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Introduction

This study is about the development of Jondaryan Station on the Darling Downs. It was undertaken in an attempt to find out more about the nature of Queensland colonial society. More specifically, it sought to discover something of the material and social condition of both pastoral employer and pastoral employee and of their relationship within the specific context of Jondaryan Station on the Darling Downs.

Colonial employer and employee alike had emigrated in hope — hope of greater material wealth and an improved social position. Their expectation was that New South Wales would be a classless society, a land of equal opportunity and social mobility for all, and that the reward for patient toil would be land. The reality, however, was that even to become a Downs squatter in the 1840s, an illegal tenant, let alone a land-owner, required such large amounts of financial backing as to preclude the English labouring classes. In the 1840s this capital was provided by English and Scottish gentlemen with British capital to invest and convict labour at their disposal. This input, coupled with British market demand, created rural capitalist enterprises on the one hand and a rural proletariat on the other. Jondaryan Station was one such enterprise.

The Downs squatters' production of a much needed export staple and their direct links with the Sydney "establishment" soon secured for themselves the status of respectable gentlemen. Men like James Andrew, John Coutts, Walter Gray, Robert Tertius Campbell, the Tooths and their resident manager at Jondaryan, James White, became Jondaryan's new entrepreneurial breed of the 50s; a breed which was Southern inspired, Southern-controlled and which exercised a political and social control out of all proportion to its actual numbers. Their use of the Masters and Servants Act to try and re-establish a "proper" relationship between themselves and their
employees and their insistence on their right to control the labour market were to remain a constant source of conflict between pastoral employer and pastoral employee.

As the 50s drew to a close, Downs society had largely solidified structurally. Downs squatters modelled themselves on the English landed gentry and assumed a dominant position within the community. They chose to express their dominance and their hierarchical view of the world through the same forms as were used by the ruling elite in Britain.

Jondaryan Station was a highly-structured and unequal society and exhibited many of the characteristics of a close-knit English village. At the apex of its structure were the lessees, Messrs Kent and Wienholt, absentee landlords who paid Jondaryan the occasional supervisory visit. The manager was bound to them by marriage, loyalty and an identity of interest. Below the management were two further divisions in the Jondaryan community, “men” and “others”. In the latter category were women, Aborigines, exiles, Indian coolies, Chinese and later Melanesians, generally held to be lower in status than the lowest “men”. From the overseer, the manager’s executive, to the lowest Aborigines, there was a scale of descending status — lower status and remuneration being afforded to lesser occupations within the community. The population could be further broken down into resident, itinerant and contract groups and within each of these the skilled and the unskilled.

This structure was bound together by a system of controls both internal and external. The rewards included promotion and bonuses for work well done. Conversely, there were fines to secure maximum efficiency, payment at the completion of a job was not always assured, and a labourer could be discharged at any time. Even the provision of station leisure, education and religious facilities was a covert means of maintaining the status quo by tying the worker dependently to the station structure.

The squatters’ internal authority was propped up externally by the legal and political system. Just as Downs squatters had brought their “proper” influence to bear to secure the right type of labour and the right decisions on local benches, so too did they use the legislature to retain control of their land. By 1877, Edward Wienholt and the trustees of William Kent were the largest owners of freehold land in Queensland and Jondaryan was the largest freehold run.

Those selectors who overcame squatter resistance in the form of pre-emption, selective purchasing and dummying, could not overcome the problem of blocks which could not be profitably cultivated
and which were too small to graze. They were forced to supplement their income by seasonally working for the squatter and formed another group in the Jondaryan community.

The Jondaryan “men” of the later 70s and early 80s comprised four distinct labouring groups, each of which occupied a particular place in the station’s social structure and each of which responded differently to the type of control which Jondaryan’s management exercised over its employees. These responses ranged from the passive state of intemperance to more direct acts of “absconding from hired service”, arson, theft, attacks on property and person, and striking. The selector/shearers experienced the same sort of control as Jondaryan’s resident employees without the countervailing benefits. The Union provided the former with the opportunity of avenging “old scores”. Of those who withdrew their labour at Jondaryan in 1889, 90 per cent were selectors and their sons.

The Jondaryan “Affair” of May 1890, whilst basically about the principle of freedom of contract, was the climax of a host of past skirmishes between Jondaryan’s management and its employees. The Queensland Shearers’ Union insisted that only union labour be employed. Employers insisted on their right to employ whom they liked, be they union or non-union. It was about this principle of freedom of contract and the squatters’ right to retain control in their own sheds that Jondaryan, in the heart of “pure merino” country and one of the largest stations on the Darling Downs, became a test case for the relative strengths of pastoral capital and newly-federated pastoral labour.
Part I
By 1826 the free colony of New South Wales had gained its ascendancy over the penal. In Butlin’s words, “the use of the colonies as wool producers for the British textile industry was greater than their usefulness as a gaol”. And so the search for an export staple came to an end. The colony, for a long time a drain on British coffers, had grown in direct proportion to the number of convicts it received. Economic growth had been encouraged by the development of a fairly significant whaling and fishing industry by the 1820s, but it was John Macarthur’s success with merino flocks that demonstrated the colony’s ability to cater for European demands and thereby establish a vital export. Wool production largely superseded that of mutton, and a bright economic future beckoned.

To complement the land and the labour required for wool growing, the government needed to attract the capital of British industrialists and established leaders of the colonial community. This they did by means of large land grants, and the alienation of crown lands in the 1820s dwarfed all previous transfers, as men such as Robert Campbell Senior and A.B. Spark, “most respectable” Sydney merchants, turned to pastoralism. A £10 licence might secure the lease of 1,000 acres for a year, or, in the case of a specific grant, might bring the Australian Agricultural Company one million acres in 1824.

Demand for land soon outstripped surveyed supply, and Allan Cunningham persuaded Governor Darling that more exploratory work needed to be done behind Moreton Bay. His previous experience with John Oxley, in 1817 and 1824, on the Lachlan and Brisbane Rivers fitted him well for his most important expedition of 1827, when he left the Hunter River, pushed through the Liverpool plains and on 5 June discovered a pastoral region which, according to an anonymous reporter, was the only area which Cunningham “ever really became excited about”. He wrote:
These extensive tracts of open country, furnish a very considerable range of cattle pasture at all seasons of the year — the grasses and herbage exhibiting in the depth of winter extraordinary luxuriance of growth . . . From these central grounds rise downs of a rich black and clay soil, which extend several miles to the Eastward, and, as they furnish abundance of grass and are conveniently watered . . . they constitute a most valuable sound sheep pasture.4

To this, “the finest meadow pasture”5 he had seen in New South Wales, Cunningham gave the name Darling Downs in honour of Governor Darling.

Cunningham was unaware of the extent of his discovery. The Darling Downs comprised 5,900 square miles of vast alluvial plains.6 It formed the basin of the upper Condamine and was bounded in the north by the Bunya Mountains, in the east by the Main Range and in the south by the New South Wales border ranges. It had been formed by successive uplifts of deep sheets of molten volcanic rock which had welled up near the present locality of Toowoomba and spread, while in a viscous condition, over thousands of square miles. The result was a level of hard rock over the top of a plateau which was fourteen hundred to two thousand feet above sea level. This basalt had then decayed to form the black soil of the region. The depth of this soil ranged from four to sixty feet and supported waving indigenous grasses so tall that, “one man riding behind the other could only see his mate’s head and shoulders”.7 Although settlement was expanding southward, westward and northward from Sydney in the late 1820s, this “pastoral eldorado” was not occupied until 1840, a delay that requires some explanation in view of Cunningham’s early euphoria.

These were the years when the unofficial squatting movement occurred, which the government tried in vain to control. Governor Gipps, attempting to “prevent the dispersion of the people”, imposed in 1829 a limit on settlement at 150 miles from Sydney, but the futility of these endeavours was increasingly apparent to his successors, who were as conscious of the profitability of the wandering herds as they were of the administrative chaos that they produced. By 1828, 26 per cent of the population were living beyond the prescribed boundaries and grazing 56 per cent of the colony’s sheep. With the abolition of the land grant system in 1831, increasing numbers of people pushed out ever further beyond the boundaries in search of cheaper and larger runs, as colonial prosperity intensified the demand for land, for stock, and for wool.

These pioneers, “monkeyfied men” or “bush barbarians” as they
were slightly called, were willing to accept a primitive life style. They were also the cause of serious political problems to the southern "aristocrats", for not only were they "squatting" on large tracts of land for nominal fees, they were also relying, in the main, on cheap convict labour at a time when the establishment was attempting to remove the convict taint. Robert Campbell was exceptional in eschewing convict labour and importing Scottish highland shepherds to form the basis of his rural work force.

The British Government was also becoming increasingly concerned about the nature of the squatting movement. The Secretary of State for the Colonies expressed this disquiet: "Nothing could be more unfortunate than the formation of a race of Men, wandering with their Cattle over the extensive Regions of the Interior, and losing, like the descendants of the Spaniards in the Pampas of South America, almost all traces of their original Civilization". Governor Richard Bourke, however, was not as worried about the squatters losing "all traces of their original Civilization" as he was about the Crown losing all claim to its land. His response to this fear was the 1833 Act in Council, entitled an "Act for protecting the Crown Lands of this Colony from Encroachment, Intrusion and Trespass". It authorized the appointment of Commissioners of Crown Lands to act as representatives of the Crown in preventing the rights of the latter from being lost sight of, by what was termed "mere occupation without purchase for a long space of time". A further means of controlling this system of the "unauthorized occupation of Crown Land or squatting" was announced in 1836. This was an annual licence fee of £10 to be paid by every run irrespective of its extent. The names of the first persons to apply for and be granted these licences appeared in the New South Wales Government Gazette of 1837. Those who failed to apply were liable to penalty.

The powers of the Commissioners of Crown Lands were greatly extended two years later under an Act further to "restrain the unauthorized occupation of Crown Lands, and to provide the means of defraying the expense of a Border Police". The Commissioners' rights now included those of being able to cancel a licence, as well as recommend that one be granted. Their duties were generally to exercise control over grazing establishments, to prevent collisions between those men in charge of such establishments and the local Aborigines, and to collect fees and assessments. They were aided in the execution of these duties by a Border Police force, the cost of which was to be defrayed by stock assessment fees.

The derogatory term "Squatter", meaning a person who had
associations with emancipated negroes in the West Indies and poor farmers on the American mainland, symbolized the hostility of established southern society. It also embodied the frustrations of governments in their attempts to maintain administrative control and preserve law and order and Crown land rights against a movement which held many attractions to the enterprising and adventurous. In the post Napoleonic Wars period many young Britons, believing that fortunes and a high social status were to be found throughout the colonial world, emigrated to try their hand at sheep-farming in the vast lands of New South Wales. One of them, George Leslie, was to lament, in November 1840: "I often think if I was to drop down in the streets of Aberdeen how few of my old acquaintances I would see. I have no doubt they are well scattered over the world ere now." Some of these emigres, including George Leslie and his brother Patrick, were eventually to find their way to the Darling Downs, which, by 1840, was falling within the range of extended settlement. Some had already tried their luck in other British colonies. Some, like Patrick Leslie, served their colonial apprenticeship with relatives or family friends. Leslie, the ninth son of William Leslie Laird of Warthill, Scotland, arrived in Sydney in May 1835 and spent one year being tutored in pastoral flock management by the Macarthurs at Camden, and another three managing his uncle's property at Collaroi, before renting his own farm at Penrith. Others, such as the Englishman W.H. Marsh, son of the Reverend M. Marsh, Chancellor of the Diocese of Salisbury, arrived in New South Wales and immediately secured their own holdings. Marsh, who was educated at Oxford and called to the Bar in 1836, decided after a few briefs that the legal profession was not for him. He arrived in Sydney in June 1840 and acquired 34,000 acres of land in the New England district. George St Gore was another refugee from the legal system. Indeed, apart from the church and the legal profession, there seemed to be few openings for university-educated men in Britain. Henry Dennis, a graduate of the University of London, was superintending in the Liverpool Plains district for the large run holder, Sir Richard Todd Scougall, and Charles Coxen, also educated at the University of London, had joined his brother Stephen at a Peel River station. Arthur Hodgson, a graduate of Eton and Cambridge, and also the son of a clergyman, had arrived in Sydney in 1839, expecting to be able to purchase sufficient land for pastoral purposes within the boundaries. Like so many others, however, he had been pushed by the price of land beyond the limits of location to the northern district of New South Wales. He leased Cashiobury, a run in the New England district.
All of these men were from substantial social backgrounds. All were well-educated and well-connected, and, if not in possession of considerable capital, had access to it. This was particularly important in determining their success. The Reverend Mackenzie, who spent ten years in New South Wales in the 1840s, estimated that the cost of equipping a pastoral run was £156.9s, a figure which took no account of the cost of stocking. Some were lucky enough to be given their initial herd or flock, but for most, the cost of buying stock in these buoyant times was a substantial expense. As well, there were running expenses variously estimated for a first year of operation at £446, £345 and £1,071. As George Leslie told his parents in October 1840: "Settling in this country is a much more serious thing than the people think it is and requires much more money — Let people be as economical as they can, £100 does not go far in forming a station."

Again in November he told them: "A person cannot imagine the expense of forming a new station till they try it." George estimated that it would take a person without capital four or five years as an overseer before he could contemplate entering pastoralism, and even then it would be a long time before he was independent. By this he presumably meant independence of financial institutions, which charged anything from 12 to 15 per cent interest on borrowed capital.

The fact that New South Wales squatters were monied men distinguished land settlement in Australia from that elsewhere. The Reverend J.D. Lang was eager to point out to readers of his book *Cooksland* that the Australian squatter was "a perfectly sui generis". "There is nothing like him", he said, "in any other part of the British Dominions, there is nothing at all analogous to him in the United States of America." In America, Lang claimed, the term "squatter" denoted someone from the humbler walks of life who took possession of a few acres of land, cultivated it, sold it to the first emigrant who came along and moved on to repeat the process.

But the Australian Squatter, [according to Lang], especially in the northern and southern divisions of the great colony of New South Wales, is, as Mr Hodgkinson rightly observes, a man of education and respectable connexions, and if not a gentleman born and bred, as indeed is not infrequently the case, he has generally a quantity of stock that implies a considerable amount of pastoral capital.

Governor Gipps drew the same type of distinction. He wrote:
Squatting here was not what squatting was in America; there the squatter was the unauthorized occupier of some twenty or thirty acres. People had no idea of our magnificent squatters, some of them occupying ten thousand acres in one place. He was pressed to say that the sons of some of the richest men in the colony were living beyond the boundaries in bark huts as squatters; there were, too, at this moment, young men of the first families in England, graduates of Oxford and Cambridge, who were all living in bark huts beyond the boundaries.

Finance was not only necessary for the establishment of a run, but also for its maintenance. Those who were not economically dependent on lending institutions relied on their families for support. Patrick Leslie was backed in his venture by his uncle, a London banker. When the latter began to dishonour bills sent to him from Dunheved, Leslie found it necessary to follow Cunningham's tracks in search of a run more tailored to his monetary shape.

On the 23 March 1840 Leslie claimed Toolburra, thereby becoming the first station owner on the Darling Downs. Others were quick to follow. Henry Hughes and Frederick and Henry Isaac, who had been well-known to one another in Worcestershire, England, had arrived in Sydney together, and had become joint owners of a farm, decided that farming held poor prospects compared to squatting on the Downs and moved north. Hodgson was also glad to move from the cold, moist and "scabby" conditions of the New England district to the drier Downs. The Gammies, John Campbell, George Eliot, Aide-de-Campe to Governor Gipps, and Henry Stuart Russell all recognized the grazing potential of the Darling Downs. This influx of predominantly Scottish men onto the Downs in the early months of 1840 has been affectionately termed "the Scottish Invasion", and, "with pardonable exaggeration", as James Collier says, the Scots were said to be acquiring all the land in Australia and the Irish all the public houses.

After this first wave of settlement onto the Downs, a mere handful of men were said to have occupied four million acres. As J.D. Lang remarked:

... as it was the custom of the ancient Kings of Persia to surround their dominions with a tract of unoccupied waste land, that they might have no intercourse with their neighbours, so it is the delight of persons of this anomalous class of colonists to surround their respective domains with as large an extent of unoccupied waste land as possible, to provide for the largest possible increase of their flocks and herds.

These men were united in their background, situation and purpose. They all intended to improve their material condition and
return home as quickly as possible. As “Squatter” remarked, it was unlikely that a man would “undertake a voyage of 16,000 miles, perilling his property and his life, leave all society, and break off his associations with what previously endeared his native locality to him, unless there were a prospect, whether real or not, of his improving his condition.”

“A thousand pounds”, a Victorian squatter assured his brother, “will go further than three thousand in London”, and, he added, “retrenchment and economy are more easily effected.” In New South Wales young emigres were able to maintain a high standard of living at a reduced cost. The Leslies’ move to the Darling Downs took into account that they could live there without much of the trouble and expense of living in Sydney. This was a very important consideration for men who, as George Leslie told his brother William, did “not come to this country to spend money but to try and make a little”.

Colonial life was a temporary exile, to be endured until such time as they had amassed sufficient wealth to enable them to return “home”. “If I could afford to live (in England) you would soon see me,” George Leslie told his sister Kate. In the words of one leading squatter historian: “They did not emigrate, as the great majority did, because they had nothing or next to nothing. They wished at least to retain or restore a way of life of some comfort which was threatened; most of them wished to improve it.”

In their pursuit of material gain Downs squatters were not unlike their counterparts in other parts of the colonies. Neither did their birth, education and pedigree distinguish them from squatters scattered all over New South Wales, in the Western district of Victoria, at Portland Bay or at Mount Gambier. Downs squatters, however, did display a homogeneity of social origin not to be found in other areas.

By August 1840 George Leslie could report that people were “pouring out with stock towards Moreton Bay as fast as possible”. In this second squatting wave came Henry Dennis and Charles Coxen. Dennis’s employer, Sir Richard Todd Scougall, was overstocked in the Liverpool Plains district and had sent his superintendent to take up a new run. Because most of the water-courses had been selected by “the originals”, Dennis was forced to go to the Northern Downs to the sources of other creeks. After a month’s search he took up, according to most historical accounts, Jimbour for his employer, Jondaryan for himself, Myall Creek for Charles Coxen, and Warra for a Mr Irving. The first record of Jondaryan as a registered run, however, names Charles Coxen
Esquire as licensee. Coxen, who was born in Ramsgate, Kent, had arrived in Sydney in 1836, and, after a time spent collecting specimens of natural history for his brother-in-law, John Gould, had joined his brother Stephen at Yarrundi. When news reached the Peel River of the occupation of the Downs, Charles’ uncle Henry William Coxen had sent his nephew, a Mr Irving, a former lieutenant in the Seventeenth Regiment, and a “black boy” north to seek out new country. Possibly Henry Dennis quickly realized how badly-watered Jondaryan was, and offered the tract of country between Oakey and Myall Creeks to Coxen. Perhaps Dennis may have claimed Jondaryan but never stocked it, or never applied to the Commissioner of Crown Lands for a licence. That there is such controversy concerning Jondaryan’s first “owner” is a reflection of the fluidity of the whole process by which land was taken up in the early 40s.

In addition to the procedures laid down by the New South Wales government, which occasioned varying degrees of delays and other complications in the occupancy of runs, the original Downs squatters unofficially observed certain other practices in choosing their lands. For example, Hughes and Isaac helped Charles Coxen select his run, pointing out their boundaries and suggesting to Coxen the best site for his head station. It was also customary to allow a neighbour three miles of river frontage on either side of his station, and all the grazing land back from it as far as the eye could see. As more and more squatters moved onto the Downs, however, these unwritten codes of co-operation were severely tested. Gentlemen’s agreements often degenerated into gentlemen’s disputes. It was particularly for the purpose of settling these disputes that the appointment of Christopher Rolleston as Commissioner of Crown Land for the Darling Downs was welcomed by the earliest Downs occupiers.

Squatting was fast becoming a more respectable activity. By June 1841 there was about twenty “bushrangers with a base” residing on the Downs and, according to George Leslie, “plenty more on the way where there was not a white man to be seen eighteen months ago”. In 1842 1,800 bales of wool were exported from twenty-six Downs runs. There were now so many stockholders “sitting down” or “squatting” on the Downs in 1843 that the New South Wales government decided to declare the Darling Downs a district separate from New England. Its boundaries were defined and Christopher Rolleston was appointed its first Commissioner of Crown Lands.

Rolleston was born in Nottinghamshire, England, the son of an Anglican clergyman. His lack of success as a farmer in New South
Wales led him to apply for a government posting through his father. New South Wales might have been a new colony, but old kinship ties brought Sydney and London close together. Opportunity for failed farmers was less than equal. Governor Gipps, seeking persons of very active habits and single men without encumbrance to act as Commissioners of Crown Lands, appointed Rolleston to the frontier district of the Darling Downs.

The first dispute which Rolleston as Commissioner-elect was involved in was a case between Henry Stuart Russell of Cecil Plains and a man acting on behalf of a Mr Richard Jones of Sydney. The latter claimed a part of Russell's run. In his book *The Genesis of Queensland* Russell described the settlement scene:

... the two Commissioners came to my cottage at Cecil Plains, and, after hearing the requisite statements, rode over the ground, and the result was a kind of compromise, which I cannot explain, for I never clearly understood on what grounds we were deprived of the part usurped, which has ever since been held under the name of St. Ruth. The decision lay with the Senior officer; his junior, whom we rejoiced to see — and much more so, when we had come to know him better — being now only installed into the settlement of these cases.

Such “cases” were to prove extremely difficult to resolve. If a run were neither naturally bounded, nor its boundaries established by the consent of adjoining neighbours, then it was necessary for the claimant to prove that his flocks ran in all directions that were said to constitute the run. The question of possession depended upon the fact of occupation, and the fact of occupation upon the presence of stock. John Watts of Eton Vale recalled in his *Reminiscences* that the “custom was for the runs to be placed in the names of those who had sheep on them”. Despite actual occupation by stocking, however, and even after the erection of huts, disputes still arose.

One such dispute was that between David Forbes Esquire and a Mr Gammie. Forbes testified before Commissioner Rolleston that Gammie had attempted to take possession of his newly-occupied run on Dalrymple Creek, had proceeded to intimidate his shepherd and watchman, and maliciously destroyed his sheep. The stock which Forbes had moved onto Dalrymple Creek was not his own, however, but belonged to a Mr Robinson. This practice of depasturing someone else's sheep was quite common. By a system of "halves" or taking stock "upon terms", squatters could be landholders without owning any stock. Forbes probably agreed to graze Robinson's stock if he received half the clip and half the increase. The Leslies also looked after some sheep on similar terms. This of
course added to the confusion concerning run ownership, as did absenteeism.

Absenteeism was a feature of the northern squatting movement. There were many who, whilst wishing to invest their capital in the bush, were not interested in residing there. Charles Coxen of Jondaryan was one such person. Coxen came north from the Peel River with Lieutenant Irving, his “black boy”, two drays and three hundred cattle to take up Jondaryan. When Rolleston visited Jondaryan in 1843, however, he recorded that it was licensed to Charles Coxen, that it carried four hundred head of cattle, that three slab and bark huts and out-­offices had been erected on it, and that seven persons lived there, none of whom was the licensee. Coxen had left Mr Irving at Jondaryan to act as his “locum tenens”. Whilst the original Downs squatters generally tended to live and work on their runs, the “second wavers” often sent their employees north to establish and superintend their runs. And yet, the New England and Darling Downs districts were regarded as being principally occupied by residential proprietors, in contrast to the Liverpool Plains district: “In New England and the Darling Downs scarcely any but principals and proprietors are resident; I mean the owners of stock who live on their stations and conduct their own concerns; while in Liverpool Plains . . . there are not more than two-thirds principals resident, and the stations are for the most part in the care of servants.” It was this type of land speculation and investment without real secondary consolidation which, as well as confusing run ownership, was said to have been responsible for the onset of a recession at this time.

In the early 1840s on the Downs, the combined effects of a colonial depression, the scarcity of labour and its much complained of “despotic and insolent worthlessness”, and the difficulties of marketing which remoteness imposed, ensured that those squatters who survived these years were men of substantial capital. Jondaryan’s first licensee Charles Coxen was not one of these.

Downs squatters had to bear high transportation and marketing costs being so distant from Sydney. Remoteness was a costly problem for men like Coxen. With Moreton Bay officially closed to free settlers until 1842, supplies had to be brought from Newcastle or Maitland, which was expensive, and subject to considerable delay. The opening of Moreton Bay to free settlers improved the situation somewhat, but Cunningham’s Gap proved an unsatisfactory dray road. Another track was found over the road near Hodgson’s Creek, but this also proved a “Hell Hole” to drivers and bullocks
alike. “I cannot conceive”, pondered Demarr, “how they ascended this gap. I believe the bullocks were unyoked and the goods carried piece-meal on their backs, and the drays in their descent let down by ropes.” George Leslie described the route to Moreton Bay as “a most horrid road enough to frighten anyone and to smash all the drays in the country”. The journey though only seventy miles as the crow flew, was one hundred and thirty miles by road, and took a month to complete. This route proved too bad to take large quantities of wool over, and so a better line via Drayton was marked out and co-operatively cleared by Hodgson and Elliot’s, Sibley and King’s, Messrs Coxen’s, Hughes and Isaac’s, Mr Dennis’s and J. Campbell’s teams. The difficulty of marketing often meant that the Downs squatters did not get their wool down to Sydney quickly enough to take advantage of the high prices. Fluctuating wool prices were a feature of the early 1840s, and a delay of a couple of months could mean the difference between profit and loss. Such was the case for the Leslies in 1841. The high price of supplies, and the low price which they received for their 1841 clip forced them to write “home” asking for £600 to carry them through.

The Leslies’ financial difficulty, as that of Charles Coxen and most of the Downs squatters, was a result of generally depressed economic conditions. These conditions have been attributed to various causes. Some have blamed the banking system, or lack of it, as was the case in the Northern Districts; some the New South Wales Government; others the internal organization of the wool industry; and others the withdrawal of British foreign investment.

There are other historians who have taken up varying positions between these internal and external views of causation. The causes of the depression in New South Wales in the early 1840s can best be attributed to the internal organizations of the wool industry itself, exacerbated by the withdrawal of British investment, and the fall in the market price of wool. Obviously the colony of New South Wales and its government had no control over the latter, but the root cause lay in the boom period of the 1830s.

Both urban and rural expansion of the late 1830s had been funded by an unbounded system of credit. This had led to extravagant and excessive speculation, which had sent land prices spiralling to fictitious values.

In the rural sector many British emigrants had been willing to purchase flocks at any price, and the northern squatting movement of the late 30s and early 40s had been largely the result of this extravagant speculation in which sheep and land had been acquired in
a frenzy of borrowing. By the end of 1840 the capital and the well-watered land were no longer available, prices were falling, and speculators, having burned their fingers, blamed the government for having allegedly encouraged them in their rashness.

Most Downs squatters operated on a system of credit secured through a Sydney agent. It was the squatter’s agent, and not his banker, who advanced him high-interest loans, the banks being wary of high-risk squatting ventures. The principal colonial currency was not bank notes, but orders drawn upon Sydney merchant houses. Generally speaking, it was this unbounded system of credit, supplied at high interest rates, which led to economic dislocation. When that credit was withdrawn, that is, when British capital was withdrawn, many pastoral enterprises crashed. Outlining to his parents the difficulty of remaining solvent George Leslie wrote: “Money flies like the wind in this country . . . No one unless those who have seen it could imagine the change there is in the Colony within the last few years . . . they must work hard to make it and if they have money they must work almost as hard to keep it.” In December 1843 he wrote of how nothing could be sold, and if it was, how there was “no money to be had, nothing but bills, bills”.

The whole colony by the end of 1843 was experiencing an economic depression. Once the land and stock market was saturated, the government, no longer able to meet its immigration payments because of reduced revenue from land sales, was forced to withdraw funds from banks. This in turn forced the banks to recall their advances to merchant firms. Those who had been so “forward in giving credit to the supposed prosperous sheep-owners of New South Wales”, remarked Bonwick, “now pounced upon their flock at this critical moment”. “Many of the hard-working enterprising men of the day,” we are told, “had to succumb”. Sheep bought for 15s. at Bathurst were now getting only 2s.6d. at top price, and cattle bought for £9 could be sold for £1. “Everyone was complaining of ‘bad times’,” wrote Demarr, “trade there was none, the staple products of the country — livestock — were almost valueless.”

