passengers during the first year. If the land given to those immigrants had been good land, suitable for agriculture—if it had not been bad land, altogether unsuitable for agriculture—it would have been a grand and glorious success, and there would never have been any occasion for the Land Act passed last session. The pastoral tenants have now given up parts of their runs, and there are a hundred millions of acres ready for settlement, and the people are waiting to come. We can no longer say that there is no land for them. The squatters have fallen in with the scheme of the Minister for Lands, and have given up the land, and there it is waiting for the people. Our experience in the past is positive proof that a

gift of land is sufficient to attract emigrating people, and rich farmers. When I was at home there were no rich farmers to be got. Whenever there was a farm to be let there were many applicants for it, but the very reverse is the case now. At that time it was not rich farmers who went away; it was the farmers' sons and a superior class of farm labourers who went to America, and they are the class we want to attract here especially. When I was lecturing in Great Britain about farming I never failed to point out the difficulties of farming in this colony, to make it clear that it was very different from farming in England. I described the herculean task of clearing the land, cutting down big trees and taking out the great roots, and the people who listened to me were often frightened at the work. At the end of my lectures gentlemen often got up and said they were astonished, as they had come expecting to see a beautiful picture painted, and a great many attractions offered to emigrate to the colony; but I had told them of so many difficulties in farming that they were amazed. That happened at nearly every one of my lectures, so little truth is there in the remarks made by the hon. member for Wide Bay. People who succeed must be workers. They must be men accustomed to toil who have hands and muscles hardened by labour and who have hearts to labour, otherwise they cannot succeed in this colony. But they are the very people who go away from Great Britain, and they are the very people that we want in this colony. The land is ready for them to occupy. As to the arguments of the hon. member for Fassifern, I do not think he could have done me the honour to listen to my remarks.

Mr. MIDGLEY: I was not here.

Mr. JORDAN: If the hon. gentleman had been present he would not have made the remarks he has done. That is a sufficient reply to what the hon. member has said.

Question put and passed.

RETURNS OF GRAMMAR SCHOOLS.

Mr. ARCHER said: Mr. Speaker,—The hon. member for Rosewood, whose motion for certain returns in connection with grammar schools stands next on the paper, certainly cannot finish his speech to-night, and even if he can we shall not be able to discuss the matter. Therefore I think we had better adjourn now.

Mr. ISAMBERT said: Mr. Speaker,—In moving—

That there be laid on the table of the House, a return showing—

1. The cost of establishment of each grammar school within the colony of Queensland.
2. The amount of money subscribed respectively by the projectors of these grammar schools.
3. The endowments in grants of land bestowed by the Government or private donors to each of these grammar schools, showing the area and the approximate value thereof.
4. The amount of all moneys granted or paid to each of these institutions, stating for what purposes, whether for permanent works, current expenditure, or scholarships.
5. The number of pupils—boys and girls—in each year, and the number and age of pupils in actual attendance at each grammar school during the last four quarters.
6. The scale of fees charged for each pupil per quarter, and the total amount of fees received during the last four quarters at each grammar school.
7. The average cost of each pupil per quarter, reckoning fees paid by parents, and endowments, subsidies, and fees for scholarships paid by the Government during the last four quarters to each grammar school.
8. The number of teachers, enumerating their salaries, time of service, the subjects and number of pupils taught by each teacher at the respective grammar schools, and the time devoted weekly to each subject so taught during the last quarter.
9. Similar information as described above so far as obtainable with regard to grammar schools established by private enterprise within the colony of Queensland.