To add to the squatters’ economic difficulties, there were the environmental ones of drought, hailstorms and the threat of scab and catarrh. H.S. Russell’s flock was badly infected with scab. He attributed the infection not to cold wet conditions but to the mixing of his flock with hundreds of a neighbour’s scabby sheep. Although catarrh and scab were more likely to have been contracted by sheep in the more-moist districts such as New England, they could also be
contracted by sheep which had come into contact with infected sheep, and break out upon the arrival of wet weather. Fred Bracker of the Australian Company on Rosenthal sent Russell Jemmy Carter, an eminent member of the scab-curing faculty, to treat his scabby flock. However, “the mercurial abominations” which Carter tried on the infected sheep failed, and Russell was driven to seek a permanent resting place elsewhere.

And, as if the economic and physical environment were not threatening enough, the government launched what the squatters considered to be a further attack on their survival. Changes were announced to the principles upon which depasturing licences were to be granted. As from July 1845, for each twenty square miles of run occupied, and 4,000 sheep depastured, a separate £10 licence had to be taken out. Further, after five years, every licensed squatter was eligible to purchase a 320 acre homestead block. If he declined to do so, he faced the prospect of losing it. Governor Gipps regarded the “New Occupation and Purchase Regulations” as a possible means of avoiding another depression in the wool industry. He blamed the latter on under-occupation and absenteeism and resulting from these, inefficient management. Restricting the size of runs and establishing a closer correlation between the numbers of stock depastured and the acreage of land occupied, Gipps reasoned, might put an end to speculation and inefficiency.

The squatters interpreted Gipps’ action as an unwarranted attack upon them at a time when they could least afford it. George Leslie voiced his opposition to the proposed squatting act:

I daresay you will have heard of the new squatting act which has been creating such a sensation throughout the whole country. Every man in the country is against it for it is too preposterous and ridiculous to tax the squatter to the extent Sir George would wish especially in the present state of the country which does not appear to be on the mend yet.

Some squatters, like Leslie, accepted having to pay a higher rental, but declined to pay the “heavy taxation”. “A Squatter” wrote to the Sydney Morning Herald detailing the revenue collected from squatters, and the money expended on them, and concluded that £25,000 more was taxed from them than was expended for their benefit.

The Moreton Bay District Association was formed in May 1844 to co-operate with a Central Association in Sydney to protect the squatting interest against the effects of the squatting regulations of 2 April 1844. The members of this Association included H.E. Isaac,
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Gore and Co., E.B. Uhr, D. Archer and Co., P. Leslie, Crawford and Hodgson, J. Campbell and C. Lawless.** Squatters were by this time also taking offence at the use of the epithet, “squatter”. The “squatter”, they argued, was “one who (occupied) land to which he has no legal title. A stockholder has a legal, though only a temporary title to the land he occupies.”**

The colonial press was quite scathing in its criticism of the Regulations. The editor of the Sydney Morning Herald claimed that they would be a “tortuous aggravation” of squatters’ sufferings, and a “dreadful check to returning prosperity”.* Commissioner Rolleston’s opinion of the Regulations was that he favoured the issuing of a separate licence for each run, but made the point that the extent of each run should be assessed in terms of its stocking ability, as well as its physical size.**

At a time when squatters were looking for greater security of tenure, they saw in the threat to auction off their homestead blocks, greater insecurity. At a time when they were looking for financial relief from the government, they saw the autocratic hand of Governor Gipps reaching out to tax them more heavily. Gipps was successful in introducing separate licences for each run, but the weight of colonial opinion successfully blocked his attempts to tax squatters more heavily.

Added to these problems was the Downs squatters’ territorial struggle with the original inhabitants, which was not only costly in terms of human lives and stock lost, but which also forced up the cost of wages.

Before Commissioner Rolleston had established himself at his new Cambooya headquarters on Hodgson’s and Elliot’s run, he was asked by Joseph King and James Sibley to accompany them and a party of settlers, to look for a flock of sheep driven away by Aborigines.* Rolleston was thus quickly reminded that his role, as well as being largely a bureaucratic one, also involved preventing collisions “between the men in charge of (squatting) establishments and the Aborigines of the country”.

It had been sixteen years since initial white-black contact on the Downs. On 5 June 1827 Allan Cunningham had observed the smoke of numerous fires from Aborigines’ camps, and had seen
Aborigines on the banks of the Condamine River. Of their reaction
to his party he had written: “... they evinced little fear, and,
having fired the grass opposite the camp, walked leisurely away on
the approach of the intruders.”71 Indeed, the “few Indians” whom
Cunningham saw wandering through the Downs area he described
as being “very careful to avoid us”.72 Another pioneer, recalling his
experiences, made the same observation as Cunningham concern­
ing the Downs Aborigines’ avoidance of the invading whites: “The
blacks were quick enough both of sight and hearing to have noticed
us... but from some mysterious cause, we escaped coming to col­
lision with them.”73 That the Aboriginal tribes of the Darling Downs
were not induced to “seek a communication” with Demarr or
Cunningham’s party was probably due less to “some mysterious
cause”, than to the fact that they “had long been warned by the
gossip of the tribes of the unfriendly nature of the whites
occupation”.74 Certainly their communication system was sufficient­
ly sophisticated to have allowed them this knowledge. “Like the
heralds of old,” squatter John Campbell remarked, “they may travel
unharmed, through hostile or any strange tribes. Their business is to
carry news, new songs, dances, corroborees, etc., as also to an­
nounce war and peace.”75 As well as tribal messengers, Aborigines
used “signalling mountains belonging to each tribe on which they lit
a number of fires, by which smoke was made to rise in prearranged
waves, the codes being perfectly understood by the tribes.”76 Through their barter system also, they would have come to know of
the superior material culture of the whites. The great Bunya nut
festivals would also have acted as the perfect forum for southern
tribes to tell of their experience of European settlers. That the Downs
Aborigines’ behaviour was characterized by caution and avoidance
was, therefore, probably more attributable to their fear of the known
rather than their fear of the unknown.

Even so, the first sighting of a white man or white men, horses
and guns, must have had a considerable psychological impact on
Aborigines. Patrick Leslie said that he was once told by “blacks” that
the thing which evinced most fear in them was the sight of a man
dismounting from his horse, “their full impression being that man
and horse was one animal”.77 Certain Aboriginal religious beliefs
were exposed to erosion as soon as white men began moving onto
the Downs in any numbers. Aborigines have been able to incor­
porate the occasional escaped convict into their belief system
because they believed the latter to be “jumped up” blackfellows.78
However, it was clearly impossible for the Aboriginal kinship struc-
ture to accommodate all the whites who arrived on the Downs in the early 40s. Not only could they not be “accommodated”, but their presence cast doubts on the belief itself. This was well reflected in a comment made by Andrew Petrie before the Select Committee to the Native Police Force in 1861: “They used to believe that when they died they would ‘jump up’ white fellows, but they don’t believe that so generally now.”79

Physically, Downs “blacks” were said to be a “fine specimen of the Australian natives, some of the men being giants in size and well-proportioned”.80 Commissioner Rolleston estimated them in 1843 as “numerous, though scattered in small tribes”.81 As far as Rolleston could ascertain, there were six tribes on the Downs, varying in number from as few as two or two hundred. So amalgamated were they with surrounding tribes, however, “as to admit to no specific classification”.82 He estimated the number claiming the district as their home at five hundred, but because of the presence of visiting tribes from the Severn, Richmond, Clarence, Boyne Rivers and Moreton Bay said that the number frequenting the district at any one time was not less than two thousand.83 Archibald Meston, Southern Protector of Aborigines, referred to the Downs “blacks” collectively as the “Gooneburra” or Fire Blacks, a name he said was given to them by the coastal “blacks” because of the former’s practice of “annually firing the grasses”.84 This they did to drive the thousands of kangaroos, emus, wallabies and plain turkeys to the hills, the dry watercourses or the lagoons and creeks.

These Downs Aborigines, residents and visitors, moved about the Downs in accordance with strict Aboriginal tribal law. Those who came from a radius of two hundred miles to the Bunya nut festival near Dalby travelled only along strips of country which were designated “free”, sought the permission of the local tribe before entering the latter’s territory, and, when hunting, respected the individual, family and tribal totems of the resident tribe. When the white man drove his flocks onto the Downs he unknowingly violated all of these laws. He came without permission, and his sheep and cattle polluted Aboriginal water-holes and drove Aboriginal game away. He was no respecter of totems: killing Aboriginal game and clearing the land. He was no respecter of property either. A whitefellow at Grantham, below the Range, wanting bark to cover his huts and stores, appropriated four hundred sheets of bark from a group of Aboriginal humpies. In John Campbell’s opinion, it was this act which resulted in the deaths of “seventeen white men — most of them shepherds”.85 It was not just this one incident,
however, but a number of injustices, which converted a once “quiet and tractable” people into one “as hostile as they had previously been peaceable”.86

The squatters had come to the Downs with preconceived ideas about Aboriginal inferiority. They believed that God had made the land to be used, and, because Aborigines were not seen to be doing this, they had forfeited their right to it. “God we are divinely assured made the earth to be inhabited”,87 wrote Lang. To a people whose point of reference was property, there were few overt signs of Aboriginal occupation.88 The belief that Aborigines merely roamed over the land supposed also that they could move on to new territory to make way for white settlement. This view took no account of tribal boundaries, Aboriginal dependence upon particular flora and fauna, or specialized knowledge of its seasonal variation to ensure adequate nutritional intake and dietary variation. The squatter and the Aborigine were resource competitors. Their needs were the same — land and water; and conflict arose around those needs. Aborigines also contravened all European aesthetic standards of morality and beauty. There were some squatters who, for the latter reason alone, believed that the “appearance of a blackfellow should be his death warrant”.89

The whites with whom Aborigines would have had most initial contact, however, were not squatters but their employees, and, of these, those shepherding in very remote parts of runs. James Demarr described convict and ex-convict shepherds as a “number of the vilest scoundrels and ruffians”.90 Probably driven mad by their previous confinements or the solitude of their latest one of “crawling after sheep”, they thought, according to Demarr, “no more of shooting a blackfellow than they would a mad dog”.91 Demarr added that they could be heard in conversation “boasting of the blacks they had slaughtered and, when relating the particular qualities of a savage brute of a dog, say, he would pull down a blackfellow or seize a blackfellow and tear his entrails out”.92 As well, they would use Aborigines as stooges for their misdemeanours. William Gray, a Downs pioneer, related a story about a team carrying a quantity of liquor back to a Downs station. By the time it reached Gatton, all the liquor had been consumed. In order to extricate themselves from this difficulty, the men demolished the empty casks, scattered the stores, bogged the drays, and left imprints of naked feet around fires, leading the tracks out into the bush.93

Squatters’ opinions differed as to how to deal with “the blacks”.
"Keep them at a distance", was Henry Stuart Russell's policy and his advice to his neighbour Charles Coxen of Jondaryan. Coxen, however, believed in admitting them, and supplying them with all in his power to give. The Leslies, like Russell, emphasized firmness and a lack of fraternization. George told his parents: "We never allow them to come about the station or hold any communication with them, except it be with a gun or sword." The Aborigines' "dread of muskets" was well known, and "firing a charge of small shot into the midst of them" was often the "method of keeping them under". "Darkey Flat" near Warwick was so named by Patrick Leslie "because it was the only place", he said, where "niggers would approach in those days, and then a shot in the air would frighten them away". Parties of settlers were frequently "got up" to hunt the "niggers", thought to be responsible for the killing of stock. The practice of killing a "good lot" to "strike terror into the rest of them" on such occasions obviously did nothing to improve the relationship between the two races. When the Leslies found that sixty of their maiden ewes had been killed their response was to go out and give the 'blacks' "what they (would) not forget in a hurry".

Aborigines retaliated by killing station employees. On 12 October 1843 John Hills, a stockman on Eton Vale, was killed. Two months later an employee of Henry Marsh of Maryvale was also murdered. From January 1842 until December 1843 thirteen white men were killed by Downs Aborigines. William Hughes was murdered on Jondaryan, verifying, according to Russell, the foolishness of Coxen's policy of admitting "the blacks". Richard White, shepherd of Messrs. Sibley and King, also lost his life. This brought the total loss in three months to four lives and 1,874 sheep. By early 1844 Commissioner Rolleston could report that Downs Aborigines were displaying "a decidedly hostile disposition towards the Europeans on several stations in the District".

Squatter John Campbell believed that Downs "blacks" had resolved that it was to be war now in earnest. He related how he had heard news of this: "My first salting season was nearly over at Kangaroo Point when one day a blackfellow came to me, and in a very earnest manner warned me not to go to the Darling Downs. He proved to be a messenger sent by Multuggerah to tell me that it was to be war now in earnest." Campbell further related the strategy of such a war: "... their intention was first to spear all the Commandants, then to fence up the roads and stop the drays from travelling, and to starve the
‘jackeroos’ (strangers). Altogether, they, in fact, intended to let no more rations go to the Darling Downs.” Within three weeks of this declaration, Campbell claimed, Downs Aborigines had carried out their programme of stopping drays laden with supplies from going to the Downs. In a scrub near Helidon, bullock-teams belonging to Messrs Francis and David Forbes of Clifton were forced in and robbed of “everything they could carry away”. This included sheep-shears which the “blacks” broke and with which they armed the points of their spears. Commissioners Simpson and Rolleston rallied forth with their mounted police and a squatter “posse”, supplemented by ten of Her Majesty’s Ninety-Ninth Regiment. Reports vary as to the success of this punitive force. Rolleston said that they were “obliged to return unsuccessful”, the blacks “having returned to the scrub immediately”. Henry Stuart Russell remarked that the whites had scoured that scrub, “with as much hope as one that looketh for a needle in a pottle of hay”. Campbell, however, claimed that the party had had considerably more success: “Twenty men started on foot and persistently followed the blacks giving them no time to procure their food and pouncing upon them by night or by day in camp, or in trees, when trying to prepare food . . . At the end of three weeks the blacks sent in a message to say that they would fight no more, but make peace now — they had had ‘plenty fight’. If the latter report is correct, this must have dealt a severe blow to the Aborigines’ plan to wage this type of war against the whites. Their enemy had successfully exploited their inability to carry “rations” and their need to stop and prepare food. As well, as Demarr noted: “Their chief source of food lay in the open country, and there it was they came into collision with the settlers.” But this was not, as Campbell asserted, where “the war between the races ended”. Rather, it was the beginning of a different style of campaign. Beset with financial problems, the Downs settlers believed that they faced economic as well as physical extinction.

In 1844 men of moderate capital were everywhere in New South Wales being declared bankrupt. John Watts of Eton Vale recalled how the bank took possession of a large proportion of runs of the old New England settlers. George Leslie wrote of the “immense number of people leaving the country”. Aberdonian John Thane’s Ellangowan and Thane’s Creeks’ huts, sheds, horses, team of bullocks, ten bales of wool, implements, 3,200 sheep and 1,200 lambs were sold for £650 cash. Seldom or never had “such universal bankruptcy over-taken any other country”. Fifteen hundred names swelled the lists of bankrupts in New South Wales.
Drought, depression and eye trouble proved too much for Charles Coxen's brother Stephen. He committed suicide in a Sydney hotel leaving this note: "All the means I have in the world is on the table, 23s.6d., and this I have borrowed."\textsuperscript{120}

The Leslies, rescued by more "advances" from "home", were not one of the pastoral enterprises to go "bust". Their non-absenteeism may also have been responsible for their ability to remain financially buoyant. George remarked in October 1844 that it had been nearly three years since he had been away from the station, "further than going to Brisbane on business". They were also saved from financial ruin, as were others, by the discovery of two new processes, the salting of beef and its boiling-down for tallow. The latter process in particular gave many an income from otherwise unsaleable stock, an income which was used to stave off clamouring creditors: "We intend boiling down some of our sheep for their tallow (which is quite the rage now) to meet that part of our New South Wales debts which we cannot pay."\textsuperscript{121} In John Campbell's opinion, "nothing else could have saved them from ruin".\textsuperscript{122} For so many boiling-down was, as Eric Fry has described it, "a grimy means to a solvent end".\textsuperscript{123}

In the long term, of course, beyond the fact that boiling-down played its part in the establishment of manufacturing industries by encouraging the setting up of tanning, soap and candle manufacture, it changed the nature of the wool industry itself. Boiling-down improved the long term prospects of the industry by culling a great many diseased, inferior and coarse-woolled sheep. This halted the trend to breed for quantity of sheep rather than quality, and allowed concentration on the production of fewer and better sheep. In the short term, however, and despite boiling-down, many squatters were forced to sell out.

On 25 January 1845 Sydney liquidators, Morris and Lyons, sold by public auction four hundred head of cattle, sixteen hundred sheep, three horses, and a team of working bullocks, etcetera, together with the station of Jondaryan at the Darling Downs.\textsuperscript{124} Charles Coxen, unlike the Leslies, was unable to call upon financial backing from "home", and was declared insolvent.\textsuperscript{125} James Macabrieu Andrew reputedly paid £650 for Jondaryan Station.\textsuperscript{126} The big Condamine Plain now belonged to Mr Andrew of Jondaryan in one direction, Hughes and Isaacs of Gowrie, and Westbrook and Cecil Plains in the other.\textsuperscript{127}

"Everyone seems to wish to come to the Downs",\textsuperscript{128} wrote George Leslie in May 1845. The low price for which "depression"
stock and stations were being sold prompted a third wave of settlement onto the Downs and further north. Like the first two, it was southern-inspired and southern-financed, but that finance now came from a different source. The government hoped that the Liens on Wool and Stock Mortgage Act, which took effect on 11 October 1843, would be another means of putting an end to the extravagant speculation which had characterized northern expansion. This act allowed money to be advanced to squatters on the wool on their sheep, and on the security of the stock itself. This allowed banks to enter the pastoral credit field where previously they had been excluded. The fact that banks could now advance loans to squatters on the security of stock would, it was hoped, lessen their need to borrow through agents at high interest rates. As far as George Leslie was concerned, this was the time “for a person coming to this country with a little money to settle”.\(^{129}\) By May 1845 sheep were again in great demand and those with capital were investing in the Downs. One such investor was Robert Tertius Campbell.

Campbell was one of the 90 per cent of respectable Sydney merchants and shopkeepers declared insolvent in 1844, but, like a few of his merchant colleagues, he displayed a remarkable facility for survival. In Buckley’s opinion, Campbell was a part of a section of the Australian bourgeoisie, who, throughout the nineteenth century, survived times of depression, “especially by concealing assets from creditors”.\(^{130}\) A.B. Spark, a friend of Campbell, was a case in point. He survived financial ruin by managing to conceal his art collection from creditors. After writing off £10,000 in debts to liquidators in 1844, Campbell went on to become owner and part-owner of seventeen pastoral leases. One of these was Jondaryan Station. Like so many others, he had an ability to survive which can be attributed to kinship support.

Robert Tertius was a Campbell of the Duntroon Castle Campbells of Argyll, Scotland. His grandfather came to New South Wales in 1789 and became Sydney’s first free merchant and first non-official member of the Legislative Council. Successive Governors, in their attempts to break the trading monopoly of the New South Wales Corps, encouraged Campbell in his merchant activities. Paralyzed by debt in 1815, he recovered to found the first savings bank in Australia in 1819. In belated compensation for a ship wrecked when bringing supplies to the colony from India, the government promised this “Father of Australian Commerce” a grant of land and sheep to the value of £2,000.\(^{131}\) From this beginning, Campbell became one of the wealthy landholders of the 1830s. Like so many others,
he saw his wealth as a vehicle by means of which he could raise his family to gentry status. One of his holdings was Duntroon, which apparently resembled an English manor with “dinners, hunts, and their season in Sydney”. With his son Charles installed as manager, Campbell, absentee grazier, was described thus in a newspaper: “He had only to go forth in the morning and get upon his horseback and superintend, and fancy that he was very busy and take credit to himself for enduring the hardships of the bush.”

Robert Tertius Campbell, licensee of Jondaryan, was a third generation merchant grazier. He was also Director and President of the Bank of New South Wales and the Bank of Australasia, and a substantial shareholder in each. His first pastoral licence was issued for Telemor on the Logan in 1844. His style of management of Jondaryan resembled that of his grandfather — absentee. He was Andrew’s sleeping partner, preferring to live in Sydney rather than endure the discomforts of bush life. J.M. Andrew was resident supervisor, taking his wife to live at Jondaryan and raising his family there. The times improved significantly for the Andrew-Campbell partnership. 1845 and 1846 were generally prosperous years with good wool prices. Many squatters who had managed to survive the preceding four years were now able to pay off debts on capital borrowed at high rates of interest, and invest some of their profits in run improvements. “As we had not the means before to make the necessary improvements,” George Leslie informed his parents, “everything has to be done over again.” The improvements which Andrew effected at Jondaryan included a wool-shed, a new sheep station hut, and two folds of hurdles. He also took advantage of low stock prices and increased his sheep numbers from 950 to 8,000 in two years. These he ran on what Commissioner Rolleston described as “good-soiled and thinly wooded country”.

1847 was a significant year for Andrew and Campbell and for all Downs squatters. In this year, their status changed from that of licensee to lessee. Fourteen-year leases with the much sought after pre-emptive right provision replaced an annual licence, revocable at the discretion of the Commissioner of Crown Lands. The March 1847 Orders-in-Council were regarded as the squatters’ Magna Carta, bestowing upon them a definite standing in law. During the currency of a lease, no person other than the lessee could purchase any portion of a run, and the lessee could, after formal application, but at not less than £1 per acre, in lots of 160 acres, the sites of his improvements. Rent was set at £10 per year plus £2.10s. for every additional 1,000 sheep over 4,000, or every additional 160
cattle over the 640 a run was estimated as carrying.\textsuperscript{138} The older land-holders of New South Wales, who had lent their support to the squatters in their fight against Gipps in 1844, objected to the squatters winning such long, cheap leases. George Leslie wrote of their bitterness:

The old settlers who have land inside the boundaries don't like them (the Regulations), so they have created considerable sensation in the Council. I was up being examined by the Council committee . . . and not considerably bullied. All the committee were against the squatters, so they gave A. Hodgson and myself being both Darling Downs men, a great examination.\textsuperscript{139}

The squatters themselves, of course, saw their “certainty of leases” as “a great advantage”.\textsuperscript{140} The \textit{Moreton Bay Courier} was equally enthusiastic. The editor thought it only just that a body of stockholders “second to none in this colony in education, talent and the polite accomplishments of society” should be raised up from their “condition of social and political degradation”.\textsuperscript{141} This response from the \textit{Courier} was not surprising in that the production capacity of the Northern Districts was closely tied to squatting. The general level of prosperity of the Northern District at the end of the 1840s was reflected in a total value of exports of £100,000,\textsuperscript{142} and a rate of northward expansion which had necessitated the proclamation of three new districts — the Maranoa, the Burnett and the Wide Bay.\textsuperscript{143} It was not until the 1850s, when colonists began to demand land held by the squatters, that the 1847 legislation was typed as “class”.

As well as providing greater security of tenure, the Orders-in-Council also led to runs being more accurately defined. Jondaryan was said to comprise “all the country drawing waters into Oakey Creek, from a line dividing Messrs. Hughes and Isaacs run down to a line dividing the Aberdeen Company having Irvingdale to the north, the large Condamine Plain to the south, Westbrook to the east, and St Ruths to the west”.\textsuperscript{144} Its extent was estimated at 65,000 acres and its carrying capacity at 12,000 sheep. Campbell and Andrew also leased Irvingdale with a grazing capacity of 6,000 and an extent of 45,000 acres.\textsuperscript{145} The Act also provided for the setting up of new machinery in the form of a Native Police Force to deal with the Aborigines and local Courts of Petty Sessions. It did seem as if order and stability were at last coming to the Darling Downs.

Many of the “old ring” squatters chose these prosperous times to sell out, take their tidy fortunes and return to England. Many runs
changed hands, and this was partly due to the Order-in-Council which stated that runs could be held unstocked. This meant that southern speculators could buy up all available land and force more genuine graziers to move further out. Henry Stuart Russell recalled his sadness at what seemed to be the passing of an era. He described the breaking up of "the old social ring on the Darling Downs": "... down on me at Cecil Plains one unheeded afternoon, swooped a throng of merry cavaliers of the olden time ... these, my then friends, about to leave, had come, in all kindness, to say good-bye." 146

Their departure marked the end of the first era of Darling Downs settlement, characterized by alternating optimism and pessimism as boom followed depression and then returned in its wake.
Securing a Labour Supply

The major problems facing the new Darling Downs frontier gentry of the late 1840s were the scarcity, "dearness" and "indolence" of labour and the pervading fear of Aboriginal attack.

The Darling Downs experienced severe labour shortages throughout the 1840s and early 1850s because of its remoteness from Sydney, because news of the "war" between the whites and the blacks on the Northern frontier filtered through to the South and because of Victorian "gold".

The Australian colonies generally had had considerable difficulty in attracting British immigrants to their shores. The United States of America was much closer,¹ land was cheaper and it symbolized all that was "free" whereas the Australian colonies were still trying to throw off their convict "taint". For every person who came to Australia approximately ten emigrated to America.

Of those who did come or were assisted, most were from urban environments and thus wished to stay in an urban colonial environment. Of the thirty-four labourers who arrived at Moreton Bay on the Tamar in July 1846, for example, all found work in Brisbane.² More arrived the following month, but with the same result.

Those immigrants who were not able to find employment in the southern colonies and decided to try "the bush" were mostly snapped up by southern squatters and rarely found their way to the Darling Downs. "When will the absurd practice of sending every immigrant ship to the most populous part of the country be abandoned?",³ the Moreton Bay Courier asked in July 1849. Employees who were directly hired by Downs squatters through their Sydney agents had to be brought to Brisbane from Sydney, shipped to Ipswich by steamer and then transported to Downs runs.

Even when a more direct system of immigration was organised to Moreton Bay in 1849 Captain Wickham, the Government Resident,
noted that most immigrants tended to set themselves up as tradesmen and thus become employers of labour rather than the shepherds, hutkeepers and farm labourers which the district so badly needed. The immigration programme in not maintaining an imbalance between the number of employers and employees was not satisfying the Downs squatters' needs.

Colonial promoter Edward Gibbon Wakefield had realized that it was crucial to maintain this imbalance. He argued that the price of land had to be sufficiently expensive to prevent a new immigrant becoming an employer too soon. It was for this reason, and to swell the coffers of the Emigration Fund, that the upset price of land was fixed at 5s. an acre. As Karl Marx noted, this artificial land price fixing had the effect of transforming labourers into wage earners. It also discouraged English immigrants from migrating to Australia when land could be bought more cheaply in America and it pushed squatters “beyond the boundaries” and eventually onto the Darling Downs. The irony was that the scheme which stimulated the squatting movement now threatened its viability because of its inability to attract immigrants. Pastoral enterprises, although they had access to vast areas of land, needed shepherds, hutkeepers and labourers.

What men there were on the Darling Downs were said to be had at such a “ruinous rate” that it would soon be a “matter of indifference to many whether it be plentiful or scarce”. This “want of labour” combined as it was with the losses which Downs squatters were suffering because of Aboriginal attack, in the opinion of a leading Downs Squatter, “no squatter could withstand”.

Two stations were “abandoned to the blacks” on the Downs in 1848 and eleven men murdered. To have recounted the “numerous outrages” committed by the blacks in that year would have been, wrote one of the Downs leading squatters, an “endless task”. During a four month period five men were murdered and several thousand sheep “lost”. Frederick Isaac's station was attacked, two of his men murdered and two thousand sheep driven off. The blacks' plan, according to Isaac, was to murder all the men at this headstation, sack the store and waylay the outlying shepherds and their flocks. In his opinion the question in respect to his own run was whether it was to be held by him or “abandoned to the blacks”.

Aborigines on the Darling Downs had waged a very successful campaign against the white intruders throughout the 1840s. In a determined effort to expel the white man Aborigines had used both old and new, individual and collective, resistance techniques. Some, such as that of firing huts, were an extension of existing
Aboriginal practices. Others, such as the formation of a composite Downs tribe and the emergence of “leader” tribes as well as tribal leaders, reflected the considerable adaptive ability of Aboriginal society.

Realizing that Downs squatters were dependent on an interflow of supplies and produce between themselves and Moreton Bay, Aborigines set themselves up in the Rosewood Scrub and from here attacked drays on their way to the Darling Downs. Jondaryan’s first licensee, Charles Coxen, had in fact narrowly escaped being speared to death by “blacks” on his way to the Downs in the early 40s. Scrubby terrain and grassy plains not only gave Aborigines the advantage of being able to observe whites without themselves being observed but provided them with “a secure refuge” into which to fly “after committing any depredations”. Once in the scrub a horseman could not follow for even a hundred yards without having to dismount. Also there “they were too far off to be reached by any missile from the guns”. Thus the Aborigines used their superior knowledge of the environment to reduce the white man’s technological advantage.

Aborigines also used their knowledge of the country and its climate to attack the very modus operandi of the squatter. Cattle and sheep were rushed and driven into impenetrable scrubs and creek beds. This was apparently done in “a most systematic manner”, particularly in wet weather. Of the Downs in January 1845 the Sydney Morning Herald carried the report that Aborigines were “spearing men, sheep and cattle, right and left”. They had driven off sheep and cattle belonging to Messrs Hughes and Isaac of Gowrie, cattle belonging to Mr John Campbell of Westbrook and had speared a man at Mr Fred Bracker’s station. Incidents such as these, and particularly the murder of two men near the present Jondaryan headstation, served to convince Downs squatters of the tightness of their policy of not admitting the blacks to their runs. The lessee of Jondaryan, it was said, had shown a friendly disposition towards blacks on his run and the result had been the murder of two of his men. A vicious cycle of attack and counterattack was set in motion. Following the murder of the Jondaryan men “the representatives of different stations were compelled to combine for self-protection and punish the offenders as neither life or property were safe”.

By 1846 and as a result of “mutual wars” and hostile collisions with Europeans it was estimated that at least three hundred Aborigines had lost their lives on the Moreton Bay frontier and fifty
Europeans had been killed. On the Darling Downs, Aborigines, it was said, fearing the same fate, were prepared "to war to the knife". Drays were being waylaid and cattle speared in all directions. The result was that blacks were shot "in all directions". Although the frontier situation was described as one of "war" where "every man carried a double-barrelled gun" Aboriginal aggressiveness was not interpreted as an organized campaign of resistance. Instead, the murder of shepherds on the northern frontier was said to proceed from the Aborigines' "innate thirst for blood". Those seen as "most dangerous" by 1848 were the half-civilized younger members of the tribes in the older parts of the district who had become "reconciled to the pursuits and comforts of civilization".

One of the most striking structural adaptations that Aboriginal society made in an attempt to expel the white man was the emergence of particular tribal leaders. Old "Moppy", it was said, was an Aboriginal tribal leader capable of raising up to twelve hundred fighting men. "Dicky", "chief" of the Gowrie tribe, was also said to have been able to exercise considerable influence over neighbouring Aborigines. Downs squatter David Perrier identified Peter, Jerry, Combo, Barny alias Boney, Bobby, Mickey, Billy and Joey as the "half civilized" Aborigines who had been responsible for an attack on a Downs run near Canning Creek in early 1848. In this attack one man was killed, three horses speared, one hundred and four ewes in lamb driven away and one tarpaulin, two guns and ammunition stolen.

The "determined and systematic nature" of these Aboriginal "outrages" throughout 1848 and the feeling that existed on the Downs following the massacre of a Scottish family at Drayton Swamp led, according to squatter John Watts of Eton Vale, to the establishment of a Native Police Force for the protection of Condamine and Burnett settlers. Commissioner Rolleston's Border Police having proved totally inadequate as a protective force, officers Nicoll and Walker were each assigned eight men and charged with the responsibility of fostering and maintaining friendly relations between whites and blacks. The Force, commanded by Frederick Walker, an ex-pastoral superintendent and a clerk of petty sessions was based on the principle of the Aborigines' superior environmental knowledge. As early as 1843 Commissioner Stephen Simpson had acknowledged this superiority and recognized its usefulness on the Moreton Bay frontier. He had replaced one of his troopers with a Limestone black, announcing his ultimate intention of retaining
only two white men as troopers and “selecting the others from the Aborigines as occasion may offer”. Commissioner Rolleston had likewise found the two Aborigines whom he had attached to his headquarters “of much use to me in affording me information relative to the movement of the different tribes”.

Once the Native Police were operating on the Downs the number of Aborigines killed on this frontier escalated. According to John Watts of Eton Vale “the number they killed no-one but their commander and themselves ever know”. Lieutenant Wheeler, when asked before the Select Committee into the Native Police Force in 1861 if he thought that there was any other way of dealing with Aborigines other than by shooting them, replied, “No, I don’t think they can understand anything except shooting them”. Any large gathering of “blacks” was assumed to be a threat to white security and “dispersed” by the Native Police.

Despite the intimidatory power of this Force, however, Aboriginal resistance in the twelve months to August 1849 was estimated to have cost the Darling Downs, Moreton Bay and Wide Bay districts £10,000 and the “dread of blacks” was said to be making labour “very scarce and dear”. The cost of carriage was “prohibitive”, shepherds commanded between £25 and £30 a year plus rations, married couples asked for between £40 and £50, shearers 3s. to 3s.4d. a score and washers 4s. a day. There was even the £25 a year hutkeeper who would “not undertake to watch the sheep!”

Almost as constant a complaint amongst Downs squatters as the “scarcity and dearness” of labour was its “indolence”. The Leslies, Commissioner Rolleston and the Editor of the Moreton Bay Courier all referred to “a general corruption of manner” among Downs employees. “We get up before daylight”, wrote the Leslies, “and raise the servants for in this country the servants would lie in bed till Doomsday if they were allowed”. The squatters, according to Commissioner Rolleston were “subservient to their men” and “the mercy of any ruffian” who chose to “lose, maim or destroy” their stock. Despite a rise in wages from £28 to £30 a year men were in the habit of “leaving their masters’ service as it suits their convenience” “and their flocks very often in the Bush to the mercy of the native dogs”. The Leslies again: “The servants here are great rascals in general and when sent down the country with drays they get drunk, and lose their bullocks and then are detained several days in finding them.” The Moreton Bay Courier spoke of the “growing evil” of labourers’ dictating terms or trying to dictate terms to their employers. “Although there is no part of the world”, the Courier
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said, "where they have such plentiful diet, large wages or indulgent liberty, there is no place where they do such little labour". The hope was that the time would "cease" when an illiterate shepherd could demand "a rate of wages superior to that which in England is often gladly accepted by classically educated men, and by Christian ministers". Rolleston in fact predicted that with only a reduced police force with which to enforce "good order... nothing but anarchy and confusion" would prevail between employer and employee on the Darling Downs.

In April 1848 there were few men to be hired in the Northern district even at "extravagant wages" and the "greatest inconvenience" was being experienced in the Darling Downs district not only "from the scarcity of servants" but from "the misconduct" of those who had "condescended to hire themselves". This problem of recalcitrant labourers was said to stem from the dearth of labour and its attendant high wage structure.

Wages were said to have been so high as to have allowed a system of subcontracting amongst employees. A cook on one establishment hired a deputy whom he paid 12s. a week. He also employed "a bevy of black beauties" to anticipate and supply "his most trifling wants". Ironically, it was argued, the higher the wages paid to employees the less satisfied they appeared to be with their "lot". High wages were not only allowing the practice of subcontracting and creating an indolent working class but seemed to be rendering some sections of that class almost independent of their employers. Shearers could earn sufficient in one season to support them in idleness for the rest of the year and therefore "did not accept employment at the Stations". They could be seen "lounging about the public-houses in the towns, and on the road". Squatters not only relied on shearers to get the "wool off" but also to do general station work during the non-shearing season.

Downs squatters came to the conclusion that European labour was too expensive, too unreliable and not suitable for pastoral purposes. It was decided that "a copious supply of immigrants" was the only way to counteract the "idolence and extravagance" of bush servants. Until this supply reached the district, one colonist remarked, "we have no reason to expect either that reformation will take place amongst the servants or that the masters will be placed in a better position than they are at present".

This "copious supply of immigrants" was effected by Downs squatters' bringing their "proper" influence to bear politically. In January 1850 Downs squatters sent their "man Friday" Sir Arthur
Hodgson to London to petition the Secretary of State for Colonies for 1,000 to 1,500 exiles.\textsuperscript{51} By mid 1850 there were an estimated 2,000 convicts in the Moreton Bay area\textsuperscript{53} despite meetings in Brisbane to put an “end to exiles”. The townspeople argued that “colonisation with criminals” was calculated to “injure the moral character” and retard the political freedom of the young colony. Their duty was to the poor of England who wanted a better life and to the working class here, and the protection of a just standard of wage for them.\textsuperscript{54} The issue of the quality of life and the moral fibre of the community, was however of less importance to the squatters than their finding a satisfactory labour supply and, in arguing their case, they had the townspeople over an economic barrel.

The signatories to the petition requesting exile labour were the proprietors of stations depasturing “upwards of 250,000 sheep; 22,000 cattle, 1,200 horses and employing 550 men”\textsuperscript{55} Five-sixths of the total export of the colony was derived from the pastoral industry — a labour intensive industry which, the squatters argued, as long as schemes to attract free immigrants failed, was dependent upon exiles, Chinese, Indian coolies and other groups that could be profitably imported. They argued further that if the last type of labour were not forthcoming the colony would never be prosperous enough to attract free immigrants and thereby create the type of society which they all wanted.\textsuperscript{56} The \textit{Moreton Bay Courier} had to concede that the stockholder, having waited eight years for an adequate supply of labour from Europe, was in a “worse position”\textsuperscript{57} than in 1840. The expectation among land-holders now was that they would “obtain a more abundant and suitable supply from Asia”.\textsuperscript{58}

At a meeting in Brisbane in January 1848, Messrs Campbell and Andrew of Jondaryan placed an order for ten Indian coolies. Both of Jondaryan’s proprietors were actively engaged in the promotion of coolie labour throughout the 1840s. Robert Tertiuis Campbell, W.C. Wentworth and Robert Towns had been the principal colonial importers of Asiatic labour and had managed to circumvent legislation and introduce sixty-one Indian coolies as menial servants. James Andrew had been a member of the “Coolie Association” formed in Sydney in 1842 at a time when, according to Henry Stuart Russell, “Gauchos from the Pampas; Coolies from India (and) Cingalese, had their advertisers and advocates”.\textsuperscript{60} Campbell and Andrew were also among the nine principal subscribers to the Moreton Bay Labour Fund.\textsuperscript{61} Downs squatters placed orders for a total of 248 Indian labourers in January 1848 and it was
estimated that employment could be found for a further one hundred. The importation of this type of labour, they hoped, would have the dual effect of reducing wages and freeing themselves from the "tyranny" of European labour. Some Moreton Bay residents, on the other hand, felt that their "purity of race" was being sacrificed for men who were not even intending to make the colony their home. The question as far as they were concerned was whether their future population was to be Anglo-Saxon or a mixture of "obstinate heathens", "New Caledonians and Coolies of the Hills". In their defence the squatters claimed that they were suffering "to a degree heretofore unparallelled from the scarcity of labour" and that their "many appeals" to the home government for British immigrants had borne no result. Squatters went so far as to argue that their "very existence" depended upon an immediate supply of cheap labour and that their attempt to procure these natives of India was "an act of self-preservation".

Various promises were made to the townspeople as to the conditions under which this labour was to be imported. The squatters emphasized that this was merely a "temporary solution" to a "temporary problem" and therefore it posed no long term threat to the social composition of the colony. The understanding also was that when a "satisfactory alternative" was found, all such schemes would be abandoned.

The question was, of course, what constituted a "satisfactory alternative" for the squatter. It was stated that this was labour that was "well trained to servility", "easy of management" and "cheap".

Aboriginal labour was used extensively in many capacities from first settlement. There is scarcely an account of the settlement of the Darling Downs that does not make reference to a "blackboy" in the party. Henry Dennis, Jondaryan's original claimant, had "his Warraba", Charles Coxen, Jondaryan's first licensee his "blackboy" and the Leslies their blackfellow, chosen, we are told, because of his usefulness "in finding water or tracking horses and cattle when lost". The Aborigines' superior knowledge of the country saved many lives and "many pounds in horseflesh and a great saving in time". Aborigines also acted as the Downs' first postmen. Relays of Aboriginal carriers with message sticks carried news from one station to another. A squatter would write a letter, place it in the end of a short stick and then give it to a "tame blackfellow" to deliver. By 1848 there is considerable evidence to suggest that Aborigines were making themselves useful to squatters "in many ways". As well as looking after stock and carrying wood and water,
Aboriginal women were the squatters' wives domestic servants. They managed to stay stocked, however, by combining two flocks into one and entrusting these to Aboriginal shepherds. At Canning Downs in September 1853 fifty thousand sheep were washed by Aboriginal labour organized by “King Darby”. In June 1858 the Jondaryan flock was being looked after by Brooks and Derwent Forster and two blacks.

Despite directing pioneering parties through hostile territory, providing the expertise necessary to build the first forms of rudimentary shelter on the Downs, being recognized as the first carriers and even acclaimed as having saved many squatters from ruin by acting as shepherds in the early 1850s, the Downs Aborigine was still not regarded as a totally satisfactory pastoral employee.

Aboriginal labour was certainly “cheap”. In most cases it could be bought for less than the cost of a bullock's or a horse's. There are numerous accounts of Aboriginal labour being paid for with a little flour, sugar or tea. Initially, however, the Aborigine's mastery of the physical environment made him too independent of his employer and thus too “unreliable” as a source of labour. Then, as Aborigines were reduced to a more dependent state, their services ceased to be as cheap because all their non-working dependents had to be supplied with rations also. Exiles, and even more especially Asian indentured workers, were more reliable and easier to manage. The bush provided no such refuge for them and once they had fulfilled their contract they were repatriated, thereby removing the threat of miscegenation. Also, their non-productive dependents did not have to be supported. The structure of the contract and convict systems, as Ann McGrath has pointed out, was indeed very similar: “in both systems the workers' liberty was denied by a dominant class for a fixed period during which they would perform labouring functions”. Aborigines were unfit to be the subjects either of the “contractual obligations and duties of indentured labourers nor to negotiation and bargaining in the instance of wage labouring”.

In terms of manageability, therefore, Asian indentured labourers were regarded as the most “satisfactory” source of labour. Pastoralists had begun privately importing Chinese coolies in 1848 and one of the first to have reportedly tried the indentured labour experiment was Robert Tertius Campbell. Campbell bought his Chinese labourers at £8 a head, hired them for a term of five years, paid them between £4 16s. and £7 4s. a year and supplied them
with two suits of clothing and rations. Various people including John Connolly of South Brisbane and Henry Buckley set themselves up as agents for the importation of Chinese labourers, but the principal importer was Robert Towns, who, by 1854, had imported 2,400 male Chinese principally from Amoy and principally to be engaged as shepherds. In January 1850 the Moreton Bay Courier announced the arrival of 108 Chinese labourers and by May all of these were under indenture to employers. A month later the Courier advised parties wishing to obtain labourers from Amoy that orders for 190 had already been placed and that a letter awaited their signature. In November 1851 the “Duke of Roxburgh” arrived with 220 of these “ordered” Chinese and agent John Connolly asked employers to remove their Chinese from his South Brisbane stores.

Thomas Hall estimated that there were three hundred Chinese on the Darling Downs in the early 1850s. They were engaged principally as shepherds for a term of five years, were to be paid 12s. a month at the end of every three months, were to receive a weekly ration and were to “obey” all their employers’ orders. An example of an agreement between Robert Tertius Campbell and a “China­man” appears in the illustrations following page 152.

A body of colonists opposed the introduction of Chinese labourers as vehemently as they had the introduction of the “Hill Coolies”. Whilst they had resigned themselves to the fact that “the demand for labour must inevitably resolve itself into a choice of evils”, they felt that the importation of Chinese would “operate injuriously upon a young and thinly populated British country”. They referred to it as a “most hurtful and unnatural system of immigration” and to the Chinese as having “debased and dishonest minds” and “the most revolting and cruel habits”. What the white colonists developed was an irrational physical repugnance and sexual revulsion towards the Chinese based not on how the Chinese actually behaved but on how these “grossly debased and wicked” beings were thought to behave. It was very easy to ascribe “unimaginable atrocities” to a group who were considered to be “all that is vile and debasing to the country”.

The Chinese, in fact, like Indian coolies, proved less “manageable” than had been anticipated. As pastoral employees and principally shepherds their personal and organized resistance to their “lot” included striking, the attempted murder of one overseer and the murder of another, abandoning their flocks to the Aborigines or the native dogs, setting dogs onto the flocks to damage the fleece and individually absconding.
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The first strike on the Darling Downs was organized by Chinese labourers at Canning Downs. The reason for the withdrawal of their labour and their unsuccessful attack on the station meat store was apparently their realization that they were not being paid “as liberally as the white workers”. They “came out into the station in a mob and took possession of the gardeners’ hut and all the vegetables they could lay their hands on”. From here they went to the woolshed where they armed themselves with old castaway shears and waited till daylight to attack the store. Their plan was thwarted, ironically, however, by a blackfellow who raised the alarm. Stockmen, mounted and with stockwhips in hand and “Tommy the black-fellow, with his spear, nulla and boomerang” soon broke up the “Chows’ stronghold”. They were rounded up “like cattle”, driven into Warwick and handed over to Sergeant McEvoy. Half received short sentences and the other half were sent back to the station where, Thomas Hall informs us, they remained “good shepherds” until their time expired.

Absconding from hired service was probably the most common form of personal resistance to working conditions displayed by Chinese and Indian coolies. Notices inserted by run-holders who had “lost” their labourers were frequently to be seen in the Moreton Bay Courier. Mr J.M. Andrew of Jondaryan inserted such a notice in December 1850 and three years later reported the loss of more of his Chinese servants, who he said, had left without any “particular cause”.

Other direct and individual resistance tactics included the killing and stealing of sheep and deliberately mixing clean sheep with those known to be scabby. Such action met with penalties under the Masters and Servants Act. Between October 1850 and October

£2 REWARD
TO CONSTABLES & OTHERS

Whereas Achay, a native of China, has absconded from my service, the above reward will be paid to any one lodging him in the lockup, a warrant having been granted for his apprehension. Supposed to have gone towards New England.

Parties are hereby cautioned against hiring or harbouring the said Achay.

Jondaryan, 16 December 1850.

J. M. Andrew.

An absconder, Moreton Bay Courier, 4 January 1851. (Reprinted courtesy Main Library, University of Queensland.)
1851, there were forty Chinese confined to Brisbane gaol for breaches of this Act. Some employers, however, saved themselves the trouble and expense of bringing their Chinese employees before the local bench and devised their own efficacious modes of discipline. On one station the disciplinary mode chosen was a lock-up, a little meat safe where Chinese were tied upright by the throat, arms and legs without food or water for two or three days and nights. Such actions were justified in terms of their being merely a reaction to the innate “violent and revengeful dispositions” of the Chinese. Faced with such ill-treatment, it is not to be wondered why some Chinese chose to remain in gaol rather than be returned to their masters. Their willingness to go to gaol, in fact, frustrated the workings of the legal system, and, by flooding the courts with their number, they almost rendered the system inoperative. The Police Magistrate at Ipswich remarked in July 1852 that the frequency of cases against Chinese servants left little time for anything else. One Downs correspondent suggested that whilst the Masters and Servants Act was “sufficiently stringent” for Europeans it was “a positive luxury” for Chinese. He or she suggested that a severer clause for “celestials” be inserted and thought that perhaps the treadmill would “ensure their services more efficiently”.

Chinese individual and collective resistance to the labouring conditions in which they found themselves were not interpreted by white colonists as a responsive phenomenon. Rather, they were attributed to their innate characteristics. “Acts of insubordination and stubborn resistance” were not viewed situational but explained away by reference to the Chinese “dogged and determined character” or their “violent and revengeful dispositions”. Their presence was opposed both on racial grounds and because it threatened the whites’ idyllic image of a “contented and happy peasantry”. On the one hand the Chinese were “uncouth and unpopular foreigners”, naturally inferior to the European and unfit to play a part in the creation of this new society and on the other their competence, their propensity to save and their social mobility threatened the white workers’ material position. Racial antipathy, combined with the economic fear that competent Chinese would usurp Europeans’ jobs, led to a few violent clashes between the two groups on the northern frontier in 1851. This inter-racial tension acted in favour of employers because it channelled the white workers’ disaffection with his “lot” away from run management to the Chinese.
By 1854, however, it was generally conceded that the experiment with Indian and Chinese pastoral labour was “not satisfactory”\(^\text{111}\). The question, it was argued, could no longer be seen as “merely affecting the employer and the employed”\(^\text{112}\). The cost to the community was high in terms of moral degeneration and miscegenation and high in terms of danger to life and property. It also cost the community an estimated £500 to hold the forty Chinese imprisoned in Brisbane gaol for breaches of the Masters and Servants Act\(^\text{113}\). Squatters began to discuss more “satisfactory” alternatives. Free negro labour\(^\text{114}\), Galician shepherds\(^\text{115}\) and American labourers\(^\text{116}\) were amongst these.

The weaker flow of European migration which the “tyranny of distance” had imposed on the Australian colonies generally and on the Darling Downs in particular had imposed on Downs’ squatters a “tyranny of labour”. Labour could only be had at a “ruinous rate” and the “proper” positions of employer and employee had been reversed. Squatters were determined to restore this imbalance of power between themselves and their employees. A “satisfactory alternative” to the indolent bush worker was sought. European labour had proved to be too expensive, too unreliable and not suited for pastoral purposes. Exiles, Indian coolies and Chinese labourers were all introduced in an attempt to find a labour force which was “cheap”, “well-trained to servility” and “easy of management”. Aboriginal labour was certainly cheap, but satisfied neither of the other criteria. Exiles, and more especially Asian indentured labourers were more reliable and easier to manage. Overt and covert forms of violence could be justified in terms of being merely a reaction to their innate “violent and revengeful dispositions”. Thus, racial theory was used as a blanket to cover and conceal the nature of pastoral capitalism — a system of structure and control which attempted to use the legislature for the perpetuation of that control and in its own class interests.
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The framers of the Masters and Servants Act of 1845 intended that it should equalize the relationship between the employer and employee. The structure of authority on the Downs was such, however, as to favour the employer above the employee. As the squatters had used their influence to secure the type of labour they wanted, so, too, they used their influence to secure favourable decisions in Masters and Servants cases. The Masters and Servants Act, it was hoped, working in conjunction with a copious supply of labour, would re-establish the "proper" relationship between employer and employee.

The employers of New South Wales had found it necessary to pass an Act "for the better regulation of servants, labourers and work people" as early as 1828. A maximum of six months gaol was set for absenteeism and worker negligence. In 1840 this Act was amended by the passing of a Masters and Servants Amendment Bill to "Ensure the Fulfillment of Engagements and to Provide for the Adjustment of Disputes between Masters and Servants in New South Wales and its dependencies". The passing of a new Masters and Servants Act in 1845 was based on the English Act, the reasoning being that if it were necessary to adopt such a course in England "where the difficulty of obtaining employment and of providing a maintenance obliges men in general to be diligent and attentive", it was "doubly necessary" in a country where, according to the evidence, "an extensive summary jurisdiction is essential, looking at the general character of servants". As George Leslie told his parents in 1840, the laws of the country were "very strict both as regards free men and prisoners". The Leslies thought it only right that free men who were receiving high wages should "set an example to Government men". A "harsh penal code" was reasoned to be necessary "when one class was forced to be continually assertive
to maintain recognition of its social superiority as well as its economic needs''.

Under the Masters and Servants Act employees could be charged with “neglect of duty” for loss of stock, allowing stock to become “mixed”, failing to meet the conditions of their agreements as defined by their employers and even, at times, leaving the job due to their own or their family’s illness. Their sentences ranged from fines of £2 plus costs, to the cancellation of agreements and fifty lashes. Downs squatter David Forbe’s employees, T. Deadman, a freeman, and William Turner, a bonded servant, were charged with “disobedience of orders and neglect of duty”. Deadman was fined £2 to be “stopped” from his wages and ordered to remain in Forbe’s service whilst William Turner received fifty lashes and was “turned into Government”. In another case magistrates Forbes and Rolleston fined stockman P. Hall, an employee of Hodgson and Elliott of Eton Vale £1 and discharged him from service. William Cullen, a shepherd and also employed on Eton Vale was fined and discharged similarly because, he claimed, he had asked for leave from work to see a doctor. His masters claimed that it was because he had allowed two flocks to become mixed.

Absconding from hired service was probably the most common charge brought by Downs squatters against their employees. J.M. Andrew of Jondaryan in fact offered a reward of £2 for the capture of John M’Murray in 1847. M’Murray, whom Andrew had engaged for six months, absconded. Ralph Gore of Yandilla laid an “absconding” charge against his drayman Thomas Barnes and Donald Coutts, later to be lessee of Jondaryan, laid a similar charge against his watchman Gammock.

Absconding was the most common form of what Kay Saunders has described as the individual passive resistance of employees to their labouring condition. In incidents of more active and direct resistance employees brought charges such as “assault”, and, most commonly, “refusal to pay” against their employers. Some “evil-disposed person or persons” did even “burn or cause to be burned” the woolshed on Jondaryan Station in April 1849 and, six months later, a new sheep station hut and two folds of hurdles “shared the same fate”. J.M. Andrew of Jondaryan was convinced that “this injury was designed and premeditated” and offered £50 “to any person who will give such evidence as will bring to light the perpetrators of these diabolical outrages”. This reward was increased to £146.17s. by the subscriptions of other leading Downs squatters and the “storekeeping and agency fraternity” who sym-
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£50 REWARD

Whereas I have reason to believe that some evil-disposed person or persons did, about six months ago burn or cause to be burned the wool-shed on Jondaryan station.

And whereas, on or about the 25th September instant, a new sheep station Hut and two folds of Hurdles shared the same fate under circumstances which leave no doubt on my mind that this injury was designed and premeditated.

I hereby offer the above reward to any person who will give such evidence as will bring to light who perpetrated these diabolical outrages.

Jondaryan, Sept. 28th, 1849.

J. M. Andrew.

Pathized with Andrew's loss. The Downs squatters' practice of "refusing to pay" an employee usually took the form of total non-payment of wages, non-payment in part, or what was called "stopping" wages — that is, deducting from an employee's final cheque so much for negligence or whatever. Downs squatter A. Hodgson "stopped" one pound from the wages of shepherd J.T. Gill claiming that Gill had allowed washed sheep to mix with unwashed sheep. The Court ruled that Hodgson had been justified in doing this and directed that the "stopped" £1 be used by Hodgson for rewashing purposes.\(^{15}\) That this judgement was brought down by a Bench comprising Christopher Rolleston, Patrick Leslie, Walter Leslie and George Gore\(^16\) somewhat predetermined its outcome.

The framers of the 1845 Masters and Servants Act had intended that it should be "stringent and impartial" and that it should "equally equalize the relationship between employer and employee, equally to compel the servant to his duty and his master to pay him.\(^{17}\) The structure of authority on the Downs was such, however, as to favour the employer above the employee.

Christopher Rolleston, the Commissioner of Crown Lands for the Darling Downs, was not only responsible for the issuing of depasturing licences and leases to runholders and the collection of the requisite rent and assessment fee from them, but he was also responsible for imposing "order" on the affairs of men. This involved being the arbiter in boundary disputes, assisting whites in their affrays with Aborigines and resolving disagreements between employers and employees. He was also responsible for enforcing Regulations relating to ticket-of-leave holders, including organizing their annual
muster and their necessary passports. Despite Rolleston's formidable responsibilities, he had only six troopers in his Border Police Force. Upon his suggestion in 1846 this "totally unsatisfactory" Force was disbanded and replaced by Constables attached to each local Court of Petty Sessions.

The machinery by which disputes between employers and employees were to be settled was straightforward enough. When a complaint was lodged with a Justice of the Peace or a Bench, a warrant was issued, the defendant apprehended and charged, and the plaintiff summoned. A Court of Petty Sessions comprising the Commissioner of Crown Lands and two local Justices of the Peace was then convened. Unlike the role which he had had in settling boundary disputes, Rolleston's part in Masters and Servants cases was not that of sole arbiter. He issued the summons and then offered his judgement as one of three Justices of the Peace on the Bench.