—I am sure I shall astonish the hon. member for Blackall with the shortness of the speech I shall make. The Act under which the grammar schools were established was passed twenty-five years ago, and it must be patent to everyone that a measure which might have been suitable and appropriate to those days is not likely to be entirely suitable to the present time. There is no doubt that there are many dry bones in it that want shaking out. The vote for grammar schools this year—that is, for incidental scholarships, etc.—was £3,302, and the endowment came to £6,500, making altogether the sum of £9,802; and up to the present time, in one way or another, nearly £100,000 has been spent on grammar schools. I do not object to the money that has been so spent; but what practical information or knowledge do the Government possess of the working of grammar schools? What control have they over them? The motion standing in my name amounts to nothing more or less than asking the Government to supply the House and the country with such information as they ought, of their own accord, to have given long ago. I know the Government are not opposed to the motion. The Premier only called "not formal" because he believed the Government could not get the information asked for. Well, then, let us have the information they can get. I do not ask more than that. If there is any information that cannot be got it cannot be helped, but if there is information which the trustees of grammar schools are able to give, and yet withhold, that is sufficient, I think, to show the Government and the country that there is something to hide which ought to come to light. Therefore, whatever information cannot be got, of course we cannot get; but whatever can be got I shall insist on having. If any grammar schools withhold the information there is such a thing as putting the hand on the purse-strings next year.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—When the hon. member gave notice of this motion first, I informed him that if he would limit it to such information as the Government could get in a reasonable time they would willingly let it go as a formal motion; but this motion asks for much information that the Government cannot get. How can we get information about grammar schools established by private enterprise? How can we obey such an order if the House should make it? We might get the information, but the Government cannot be responsible for its accuracy; it might be misleading. The Government can give returns relating to matters within their cognisance, but they could not demand this information. The hon. member might as well ask for a return of the income of all persons in the town of Bowen. We might ask the inhabitants of Bowen to give us the information; but if they did give it to us I do not know that we should be justified in laying it before the House. Another objection to the motion is that it asks for information covering the last four quarters. Now, the information as to the expenditure of the different grammar schools is given every year to the Government, but it is given for the year from January to December. The hon. member will get that information in the statistical returns of the Registrar-General; it has been compiled for last year. The schools are required to make up annual accounts, and they do so. If the hon. member wants their accounts from the middle of the year, of course he will not be able to get them. The Government cannot compel them to make up accounts not required by law. They may do so, and probably they would if they were asked; but the information could not be supplied in time for it

to be of any use to him this session. If the hon. member will ask for the information regarding last year I believe he will be able to get it. As to the last item referring to grammar schools established for private enterprise, of course that is out of the question. With respect to the teachers, we could get the number of teachers, their salaries, and time of service; but not the number of pupils taught by each teacher, and the time devoted to each subject during the last quarter. We know that in grammar schools there are not ten boys taught by one teacher, and ten by another; one teacher probably teaches three-fourths of the boys, another two-thirds, and so on. The calculation could not be made; boys are changed from class to class and the numbers fluctuate continually. If the hon. member will amend his motion so that the Government can comply with it, we are perfectly willing to accept it. I would suggest that the hon. member should withdraw his motion, and give notice of a motion in such a form that the Government can supply the information.

Mr. ISAMBERT said: Mr. Speaker,—I have mentioned already that I would not insist on having any information the Government cannot give. If any of the information I ask for cannot be given during the present session, it will come in for next session. My object is to remind the Government to get a little more insight into our grammar schools, and to take steps to reform any defects, particularly with a view to establishing a still higher system of education—a university, an agricultural college, and a teachers' training college. The Government ought to take steps without delay to bring the grammar schools under the control of the Education Department, and have the pupils examined by the department, and not by the grammar schools themselves. I am quite prepared to accept such amendments as will make it practicable for the Government to get the information.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—With the permission of the House I would suggest that the motion should be amended by substituting the words "last year" for "in each year," and "last year" for "four quarters" in the 5th paragraph; by striking out all the words after "last" and inserting "year" in the 6th and 7th paragraphs; by striking out all the words after "teacher" in the 8th paragraph; and by omitting the last paragraph altogether.

Mr. ISAMBERT said: Mr. Speaker,—I accept those amendments.

Motion amended accordingly; and question put and passed.

SEPARATION OF NORTHERN QUEENSLAND.