This legal system was based on the British principle of the honorary magistrate and the British notion that responsible man could govern himself. In fact the only departure from English legal practice was the setting up of the Border Police Force and then the Native Police Force. As was the case in Britain, the only local men thought to be responsible enough to sit on the local Bench were men of property. The men who sat in judgement on Masters and Servants' cases therefore were very often the very employers of those being tried. This very economical practice, therefore, of using local squatters as honorary magistrates on the Downs limited the impartiality of justice on this frontier. Arthur Hodgson charged his employee Fred Harrison with "insolence of order and neglect of duty" and then sat on the Bench with Christopher Rolleston and David Forbes Esq. to hear the case. Those magistrates who were not themselves the employer named in the case were very often related to him.

Inter-marriage plus the severe test of pioneering had in fact welded the Darling Downs squattocracy into a close-knit and identifiable social caste. Those Downs squatters who did not go "home" to choose a bride chose instead from local families of equal social standing.

Patrick Leslie married Kate Macarthur and George Leslie married Emmeline Macarthur. Charles Coxen, Jondaryan's first licensee, married Elizabeth Isaac, daughter of Isaac of West Gowrie, and Arthur Hodgson of Eton Vale married Elizabeth Dowling. James Andrew of Jondaryan married Barbara Richardson at the residence
of John Gilchrist of Darlinghurst and Robert Towns married Sophia Wentworth. Henry Russell married Miss Pinnock, niece of the Governor of Jamaica. Squatters and Government Representatives were thought to be of equal social standing and Christopher Rolleston married Katherine Leslie and Police Magistrate Wickham a Macarthur. It is not surprising, therefore, that these squatting families, linked by marriage and with shared economic interests, acted in their own class interest.

Even magistrates who were not the employers named in the cases to come before the bench or were not related to the employers, by nature of the fact that they were employers, were expected to display “a bias in favour of their own class”. A Sydney Justice of the Peace remarked that employees had come to expect that “some partiality” would be shown in their Masters and Servants cases. The potential for bias in a legal system which was conducted by honorary magistrates drawn exclusively from the landed class, given very broad powers and no “professional assistance” was recognized by the 1845 Select Committee on Masters and Servants Cases. The Committee felt, however, that nothing could be done to correct this injustice because no-one “below the grade of run superintendent” was “competent to serve” as a magistrate. Class law did prevail on the Darling Downs.

Whilst the 1845 Masters and Servants Act and its implementation on the Darling Downs went part of the way towards assigning labour its “proper” place, its full punitive effect was reduced by the countervailing force of a shortage of labour. As long as an employee could leave the service of one employer and immediately be employed by another, the penalties for absconding from hired service were not as severely felt as they might have been. The labour market in the 1840s worked in direct opposition to the restraints of the Masters and Servants legislation. It was only when the squatters had secured a “copious supply” of the right type of labour that they were able to establish “proper” control over their employees.

James Andrew of Jondaryan had been one of the Downs squatters who had met in July 1850 to discuss the “ultimate separation of the Northern district from New South Wales proper”. These squatters felt that their needs, particularly with respect to their labour requirements, were being neglected by the southern government. A further meeting was held in Brisbane on 4 March 1852 to petition the Queen for direct emigration. In 1852 and 1853 more than two thousand immigrants, “drawn principally from the farming districts of England, Scotland and Ireland”, arrived in Moreton Bay. It was, in the words of squatter George Leslie, “all we wanted”.
Only those prospective immigrants who were prepared to make themselves available for employment were now eligible for selection. Respectable young women trained in domestic farm service were welcomed but single women over the age of thirty-five years were not eligible. Single women with illegitimate children were in no cases taken, neither were persons who intended to resort to the gold fields, to buy land or to invest capital in trade. In other words, the object of the immigration scheme was to attract people in the most active period of their working lives. This direct immigration was particularly crucial because the discovery of gold in Victoria had caused an even more severe labour shortage in the Northern district.

The North’s immediate reaction to the news of “Victorian gold” was, as David Denholm has asserted, one of confusion, panic, restraint and detachment. It seems that there was no immediate loss of labour on the Downs because the Moreton Bay Courier reported that sheds were “well supplied with hands”. In fact, the Courier believed that initially, far from having an adverse effect on the North, the discovery of gold in Victoria might be the answer to the North’s problems. The Courier’s optimism was shared by Patrick Leslie, who wrote to his sister in Scotland: “Labor will rush to us and all we want to be the most prosperous colony in the world is Labor.” Whilst this optimism was to be borne out in the long term, in the short term “gold” was to cause considerable dislocation. In a dire attempt to stem the flow of labourers to the south, rewards were offered for the discovery of gold in the Moreton Bay area. German immigration was also seriously advocated for the Northern district.

German immigrants were high on the colonists’ scale of migrant acceptability. They were Caucasian, had proved their industriousness in South Australia and were seen as a good counter-balance to what J.D. Lang described as the “romanizing” of New South Wales. In fact, apart from immigrants from the United Kingdom, they were regarded as the “most desirable” immigrants. The Moreton Bay Courier advertised in May 1851 that German labourers could be landed at Moreton Bay at a cost of £20 a year plus rations and could be hired for one or two years. Though these workers were initially not as cheap as Asian indentured labour, the promoters of this source of labour argued that German labour would prove more economical in the long term because employers would be saved the extra expense of bringing recalcitrant workers to Court. In April 1852 the Moreton Bay Courier announced that a Mr Edward Lord, an agent for Godeffroy and Son of Hamburg, had procured four hundred German labourers for the Northern
When the first shipload of these immigrants arrived in Brisbane in June 1852 all had already been engaged to Northern squatters. A number of Darling Downs squatters employed German labourers from the “Reiherstey” which berthed in Brisbane in December 1852. Mr Arnold Wienholt of Maryvale hired four shepherds and a family of vine dressers, Mr George Leslie nine unmarried shepherds and five families and Mr R. Gore two families. In contrast to the “treacherous and revengeful dispositions” of the Chinese, the Germans were typed as “devout people” of “frugal and industrious habits”. The squatters’ enthusiasm for rescuing German immigrants and their fellow countrymen from their “degradation and wretchedness” had less to do with philanthropy than with their having experienced the “utter inefficiency of Klings, Coolies, Cannibals and Celestials”. Although there is evidence that some German servants did abscond from hired service they were generally regarded as “excellent servants” with many remaining in the service of one squatter “for as long as fifteen years”. By this time the Northern district was also receiving an influx of disappointed miners from a glutted Victorian labour market. These men wandered north in search of employment.

This labour market, operating in conjunction with the Masters and Servants Act as it was implemented on the Darling Downs, was finally allowing squatters to exercise what they regarded as their “proper” control over their employees. The extent of this control was particularly evident in the early 1850s, when the “merchant princes” of Sydney became Downs’ pastoral lessees as well.

This new Darling Downs frontier gentry, although of a more diverse social origin than the “old ring” squatters, was just as socially exclusive and just as politically conservative. By the late 1850s they were an identifiable squatting establishment and one which used its political influence and considerable wealth from these “golden years” to consolidate its ownership of these vast alluvial plains. “Cathedrals of timber” emerged to bear witness to the fact that the Darling Downs was a “big man’s frontier”. The structure of authority, based as it was on kinship and class, further reinforced this fact.

Like Robert Tertius Campbell, John Gilchrist was one of the new breed of squatting merchants, eager to invest his commercial capital on the northern frontier. Gilchrist came from Glasgow in 1828, founded a Sydney merchant firm and was later joined in it by a friend, Alexander, and a nephew, J.B. Watt. This firm, Gilchrist Watt and Alexander and then Gilchrist Watt and Company became one of Sydney’s best known merchant houses. Gilchrist was involv-
ed in land deals with Robert Campbell and both men were directors of the Bank of Australia. In 1842 Gilchrist married Helen Andrew, sister of James Andrew of Jondaryan, and, when Campbell decided that there was more money to be made in Sydney with “flour and gold than in sheep-farming”, he sold his interest in Jondaryan to John Gilchrist. From his residence at Potts Point, Sydney, Gilchrist in absentia oversaw his interest in Jondaryan, Irvingdale and Myall Creek whilst his brother-in-law James Andrew stayed on at Jondaryan as resident manager.

Gilchrist acquired his interest in Jondaryan at a fairly difficult time. Wool prices fell in 1851, the Downs was experiencing a “severe drought” and labour was scarce. In 1853, because of the crisis with respect to the supply of labour on the Downs, because wool prices were still low and, running costs high, a number of Darling Downs runs changed hands. George Gammie sold his properties Clifton, Talgai, Toolburra and Ellangowan; Henry Hughes sold the magnificent Westbrook for only £2,000 and went back to England; and John Gilchrist sold his share in Jondaryan. By the end of 1853, even James Macabrieu Andrew, who had lived on Jondaryan for eight years, had had two of his children baptised there and had seen “sleeping partners” come and go, decided it was time to depart. The Moreton Bay Courier observed that “Jondaryan and the other stations on the Darling Downs connected therewith, are advertised in a Sydney journal, as for sale”. In January of the following year the Courier was able to report that a “Mr D. Coutts had purchased the stations and stock of Mr J.M. Andrew of Jondaryan, Darling Downs, for 20s. per head for sheep and 60s. per head for cattle”. The purchase price amounted to over £24,000. All those Jondaryan employees with any claim on J.M. Andrew were invited to submit them to the Sydney office of Gilchrist Alexander and Co.

In the type of squatting partnership that seemed to characterize Jondaryan proprietorship, Donald Coutts, Jondaryan’s new lessee, was the resident manager and Walter Gray, a local wool-handling, immigration and storekeeping agent, his sleeping partner. In 1856 they, in turn, sold Jondaryan and Irvingdale to Sydney merchants, brewers and pastoralists Robert and Edwin Tooth: “Mr Donald Coutts purchased Jondaryan and only retired there for a short time and sold it to Mr R. Tooth, Mr J.C. White being in charge for him.”

Robert Tooth Senior, hop merchant of Cranbrook, Kent, had arrived in Sydney in 1828. He received a grant of 2,560 acres of
land from the New South Wales Government, acquired numerous cattle runs and set up a general merchant and commission agency in Sydney. In 1835 he added to his business enterprises by opening the Kent brewery but over-extended himself pastorally and was declared bankrupt in 1848. Robert and his brother Edwin Tooth arrived in Sydney in August 1843 and leased the brewery for nine years. Their brother Frederick joined them ten years later and hence the partnership of R.E. and F. Tooth. With T.S. Mort, Robert Towns, T. Holt and others, Robert Tooth was involved in numerous pastoral dealings as well as processing innovations in the meat and sugar industries. In 1856-57 he was said to have been the employer of six thousand pastoral employees. He was also a Director of the Bank of New South Wales and of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company and involved in a “chain of operations from finance to production, marketing and export”.

The new proprietors of Jondaryan were thus involved in both the production and marketing of wool and Jondaryan was more than ever economically tied to the South. Like Robert Tertius Campbell, the Tooths belonged to what Michael Roe has described as Sydney’s “handful of merchant princes” who had “economic and social affiliations with the gentry”. In the early 50s those Down squatters who had regarded their stay in the colony as temporary departed for “home” and a group of southern-based merchant and commercial men established themselves as the new Downs squatting breed of the 1850s.

If the business world seems “small” today, it must have seemed even smaller in the 1850s — the “era of the agency”. Every squatter required the services of an agent to conduct his general business and, above all, to consign his wool. The Darling Downs squatter needed an agent in Sydney to receive and ship wool, to purchase and forward supplies and to hire labourers. By the 1850s this agency system had become fairly specialized with particular agents acting solely as wool brokers, and within what appeared to be a three-tiered system. In addition to the local agent there was the Sydney and the London agent, the latter dealing exclusively with wool marketing.

Jondaryan’s main Sydney agent was the large mercantile house of Gilchrist Watt and Co., they themselves being large land-holders and Gilchrist a former lessee of Jondaryan. They handled the sale of all of Jondaryan’s wool, whether sold locally or by consignment, and all of her stock transactions. As well, they acted as the intermediary between the proprietors of Jondaryan and the colonial
The treasurer in negotiations about the purchase of Jondaryan land and dealt with all manner of sundry items. Other notable firms with whom Jondaryan dealt included James Mort and Co., G.H. Wilson and Co., and Griffith, Fanning and Co. Agents' services were only available at a price, of course, and the “price” was normally 5 per cent commission a year. As well as having to pay what some squatters regarded as this exhorbitant fee, squatters often had to wait months before their agents forwarded to them the proceeds of the sale of their clips. George Leslie described Sydney agents and merchants as the “greatest scoundrels on the face of the earth.”

The economic stranglehold which agents had over their squatting clients became most evident during times of falling wool prices and rising costs. Once a squatter became indebted to an agent, the former lost all control of the marketing of his own wool. He could not bargain for its sale, he had to send it to London in ships chosen by the mortgagee, bills of landing had to be endorsed by the mortgagee at the charge of 2½ per cent, and he had to accept supplies from the merchant at the merchant’s prices. In effect, as Collier remarked, a “chain of monopolies bound him hand and foot.”

The extent of this “chain of monopolies” is further recognized when it is realised that, in many instances, Downs squatters' agents were their bankers as well. Any money not being used by the agent on the squatter’s behalf was held in trust and interest paid on it. The Leslie’s agent, Stuart Donaldson of Sydney, paid them 10 per cent on the money he held. Gilchrist Watt and Co. paid William Kent of Rosalie 1¼ per cent interest on the amount which Kent had deposited with them. Banks preferred to finance merchants who in turn financed squatters because of the risky nature of pastoralism. But in this sense the agency and banking systems were closely linked. They were even more closely linked when one remembers that the “merchant princes” were also shareholders, directors and presidents of banking institutions.

If the squatters were, in a sense, tied to Sydney bankers and merchants, the squatters’ employees were even more closely tied to their employers. The method of paying pastoral employees, the squatters’ arguments about the unsuitability of the Downs for agriculture, their influencing of the positioning of townships and their use of the pre-emptive right to “pick the eyes out of their runs” were all part of the squatters’ attempts to tie their men dependently to the station structure and maintain the status quo.

Whilst the townspeople recognized their debt to the Downs squatters as “their pioneers”, they also thought it inevitable that the squat-
ter would be pushed to new frontiers by the demand for land, and believed that he should willingly vacate his land for the second and most productive stage of occupation — agriculture. Whilst it had been perfectly acceptable for the squatter to displace the Aborigine and claim vast areas of land in his role of a producer of a much needed staple, squatting was viewed as only a temporary phenomenon. Man, it was argued, had to move on to a more civilized state. Pastoralism, with its predominantly male work-force, set up an unnatural relationship between men and created a society of doubtful moral character. Only when squatters could "condescend to become hewers of wood and drawers of water for themselves" could society expect to "move on to its natural state".\(^{63}\) With the pastoralist replaced by the agriculturalist, it was argued, there would no longer be the need for the importation of vast numbers of morally objectionable labourers. The settling of the small man on the land would promote social order and "civilization". The feeling was that for the "decencies of British civilization" to be preserved settlement had to be "concentrated with ample provision for small holdings and agriculture".\(^{64}\)

Despite these feelings, however, and mostly because of the squatters' political influence and the colony's economic dependence on wool, hides and tallow, the squatters gained greater security of tenure in 1847. Some colonists like J.D. Lang condemned the 1847 Orders-in-Council as a piece of "class legislation" and claimed that the squatters were using it to prevent agricultural settlement. The working classes in many parts of the interior, he said, were actual serfs and living "under a species of villeinage, their interests being sacrificed in every way to the privileged few".\(^{65}\) The feeling was that the time had come for a redistribution of resources. A "Scheme By Which The Crown Lands May Be Thrown Open For Sale To The Public Without Injury To The Squatting Interest"\(^{66}\) was announced. The object was the creation of Reserves from squatting leases. If a squatter failed to exercise his right to buy a minimum of 160 acres of his run within twelve months, a reserve could be resumed from his lease. Far from relinquishing any part of their land, however, squatters sought to use their political influence to consolidate their hold over it.

The declaration of a reserve at the Long Water Hole, Oakey Creek, Jondaryan Station, prompted the owners, Coutts and Gray, to apply for the purchase of 320 acres at "Jondaryan-Oakey Creek". This block comprised the homestead and the woolshed and was described as being "generally good" and in places "suitable
for agriculture". R. and E. Tooth who bought Jondaryan from Coutts and Gray made the last payment on this freeholded block. William Kent of Fassifern told his Sydney agent that, although he wanted to sell Fassifern, he was still quite anxious to freehold as much of it as he possibly could to increase the overall value of the run. Downs squatters attempted to freehold as much land as they could afford or could get advanced to them to buy their runs at £1 per acre. Robert Tooth of Jondaryan pre-empted 2,210 acres of his run. The extent of his purchase, however, was not as significant as its location. By purchasing a block of land along either side of Oakey Creek he rendered all the land back from it much less attractive to prospective farmers because of its lack of water.

As well as “picking the eyes out of their runs”, the Reverend Lang argued that the squatters were also preventing agricultural settlement by bringing their political influence to bear to influence the positioning of new townships. Drayton’s location, Lang argued, was not determined by the availability of water, the meeting of access roads, or the topography of the area, but by the squatters’ concern that such a town should not interfere with the running of their runs. Drayton was not laid out upon a site that best suited the needs of the townspeople, but where it best suited the interests of the squatters. A township too close to their runs would lure Station employees away, thus interfering with the maximum efficiency of the pastoral operation, and would lessen their total dependence on the station, a dependence which geographical isolation now ensured.

In an effort to forestall agricultural inroads onto the Darling Downs squatters also asserted that the Downs was not suitable for cultivation. “Mr Hodgson and the squatters”, wrote the Editor of the Moreton Bay Courier, are “making fun of the people” and “reiterating the tale that no wheat can be raised successfully beyond the dividing range”. In one sense the squatters were right. Wakefield’s system, based on the notion that all land was equally useable and saleable was not applicable to the Darling Downs. Queensland could not be compared with, for example, South Australia, where agricultural settlement had been successful because of the right soil and climatic conditions. But, of course, contrary to the squatters’ claims, there were some areas of the Darling Downs which were eminently suitable for agriculture and it was these areas which the squatters were determined to retain.

Downs squatters were also said to have been using their political influence to forestall the construction of better roads in the region. “It is common opinion”, commented the Courier, that “the squat-
ters are opposed to good roads, whether rail or tramways . . . as it is not in their interest". The transmission of heavier agricultural produce on the existing system was “next door to an impossibility”. The *Courier* asked also “what public benefit” could result from the reservation of townships in places “where the cultivation of grain is impossible”. The “supposition of conflict” between the real interests of squatting and agriculture was thought to be “quite unreasonable”. The high cost of flour and carriage to the squatter, the *Courier* argued, showed how much “benefit the pastoralist would derive from the extension of agriculture to this side of the range”.

But the extent of the political influence of the Downs squatters was widely known. In the earlier years they had played a much more limited role. The business of squatting had required their “continued and active attention” and they had only regarded their stay in the colony as “temporary”. Technically, too, they were not eligible to vote because of the freehold franchise qualification, although as David Denholm has asserted, “strategically their power lay near Sydney where, on balance, they tended to live and vote”. By the early 50s, however, Downs squatters had the reputation of being the most politically active of their northern counterparts. A Burnett squatter commented how he wished that the squatters in his own district had “a little of the public meeting, petitioning, Government-bothering, Darling Downs Go-Ahead Squattocracy”.

On the Darling Downs and on the Northern Downs in particular, squatters like the Gores of Yandilla, the Bells of Jimbour and the Tooths of Jondaryan had a political influence out of all proportion to their actual numbers. This influence was based on land “ownership”, social cohesion based on kinship and class interests, and the wider social responsibility which land “ownership” conferred. From the winning of their Magna Carta in 1847, the squatters sought to create the illusion that they owned the land. The gracious homestead, the township which grew up around it, the dams, and, more particularly, the fences, were visible signs of the squatters’ land-owning hegemony.

Jondaryan Station as it was to be known for the next thirty years could be said to have been born in the early 1860s. Jondaryan Homestead was upgraded in late 1860, possibly in preparation for the visit of the new Governor of Queensland. The primitive, unceiled and verandahless Jondaryan was replaced by a more lavish homestead built by Charles Hines and Co. A new station store, a hides and tallow house, stables and a coach house were
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built. C. Francis erected a new butcher's shop. A shearers' hut, floored with ironbark and fitted with twenty-four bunks, tables and chairs was completed at a cost of £35.*1 The Station Church, St Ann's, was also built and named after the Manager Mr White's second wife, Ann. 1860 was also the year in which many hut and yard improvements were carried out on William Kent's Rosalie Plains. Carpenter Alfred Blinco, who was later to work on Jondaryan for many years, was engaged in hut building and bushmen Shaw and Norman built a stockyard and erected three huts.*2 Some indication of the extent of building activity going on on Jondaryan in the early 1860s is revealed by the Station records. Between June and September 1861, bushmen Walsh, Hewson and Williams cut 6,200 ironbark palings and 66,000 shingles, and between 1860-63, six men were employed for a total of thirty-eight weeks and cut 111,000 shingles.*3 The impact of such an improvement programme upon the physical environment is hinted at by the comment made by one fencer in the 1870s. He lamented his reduced earnings, recalling how in earlier times trees suitable for felling could always be located close to worksites. He now lost valuable felling time looking for suitable timber.

If the squatters' home "gathered up the refinements of the newly settled country, the shearing shed focussed its work and its wealth".*4 Under the proprietorship of the Tooths and the management of J.C. White, Jondaryan became the showplace of the Northern Downs. Jondaryan woolshed number three*5 was built to replace a "comparatively small building" situated on an "open space a little to the North of Tom Evan's cottage".*6 A Mr T. Jones, a sawyer and carpenter involved in the cedar trade on the Richmond River and an employee of the Port Stephens Company, was hired by Mr White to build the shed.*7 A design problem with respect to its internal layout and drainage was corrected between April and September 1862 by Charles Hines and Co. They built a new extension and gutted and refitted it. The shed yards was also cobble-stoned and eighty cubic yards of earth excavated from under the shed. The shingle roof was probably replaced at this time by a corrugated, galvanized iron one, cut and bored in England. The roof beams were also cut in England, and, because of their length, had to be strapped to the sides of the vessel which brought them out. The shed was a huge T shape and the roofline of its northern wing became, and still is, "a distinguishing feature of the Jondaryan woolshed".*8 Some of the shed's other noteworthy construction features included the use of whole trees to form the uprights to sup-
port the main roof, slab walls held together without nails slotted into noggins (back-up rails), and pen and shute doors made of Australian cedar. Something of the size of this shed can be gleaned from the fact that it had fifty-six pens to accommodate fifty-six blade shearsers, and an under-shed rain-protected holding capacity of four thousand head. Worried by the prospect of an arsonist destroying this new edifice, White employed James MacConnah as a night watchman during the 1861 shearing season.

Woolsheds were a great source of pride to Downs squatters and there was considerable rivalry as to who had the best. There was also considerable debate as to who had the most efficient washing facilities and which washing technique was the most economical. Washing sheep prior to shearing was a costly business. Washpools, boilers, spouts, troughs, and yards had to be constructed and "washers" paid for. The 45 per cent lighter fleece that resulted and the saving that this represented in carriage costs, however, was thought to justify the exercise. There was considerable rivalry amongst the larger Downs runs, in fact, about every aspect of Station management, but, because this rivalry centred on the quantity and quality of wool shorn, the woolshed and the washpool were the focus of attention.

The improvements that were effected on Jondaryan in the early 1860s were only made possible by estimated net profits in three years of £80,000. These profits were largely derived from Victorian "gold".

Faced with a five fold increase in population and a much greater demand for meat, the Victorian meat market was exhausted by the end of 1856. Victorian and Riverina men began looking for stock for their fattening country and sent buyers north to New England and the Darling Downs. The Moreton Bay Courier reported that in March 1857 100,000 sheep were on their way to Port Phillip. According to Oscar De Satge, a squatter who had begun his pastoral career driving mobs to the Victorian markets, "a good few made solid fortunes" out of this southerly market. The proprietors of Jondaryan were amongst these. J.C. White sold 20,000 Jondaryan wethers to the Victorian market.

Not only were wethers in demand for the southern market, but breeding ewes were wanted to stock the northern country being opened up. With reserves of bullion abundant, the Bank of England advanced more money for lending, and, with money plentiful, speculative run-holding in the northern district was once more a feature of squatting. The Downs gained the reputation of being a
particularly good supplier of fine breeding stock. Joseph and William Hann, new settlers in the Kennedy district, went to the Darling Downs to purchase stock as "this was unquestionably the best source of quality livestock in Queensland". Mixed cattle were being bought from the Downs in 1862 at 39s. a head. This "double market" condition for Downs squatters in the late 50s and early 60s assured them of a much more certain income than the squatters of the 40s had enjoyed. The policy of breeding up to meet market conditions was not without its repercussions, however. The Downs of tall waving grasses described by Demarr in the early 40s was reduced by heavy stocking to herbage "showing less than a foot above the ground".

As well as good stock prices, Downs squatters also enjoyed wool prices of 8d. above those in the 1850s and double those of 1848. The Yandilla clip was bringing 24d. to 30d. per pound "roughly washed on the sheep's back" and one bale of William Kent's wool sold for £48.1s.10d. in Paris in December 1860.

These higher prices were not only a result of improved wool prices but reflected the better quality of wool being produced. Large numbers of coarse-woolled sheep had been boiled down in the early 40s, inferior animals had been sold to the Victorian market and rams had been imported, all of which contributed to the production of a better quality wool. By the late 50s and early 60s it was not only the good breeding and the "Government-bothering" which distinguished Northern Downs squatters from their northern and western counterparts. It was also their wealth and their attempt to model their lives on the English rural gentry.

The squatters' recreational activities, visiting neighbouring squatters and receiving visitors, racing, game shooting and reading in well-stocked libraries, were all English leisure-time pursuits. This is not surprising because they were, after all, "Europeans living in Queensland". They went "home" to select their brides or else married suitably in the colonies. Vice-regal visits such as that made by Governor Bowen to the Downs in 1861 reinforced their "Englishness" and eliteness. The Toowoomba Chronicle reported that the Governor was received with "considerable éclat" at Jondaryan. After resting at the Jondaryan residence and inspecting the woolshed, he had left, "highly pleased with all he saw". Jondaryan's neighbour, William Kent at Rosalie Plains, had the pleasure of entertaining the Governor and his suite the following year and the Governor and Lady Bowen the year after. Occasions such as vice-regal visits gave the Northern Downs squatters a chance to reassert their Englishness, the signs of which were always evident,
particularly in their residences. Various concessions, of course, had to be made to the environment, but even in the working environment of the Jondaryan woolshed there were cedar wool classing tables, especially imported from England.

The end of the shearing on Jondaryan was celebrated with “a sort of Harvest Home” as it was in England. Everything stopped on the station and everyone except the far away shepherds was present. Jondaryan’s manager invited his neighbour, William Kent, and the day’s activities included horse and foot racing in the afternoon followed by a banquet, talent quest and dancing in the evening. Harvest Homes or Shearers’ Feasts were common throughout the Northern Downs. It was the one day of the year when the Manager’s residence was opened to the men and was the squatters’ attempt to provide the same type of reward for the year’s labour as English squires provided for their rural labourers in the mid-Victorian English countryside.103

Like their English counterparts, Northern Downs squatters were all conscious of the wider role they had to play in the community. Jondaryan’s manager had helped form the first racing club in Toowoomba in 1860 and was the first to suggest that a show society be formed on the Downs.104 He was also on the Committee formed to discuss whether the joint municipality of Drayton-Toowoomba was to be retained,105 was a magistrate on the Drayton Bench106 and was in the School of Arts Debating Class.107 When John Watts was forced to resign as Member for the Northern Downs in 1862, James Charles White responded to the public call “to bring himself forward”108 as the local candidate. White was not, however, enough of a squatters’ candidate, was described as “stern, imperious and unyielding”109 as a magistrate and became, in his own words, “embroiled in the political in-fighting of squatter-politicians”.110 For his contravention of group loyalty, White was removed from the Bench at Warwick and dismissed from his position of Police Magistrate, Returning Officer and Visiting Justice of Her Majesty’s at Toowoomba.

Class law prevailed on the Darling Downs in the 1840s and 1850s by nature of the shared interests and kinship ties of those responsible for the administration of justice. The bias of this system, however, was offset in the 40s by the labour market. Then, a shortage of labour and its attendant high wage structure bred indolence and dissatisfaction amongst the working class. It was decided then that a copious supply of labour, working in conjunction with the Masters and Servants Act and “favourable” land legislation, was the only way to counteract this indolence.
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In December 1859 when Queensland was declared a separate district from New South Wales, Brisbane had a population of 7,000; 14 churches; 13 public houses and 12 policemen. Its leading inhabitants were a “hard-headed set of Englishmen, Scotch merchants and manufacturers”.¹ On the Darling Downs, and particularly on the north-west Downs, lived a group of men who “modelled their lives on the English gentry, furnished their spacious homes with costly imports, employed servants and governesses, kept stables of thoroughbred horses and entertained in a lavish style”.²

They were the survivors. They had been under attack both from the physical environment and the original occupiers of the land, but had weathered these and the opposition of government and gentry.

The gentry’s opposition to squatting was closely tied in with ideas about land use. They argued that land should be used for agricultural purposes. Young married Britons who would cultivate the land were regarded as the ideal colonial immigrants.³ Squatting, in terms of land use and its ideal labourer, the unmarried shepherd, was “contrary to every ideal”⁴ held by the gentry. The gentry’s opposition, however, had less to do with ideals and more to do with basic envy.

After 1830 the gentry had been forced to buy land at auction prices. The squatter claimed as much land as he wanted for a £10 licence fee. The gentry’s purchase of land also paid for labour which the squatter used.

It is important to realize just how anarchic the squatting movement must have seemed to those established land-holders. Squatting, as it pushed beyond the bounds of civilization, was thought to be making no contribution to, and in fact was thought to be obstructing, social development.

Initially, too, squatting allowed for a degree of social mobility
quite distasteful to the gentry. It also transformed the colonial economy from a convict system to one based on wage labour.

Downs pastoral employees in the 1840s had a much more secure and optimistic future than their colonial bonded brethren or their English agricultural counterparts. Their labour was in demand and their rates of pay enabled them to save. Because of the shortage of labour, masters had to work alongside their "men", and this softened the relationship between employer and employee. The strong bargaining position of the wage labourer on the Downs in the 1840s was resented by the new frontier gentry, however, and Masters and Servant Acts, and the importation of cheap exile and coloured labour were the means by which employers sought to redress the imbalance of power. The Downs squatters were determined to restore a "proper relationship" between master and man.

Whilst squatting had transformed economic relationships and was anarchic in its disruption of social and political relations, it was itself socially conservative.

Downs squatters of the 40s were young men, if not of aristocratic blood, then of excellent family connections and because, as in England, land equalled wealth equalled status, they became the local government representatives as well. It has been noted that by the end of the 1840s "11 of the 19 Justices of the Peace on the Downs belonged directly to the titled or untitled aristocracy of Great Britain".5

Just the severe test of pioneering probably would have been sufficient to weld those who survived into a "cohesive, identifiable and closely-knit caste",6 but Downs squatters also shared common backgrounds and a common goal. This goal was to make sufficient money to return "home" — a home from which they were suffering an involuntary exile. Though Downs squatters therefore were physically estranged from their homeland, they were not socially remote from each other.7 The binding tie of property, and their bond of common purpose was further cemented by inter-marriage. If squatters themselves were not representatives of the Crown, more than likely they were related to the latter through marriage. Thomas De Lacy Moffat of Cumkillenbar married one of Joshua T. Bell's sisters, and when Henry Dennis was drowned in the "Sovereign" in 1847, he was on his way to Sydney to marry one of Thomas Bell's daughters.8

It was in fact the wreck of the "Sovereign" in March 1847 which revealed just how closely-knit a community the Downs was in the late 1840s. The loss of a few of the Downs leading citizens9 was a
"severe blow" to many. George Leslie wrote to his parents in May 1847 that such a fatal incident "in a small community, when one knows everyone personally, is felt much more". Far from being a social abyss, the Downs social establishment was a little tiresome for Emmeline Leslie. "I most thoroughly enjoy our Bush life. My only objection to it is the number of visitors we are forced to entertain but time alone and the establishment of Inns can remedy this evil." The Downs, of course, was not unique in this respect. A chain of related station families was a common feature of the Riverina and the western district of Victoria. But in their homogeneity of background and purposes, the Downs squatters displayed a uniqueness not found elsewhere. This was as true of the 1850s as it was of the 40s.

Despite a change of ownership, with many of the old "hands" returning "home", and runs passing into the hands of mercantile men of more diverse social origin, the Downs squatters retained their reputation for parochial loyalty.

With internal problems such as Aboriginal aggression and a dire shortage of labour behind them, and enjoying prosperous "gold" years, squatters could devote more attention to their social, business and political commitments. It was in this way that squatting bonds were tightened. The Towns, Campbells, Wentworths and Tooths shared squatting, merchant and entrepreneurial interests.

Each district of New South Wales produced its own type of squatting caste. Of the Kennedy district Ann Allingham has said: "the Kennedy district could be a recreation neither of the landed gentry society of the British model, nor of the colonial derivative of the Darling Downs". "Sylvanus", squatter of Wide Bay, lamented the heterogeneous character of the squatters in his district and their unwillingness "to co-operate for political or even commercial purposes in the simplest forms and on the most important occasions". By contrast the other districts envied the "Go-Ahead Squattocracy" of the Darling Downs.

On the Downs there was an identifiable squatting establishment. Nehemiah Bartley, the squatters' agent, on his trips across the Downs, would call into the Bull's Head Inn, Drayton, and be sure of sharing the companionship of De Lacy Moffat, Atticus Tooth, William Beit, Thomas Coutts or other prominent squatters. As squatting historian David Denholm has remarked about squatting after the 1840s, "the spread of squatting would pass more and more into the hands of certain family and kinship systems . . . become almost [an] hereditary and specialized or professional occupation".

Whilst the "Queensland" town population and employees
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generally had begun to voice their opposition to the predominantly pastoral use of the land by the 1850s, the cry to “unlock the land” lacked the fervour of the campaign in the south.  

There, the landed were no longer politically and economically dominant after the 1850s whereas in “Queensland” the former’s influence lasted much longer.

As the 50s drew to a close not only were they, in many instances, the masters of their men within their estates, but without as well, as they sat upon magisterial benches and cast judgement on their recalcitrant employees. Socially they were quite exclusive and politically they exerted a great deal of influence. But Downs society was not a microcosm of English society, and Downs squatters were a gentry of a different type.

They differed in a number of significant ways. First they were “temporary”, in the sense of their own limited commitment to the Downs and in the insecurity of their position. “I can make up my mind to stay eight or ten years in this colony”, wrote George Leslie, “but if I thought I should be obliged to stay all my life I don’t know what I would not do”. The aim of the 40s squatter was to make as much money as soon as possible and return “home”. George Leslie reassured his mother that his affection for his old home would never be displaced by his feelings for his new:

The first thing (which) you my dearest mother will think is that by marrying in this country my affection for my native country, will be transferred to this, but such is not the case, for as soon as practicable you shall see me and my dear Emmeline at home, and my intention is as always was, if our present prospects are realized eventually to return home.

Squatting women remained similarly detached from their new home. They had come to make money, and wealth, particularly in the 1850s, was the yardstick by which a man’s eligibility to join the squatting establishment was measured. James Taylor was a “bit rough”, but his wealth enabled him to enter exclusive ranks.

The Downs squatters’ physical environment was also much more threatening and their economic position much more precarious than their English counterparts. In addition, it was not economically viable for many squatters to freehold land, and so they never became “owners” in the English sense. They themselves remained tenants. Not only were they a temporary, economically precarious gentry, but their position was politically insecure also.

Pastoralism had always been regarded as a necessary though undesirable stage of settlement prior to the more civilized agricultural
stage. The mood of the town population and employees by 1859 was that the time had come for the squatter who had made his pastoral fortune, and, in many instances, returned home to spend it, to give up his vast acreages. But the new squatting breed of the 50s was reluctant to do this. As Governor Bowen wrote in 1860, the land question threatened "to become an irritating contest between rival interests — between the towns and the country — like the corn laws in England, and the agrarian laws in ancient Rome".  

The Downs leading citizens, as Governor Bowen also remarked in his correspondence to the Duke of Newcastle in February 1860, were wealthy but not privileged in the English sense. There was no House of Lords, no hereditary privilege, no Church establishment and no paid idlers or sinecurists. Every man was a working man in this sense. This and the common experience of emigration greatly reduced the gulf between master and man. Initially work was a bridging experience between employer and employee. The squatter might only ride out in the morning in his shirt-sleeves, but this was significant. The fact that squatters viewed themselves as "temporary sojourners" also meant that as "masters" they were employers of labour rather than masters in the English sense of commanding loyalty from generations of faithful servants. "There were instances where the squatter attempted to live up to the best traditions of an English country squire with regard to his men, but his tenure was not permanent and the rule was just commercial." 

Thus, however much the "Pure Merino" may have wished to model his life on the English gentry, he could only do so within this milieu, and with these limitations. As Rosecranze said, although the "geographic and economic imperatives" of the Australian environment created a landed aristocracy, it was more correctly a "quasi-aristocracy", and it "provided no more than a rudimentary insight into the nature of traditional European conservatism". The Downs squatters were "rural capitalists and their hirelings were not serfs, but rural proletarians".
Part II
Jondaryan Station exhibited many of the characteristics of a close-knit, ordered and hierarchical rural English village. It was comparable in size, similar in physical appearance and, at the apex of its social structure were its new lessees, Messrs Kent and Wienholt, absentee landlords who paid Jondaryan the occasional supervisory visit.

The headstation of Jondaryan and of runs like it was said to have “thrown into shade” many Queensland towns of the early 1870s. It bore “the appearance of a small township”. Besides a row of cottages for the married residents, there was a blacksmith’s shop, a wheelwright’s shed, a store, and “a very nice little church” where the Reverend Moberly of Dalby conducted a service once a month. Along the street of cottages the next building was the Superintendent’s house, which was large and resembled “in many respects a large hotel”. But the focal point of this thriving community was the Jondaryan homestead. It was surrounded by a vineyard, a garden full of flowers, fruit and vegetables, “with a nice stream of water flowing past the front of the garden, where one could engage in the luxury of a swim”. This bathing place was “embowered in trees and shrubbery” and had “a very convenient platform and steps leading down to the water”. The Gore’s homestead at Yandilla also stood on a creek and “comfortable huts for the employees ... a schoolhouse and a chapel (surrounded) the solid brick home of the resident partner”. Jimbour Station was also quite a little township with its homestead surrounded by a church, school, a butcher’s and a blacksmith’s shop, a general store, men’s quarters, marrieds’ quarters, a cook’s kitchen and a dining place. “A little apart” was the “house of the manager and the cottage of the overseer”.

The house of the manager or the proprietor reflected the origin of its inhabitants. Jondaryan’s homestead was described as “a very
comfortable residence very similar to a country gentleman's house in England". The one design adaption to the new climate was that it was "all on one floor with a verandah all round and built of wood" rather than brick. Jimbour homestead, however, was a "big stone English country house" which, according to Trevelyan, could have been "anywhere in Northumberland and not ashamed of itself". The squatters' residences, apart from a few architectural concessions to the new environment, reflected that their hearts were still in rural England. Indeed, being at Eton Vale on the sabbath was said to have been like being "in the heart of rural England".

And, as in rural English villages, both the differing quality of station buildings and their arrangement reflected the ordered and hierarchical nature of the community. The homestead, where the proprietor or his representative, the manager, lived in "almost feudal splendour", usually stood on a creek or river fringed by a beautifully well-kept garden. Inside could be found "all the comforts and most of the luxuries and refinements of the houses of country gentlemen in England" "carpets and curtains, plate and pianos, champagne and crinoline". Nearby lived the manager's executive, the overseer. His cottage was considerably less comfortable than the manager's splendid dwelling but considerably more comfortable than the men's quarters. It was always, too, set apart from the latter, emphasizing the social distance which separated management and men.

Even when travelling, a member of the managerial class rarely stayed overnight at any inns or shanties but would make it to the next station and there be taken into the manager's or overseer's residence. The labouring man with a swag on his back would be sent to the barracks, which consisted of one large room for visitors, two rough forms and beds with wooden frames. Any guests who were neither social peers of the management nor of the swagmen class were accommodated in the superintendent's house. Thus there were three classes of bush welcome on Jondaryan, and the hospitality offered, like the appearance of the headstation itself, reflected the differences of status, wealth and power in the station community.

At the apex of this social structure were the absentee lessees, William Kent and Edward Wienholt. Both men came from gentleman farming backgrounds. Kent was born in Warwickshire in 1823 and Wienholt in Carmarthenshire ten years later. The Wienholts had combined landed proprietorship with the business of London merchants. These skills of rural and business experience
and the crucial ingredient of financial backing from “home” gave these men more than equality of opportunity in their colonial pastoral pursuits.

Five years after arriving in New South Wales William Kent "owned" three runs on the Darling Downs. These he "oversaw" from his residence in Brisbane. The following year he acquired another run, Mt Hutton north of Roma, and went into partnership with an equally successful squatter, Edward Wienholt. Edward was one of John Birkett Wienholt’s four sons to settle in Australia and acquire pastoral holdings. These holdings included Maryvale, Gladfield and Fassifern. In February 1863 Kent and Wienholt bought "the princely estate of Jondaryan" from Robert Tooth. The Toowoomba Chronicle announced: "Mr William Kent Esquire of Rosalie has become the purchaser of Jondaryan Station . . . all the Toowoomba property with implements on the station is comprised in the purchase." The purchase price was £108,000.

Neither Kent nor Wienholt ever lived on Jondaryan. Their choice of absenteeism was quite a conscious one. Kent chose to move from Rosalie Plains to Jondaryan and then almost immediately to Brisbane, Sydney and Hobart Town. The move was due, he said, to the harshness of the climate and its draining effects upon the English constitution. There was, indeed, a whole body of thought which identified one of the reasons for Australia's social decline as due to the effects of the climate on reducing the motive for exertion. Also, Jondaryan was felt to be too far from culture and education for his children. Hobart Town was no more satisfactory in this respect, Kent returning "home" as often as finances would permit and sending his children "home" to be educated.

Edward Wienholt spent more time at "home" than in Queensland. Whilst Kent resided at Rosalie Plains, Wienholt was living in the Lake District of England. When the Queensland Post Office Directory listed Wienholt’s residential address as Dalby, he was back in England, looking after the firm’s London outlet and probably also reassuring himself that he had not become like Geoffrey Hamlyn — half an Englishman. William Kent chose to live in the Southern colonies because the opportunity for his children to meet and marry those of their own class was less at Jondaryan than in Hobart Town.

For it was kinship which gave this upper class solidarity. It also bound the manager, the absentee proprietor’s representative, to them in loyalty and identity of interest. On Jondaryan it was fairly common for a shepherd, after many years of faithful service, to
become a boundary rider. The management, however, was never recruited from below but imported and implanted from above. Social mobility was restricted. None of the Jondaryan management came exclusively from the working class. William Graham came out from Scotland in 1855, jackerooed and did some droving for Kent and Wienholt at Rosalie Plains and Mt Hutton, married Louiza Elizabeth Kent in 1861 and was made manager of Mt Hutton prior to becoming manager of Jondaryan in 1863. Nephew succeeded son-in-law on Jondaryan. William Graham moved onto his own run in 1870 and Charles Williams became manager. Williams, who was born on the Isle of Anglesey, came out to his Uncle, William Kent, at Rosalie Plains in late 1862. He jackerooed there until it was sold in 1864, moved to Mt Hutton on the Dawson until it, too, was sold, and then moved to Jondaryan, where he was made sheep overseer for William Graham. He managed Jondaryan from 1870 until his death in 1913.

Prior to Kent and Wienholt's acquisition of Jondaryan, the pattern of management selection had been the same. The absentee licensee, Campbell, a Sydney brewer, banker and merchant, employed his brother-in-law James Andrew to act as his resident Jondaryan manager.

Kinship bound the managerial class to the proprietors and insulated it from the "lower orders". Quite obviously though, not all family dependents could be accommodated in this way, particularly as William Kent's nephew was to remain manager for forty-three years, and William Kent III, who married one of Charles William's daughters, held the position from William's death until his own in 1952. The practice was, therefore, for family members to be given the managements of other runs owned by the company and, ultimately, their own run. William Kent I's son, for example, who was born on Rosalie Plains in 1856 was sent to manage Dalgangal on the Burnett, eventually becoming lessee of Dalgangal. Those Kent family members who could not be accommodated in this way were often given financial assistance. William Kent I's cousins John Kent of Maryborough and William Kent of Sydney were among these.

It was the general pattern for young upper middle class Britons to come straight from English schools to gain their colonial experience on the Queensland runs of relatives and friends. It was a Wienholt family tradition to jackeroo on Jondaryan. Arnold Wienholt, an Etonian, was sent to jackeroo on Jondaryan before becoming manager of Widgee Widgee and lessee of Fassifern. Humphrey, his
brother, also went there as did his nephew Leslie. Leslie hated it however, and went back to England as quickly as possible. Jackerooing on Jondaryan as part of the training for all prospective family managers continued into the 1930s according to W.F. Wienholt.

One of the great advantages of keeping management within the family was stability and continuity of management. Jondaryan had only one change of management in forty years. The station was not unique in this respect. James Tyson enjoyed a similar high level of management stability on his runs and achieved it in the same way. Twelve of his managers were related directly or indirectly by marriage.

Kinship not only made management stable and exclusive, it also created a string of squatter-related families across the Downs and throughout Queensland. Added to those forty-eight Queensland runs "owned" by Kent and Wienholt, Edward Wienholt and the Wienholt Brothers were those owned by William Graham and Edward Wienholt, and those owned by managers Graham and Charles Williams. Those families not united by marriage shared similar life-styles, common interests and, above all, a belief in their own superiority. Their womenfolk fostered and maintained this unity and "played an active role in maintaining class consciousness through their policing of gentility, and in maintaining contacts through correspondence, visits and entertainment".

It was no cabbage-tree hat, blue flannel shirt and corduroy or canvas trousers for the Downs leading squatters and their managers. In the Western Downs region particularly, they clung to their riding coats and vests as they did to their Englishness. James Bell was always "perfectly dressed, in London style". William Kent was willing to make slight environmental dress concessions, such as ordering four pairs of pantaloons which would "not show the dirt" and "summer shirts of the lightest and coolest material". However, like William Graham and Charles Williams he would never sacrifice elegance to utility. A "lady pioneer" recollected how she had worn a long flowing riding habit on a horseback journey from Brisbane to the Darling Downs. It was as if, she said, "we were still riding in the country lanes of the lowlands or those of England". Her companion "did not approve of innovations or of the relaxation of any of the conventions either for himself or for me".

It was, indeed, precisely these observed conventions and the social round of visiting, tea parties and dinners, which convinced a Miss Anna Hume that there were "few places at home, where you
would find more pleasant and worthy people in one locality!" In short, she found the Downs landed fraternity "a nice superior people". With the status afforded the proprietors and managers came broader responsibilities, political and civic, at local and state levels. William Kent II was a member of the legislative assembly for the Burnett from 1899-1904; Arnold Wienholt the same for Warwick from 1863-67; Edward Wienholt for the Western Downs from 1870-73 and for the Darling Downs from 1873-75 when this representation was taken over by William Graham, who was later member of the legislative council from 1880 until his death in 1892. Locally, Charles Williams and "Boss Kent" both served lengthy terms as chairman of the Jondaryan Shire Council. No better example, no finer "specimen of colonial Toryism" could be found than that of Edward Wienholt. His laissez-faire views on immigration, land, tariffs, and education led the Brisbane Courier to label him peculiar, eccentric and antiquated, whilst at the same time respecting the honest and principled way in which he continued to assert his views.

Whilst Wienholt, dubbed the ultra-squatter, dominated the political sphere, William Kent I was deeply involved in patronizing various clubs and societies. William Kent epitomized the Victorian concept of the "responsible man". He was responsible in his commitment to his family, responsible in his commitment to his employees, and responsible in his commitment to society at large. President of the Darling Downs Benevolent Society and of the Toowoomba Hospital and Benevolent Asylum, he was said to have been connected with almost every charity. His son was president of the Oakey Farmers Association, and his grandson president of the Royal Agricultural Society as well as the United Graziers Association; chairman of the Downs Rabbit Board and the Downs South-Western Racing Association; vice chairman of the Queensland Turf Club and a member of the Queensland Club. Kent was always being approached by businessmen who wanted to commit him financially to some new venture, such as the establishment of a cotton industry in Queensland, or a meat concentration establishment for Ipswich.

The management of Jondaryan were societal leaders. They saw themselves as such and were seen as such. Professor Michael Roe's assertion that Australia's colonial gentry "never approached social leadership" cannot be applied to the Darling Downs. Their background, affluence, respectability and civilization qualified them
for the task. Their kinship structure ensured that they would keep out all those not so eminently qualified for the task. It was only proper that they, with so many people dependent on them, should exercise a powerful societal influence. These dependent people on Jondaryan can be broken down into three major groups — management, men and others.

Zita Denholm has described the manager as essentially “the grazier’s creature, a buffer between the men who produced the wealth and the family who spent it”. It has been seen that on Jondaryan the manager was bound to “the grazier” by loyalty, identity of interest and, above all, by marriage, and that he was set apart from his men physically and socially. Jondaryan homestead, the manager’s residence, a splendid dwelling when compared to the rough accommodation around it, symbolized an ideal in gracious living. It also symbolized the social distance between management and men. The manager not only lived in a better dwelling but ate and drank better, entertained more lavishly and sent some of his children away to be educated, the youngest having their own governess on the station. The men’s children were educated in the schoolhouse.

Below the management were two real divisions in the Jondaryan community, men and others. In the latter category would be included women, blacks, Indian coolies, Chinese and later Melanesians, generally held to be lower in status than the lowest “men”. From the lowest blacks, who collected sheets of bark, to the overseer, the manager’s executive, there was a scale of ascending status, different status and remuneration being afforded to different occupations within the community. The population can be further broken down into resident, itinerant and contract groups, and within each of these, the skilled and the unskilled.

Within the resident group those with skills included the overseer, storekeeper, blacksmith and his “mate”, wheelwright, carpenter, butcher, saddler and groom, and those without skill, the burr-cutters, hay-makers, farm labourers, gardeners, cooks, kitchen and stable boys, boundary riders, bailiffs, shepherds, lambers and generally usefuls.

Immediately below the manager and also in the dominant class was the overseer, the manager’s executive. It was usual for him to be addressed as “mister”. His accommodation, the type of work he did, and his salary also set him apart from the men. Jondaryan usually employed three overseers, the principal one at the head-station and two off-siders, one at the outstation, Codrington, and
the other at the outstation, Bear. These last two positions attracted a wage considerably below that of the principal overseer at the headstation, who was responsible for all stockwork on the run. As many as four, five or six overseers were employed on Jondaryan in any one year. Kent liked personally to choose his overseers. In the early 60s he had Thelwall in charge of the Mt Hutton stud, and for the 1861 Rosalie Plains shearing season he had Cran as overseer, Graham at the washpool and Brissenden in charge of the shed. In the late 60s he had Williams and Baker in charge of the Jondaryan woolshed, Williams at the head-station, Cran overseeing at Irvingdale and Winks at Codrington. Winks "oversaw" for Kent from 1858-73.

The duties of the Jondaryan storekeeper were basically to look after the store, keep the books and make sure that the outstations were supplied with rations. Once a week set quantities of meat, sugar and flour were measured out and delivered to hutkeepers, shepherds and their families. It was also the responsibility of the store-keeper to ensure that all necessary stock was ordered and all purchases made by station employees recorded. In the absence of a butcher the store-keeper on some runs became the butcher also. On Jondaryan the two positions remained quite distinct, George Cockburn being Jondaryan's storekeeper in the late 1860s and John McGill, the butcher. For their services the latter received between £40 and £52 per annum and the former between £50 and £60 in the late 60s, between £60 and £75 in the 70s and between £75 and £80 in the 80s and early 90s.

James Mires worked as a blacksmith on Jondaryan for sixteen years. Life was not all work and no play for this "smithy" however, and he spent his wage on visiting shows, concerts and by being a very active subscriber to visiting clergymen, the Toowoomba Hospital, the Dalby church fund, the school fund and to various other charities such as the "blind man". He also bought a mare, "Norah", for £8 in 1863. In August 1861 this notice appeared in the Toowoomba Chronicle: "Wanted for Jondaryan, a sober, steady, and efficient wheelwright. Permanent employment and a good wage. Apply J.C. White." John Schell did not come to Jondaryan in response to this advertisement, but he was the type of fellow J.C. White had been looking for. Schell began work on Jondaryan in October 1864 on 40s. per week and finished there almost twenty years later on the same wage. A carpenter on Jondaryan earned slightly less than this — 30s. per week. There was usually just the one employed, though sometimes two, in the years when most im-
provements were carried out, that is, 1863, 1865, 1883 and 1887. Saddlers like R. Lynch earned £40 per annum as well as what they could pick up themselves through doing work on the men’s saddles.

The late 70s saw an increase in the number of more specialist domestic labourers brought to Jondaryan from Toowoomba. Among these were seamstresses, nurses, maids, laundresses, kitchen maids and cooks. There was a plethora of cooks employed on Jondaryan. The number of cooks was tied to the level of work activity on the station. In 1863 and 1864, for example, particularly busy years, fourteen and nine cooks respectively were employed to feed Jondaryan’s employees. Their wages varied from £30 to £45 per annum for housecooks and singlemen’s cooks, to the hardest worked and best paid shearers’ cooks, who could earn as much as £37.10s.11d.¹ for the season alone. In the 60s the shearers’ cook received a subsidy from Kent and Wienholt, plus a certain amount per week from each shearer.² It appears, however, that this practice was discontinued in 1870 and, from that date, shearers’ cooks received only transfers from the men. The reason shearers’ cooks were the elite of their fraternity becomes quite obvious when their daily routine is noted:

Breakfast (was) an ample meal. A profusion of mutton roast and boiled, bread and potatoes, washed down by unlimited pannikins of tea. Back to work by 9am. Smoke, Oh! of fifteen minutes, at 10.30am. Knock off for dinner at 12 noon, more mutton, potatoes, etc., and tea, back at 1pm. Smoke, Oh! at 2.30pm . . . Lunch is brought in by the cook at 4pm . . . the “snack” consists of tea and “brownie” . . . At 6pm. knock off for the day, and after a good wash . . . more mutton and potatoes . . .³

This went on day in and day out for nearly three months. It was a difficult task satisfying the appetites and the peculiar tastes of fifty odd masters.

Shepherds, lambers and generally usefuls were an integral part of the wool production cycle and accounted for a large proportion of Jondaryan’s resident workforce. Indeed, they did of every squatting establishment. In 1851 the Moreton Bay Courier conducted a census and by far the largest labouring group on the Darling Downs was the shepherds’ and sheep managers’ group. They accounted for one third of the workforce. The names of all Jimbour shepherds, with the numbers of their hut and the numbers of their flocks was said to have made lists “feet long”.⁴ On Rosalie Plains in 1860 there were twenty-six employees, fifteen of whom were shepherds.⁵ In 1859 there were fifteen outstations on Jondaryan,
most of which had from two to four shepherds. The exceptions were the Reservoir which had as many as twelve and as few as seven, and the lambing station and the head-station whose shepherd population fluctuated between seven and nine. In 1863 there were two hundred and eighteen shepherds, lambers and generally usefuls employed by Kent and Wienholt.

In the 1840s and 50s a few ticket-of-leave men had been Jondaryan’s “crawlers after sheep”. Every contemporary account of shepherding stresses the loneliness and isolation of this task. They lived, as George Tarwell wrote, “in utter solitude on greasy mutton chops and doughy damper they baked themselves”. Each day was the same. The sheep were taken from the fold each morning, kept on the pastures all day and brought back at sunset. They were to be driven out sufficiently far from the shepherd’s hut, were not to be “dogged”, to be separated according to age and sex, and their hurdles were to be shifted daily. At the end of the day they were counted and handed over to the watchman, whose responsibility it was to see that the sheep were not taken by dogs at night. In the morning they were recounted and handed back to the shepherd. Once a week the shepherd would see the ratton-carrier. This would be either the storekeeper or the overseer who had come to inspect and count the shepherd’s flock to ensure that none had gone missing. Once a year the shepherd had to drive his flock into the head-station to be washed and shorn. The remuneration for this type of work, said to have reduced the most erudite man conversant with the best English literature to paranoic figures, was between £40 and £50 a year more, if the employee was lucky enough to have a wife to act as cook, hut-keeper, yardshifter and general jobber.