Mr. BLACK said: Mr. Speaker,—I want to give certain reasons for withdrawing the motion standing in my name, which is as follows:—

That there be laid upon the table of this House copy of letter from the Premier to His Excellency the Governor upon the proposed separation of Northern from Southern Queensland, published in London *Times* of 12th October, 1885.

On Tuesday last, October 13th, there appeared in the newspapers the following cablegram from London:—

"SEPARATION QUESTION.

"London, October 12th.

"A letter from the Hon. S. W. Griffith, Premier of Queensland, to His Excellency the Governor, on the subject of the proposed separation of Northern from Southern Queensland, was published to-day in the *Times*, which paper, commenting thereon, says the letter proves the difficulties to be such that the Crown could not at present face the question of separation."

There was also another cablegram, dated from London, which read as follows:—

"In an article published this morning the *Times* says the proposed separation of Northern from Southern Queensland is premature."

Taking, as I did, a view of the subject which is endorsed by a very large population in the North, I was naturally anxious that the correspondence referred to, which I considered would be of great interest to those concerned in the separation movement, should become the property of the House and the country—especially as it was evidently considered of so great importance in London as to call forth a leader in the *Times* and necessitate cablegrams to the colony. Consequently, I gave notice of the motion standing in my name. I assumed that there would be no objection to produce the correspondence, and I am not prepared to say that there has been any difficulty. When my motion was first called on, the Premier pronounced it informal, but immediately got up and laid on the table his reply to a letter by Messrs. Davidson and Lawes, which was published in London, and was dated January 15th. These gentlemen, being in London at that time, wrote, giving their views on the separation question. Their letter has been public property for a very long time. It has been commented on in various ways, both by those interested in and by those opposed to the separation movement. That letter, I believe, was sent out to His Excellency, and was referred by His Excellency to the Premier for a report thereon. At all events the Premier did reply in a letter dated April 1st, and his reply has also been published in the various newspapers of the colony. Hon. members must bear in mind that the Premier's reply was dated April 1st, and in the ordinary course of events would reach London about June 1st, allowing ample time for all detentions. When I see that four months later, on October 12th, a leader appeared in the London *Times*, and that it was considered necessary to send cablegrams out here to that effect, and that the leader in the *Times* said that certain reasons contained in the correspondence between the Premier and His Excellency showed that separation was premature, I could only infer that some further correspondence on this subject had taken place. The Premier assures me that, although certain correspondence has taken place between His Excellency and the Home Government on the matter, he has had no further correspondence from His Excellency.

The PREMIER: Only a purely formal letter.

Mr. BLACK: I therefore considered it only right that I should explain to this House my reasons for having given notice of my motion, and why I withdrew it. If no correspondence of the kind referred to in the cablegram has taken place it is quite certain that some interested parties in London are treating this separation movement in a very unfair manner, and for political purposes no doubt. There is someone trying to pull the wires at home in a very unfair way. The separation movement is one which, in my opinion, will benefit the southern quite as much as the northern portion of the colony, and it should always be open to free and fair discussion. Of course attempts have been made, and will be continued by those who are unfavourably disposed to the movement, to throw as many obstacles as possible in the way. Up to the present time the coolie scare has been made very free use of, but if the movement can be justified on grounds of general benefit to the whole colony it will outlive any misstatements made at its initiation. We

must bear in mind the time that it took to bring about the separation of Queensland from New South Wales. We all know the antagonism which existed in that colony against the separation of Queensland, but we have lived to see the wonderful progress our colony has made since the time she separated from New South Wales. I shall not detain the House any longer, and with the consent of the House I beg to withdraw the motion standing in my name. I shall move it in another form next week, in order to get any correspondence that may exist on this very important subject.

Motion withdrawn accordingly.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER, in moving the adjournment of the House, said that on Tuesday, after the disposal of the motion respecting the extension of the Cooktown Railway, and the formal business, it was intended to proceed with the second reading of the Federal Council Bill, then to consider the Pacific Island Labourers Bill in committee, and afterwards, if there was time, to go into Committee of Supply.

The House adjourned at fifty-five minutes past 9 o'clock.