Lambing, washing and shearing were referred to as “the three great operations of a squatters’ life”. A sheep had to be born, washed and shorn. Ewes about to lamb were withdrawn from the flock and looked after by the lamber until the lambs were strong enough to travel with their flock. On Jondaryan lambs were dropped in August-September, and lambing places on Jondaryan were chosen because they had plenty of green feed. Hurdles were used to enclose those ewes which would not “mother” their young. Obviously a high lambing percentage was crucial to flock management. Lambers, in addition to their wage of one pound per week, were given a bonus of 1s. per head for all lambs marked over a certain percentage, say 85 per cent. In 1867 this wage dropped to 17s a week plus a percentage; in 1868-69 it dropped further to 15s. plus a percentage, and in the 1890s lambers seem to have only been of-
fered a percentage bonus payment. A number of lambers were paid extra for travelling with sheep. Once the lambing was over the lamber would often take his place in the shed, rolling or shearing.

The average number of shepherds, lambers and generally usefuls employed on Jondaryan in the 1860s was 134.7. The average number in the 1870s was 66. This reduction by half was largely the result of the erection of miles of wire fencing. Shepherding was thought to “knock” the sheep about too much and was expensively labour intensive. When profits were high enough to finance improvements, therefore, fences replaced hurdles and boundary riders replaced shepherds.

The boundary rider was responsible, as the name suggests, for riding the run boundaries and checking the fences were secure. He was also responsible for keeping the native dog population under control. Native dogs were a problem in the 1860s and 1870s partly because Aborigines were not! Dog numbers, previously controlled by Aborigines, now had to be kept down by poison. For this, the boundary rider, the shepherd or the hut-keeper was paid 10s. a dog. This was in addition to their wage of between £40 and £45 a year.94

Jondaryan’s boundary riders had usually worked on the station for a long time and had been promoted to that position. Patrick White, for example, had been lambing and shepherding on Jondaryan for eleven years before becoming a boundary rider for sixteen.95 Thomas Hardie was a shepherd for four years before becoming a boundary rider for twelve. Elias Corney had been a lamb and a “generally useful” for twenty-eight years before becoming a boundary rider in 1890. Adam Gerhardt actually did a boundary riding apprenticeship. He received £26 for his first four years, £35 for his next three and £40 when he was a “fully-fledged” boundary rider. Christian Donges arrived at Jondaryan from Germany in 1862 and, after working off his indenture (one year), lambed, shepherded and boundary rode on Jondaryan until September 1876.96 The first reference to “boundary riding” as such was in 1878, and from then until 1893 Jondaryan employed, on average, eight and a half boundary riders per year.97 There were usually two on the Prairie,98 one at Hartley’s Paddock, one at No. 1 Stallion Paddock, one at Jones’ Camp, Crofton and Lagoon, one at Bowenville and one at the Head Station.

After 1878 the boundary rider was frequently the “bailiff” as well on a Jondaryan selection. A bailiff was a male employee who leased a selection from his employer for an annual rent of £40 per annum.
He was paid £40 per annum for his bailiffing — boundary riding duties! As far as can be gleaned from station records the bailiffing practice was adopted on Jondaryan in 1874. In the following year there were ten bailiffs each earning between £35 and £40 per annum. Among their selections were Grey’s, Fraser’s, Hill’s, Craig’s, E. Wienholt’s and F. Wienholt’s. Between 1876 and 1879 the number of bailiffs fell from seven to three and then dwindled to one throughout the early 80s. There were more after 1884. George Harris was a shepherd and a lamber on Jondaryan from 1863-75, a bailiff from 1875-81 and a boundary rider from 1881-93. “Bailiffing” only lasted for a decade on Jondaryan.

Whereas it was the boundary rider’s responsibility to report any fence breakdowns, it was the stockman’s responsibility to take care of and muster the stock, and to treat them for disease. They were assisted in this task by station hands and jackeroos — a human being, according to G.L. James, not “to be confounded with a kangaroo”.

A jackeroo was a young gentleman who had come to acquire a knowledge of sheep farming in Australia. He paid a premium to sit at the table with the boss and got his colonial experience in a much less rough way than the station hand.

The resident labourers on Jondaryan included farm hands such as Tom Evans, mowers, hay makers, thrashers and burr-cutters. This group could account for as many as forty-three of the resident population or as few as twelve. As there was no corn or chaff, horses were fed on bush hay and in 1863 nine men were employed mowing and haymaking on Jondaryan. They received 20s. per week. Burr-cutters or “noxious weed killers” were employed in greatest numbers when the noogoora burr was at its worst. On Jondaryan this was in the years 1863-66, 1878-83 and 1885-88.

The first mention of cutting it out was in December 1860.

Shearers like I. Cameron, J. Carlish and J. Webber would spend time between seasons cutting burr for 2s.6d. to 3s. per day. Gangs of men would go out on horseback armed with short-handled miniature hoes and cross the paddocks in evenly spaced strips.

By the early 80s the trend was to employ burr-cutters on contract to clear particular paddocks rather than to pay them by the day. A cutter might earn £125 for a four month contract.

As well as the resident labourers there were the contract labourers — the fencers, drovers, carriers, well-sinkers and dam-makers. Their number was tied to the level of improvement activity on Jondaryan. In 1863, for example, there were seventy-six contract
workers employed on Jondaryan. In 1873 there were only thirteen. Their number was also related to technological advance. The coming of the "iron horse" to Jondaryan resulted in a reduction in the number of carriers from twenty-one in 1863 to only one in 1883.

The whole station operation was dependent on the arrival of supplies and the despatch of wool. During the 1863 shearing season carrier Sam Pearce brought goods up from Ipswich one month and took wool down the next. He received 7s. to 10s. per hundredweight up and 20s. per bale down. Although goods were transported to and from Toowoomba, Mt Maria, Mt Hutton, Irvingdale and Rosalie Plains, Ipswich was the main centre to which wool was sent and from which goods were purchased. In the early 60s carriers like Sam Pearce had been paid on a contract basis. From the mid-60s, however, the trend was to employ a resident carrier and his wife (who could act as cook) and pay him a yearly wage. Carrier Stilgoe and his wife earned £70 per annum from 1863 to 1879. After 1868 it became only a matter of carrying wool and supplies to and from the Jondaryan railway station and the number of carriers employed fell dramatically.

Sheep still had to be driven to southern markets or, in times of severe drought, to agistment country, and drovers were employed into the 1880s and 90s. In the 1860s and 70s they were paid either at the rate of 20s. to 30s. per week or £40 per annum, or, 30s. per week there and 10s. per week home. In the 1880s and 90s the rate changed to between 48s. and 50s. per thousand per week.

The bushmen were the fellows who could turn their hand to anything — droving, bullock-driving, paling, fencing or building huts and yards. The years in which there was most fencing done on Jondaryan were 1863, 1868, 1869 and 1874. In 1868 twenty-two fencers were employed on Jondaryan at 2s.6d. per rod, £3.10s. per mile for wiring and staying, and £4 for staying and bracing. Splitters were paid between 21s. and 30s. per hundred. Like shearers, splitters and fencers were known for their big cheques and the ease with which they disposed of them.

The size of Jondaryan's resident population in the 1860s varied from 150 to 200. However, this number swelled by anything up to an additional 150 during shearing, when itinerants idled up to the station to sign on for the season. Their status ranged from shed overseer and shearer to shed boy. There were washers, picker-uppers, rollers, dumpers, pressers, penner-uppers, sweepers, cooks for each of these groups, a dosser and an engineer to keep the pumps in good mechanical order. The stockmen who kept the
sheep up to the shed, via the washpool, were an important link in the shearing chain, as were the carriers, who carted the wool away to Ipswich, Helidon or later the railhead, and brought back the supplies needed to support such a huge operation. In November and December of 1875, fifty-eight shearers shore 190,000 sheep with the direct help of fifty-eight shed rouseabouts and the indirect assistance of one hundred and three station men.

On Jondaryan lambs were usually dropped about August-September, washing commenced about mid-September, and shearing, which began in early October, was not completed until mid-December. Each station took particular pride in its washpool and there was much discussion about the best washing method. The Jondaryan washpool at Bowenville was said to present a “very animated appearance” with two relays of men, each relay in the water for two to three hours. The sheep were plunged from a stage into the water and passed one by one through what was called a soak-hole up a narrow lane. Washers, up to their waist in water, took up their positions along the lane roughly squeezing the wool as each sheep passed by. After this operation called “soaking the sheep”, the washers stood close together to sweat the wool. Each sheep was then once more passed through water and turned over and under by two men to ensure thorough washing. The sheep was then driven from the washpool to the shed, a journey which occupied a couple of days, allowing the wool to dry out sufficiently to be shorn.

Fifty-eight washers were employed at the Jondaryan washpool in 1864. They were a group of “knock-about men” regarded as a class considerably below that of the shearer. Their wage was 20s. to 30s. per week in the early 60s, 40s. in 1865, 5s. between 1869 and 1873, and 45s. in 1875 for men who worked out of the water, and 4s.6d. to 5s. per day throughout the 60s and 70s for men or “spouters” who stood in the water. They were provided with huts in which to sleep and bunks onto which to roll out their swags. The station supplied their cook, their rations and their overseer who was paid £4 per week.

Despite the high cost of the washing operation, until the late 70s it was more economical to wash the dirt from the fleece than to cart it. Once the cost of carriage was reduced, however, shearing in the grease became more general.

At the end of August each year a notice “To Shearers”, similar to the following one appeared in leading Downs newspapers: “Shearing will commence at Jondaryan about 1 October. Terms — 3s.6d.
per score. In some years, however, shearing would commence earlier in September and in others, later in November. The men who responded to this advertisement were of three distinct types.

There were some shearing families who returned to Jondaryan year after year to shear. Arthur Burns and his three sons, Johnny, Tommy and Jack, shore for twenty consecutive years on Jondaryan. Hugh Rafter and his six sons shore here from 1869-88 and the Erbacher family, the Kerwin brothers, the Kratzman brothers, G. Zimmerle and his four sons and James Cecil and his three sons were among others who shore on Jondaryan year after year. They belonged to the professional shearing group, the itinerants who followed the seasons all through Queensland and New South Wales. They might shear “up country” before moving onto the closer Downs runs. Usually they were what might be termed bushmen “par excellence” — men who could turn their hand to whatever skill was in demand be it fencing, splitting, building or shearing.

Those resident Jondaryan labourers who helped out at shearing time formed another shearing group in the Jondaryan shed. Frank Le Feuvre combined his saddling duties with shearing from 1863-91. H. Gerhard was both boundary rider and shearer on Jondaryan from 1869 to 1893, and a fellow by the name of Bruton was a shepherd, lamber, burr-cutter, bailiff and shearer from 1864-87.

The 1870s and 1880s saw the emergence and growth of another small yet significant group of shearers, the small selector who found it necessary to supplement his otherwise meagre selecting income by shearing at neighbouring stations.

The day before shearing started or the shearers “cut in” was a very busy day on Jondaryan. Shearers, washers and rouseabouts could be seen rolling into Jondaryan on horseback, and the resident station hands were busy mustering the mob for the morning. M.M. Banks described how on one station it was the custom for the ladies of the house to visit the shed on the first day of shearing “and greet the shearers with a first footing, usually in the shape of two bottles of rum”. However, this was certainly not the case at Jondaryan where the men were expected to remain sober for the duration of the season. Four shearers were fined for not doing so in November 1862. A ship’s bell, placed at Jondaryan homestead in 1844, was rung at six to awaken the shearers and rouseabouts, at eight for breakfast, at nine for “smoko”, at twelve for lunch, at three for
“smoko” again and at six for the evening meal. Within the shed there was another bell. Imagine the bustle and excitement as “gun” shearers and others took their positions for the first time on the board, made their first dash into their pens and quickly peeled the fleece from their victims. No sooner had the fleece hit the floor than the “picker-upper” had flung it onto the table at the head of the board. Amidst shouts of “tar” and “saw” and after classing, the roller turned the fleece in a peculiar way and another rouseabout placed it in a particular bin. It was then pressed, baled, branded and loaded onto wool waggons for the Jondaryan railhead and Brisbane.

The most highly paid men in the shed, apart from the “gun” shearers were the shed overseer and the wool classer or sorter. The overseer earned £4 per week in the 1870s, £5 per week in the 80s and 10s. per thousand sheep in the early 90s. The classer earned 25s. in the early 60s and between 15s. and 20s. per thousand fleeces in the 70s and 80s. Between one and three fleece gatherers or “picker-uppers” were usually employed in the shed, although in 1880, 1883, and 1889, twice as many kept the floors clean. Their wage was 12s. per week throughout the 60s, 70s and 80s. The fellow in charge of the rollers was paid 8s. per day, the rollers themselves 4s.6d. per day, or between 20s. and 30s. per week. The average number of their complement employed between 1877-93 was five, prior to this, two. Except for the years 1884 and 1885, when they were paid 4d. and 5d. per hundredweight respectively, pressers were paid by the bale. The rate was 1s. per bale in the 60s, rose dramatically to 2s.6d. in September 1868 and fell to 6d. in 1870 and 1871. There were normally two people dumping and branding, for which they received 9d. or 10d. per bale. Others in the shed included the wool stower or stacker, the sweepers, the shed boys, wool stapler and bale maker.

The total number employed in the Jondaryan shed in 1863-73 was sixty-six, in 1883 eighty-six and in 1893 eighty-four. Whilst the ancillary itinerant staff increased, the number of shearers remained the same at fifty-six. In the three years prior to Kent and Wienholt’s acquisition of Jondaryan the largest number of sheep shorn had been 64,283 in 1860. Upon the change of ownership the number shorn immediately rose to 117,867. In October 1869 forty shearers turned out just less than fifteen thousand shorn sheep per week. But even these figures paled beside those recorded for the Jondaryan shed in the 1870s. The decade opened with a tally of 212,521 and in its first half maintained an average of 187,140
sheep shorn. The sheep shorn were Jondaryan's own, plus contract sheep from the smaller runs and selections as far west as Dalby. The station's and contract sheep were branded differently, counted, and the number credited to each shearer.

There is considerable disagreement as to what constituted a fair day's work for a shearer. Tallies ranged from 60 to 150. George Perry, a blade shearer employed at Jondaryan from October to December 1861, shorn 5,203 sheep. A similar tally over a similar time span was recorded in 1873 for which the shearer received a cheque of over £50. This was "not too bad" according to the Brisbane Courier in a "squatter-ridden colony". It was a score of 321 sheep shorn in seven hours and forty minutes which won Jackie Howe, the son of an acrobat from a Warwick circus, the Australian shearing championship in 1892 at Alice Downs, Blackall.

Big individual and big shed tallies were recorded at Jondaryan's fifty-six stand shed. An even bigger shed, and the largest in Queensland, was Bell and Son's Jimbour woolshed. Situated fifteen miles from Jimbour head station near the Condamine, this six hundred feet shed had room for seventy shearers and had seventy-five on the floor in 1871. Comparing these two huge woolsheds the Dalby Herald noted that, in September 1870, 200,000 sheep would be shorn at Jimbour and 150,000 at Jondaryan.

There was usually just the one end-of-year shearing season at Jondaryan. This was so throughout the 1870s. The only exceptions were in 1872 when the high price of wool and the previous years lambing induced a March shearing, and in June 1874 when 419 were shorn. This was also true of the 1880s until 1888, when there was again a March shearing, 1,000 odd shorn in June, and the normal end-of-year shearing. The pattern from 1888 into the 90s was this one of shearing twice a year, in March and April and in September and October.

Besides management and men, the other real division in Jondaryan society was the one referred to previously as "others". The members of this group included women, blacks, Indian coolies, Chinese and Melanesians and they occupied a social status lower, in fact, than the lowest "men".

Just as there were station management and station men on Jondaryan so too there were station ladies and bushwomen. The "bushwomen" were employed to do the cleaning, washing and cooking, leaving the "ladies" to engage in their leisure-time activities of reading, sewing and visiting. For management there was status
attached to bringing a wife from “home”, or marrying a colonial girl of equal class position. Indeed, on the predominantly male dominated pastoral frontier of Queensland\textsuperscript{132} “ladies” were such a rarity as to attract considerable attention. A young lady pioneer recalled how splendid the Downs pioneer men were as hosts: “a young girl as guest was unusual, and I was treated as a fairy princess”\textsuperscript{133}. These young lady imports in many instances served to reinforce the social distance between management and men. As the homestead was refurbished, domestic staff hired, gardens planted and “entertaining” a much pursued activity, the separateness of the homestead from the men’s quarters was even more marked. Russell Ward has made this point: “before the squatter’s wife arrived to define more rigidly the barrier between ‘the house’ and the huts conditions forced a fair degree of understanding between the occupants of both”.\textsuperscript{134} The Jondaryan management had never shared the life of its employees and the presence of managers’ wives maintained and reinforced that division.

Victorian gentlemen, like the proprietors of Jondaryan and their managers, regarded the home as a refuge from the competitive and harsh commercial world — a place where they could “try to regain the humanness”\textsuperscript{135} the competitive world had taken from them. It was a temple for those like William Kent who believed in God, but rejected orthodox Christianity. They could direct their altruism towards their immediate and extended family and those in need. And it was the women’s role to uphold this temple, this refuge, to “uplift her more worldly and intellectual mate”.\textsuperscript{136} This was her feminine mission.

\begin{quote}
Man for the field and woman for the hearth;  
Man for the sword and for the needle she;  
Man with the head and woman with the heart; 
Man to command and woman to obey; 
All else confusion.\textsuperscript{137}
\end{quote}

The outside world was sinful, immoral and atheistic, it was womanhood’s mission to instill a sense of purity, morality and humanity into it, and she could only exercise that moral influence from inside the family.

The whole moral fibre of New South Wales was thought to have been under attack in the 1840s because the wrong type of female immigrant was being chosen to emigrate to Australia. Needle-workers and street-walkers were not considered fit and proper moral reformists: “these are the individuals who are to be the close companions of single men, and the wives and daughters of reputable men.
of family; the household servants of our own houses; the nurses of our children; our shepherds' wives; and the reformers of our convict population."^138 Thus it was the bushwomen's as well as the ladies' role to be the moral conscience of the emerging society. A shortage of women of the "right type" to fulfill this role caused considerable alarm.

Specifically the concern was that unmarried men would seek sexual "release" by taking Aboriginal women or by visiting "houses of ill repute". Official Brisbane police figures listed seventy-seven prostitutes in Brisbane in 1868 and one hundred and fifteen in 1877.^139 The Queensland Figaro commented that these figures represented only one fifth of the true number operating in Brisbane. Matrimony was encouraged as a means of lessening the abuse of Aboriginal women, reducing the spread of venereal disease and reducing prostitution. Another real concern was that amongst bushmen without access to black women and prostitutes, homosexuality was rife.

As well as "civilizing" and removing the evils of prostitution and homosexuality, the introduction of women into pastoral areas was thought to have a stabilizing effect on the male population. The hope was that the uncivilized pastoral nomad in the habit of "knocking down his cheque" at the end of each season would be transformed by wife and home into a more sober and responsible citizen. Like the provision of banking facilities, matrimony would encourage thrift, and, in place of wandering bushmen would arise small agrarian communities. This did eventually happen. However, the transition was not as fast as it was assumed it would be, and the supply of eligible young ladies at times exceeded the demand.

The Editor of the Courier, in fact, in February 1869, berated emigration agents who had created the false impression that any single women who came to Queensland would be met by "crowds of well-to-do young men ready and anxious to meet them . . ., propose to them at once, and marry them with the least possible delay".^140 One case in point was a number of a Miss Ryte's well-educated and well-connected female immigrants who had been brought to Brisbane to console disconsolate bachelors. They found themselves neither husbands nor governessing positions, but on the streets or in domestic service.^141

It was true, of course, that the disproportion between the sexes had always been greater in the Northern districts of New South Wales than in the southern and more settled districts, with the result that the disproportion between single and married males had been
greater also. In the Moreton Bay District in 1851, for example, there were six single males for every married male. By the early 60s this had been reduced to two and a half single males to every married man, and there were five single males to every three single females. But the disparity between the sexes was much greater than this in the Dalby area, where there were 626 males to 299 females. A decade later the disparity was even greater — 1,508 males to 638 females. Whilst the disproportion between the sexes was greater in Queensland than in the South, and greater still on the Northern rural Downs than in the urban areas, the desire to marry among young men was not proportionally greater. In the main, station hands either regarded the bush and women as incompatible or felt that they could not financially support a wife. Those who did marry found their wives more of a financial asset than a liability.

The average number of women employed on Jondaryan between 1866-93 was ten, the smallest five and the largest twenty-five in 1863. Up until 1866 they were primarily shepherds' wives employed as hut-keepers and washerwomen. Most wives of station men, whether the latter were resident, itinerant or contract, usually found themselves cooking, laundressing and hut-keeping, and their labour increased the wage of their burr-cutter, horse-driver, shepherd or shearer husband. In the early 1860s a single shepherd could expect to be paid £40 per year and a shepherd with a hut-keeper wife £45 to £50 per annum. The presence of women did provide a stable and economic labour unit for the station. In fact, where the employment of family men had been discouraged in the 40s and 50s because wives and children were seen as hungry, costly dependants, in the 60s and 70s the family was regarded as a good labour investment. A shepherd with a wife and two sons earned £120 per annum in the late 60s and in 1872 a shepherd, a wife and one son earned £80. Jondaryan's management even paid a family allowance to some of its employees. A Mr Mcleod received £5.7s.6d. per annum under this scheme in 1860. This would have been very important to the family working man because colonial families tended to have more surviving children than English families.

Between 1867-75 women on Jondaryan were primarily employed as cooks, and in the period 1876-93 as servants of one kind or another, housemaids, houseservants or laundresses. Cooks were the most highly paid of female employees and a housecook would receive £35 to £40 per annum. Seamstresses were brought from Toowoomba to attend to the Jondaryan ladies' wardrobes.
Their visits could last from two weeks to two months and they were paid 2s.6d. a day. Nurses received the same rate of remuneration as barracks servants, 8s. per week. Laundresses like Elizabeth Milligau earned £30 per annum throughout the 60s and 70s. Elizabeth Roberts and Mary Haugh, both washerwomen, earned £20 to £26 in 1868–69. Housemaids and house servants earned an equivalent sum, maid servants slightly more and servants considerably less, 4s. to 6s. per week or £10 to £15 per annum in the early 70s.

Over the thirty years from 1860–90 women comprised 10 per cent of the total Jondaryan population.

The next largest “other” group on Jondaryan, and one which performed similar labour, was the Chinese. Between 1863–93 the Chinese population represented approximately 2½ per cent of Jondaryans’ total population. The number employed in any one year ranged from a single Chinaman to eleven, this highest figure being recorded in 1863.

The greatest number of Chinese were employed in the early 60s as shepherds. There usually were two to four Chinese working on Jondaryan in any one year but, in 1865, there were five Chinese shepherding on Jondaryan at £52 per year. In the late 60s and early 70s they were predominantly hired as lambers and washers when these jobs did not hold much attraction for Europeans. In fact the small number of Chinese employed at Jondaryan belied their contributions. They performed tasks which European workers preferred not to do. Although the majority of Chinese workers were employed as shepherds, lambers, cooks and gardeners, they did occupy the full range of station occupations, from burr-cutting and rolling to shearing. They performed all tasks competently and in all occupations were paid a comparable wage to Europeans. Shepherds received £40 to £50 per annum in the 1860s, lambers 20s. per week in the 70s, gardeners like Ah Whey, Ping Chaw and Sing Quo, 20s. per week in 1878, cooks 25s. per week, washers between 10d. and 12d. per score and shearers 3s. to 3s.6d. per score in the 1860s and 1870s. In September 1862 Chinese gardener Whey, at Jondaryan, was busily laying out the garden and plants.

Although they were quite an unstable supply of labour in the early 60s, some only staying two to four months, there were some Chinese who worked on Jondaryan for years. One fellow worked on and off for thirty years, one shepherd worked from 1861–63 and another from 1861–69. Of the eighty who were recorded as having worked on Jondaryan only one was ever discharged.

At the same time as European workers regarded the Chinese as
racial inferiors, they also regarded them as labour competitors. The fact that Chinese labourers mostly occupied the lower rungs of the occupational ladder somewhat lessened this competitiveness and served to reassure the Europeans of their own superiority. The Chinese occupation of these positions also allowed European workers to be more socially mobile. But the Chinese were still labour competitors, and this led to ill feeling and tension. This job competition tension was heightened by racial differences. Violence occasionally erupted. In July 1869 John Ah Sing, shepherd on Jondaryan, was arrested for stabbing fellow shepherd William Fuller at Campbell's Camp. Those Chinamen who found their work situation intolerable chose the same means of escape as their white counterparts. Some absconded, some "absented" and the occasional one committed suicide. On Jondaryan, in October 1862, a magisterial inquiry was held into the death of Chinaman Go Gong found hanging by the neck in one of the Jondaryan huts.150

Following the passing of the "Chinese Immigration Regulation Act" of 1877 only thirteen Chinese were employed at Jondaryan in the next five years.

Downs squatters had imported Chinamen because they had argued that Aboriginal labour was not a viable source. Arthur Hodgson, a leading Downs squatter, remarked in 1868 that all attempts to utilize Aboriginal labour on the Darling Downs had "most signally failed".151 "You might employ an Aborigine today", he said, "and he might leave your flock of sheep in the bush tomorrow".152 Aborigines comprised only .36 per cent of Jondaryan's population over the period 1863-93. Prior to this they had occasionally been hired to collect bark and to carry tools to an outstation153 and were paid in rations from the station store. In August 1875 "Peter and Co" were paid at the rate of 50s. per hundred for collecting sheets of bark and, in 1877, 4d. per sheet for stripping it. The following year Peter was shepherding for £40 per annum. Five years later he was working on another of Kent and Wienholt's properties, Irvingdale.

By 1868-69, of the fifteen hundred to two thousand South Sea Islanders or kanakas154 indentured in Queensland,155 forty-six were employed in the Dalby district. This district was in fact the eighth largest employer of this type of labour. Groups of kanakas in Uncle Tom's Cabin-like scenes could be seen passing through Dalby on their way to the Maranoa and the Burnett to work as shepherds. They had been attracted away from the coast by the higher wages being offered in pastoral areas. At a time when white pastoral
labourers were finding it hard to get work on the Downs, these im­
portees were not greeted very warmly. Dalby was full of un­
employed and the storekeepers complained that their businesses
were suffering from the prevalence of low wages and unemploy­
ment. A public meeting held in Dalby and followed by meetings in
Toowoomba and Brisbane culminated in a Select Committee recom­
mendation in 1876 that the government force Islanders from the
pastoral industry back into the sugar industry.

There is evidence of only two Islanders being employed on Jon­
daryan. One fellow, Bishop, was brought by rail from Brisbane to
Jondaryan, stayed four months and was paid at the rate of 12s. per
week. Another by the name of Perry stayed two months.

A few Indian coolies or “blackboys” had been employed on Jon­
daryan by James Charles White but there is no record of any coolie
being employed by Kent and Wienholt.

No more than fifteen per cent of Jondaryan’s population in any
one year was made up of this “other” group. In fact, a feature of the
station’s population was its homogeneity. English, Irish and Scots
dominated with a sprinkling of European nationalities, a few
Chinese, a couple of Aborigines and an Islander or two. The values
of the community were Anglo-Saxon. Ownership of land was ac­
cepted as a criterion of social leadership. The lessees and manage­
ment of Jondaryan provided that leadership. Kent and Wienholt,
William Graham and Charles Williams formed a type of “moral
aristocracy”156. Their virtues were integrity, honour and a striving
after the gentlemanly ideal. That these gentlemen clung to their
Englishness was reflected in their dress, residences and their life­
style. The appearance of Jondaryan head-station, like the hospitali­
ty offered there, reflected the very real differences of status, wealth
and power in the Jondaryan community. The differences were
economic as well as social. The “men” formed a much less
homogeneous group than the management. The many tasks which
had to be performed on the station and the different remuneration
afforded to each created separate labouring groups and complex
social relationships.
Jondaryan’s managers had successfully transplanted themselves in Queensland. They were a respectable, affluent and civilized colonial quasi-aristocracy with many people immediately and occupationally dependent upon them. Over these persons they exercised a powerful and a “proper” influence both within the station community and without. This influence took the form of rewards and bonuses for work well done and fines for unsatisfactory work or absenteeism. Remuneration was not always assured and could take varying forms, some of which were more profitable than others. “Takehome pay” could fall short of advertised rates once the “necessary” deductions had been made. Store prices could considerably erode the income and independence of the worker, and the supply of rations could be altered to necessitate heavier purchasing from the storekeeper-squatter.

There was provision in the Masters and Servants Act of 1861 for employees to seek redress before local Benches of Magistrates, but those who did so quickly came to the realization that the squatters’ internal authority was propped up externally by the legal and political system.

Even the provision of station leisure, educational and religious facilities was sometimes an overt but more often a covert means of keeping the worker happy, maintaining the status quo and breeding respect for existing social institutions and relationships.¹

But the Jondaryan labouring man² had emigrated in hope, not in resignation. He hoped for equality of opportunity, freedom, and an improved quality of life. He had not emigrated to be contained within the same type of social relationship he had left behind, but rather wanted to save sufficient to establish himself independently of his employer. Despite the “deductions”, his material condition had improved, as had his bargaining position vis-a-vis his employer. He
was more free to choose his master, but in each case the master seemed real enough.3  

Jondaryan's hierarchical structure was bound together by a system of controls both internal and external. The "rewards" included promotion and bonuses for work well done. The normal gratuity for shepherds and generally usefuls was £5,4 which I doubt if one fellow referred to as "generally useless" ever received. Lambers were given extra for travelling with sheep and encouraged to be zealous in "lambing down" by being given a percentage of their lambing in addition to their set wage.5 The Darling Downs Gazette of November 1866 commended their gratuity system, saying that it cemented "ties of mutual regard between squatters and their servants".6 This it probably did, but more directly it increased the profitability of the run. It was generally held that whilst wool paid for the running expenses of the station, the increase yielded the profit. A lamb received £1 per week in 1866 plus a bonus of 1s. per head above a nominated lambing percentage.

Conversely lambers were fined for the loss of lambs even when this loss was because of a bad season and no grass rather than their own negligence.7 Shepherds were fined for the loss of sheep and damage done to the flock by mixing.8 One fellow was fined 4s. in January 1871 for breaking a sheep's leg and another £10 for damage to a horse.9 Absence from work because of illness also merited a fine. 5s. per day or £2 per week was the general penalty rate although some were charged more and some less.10 The Toowoomba Chronicle reported how shearers at Jondaryan in 1874 were fined £1 each for reporting late for work one Monday morning. The shearers' explanation was that one of their number had gone missing and that, after the delay caused by being refused a station horse to search for him eventually procured their own, but were late getting back to the shed. They were told that in being fined £1 each they had been let off lightly and could be made to forfeit all their wages.11 In a similar case, but this time the result of family illness, two shearers had arrived back late for work and been fined accordingly. Both men argued that this was unjust as they had not been wilfully absent or disobedient but had been on missions of mercy. However, this was not, as William Thomas wrote to the Chronicle, "the first occasion on which the Jondaryan woolshed had been converted into a courthouse, and the overseer, judge and jury".12

Shearers were also fined for drunkenness13 and "bad shearing",14 which was a very loosely defined and subjective term. Management,
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concerned that a residue of four to six ounces of wool on a sheep represented a loss of £1,200, inserted the clause that a shearer should "shear to the satisfaction of the overseer or who may be otherwise" in the agreement. As well as shearing "clean", this meant that sheep were not to be scamped, tomahawked or cut. Jondaryan’s shearsers argued that it was "physically impossible to shear a sheep and take the whole of the wool off without cutting". There was one shed overseer who rejected an average of ten from every hundred sheep shorn. Another threw aside fifty-four sheep from a fellow regarded as a "capital shearer" by his peers. And it was not only the shearer’s professional pride which suffered. After he had paid for the cook, his extra rations, his own shears and his fines for bad shearing, a shearer was lucky to clear over 8s. per day, working from early morning to sundown.

Fines were not the only punitive measures used to secure maximum efficiency and profitability. Remuneration at the completion of a job was not always assured. If the shed overseer decided that a shearer had not shorn satisfactorily then he refused to pay him. As the Toowoomba Chronicle pointed out, this was a "very cheap and easy way of getting sheep shorn". In the Jondaryan shed as many as 150 sheep per day had been stopped. Having "signed on" for the season, the shearer was bound by the agreement to shear for the season no matter what the conditions with respect to accommodation, store prices and shear prices, but the employer was not likewise bound to pay him. Technically, under the Masters and Servants Act of 1861, an employer could be summoned, and made to pay £20 or be imprisoned for up to three months for unpaid wages, but there were a number of claims for wages where the defendant denied ever having hired the complainant and the case was dismissed in the defendant’s favour through insufficient evidence.

Another common practice was the issuing of calabashes or orders upon stations. Instead of men being paid in paper which could be converted into cash at the nearest town (Dalby) and used to buy bread and meat, they were given orders which could be drawn only upon the Sydney firm with whom the station dealt. This meant that the men had to travel to Sydney to cash it in but more often than not, and employers were well aware of this, they got only as far as the nearest shanty. Having been denied alcohol on the station during shearing, while voluminous quantities of wine and spirits were consumed at the Homestead, the men were naturally "dry", and the publican was only too willing to relieve them of their cheque, no part of which ever found its way back into their pockets.
They would then go back to monotonous toil and tea for twelve months until it was time, and they had the resources, to burst out once again. "Downing the cheque" was as much a symptom of the remuneration system as it was of the pastoral labourers' intemperate habits. The order system obliged the servant to go to a public house to have his order cashed, to a country storekeeper, to Sydney or, to pay a discount. Whichever way, he must drink, buy goods which he did not want, get to Sydney within three months because after that time the order was not negotiable or pay an exchange rate of between 11 and 30 per cent. The reputation which the colony had gained for high wages did not take into account the method of paying them.

Cries about the injustice of the "wretched calabash system" had been registered as early as 1845, and yet in 1860 issuers of these documents continued to make money out of them at the expense of their employees. The Masters and Servants Act of 1861 ruled that any payment by cheque, draft order or note on any bank or person outside of the Colony would be exchanged at the rate of one per cent on orders less than £50 and half a per cent on those greater than £50, this rate to be borne by the employer and added to the amount of the wages. The Chronicle had seen the calabash currency as something of a necessary evil before the establishment of banks in the Colony, but with the opening of the Bank of New South Wales in Toowoomba in 1861, this leading Downs newspaper was asking the question at what stage the Government would prohibit the issuing of "IOUs" and calabashes. It did not, but the provision of banking facilities and the change in the nature of a significant sector of the run labour-force had the same effect. As boundary rider or "married settled paddock keeper" replaced shepherd, "the bush publicans' receipts (were) not to be swelled by the reckless and senseless debaucheries of men half mad from a long course of solitary living", and publicans were not the only rural group to lament the passing of a reckless nomad group of pastoral labourers.

"Downing the cheque" was encouraged by some squatters for two reasons. First, it ensured that, wage-spent and destitute, the men would be forced to return to the station to sign-on for another season, and, secondly, wages dissipated in alcohol could not be saved to buy that little block of land so zealously guarded by the squatter. A greater savings capacity lessened the labourers' dependence on the squatter and strengthened his bargaining position in relation to wages and conditions. Whilst the most marked feature of the wages offered to Jondaryan's resident male and
female employees over the period 1863-93 was their stability, shepherds' wages rose from £40 to £60 per annum, and for most of the period remained at twice the level they had been twenty years before. Washers' wages rose, while the shearsers' rate remained the same, with only a few notable exceptions. There had been, therefore, no marked change in the earning capacity of the two latter groups but it was generally acknowledged that they were "getting to be a more respectable class of men than formerly, and instead of 'knocking down' their cheques in public houses, they now took their money home and spent it on their families". The more employees either "saved up", rather than "knocked down" their cheques, the less dominant the squatter's position became. The very development of pastoral capitalism was dependent on the maintenance of this dominance and it was through the legal and political systems that the Downs pastoral employers maintained what has been referred to as "collective domination".

Labourers who realized the worthlessness of the orders with which they were paid or whose real wage, after the "necessary" deductions, fell considerably short of the advertised rate, or who were refused payment under the "truck" economy and who decided to take their grievances to the local court soon discovered that the internal authority of their employer was reinforced by the legal superstructure. Any Police Magistrate or any two or more Justices of the Peace could conduct an open Court into disputes between masters and servants and, almost without exception, these officers of the law were squatters or related to squatters. Once a squatter had established himself in Queensland it was usual for him to be listed among those "gentlemen holding the Commission of the Peace", and, more than likely, he would have been called upon to sit on a magistrates bench. Of the sixty-two Justices of the Peace on the Downs in 1861, all but nine were Crown lessees. These men, according to the working man, imagined themselves the aristocracy and hung the Masters and Servants Act above their employees' inferior heads "like the sword of Damacles". On the one hand they had masters "whose only aim in respect of their servants (appeared) to be a constant fault finding, eternal law-going and an unconcealed desire to deprive hard-working men of their miserable wages" and on the other, capricious Benches. Opposite decisions were handed down at different country benches on similar cases. Inconsistent class law prevailed . . .
God's laws are equal,
His wise plan
Is fraught with justice;
Man is alone unjust to man —
The rich oppresses the poor.\(^4\)

The influence which squatters wielded was out of all proportion to their actual numerical strength. Evidence of this was the removal from Warwick of Police Magistrate James Charles White, described by one colleague as “as able and just a magistrate as ever sat on the bench”,\(^4\) and by another as “strict and independent”.\(^4\) It was precisely this independence in the performance of his duties which incurred the wrath of squatters and led to White’s removal to Dalby. According to White, the exhibition of party feeling on the Warwick Bench was disgraceful and the way the bench was constituted, “a farce”.\(^4\) In the absence of independent lawyers the labouring man believed the law to be a dead letter and that the squatter would use his position, friends and influence to secure favourable decisions in “masters and servants” cases.

They had even used their influence, as we have seen, to influence the positioning of new townships so that they would not interfere with the monopoly which the squatters enjoyed in supplying their employees with commodities.\(^4\) Without competition, the squatter could place what prices he liked on his wares of inferior quality. The 1845 Select Committee on the Masters and Servants Act recognized that prices for basic commodities on some runs were exhorbitant but did not think their regulation a “fit subject for legislation”.\(^4\)

Some squatters quite openly admitted that it was run practice to defray their wages bill by profits derived from the store. C.P. Hodgson considered his nominally high wage scale “a necessary duplicity”, and raised his store prices to recoup what he paid out in increased wages. By his own admission, his employees were actually receiving less,\(^4\) despite a doubling of wage. It was the opinion of one of the shearers on Jondaryan that the profits accrued from the station store on that run “must pay the rent of the run and the salary of the storekeeper”.\(^4\) It was alleged that sugar, which could be bought at 3½d. per pound in Toowoomba,\(^4\) cost 6d. per pound at Jondaryan and “other articles in proportion”.\(^4\) Clothing was said to be “fully 20 per cent and on some things 50 per cent above the Toowoomba prices”.\(^4\) A decade earlier Jondaryan store prices for tea, sugar, coffee, soap and boots were from 33½ per cent to 50 per cent above the general Queensland price,\(^4\) and Jondaryan’s smokers had to pay twice as much for their tobacco. In these years
though, prices would have been magnified to some extent by the cost of carriage. In 1874 however, prices were much the same despite a fall in the cost of carriage and a general world wide fall in the cost of basic commodities. It would seem that Jondaryan’s proprietors were doing in the 70s what they had done in the 60s, that is, fixing store prices not simply to leave a little profit to cover costs, but using the store as a money-earning service to offset the stations’ running expenses.

Stores were “issued” to resident employees and washers and “bought” by the other contract and itinerant groups. On Jondaryan the ration issue was always flour, sugar and tea in the ratio of 4:1:1/8, although the quality might vary. A shepherd, for instance, would receive eight pounds of flour, two pounds of sugar and a quarter of a pound of tea, whereas an overseer might receive forty pounds of flour, and sugar and tea in a like proportion. Sixteen pounds of meat was the usual allocation although in less prosperous times the ration would be altered. The issuing of less meat and more flour forced the employee to buy extra meat from the store at store prices. Anthony Trollope estimated that receiving rations was worth 5s.6d. a week to the washer. On Jondaryan, at Jondaryan store prices, it was worth 10s.4d. per week. Jondaryan’s management used the ration incentive to secure their labourforce. Workers would not be placed on the ration list until they had “signed on” for the season. Some must have wondered at the sagacity of their decision when they received their first issue of ration sugar and tea, the latter being commonly referred to as “post and rail” or “Jack the painter”. It was notoriously of poor quality.

The station not only raised revenue by charging “very high rates” for basic commodities and “extra rations” but also by selling shearers their tools of trade, and by charging a service fee for employees’ mares. To shear at the standard required by the shed overseer a shearer needed a new pair of shears every five days, or, at least, a new pair a week. The normal season lasted eleven weeks so that at 5s. a pair, a £2.15s. shears deduction had to be made from the shearer’s account. Whilst the men were allowed to keep their horses on Jondaryan this obviously benefitted the proprietors as much as it did the men. £5.5s. was the fee charged for the use of the station sire “Fireaway”, and each employee who put his mare to “West Australian” had £3.3s. taken from his account. Overseers were not exempt from this service fee. They did, however, received 2 per cent higher interest on their station accounts than the men. The men’s accounts bore 8 per cent interest on the balance after their cheques had been drawn.
Jondaryan’s proprietors certainly were storekeepers with a monopoly of supply of goods and services which they provided at non-competitive prices. By eroding the take-away pay of their employees they were eroding their independence and heightening their dependence on the station.

Of all the station labouring groups discussed, shearers, because they were a large mobile group with an essential marketable skill were in the best position to assert their independence of their employers. Their mobility was their weapon. If a squatter would not pay the rate they demanded for the season, they could simply move on. Wool had to be taken off; the whole profitability of the run depended upon it. As early as 1849 shearers on the Downs learned of the advantages of collective bargaining. In October of that year shearers demanded and were given the same rate of pay as they had shorn for the previous year. Their migratory work pattern placed them in a strong bargaining position vis-a-vis their employers. The latter reacted to this strength by themselves combining to set a price for labour. This wage-fixing policy was particularly necessary in the late 50s and early 60s when labour shortages were pushing the shearing rate up to 4s. per score. In 1857 some run superintendents entered into a “3s. compact” although others continued to pay 4s. per score. Some squatters employed men a month before shearing time “purposely to secure their services” for the season. John Watts of Eton Vale told of how he would go to a neighbouring shed and sign on the shearers there for his shearing before they had had a chance to move on. The severe penalties in the Masters and Servants Act for breach of agreement were designed to curtail the mobility of employees. According to “Correspondent” of the Toowoomba Chronicle, however, not only had the Act not done this but it had resulted in employees only being willing to enter into weekly contracts at exorbitant wages. Instead of heightening capital’s control over itinerant labour, the Act had led to just the opposite.

Jondaryan’s workforce was a curious combination of the resident and dependent and the mobile and independent. Nothing was probably further from the minds of Jondaryan’s resident employees than the Masters and Servants Act. Station men like Tom Evans did not need binding agreements to tie them to Jondaryan. Jondaryan was their home; they belonged there and felt secure there. Some were born there, married there and died there. Although obviously lacking the generations of servant familial continuity which were known in English farming villages, some Jondaryan residents iden-
tified very strongly with the station and stayed for years as faithful servants. A farm hand in Buckinghamshire, Tom Evans, came to Australia and Jondaryan in 1873. He married Elizabeth Ewers at Aubigny three years later. During his twenty labouring years on Jondaryan, Evans was a farm labourer, horse driver, shepherd, boundary rider and farm overseer. Promotion to jobs of higher remuneration and greater status served to convince Evans and others that equality of opportunity was indeed possible in this new land. He was upwardly mobile and his material and social condition had improved. Unlike seasonal workers, to whom Jondaryan was just another “cheque”, to resident employees it was their home. Jondaryan’s proprietors were not just their employers but the providers of their social and religious life and the educators of their children.

Management had their clubs, societies, shoots, their endless round of visiting, and, on a private level, their newspaper and novel reading, sewing and piano playing. The “men” had what was provided for them by the management, travelling shows, circuses, plays, concerts and public lectures. Particularly popular was a show called “Mr. Vinson’s Dissolving Views”, which was a series of places, diagrams and sketches illustrative of “Anatomy and Natural History” with musical accompaniment. Like the lecture this show was educational as well as entertaining. The shows which were more for self-indulgence than self-improvement included the Magic Entertainment, the Dream Entertainment, Carey’s, Clarkson’s, Mr Hall’s and Miss Balfour’s, with admission prices ranging from 2s. to 7s. The coming of the railway to Jondaryan meant that more group performances such as circuses could be staged. A cricket club was formed in 1877, and there was spirited competition between the Jondaryan township and the Jondaryan head-station teams. For the most part, however, the leisure-time activities of management and men were mutually exclusive.

It was this exclusiveness, this aloofness and lack of social intercourse which the Toowoomba Chronicle argued was responsible for the strained relationship between squatters and their employees on the Downs in the early 60s. For this reason the proprietors of Eton Vale and Jondaryan were commended by the Chronicle for their provision of “Harvest Homes”. It was hoped that the good old English custom of having Harvest Homes would “bring about greater co-operation and good feeling between employer and employee”.

The goodwill displayed by Jondaryan’s proprietors was in part a
reflection of their own membership of the village community and in part a recognition of the utility of such rites in dissipating any ill-feeling between employer and employee. In this way their own position of authority was reinforced.\textsuperscript{62}

Religion also was looked to as a means of reinforcing the authority of the employing class. The Reverend Benjamin Glennie had been a twice-yearly visitor to Jondaryan since 1848.\textsuperscript{63} The attendances at his services, however, suggest that his congregation was largely made up of the managerial class. Glennie himself was a graduate of Cambridge and from his arrival in the Colony had identified himself with the leading squatting families. Indeed his brother belonged to that class. It was not surprising therefore that he had more in common with run managers than wild bushmen. One Down’s working-man’s opinion of Archdeacon Glennie was that he was “very suitable for a fashionable church in Sydney, but most unsuitable”\textsuperscript{64} for the bush. This reflected the itinerant bush labourer’s response to religion in the bush generally. The work routine, the living conditions and the harsh physical environment all conspired to reduce its apparent relevance.

Contract groups worked seven days a week, shearers and itinerants chose to spend their one day of the week out of the shed washing or getting drunk; and the working-man’s response generally to his conditions was not prayer but drink. Reverend Glennie recorded in his diary how difficult it was to get a congregation on a station and how many drunken men he saw in his travels. According to the Reverend Kirby, an Independent Church representative in Dalby in the 1860s, Dalby was a “high place of Satan”. Nowhere in the Empire, it was claimed, was there “blasphemy, drunkenness and lasciviousness to beat what prevails here”.\textsuperscript{65} Small congregations were also the result, it was claimed, of the failure of the church to adapt to new climatic conditions. Services were held with the midday sun beating down upon galvanized iron roofs and the worshippers were expected to keep their coats on! The sermons of Dr Nelson (Presbyterian) lasted for over an hour! If the masses were losing faith as the establishment feared, this was certainly not the way to set about restoring it. Although, in name only, they were predominantly Roman Catholic, Church of England and Presbyterian,\textsuperscript{66} itinerants used their denominational status to evade visiting clergymens’ services and were almost non-denominational. They gave subscriptions to whomsoever visited Jondaryan and asked for a subscription, be there Congregational, Presbyterian, Church of England or Roman Catholic. In the same way they subscribed to the
Blind Man and the Lame Man. The church did not exert much influence over these men.

For Jondaryan's resident employees church-going was part of the community life of the station. St Anne's, built in 1859, had its first service conducted by the Reverend Glennie and attended by 123 people in that year. Open to all denominations St Anne's was the second church built on the Downs. Like the "Harvest Homes" the church broke down something of the social barrier which existed between Jondaryan's resident employees and management. Mrs White, the wife of J.C. White, manager for the Tooths and in whose honour the church was named, would gather all the children on the property and teach them at Sunday School. Mrs Williams was also the Sunday School teacher and Mr William Kent the church warden. The Christian virtues of duty and obedience reinforced the master's position. Also Christianity drew perhaps what was the sharpest of all divisions on Jondaryan; that between the respectable and the non-respectable. The poor could be respectable provided they showed a proper respect for moral behaviour. Diligence, obedience, respect for authority, thrift, and church attendance, constituted moral behaviour. Those who were to be seen to be desiring a correct code of moral behaviour were station residents. Religion was a cohesive agent in this community.

The provision of educational instruction on Jondaryan, like the provision of leisure activities, reflected the status difference between master and men. Whilst it was a Wienhoft tradition to be educated in England and whilst the Kent children were educated in Brisbane, Sydney, Hobart Town and London, the Whites' children were sent to Ipswich or Toowoomba or taught at home by a governess, and the Williams' children similarly taught by a governess until they were old enough to be sent away. The men's children were instructed by a schoolmaster at Jondaryan head station. Although the station did hire the schoolmaster, his salary, the maintenance of the school, school prizes and picnics were in part paid for by subscriptions deducted from the men's wages. Station employees were totally dependent on the station school for the instruction of their children until the mid-1870s, when a new primary school was built by subscription at the township on land purchased from Edward Wienholt. This dependence reinforced the authority of Jondaryan's management.

Charity was an integral part of this dependence. Jondaryan's resident employees were urged to be morally responsible and financially independent, but, if some misfortune undermined their in-
dependence, William Kent their employer was also their benevolent patron. Kent felt the same kind of responsibility towards his long-standing and faithful employees as he did towards his family members; if they needed his financial assistance then he was prepared to give it. When John White's widow and six children were left without any means of financial support in 1869 the Dalby Herald was certain that his bereaved family would "receive every consideration at the hands of the proprietor — being the relic of a faithful servant". Kent, unlike Wienholt who lacked his partner's personal warmth for his resident employees, took a particular interest in their welfare. The sale of Rosalie Plains and Cooyar, he told Henry Jordan, Queensland's Immigration Agent in 1863, would enable him "to assist (his) friends and give some of the many people who had been in my service a start in life". He and his wife's philanthropy (she was dubbed the "Lady Bountiful") became so widely known that Kent began receiving letters of financial request from strangers. Kent's popularity both within Jondaryan and throughout the Downs was evidenced by the eight hundred mourners present at his funeral. Of these five hundred were Downs residents and the rest his employees.

School for the children, church, travelling plays and circuses and the patronage of William Kent cushioned the impact of the working environment on Jondaryan's resident employees. Contract and itinerant groups enjoyed no such cushioning benefits and by late 1874 were becoming vocal about their plight. Shearers in particular resented their employers' attitude to them. They were regarded, they claimed, not as men but as "machines" and were threatened with "the terrors of the Masters and Servants Act" if they dared to resist the tyranny of their masters. Having signed on for the reason at 3s. per score, the shearer was bound by his contract to shear for that season regardless of the conditions provided for him by his employer. Failure to do so was regarded as a violation of his agreement. On Jimbour, in November 1867, sheep were not kept up to the washers or shearers and they sat for five to six days with no work. Shears from the station store were expensive and in such poor condition that the men were forced to buy up to four pairs. The men, therefore, decided to withdraw their labour. For this action the Dalby Court fined them 20s. for breaking their agreement and they were made to meet court costs. The shearer was bound by his agreement to shear for the duration of the season, but his employer was not likewise bound to employ or pay him if he did not shear to the satisfaction of the overseer. 3s.3d. a score with no second cut
was a “beggarly price” to be paid, too, they argued, particularly when there were always deductions for their cook, all their extras, shears at excessive store prices and fines for bad shearing.

Shearers’ accommodation was another point of grievance. It was described as “wretched” on Eton Vale and on the other three major Downs runs of Westbrook, Gowrie and Jondaryan. On Eton Vale thirty-four men camped in a 30 ft by 14 ft hut which was also used as their kitchen, on Westbrook twenty-five were forced to eat in a hut where only fourteen men could have dined with comfort and, on Jondaryan, shearers were housed in two huts, one of which accommodated thirty-two and the other thirty-six. The largest dimensions of these huts were 30 ft by 20 ft and in them the men were expected to sleep, dress, cook and eat. One shearer maintained that they could not “retire with decency nor sleep with comfort” in such Calcutta-like habitation. Another concluded that their employers had “no regard for the moral and social conditions of (their) employees”. These conditions were particularly resented in the mid-70s because of the profitability of sheep breeding and the value of the properties on which they were endured.

The years 1855–65 had been heralded as the golden decade for Downs squatters. During these years men like Kent and Wienholt had enjoyed “unexampled prosperity” as they reaped the benefit of southern gold discoveries and northern pastoral expansion. As well as an “abnormal price” for their wool these “Pure Merinos” had been able to take advantage of the scarcity of sheep in the Southern districts and the great demand for maiden ewes in the north. Over the period 1858–63 the sale of sheep both locally, to northern runs, and to the Victorian overland market had netted Kent and Wienholt £31,291. By 1864 the partnership had acquired the runs of East Prairie, Lagoon Creek and Mount Flinders as well as Jondaryan, and J.C. White, ex-manager of Jondaryan, estimated that its proprietors would have netted £80,000 from Jondaryan alone during their first three years of ownership. It was profits such as this and the sale of Rosalie Plains and Cooyar in April, 1864, which enabled Kent and Wienholt to pay off the balance owing on Jondaryan the following year. Their objective then was to freehold or “to secure” as much of the Jondaryan run as was financially possible. They were fortunate enough to have had and been able to borrow sufficient funds to acquire large portions of land under their pre-emptive right. The fact that they had been able to secure their position by the mid-60s meant that they were much better able to withstand the economic crash of 1866.
A doubling of wool exports from Australia in the early 60s had led to a large inflow of British funds borrowed at exorbitant rates by would-be pastoralists. Interest rates of 17 per cent were not uncommon and could be met until, because of a stockpile of wool in London, prices fell. This forced many station owners who had outrun their own resources to surrender their runs to the Banks. Downs squatters who were not tied to such ruinous interest rates and who were, and had been operating profitable runs for many years, were able to withstand the fall in wool prices and, in fact, derive an income from their stock by boiling them down for tallow. The practice of boiling down also resulted in better quality stock in the long term. Jondaryan’s proprietors also responded to a rock-bottom price for their wool in 1870 by forcing the wage of shearers down to 2s.9d. a score and 2s.6d. a score in 1871. In fact, the economic downturn of the late 60s had a marked effect on pastoral labourers.

As stations went bust and Sydney mortgagees moved in, men were turned away, often without being paid for months of hard work. Dispossessed, they wandered onto the Downs looking for work at a time when Downs squatters already had sufficient labour and were in fact “discharging shepherds due to fencing”. Closely tied to the purchase of freehold land was the more intensive use of that land for greater production. Paling dog-proof fences had already resulted in higher lambing percentages and in 1868 Jondaryan’s proprietors launched an extensive wire-fencing programme. Although the impact of this programme on shepherding numbers would not be felt until the 70s, it certainly meant that even by the late 60s fewer of the swagman class could be placed in this occupation. Scores of men were said to have been going about stations in search of work, and had it not been for the bush custom of giving a traveller a feed, an “immense amount of suffering not exceeded amongst the poorest class of English labourers” would have been in evidence. As it was, shepherds on Jondaryan had to carry their rations out on the run with them because their huts were frequently robbed. “It is sad to contemplate”, wrote the Dalby Herald, “that in Australia felix — the most attractive country . . . where the man sound in mind and body may be seen as independent as man ought to be — we see such a mass of helpless men . . . wandering about the country soliciting alms or demanding charity”. The squatter took advantage of this labour glut, kept store prices up, forced wages down and demanded a higher quality of work. The wages paid to shearers in the early 70s were the lowest
paid at Jondaryan in the period 1863–93 although the price of wool and the numbers of sheep shorn were amongst the highest. The industry made an “abnormal recovery” in 1871–72 and despite its remonstrations that it could not afford to pay higher wages the lifestyle of squatters on the Downs suggested otherwise. The men resented the fact that their employers enjoyed all the “blessings and refinements of life”, living and travelling abroad in the splendour of Dukes when their own huts and conveniences were a “disgrace to the so-called civilization of the age”. Their request for better remuneration did not seem unreasonable when it was known that one Downs squatter had paid £38,000 for an English estate with money he had derived from his Downs run. Employees resented profits which they had helped to accrue flowing out of the country and back to England, particularly when there was a mass exodus of destitute labourers from the colony. They had come to this colony on the promise of equality of opportunity for all. That promise had not been fulfilled.

Their masters, in fact, did not believe in social equality. They believed in a plutocracy. Those men who found seasonal pastoral employment and who were “content to have a home little better than an animal’s lair” certainly did not know want in the English sense of going hungry, but their social condition bore a strong resemblance to English country-house existence; that is, their life was what the owner-manager chose to make it, and he chose to make it more comfortable for some than for others. Shearers at Jondaryan demanded to be treated as moral beings and housed at least as comfortably as imported stock. The life of an imported bull or horse was felt to be of more consequence than that of a human being. By the end of 1874 shearers, tired of the “arbitrary bearing of the managers of this station towards the men, were calling for the formation of a shearers’ association”. If anything could “show the need of a shearers’ association”, it was argued, “it is the treatment of men at this station”. “One of the men” at Jondaryan told of how some of the shearers had been threatened that they would never be employed again if they did not reveal the identity of a “Mr Thomas” who had written to the Press of conditions at Jondaryan. This letter, however, had had a good effect as far as the men were concerned. The storekeeper dropped the price of sugar from 6d. to 4d. and the price of trousers from 12s. to 9s. Forty-nine Jondaryan shearers were signatories to a petition calling for the establishment of a Shearers’ Association.

The labouring man’s experience of the type of control which the
management of Jondaryan had exercised over its population had led to differing responses. Resident employees found security, limited mobility and compensating benefits in their dependence. Shearers found the need for an Association. They also found a consciousness of their class position, a consciousness which would attempt to force mutual accommodation on their employers. The latter, however, were determined to ensure that a "proper" relationship was maintained between themselves and their employees.
By 1859 the young colony of Queensland was dependent upon an industry which controlled a great portion of its useable land and the capital demands of which fairly effectively excluded the small man. Those men who had broken through the legal, social and financial barriers to become Downs squatters in the 40s and 50s quickly acquired a position of respectability and societal leadership. Their move from an outlawed position to one of social pre-eminence was the result, partly, of the numbers of people who were occupationally dependent upon them, partly of their broader judicial and political participation, and greatly of the fact that the young Queensland colony was economically dependent upon them. The pastoral industry employed more labour, raised more exports and contributed more to the revenue of the colony than any other industry.

Whilst the colony’s economic debt to squatting was acknowledged, pastoralism was viewed as merely the first stage of settlement from which the colony would move on to the second morally and socially superior agricultural stage. “As the whiteman is to the Aboriginal”, wrote the Editor of the Courier in December 1865, “so is the tiller of the soil to the squatter.” The squatters’ use of the land was seen to be such as “only to justify a comparatively brief tenure of the land.” The “only true and original inheritance” was said to belong to those who were prepared “to use the land and not let it lie idle”. Thus, while, as Kingston says, there was no real antagonism towards squatters as a group by the mid-60s, there was a strong set of beliefs about what the future of Queensland should be like.

The increasing number of immigrants who migrated to the colony did so in the belief that they were entitled to share in the State’s collective wealth, that is, the land. They had no desire to live in the type of stratified society which monopolistic land ownership created. They also believed agricultural settlement to be morally, socially and productively superior to pastoralism.
The working classes fairly quickly defined their ideas about employment and land and the relationship between the two. They recognized that for the squatter the “land question” not only involved remaining the dominant landholder but maintaining a cheap labour supply as well. The *Courier* claimed that the big squatters viewed “with satisfaction” the fact that itinerant labourers, because of land-jobbers and their being relieved of their cheques by sly grog sellers were not able to invest their seasonal earnings in a piece of land. This they saw “as a means to secure these labourers at their own terms” when they were wanted again on their stations. Access to land was a means of labourers lessening their dependence on the squatter — non-access tied them to the station structure. As early as 1857 the small man had recognized the relationship between land and labour and through the pages of the *Moreton Bay Courier* called for some kind of improved land legislation.

The cultivation of the land was referred to as the “natural source of existence” and the message which rang from the Legislature was that the mere discovery of new land gave the pioneer squatter no claim to its possession. Many members were of the opinion that cultivation alone was the only valid claim to its possession and that the person who merely grazed stock upon the natural grasses had “no greater claim to the soil than the aboriginal who merely hunts thereon the wild animals indigenous to it”. The *Dalby Herald* commented that the squatter had effected an improvement upon the land but only one which could be compared with that effected by the Aborigine. Sheep had replaced the kangaroo, the slab hut the gunyah and the ration carrier the hunter. The squatting system was compared with the Aborigines’ possession of the country in its temporary and transitional nature. The land had been held in trust for the use of the people, and, as inevitably as the white man had replaced the black, the agriculturalist would replace the pastoralist.

As well as the agriculturalist replacing the pastoralist as being the inevitable and natural order of “things”, squatting was, by the mid-60s, seen to be materially retarding the colony. The economic contribution of runs which employed only a few people and tied up huge areas of land was thought to be small compared to what it could have been with closer settlement. Mr Groom, the Member for Toowoomba claimed that the large stations surrounding Toowoomba, namely Gowrie, Westbrook and Eton Vale, were not worth £100 annually each to Toowoomba. The Editor of the *Dalby Herald*, whilst acknowledging that Dalby was almost dependent upon pastoral pursuits, looked forward to the time when agriculture
would be the mainstay of the district and colony, and hundreds of sturdy yeoman farmers would take the place of a flock of sheep. That four or five acres were needed to support one sheep was considered a waste of a valuable resource and, as fencing and boundary riders replaced shepherds, runs themselves, far from becoming more civilized were thought to have "retrograded greatly as far as the support of human life (was) concerned". Whereas in the 60s runs had employed fifty shepherding families, in the early 70s they were employing six boundary riders. As this reduction in run labour needs occurred at a time when unemployed labourers were wandering about the country looking for work, it was particularly felt that "a race of men who would people the earth at a rate of a soul to fifty acres, must be more important to a young community than an aristocracy which hardly employs one man permanently to every ten thousand acres".

The profits amassed by this aristocracy, many of whom were now absentee speculators, were resented by the labouring classes, whose material position fell far short of their expectations. They resented the fact that their collective wealth, the land, and their labour were used to perpetuate the very type of aristocracy which they rejected. One squatter had reputedly paid £38,000 for an English estate with money he had derived from the Darling Downs. It was felt that "thousands of acres should be settled upon by thousands of human beings instead of being a huge sheep walk which benefits only two or three wealthy families and the wealth itself transmitted to England and spent there".

This anti-Downs squatting sentiment was not only confined to the labouring and middle classes but was shared by squatters in other districts. Northern and western squatters were envious of the more secure land tenure, the lower operating costs and the higher profits of their Downs counterparts. The outside squatters claimed that they "could not raise 6d." on the strength of their leases and demanded a more positive tenure so that they, too, could raise money on reasonable terms. They resented paying up to 20 per cent on borrowed money, when they could procure it. In addition to this heavy burden of interest and higher costs of labour and carriage, they were not happy about what seemed to be uneven distribution of colonial development. They resented contributing towards the cost of railway construction when they derived no benefit from it. Their peculiar problems in fact led to the "Squatters' Relief Bill" of 1866 but to no greater understanding between themselves and the Downs Squatters.
Regionalism had always been a feature of political life in Queensland. Rivalry between the Brisbane residents and the Ipswich "bunch", between the Ipswich bunch and the Downs squatters, and between the Downs squatters and the grumbling separatists of the Burnett was common in the 50s. Ipswich, Maryborough, Rockhampton and Gladstone were all suggested as State capitals. It was as if, in the 60s, all of these divisive strands coalesced in a strong anti-Downs sentiment. This feeling was heightened when only the Darling Downs was declared an agricultural reserve for closer settlement.

The Government, in trying to reconcile the demands of the agriculturalists with the rights of the pastoralists and the economic benefits of the leasehold system, had steered a middle course. Its stated aim was to "provide settlement to a limited extent, without interfering with the pastoral interests of the colony". The first legislative expression of this intent was the Agricultural Reserves Act of 1863.

Small agricultural reserves were set aside around the Darling Downs towns of Toowoomba, Dalby, Cumkillenbar and Warwick. Sections of not greater than 320 acres could be taken up at £1 per acre. The Lands Department was divided into Lands and the Surveyor-General's Department to cope with the anticipated extra workload. The Queensland Government believed that the provision of these reserves afforded intending settlers superior advantages to those offered in the other States. The "man of small means", it was argued, could "become the owner of his own homestead", the capitalist could engage in squatting, and the labourer could "employ his 'capital' — his bone and muscle — in either market which best suit his purpose". This was the belief, the ideal. The reality was that squatters and the Queensland environment as effectively excluded the small man from land ownership in the 60s as they had done in the early 40s and 50s.

There was a public meeting in Dalby in 1866 to discuss the allegedly fraudulent measures being adopted by pastoral tenants to retard settlement in the district. Specific reference was made to Jondaryan. By use of their pre-emptive right, Jondaryan proprietors "picked the eyes out of their run" thus rendering much of the remainder useless for prospective yeoman farmers. This same tactic of selective freeholding was used with respect to the railway, squatter-owned land along the Toowoomba to Dalby line making access to the line more difficult for selectors. In a skilful use of the land order system squatters even became big selectors themselves. Their exten-
sive use of their own employees as bailiffs was a denial of the whole legislative aim of bona-fide settlement. But the opposition provided by the environment to the yeoman farmer was to prove even more tenacious than that mounted by the squatter. In the whole notion, in fact, that a peasantry on the British model could be planted in an environment like that of Jondaryan's was sown the seeds of its failure.

When William Kent wrote to his Sydney agents in June 1857 that he thought “the good times” were “only commencing”, he could not have been more correct. The decade 1855–65 was one of “unexampled prosperity” for Downs squatters as they reaped the benefit of southern gold discoveries, northern expansion and the “abnormal price for wool”. This was translated into large profits, which enabled men like Robert Tooth of Jondaryan and William Kent of Rosalie Plains to consolidate their land-holding positions. Their tools of consolidation were the exercise of their pre-emptive right, the purchase of immigrant land orders, and the buying of land at Government auctions.

The lease conditions of a run stated that should the Crown require that land at any time, for example, for a gold-field, township or a reserve of any kind, then the lessee was forced to give that portion up, receiving compensation for any improvements effected thereon. However, if land was required for agricultural purposes, the squatter had the right of pre-emption over it at the Government upset price. Notice of Government intent to reserve from lease several portions of Darling Downs runs appeared in the Government Gazette and Moreton Bay Courier of 28 July 1855, with the advice that the case could be defended by the licensed occupant by the exercise, within 12 months, of the pre-emptive right conferred upon him by Her Majesty's Order in Council of 9 March 1847. In response to this and other similar notices, by December 1865, Robert Tooth had pre-empted 15,601 acres of Jondaryan at a cost of £15,624, all of which was paid for in land orders. Kent and Wienholt pre-empted 4,825 acres on Rosalie Plains, most of which was also paid for in land orders. The Order-in-Council had stated that all pre-emptive purchases were to extend back from a water frontage by at least one mile, but there were many applications which did not meet this condition and which the Surveyor-General “specially approved”. One of these was on “Westbrook”, where the proprietor, on the strength of his pre-emptive right, had bought every lagoon and water-hole on the station, the proprietorship of a few acres thereon making the rest “useless to everyone else”. Of the area of Jondaryan within two miles of the railway between
Toowoomba and Dalby, Robert Tooth had purchased 1,890 acres prior to 1860 and a further 3,857 acres were purchased in 1865 and 1866. By 1867 22,115 acres of Jondaryan’s 154 square miles had been purchased under pre-emptive right.

The Land Order System had begun with the Immigration Societies and was adopted by the new colony of Queensland in an attempt to attract prospective settlers. It was based on the principle that the colony gave an equivalent acreage of land to the passage money paid to immigrants. A Land Order was legal tender for any country land at the disposal of the Government and was not an order for a particular piece of land. Immigrants who arrived in the colony and found themselves unable to maintain themselves or their families found agents, publicans, pimps and squatters only too willing to relieve them of their land orders at a discounted price. These orders, procured generally for between £10 and £12 became an alternative currency for the speculator, and of no benefit to the immigrant whose dream of becoming a land-holder was “postponed to an indefinite period”. Squatters, on the other hand, purchased millions of acres of land by the “unlimited use of land orders”. A “farmer” asked the Minister of Lands, J.P. Bell, per favour of the Toowoomba Chronicle in 1867, if he was aware that of the 5,000 surveyed acres of the Cambooya Reserve only 1,000 acres had been offered for sale and that the owners of Eton Vale intended “to purchase every acre of it, and have bought up land orders for that purpose”. The sale did take place and 900 acres fell into the hands of one person for grazing purposes.

Even land therefore which was not waste land, not reserved or pre-empted and was put up for public auction at one of the infrequent government land sales was more likely to be bought with land orders by the local squatter than to fall into the hands of the small man. Of the fifty-two township lots offered for sale at Bowenville, formerly the “Long Water Hole”, Jondaryan, in January 1861, all but two were purchased by R.F. Tooth & Co. In the township of Cambooya all the quarter acre allotments were bought by neighbouring squatters and auctions of land at Westbrook, Cecil Plains and Felton resulted in its exclusive purchase by the three original landholders. The small man was practically excluded from obtaining an acre for a number of reasons.

First, the price of land “elbowed the small man out the auction room”. The Government’s dilemma was how to offer land which was priced sufficiently low to attract immigrants to the colony but sufficiently high to swell the coffers of the Treasury, to prevent land monopoly and speculation and to maintain a colonial proletariat.
The problem of finding a “sufficient” price for land had plagued colonizers since first settlement. John Macarthur had asked the question “what price will be sufficient to prevent monopoly of fertile lands by mere speculators and jobbers, and yet not so high as to cause the diversion of British capital and enterprise from our shores to the United States and other young countries?” The New South Wales Select Committee on Immigration in 1845 asked a similar question: “Do you think agriculturalists would go 16,000 miles to pay £1 an acre for land when they can go to Canada and purchase it for 5s.?” The upset price of £1 an acre decided upon by the new Queensland Parliament was denounced as not promoting agricultural settlement and of having reproduced in the colony “that accursed system of land monopoly which many of them had much reason to remember with regret and disgust, as obtaining in the old country.” The effect of reducing the price however, would be, according to a Public Meeting in Dalby in 1866, that the squatters would “buy up all the land”. Also, within a borrowing community, any reduction in the price of unalienated land might impair the Colony’s credit in the money market.

As well as prospective settlers being “elbowed out” of the auction room because of the high upset price of land, intending small farmers, aware that a squatter’s agent would be in attendance at the sale to outbid them for the most desirable portions of land, stopped attending these sales. Squatters then used the poor attendance to argue that there was no demand for agricultural land. In many cases, too, there was no demand for the type of land which was put up for sale because of its “extraordinary location”. At Bowenville township all of the suburban lots purchased by the proprietors of Jondaryan were beautiful pieces of level land complete with water frontage, whilst the remainder of the lots extended up and over a rocky, waterless, iron-stone ridge. The people of Dalby were convinced that the laying out of Bowenville, like the townships of Drayton and Cambooya, was created by the surveyor’s map to suit the demands of the big squatters rather than the necessities of a population. The same was said of the resumption of land from runs after the Crown Lands Act of 1868.

This Act stated that runs were to be divided into two portions, one of which the Government was to resume for agricultural purposes; the other was given a new lease. Because political influence was brought to bear, however, one run was divided into three not two, and Archer, Bell and Taylor did not feel disposed to offer their own runs for resumption. Bell, as Secretary for Lands, made use of his
position, and, when proclaiming a reserve on the Downs availed himself of the opportunity to leave out his own run.\textsuperscript{52} The squatter-dominated government\textsuperscript{53} had in fact been a party to a number of instances of malpractice in an attempt to conserve its territorial right. The impact of resumption was reduced further by the evasive tactics of the squatters.

In August 1870 notice was given to Kent and Wienhoft that the resumed half of Irvingdale run was to be put up for sale at auction, and, after thirty days, all lots not sold were to be opened for selection. When this was done only one application of 3,500 acres was received and that from “a gentleman connected with Jondaryan Station”\textsuperscript{54} The reason for this was as the \textit{Dalby Herald} explained. This was “one of those selections so often noticed as being intended, by taking up a water frontage, to secure the possessor the undisturbed use for grazing purposes of the area of plains lying away back for miles”.\textsuperscript{55} The applicant was William Kent Junior.\textsuperscript{56} The proprietors added to their holdings when Frederick Wienhoft and William Kent Junior bought a further 6,970 acres in July 1871.\textsuperscript{57} A few months before this auction sale Kent and Wienhoft bought 1,830 acres of Jondaryan at 15s. an acre,\textsuperscript{58} and the proprietors of Westbrook, Cecil Plains and Felton did likewise, with the result that except for one block of 640 acres all the land put up had been purchased by the original landholders.\textsuperscript{59}

A proposal under Section 10 of the Crown Lands Alienation Act of 1868 was to resume a further 179,480 acres of Jimbour run and yet, by 1874, “not an acre had been taken up”.\textsuperscript{60} James Taylor’s explanation for this was that there was simply no demand for the land, but a more probable reason for non-settlement was that most of the resumed portion was broken ridges or “wallaby country”.\textsuperscript{61} As well as this rocky, waterless and grassless land being unsuitable for agriculture or grazing, and at an uneconomic distance from markets, the acreages allowed for selection were just too small to be viable grazing units. Also, as a counter to the squatters’ “no demand” argument, it was known that not a single acre of more suitable land was left from the resumed portions of Rosenthal, Yandilla, West Prairie and Felton, and only a few scrubby acres on Irvingdale, a few rocky acres on Rosalie Plains and only 200 acres on Jondaryan.\textsuperscript{62} On none of these runs was there sufficient remaining acreages for viable selection.

It was generally recognized that the blame for the unsuitability of this resumed land could not be laid at the feet of the Crown Lands Commissioner for the Darling Downs. He was told to select eight
square miles of the best land, but had “to take the best of what was left”. The Telegraph maintained that all of the squatters’ selections had been made with the express object of keeping the leased portions of their land intact. All that was left even by 1871, according to the Downs Commissioner, was comprised “principally of un-watered land, and land that is broken by ridges and hills, and land covered in great measure by scrub”. By 1875 60,250 acres had been resumed on Jondaryan, 15,600 alienated, selected or reserved and there were 4,650 acres available for selection. The Dalby Herald of April 29 1871 reported that 10,600 acres of Jondaryan had been selected, 7,000 of which had been taken up by Jondaryan people. It was pleased to report that “shepherds and their cheques” had, in fact, become “exceedingly scarce” and that “at last people were becoming alive to their own interests”. The results of the sale held two weeks before, however, were more an indicator of the general trend. Each of the 1,832 acres went to Kent and Wienholt for 15s. an acre. William Kent had bought 177 acres at Bowenville in February and Edward Wienholt, Frederick Wienholt, William Kent and William Kent Junior had also bought land on Irvingdale.

Once again it was not what the squatters were buying so much as where they were buying. Jondaryan's owners by use of their preemptive right and the 1868 Act had secured land ten miles either side of the Western rail line, thereby forcing the selector further back. This greater difficulty of access to the railhead disadvantaged the small man in getting his produce to market, whilst the very presence of the line subjected the selector to competition from southern markets. Ironically, therefore, the extension of the railway to Jondaryan, which was viewed as the vehicle of hope for closer settlement, was to prove of greatest benefit to the pastoralists.

Not only had the squatters displayed “a certain facility for bringing the railway to their own doors” and, by dummying, had absorbed land for twenty miles back from the railway line, thereby forcing the “poor cockey” “to take to the hills”, but their wool carriage costs were reduced by a third. It was well known, according to the Secretary for Public Works, that on some large Downs stations a saving of £1,500 to £2,000 a year in cartage had been effected. Whilst the small man had looked forward to a reduction in carriage costs Dalby residents complained in October 1869 that their goods' rates were, in some instances, double those of Warwick's, and demanded equality of rates. The high cost of railway construction was borne by large amounts of capital borrowed from Britain and raised from taxes and charges. In 1869 freight rates were increased by 15s.
a ton to cover increased costs, thereby making Queensland goods' rates double those of Victoria's. A Public Meeting in Dalby in 1870 claimed that these excessive rates had led to the closure of the Blaxland boiling down establishment in Dalby and the Hogarth meat preserving works in Oakey. If these high rates were not reduced Dalby residents threatened to forward the whole of their goods by carriers. It was one of those “anomalous circumstances”, remarked the Editor of the Dalby Herald, that bullock teams should be able to compete successfully with the railway. What was needed, he argued, was not an extension of railway line with its associated cost, but better management of existing lines. By 1871 the extension of the Toowoomba line to Dalby was viewed as a “lamentable failure”.

In October 1874 the Editor of the Toowoomba Chronicle passed comment on the “obstructive policy and avaricious greediness of a mere handful of Crown tenants” who were “using every means — fair and foul — to establish that worst of all ocracies — a territorial one”. Once the unsuitability of the Downs for agricultural settlement had been disproved, the tactical argument of the monopolists shifted to maintaining that there was no demand for land. Once it was known that this also was untrue and the squatters were determined to maintain a “territocracy”, other evasive tactics such as the failure to advertise land sales were used.

According to one of Jondaryan’s oldest residents this was the case with the sale of twenty-two of Jondaryan’s suburban lots in June 1877. “Patriot” wrote in June that he and other Jondaryan residents were quite prepared to pay £4 an acre for the land but that they had not had the opportunity as the sale had not been properly advertised. None of the residents had been aware that the sale was held. Although Jondaryan was in the Police District of Toowoomba and licences were obtained through there, the sale had not been advertised in the Toowoomba papers and had been held in Dalby. “It suits the large landholders to decry advertising”, wrote “Patriot”, “because publicity causes competition”. There had been no buyers except Mr Wienholt, who had purchased 414 acres near Jondaryan Railway Station at £2 an acre. When some of the unsold lots were subsequently applied for the applicants were told that the land was “not open for selection”.

This practice of withdrawing lots from sale once Crown tenants had made their selections was another evasive tactic used by squatters. In February 1869 the “whole of the land on Jimbour, Cumkillenbar and Cooranga had been withdrawn from selection”,
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and the *Dalby Herald* reported that it was “impossible for anyone to get a single acre either on Jimbour or Jondaryan”, although intending selectors had “made inquiries repeatedly at the Land Office”. The *Dalby Herald* knew of no more than three instances of selectors taking up land on Jondaryan, and they were sawyers from the Bunya Mountains. By 1875, of Jondaryan’s 200,928 acres, only 4,650 or 2 per cent was available for selection. 29 per cent of it had either been pre-empted, reserved, selected or alienated, but, unlike many other squatters, Jondaryan’s proprietors had not placed themselves in a hopeless situation of indebtedness in their attempt to freehold as much of their run as possible.

Jondaryan’s proprietors were very fortunate in being able to consolidate their land-holding position in the prosperity of the 1855-65 decade. By 1864 they had sold Rosalie Plains and Cooyar for £70,000 and had acquired Jondaryan, East Prairie, Lagoon Creek and Mount Flinders. Their profit from Jondaryan alone in its first three years under their management was estimated at £80,000. It was profits such as these and William Kent’s management practice of spending when “things have been below their value through a glut in the market” which enabled them to pay off the balance owing on Jondaryan in April 1865. Kent’s next object was “securing our Jondaryan property by large portions of land”. To do this Kent and Wienholt had to not only surrender their Jondaryan lease but those of Irvingdale, Lagoon Creek, Downs West and East Prairie as well. The Bank of Australasia, or Alexander Campbell as its proprietor, became the nominal lessee of all these runs. They were transferred back to Kent and Wienholt on 9 June 1873. This temporary surrender of these runs to the Bank of Australasia had achieved Kent’s goal. By 1873 the Jondaryan freehold run extended from Rosalie Plains in the north to Mount Russell in the south, and from Westbrook in the east, west to Blaxland. As well as securing this freehold, all of their runs were well improved.

When Kent arrived on Jondaryan in February 1864 he noted that there was money to be spent “making bedrooms and dams” and wrote how he was “determined before the year was out to make Jondaryan carry in any season 100,000 sheep”. Jondaryan was, in fact, carrying 108,000 sheep by the end of 1864 and 150,000 sheep and 4,000 cattle on its 155,500 acres by 1873. Water was a priority, particularly on the vast waterless tracts of Jondaryan. When 40,000 acres of leasehold with no water was purchased from James Taylor of Cecil Plains in 1864 seventy-three men at Mt Moriah put
down a dam which increased its carrying capacity four times. A
greater part of the run's improvement activity from 1866-70 was in
making and repairing dams and deepening wells. Fencing also in­
creased the run's carrying capacity as well as reducing its labour
needs. Two-railed and four-railed dog proof wooden and paling
fences were particularly erected around reservoirs prior to 1868,
when the first wire fencing seems to have made its appearance on
Jondaryan. Between January and May 1868 fifty-nine and a half
tons of number nine black wire, forty tons of galvanized strand wire
and fifty tons of black wire were imported from London. As well as
reduced labour needs, greater sheep per acre, more wool per sheep
and higher quality wool, subdivisional paddocking was a means of
re-inforcing ownership. Fences were erected between the railway
line and Oakey Creek and at the Westbrook boundary along the
Dalby road in the latter part of the 70s.

Timothy Coghlan, the Government Statistician at the end of the
century, argued that fencing was a response to the dry year in 1868
and depressed wool prices. However, it was probably more a
response to the talked-about productive advantages of fencing and
to the attraction of being able physically to secure their land.
Jondaryan, Cecil Plains and Eton Vale could all boast considerable
labour-saving costs through fencing by 1871. James Taylor's labour
bill was a third less and Eton Vale's permanent labour force was
reduced to seventy by a small proportion of fencing in 1868, to
forty-five by 1869 and to thirty when the run was fenced in 1870.
Despite the high cost of fencing and a certain prejudice against it, by
1871 the question was no longer whether fencing was preferable to
shepherding — pastoralists either fenced in or lost money.

The squatters' response to the 1868 Act was not only to freehold
and improve as much of their runs as they could, but, once again, to
call upon their political allies, and, in a skilful use of lawful channels,
to become big selectors themselves.

The Land Act of 1868 provided that after three years a lessee
should prove that he had been in continual residence, that he had
spent 10s. or 5s. an acre on improvements and that he had fenced
in the land. Failure to meet these conditions should result in
forfeiture. As was noted by an eminent politician, however, the abili­
ty to meet these conditions did not ensure bona fide settlement:
"You could get a man to take up land nominally for himself but ac­
tually on your behalf and he could live on the land and perform all
the conditions and no-one knew who paid the money." The prac­
tice of squatters getting their employees, sisters and cousins to select
land on their behalf was quite common. The member for Toowoomba alleged that there was only one run on the Downs where the dummying system had not been carried out. Even before the 1868 Act and under the 1860 Land Bill, the selections which were set aside were “gobbled up in the names of infants in arms and in other strange ways”. At Westbrook twenty-four selections were taken up in the names of Beits and Macleans and at a Toowoomba ballot, of the one hundred there, fifty were speculators or there on behalf of others. Just after “selection before survey” was introduced, thirteen applications for the maximum amount of 320 acres were sent in from one of the stations in the Warwick district. Even though it was well known that all the applicants were employees of Canning Downs who admitted that the blocks were not for themselves but for their employers, the law was powerless to reach the squatter.

The solution, as far as the Brisbane Courier could see, was to “make residence a condition of alienation — (the) only means of preventing fraud”. This was done in the Act of 1868 but, because of the “ambiguity of the new Land Bill”, there was a “wholesale system of evasion”. As squatters feared that they would lose the resumed halves of their runs, applications were made by all types of men ostensibly for themselves “but in reality for those who engaged them”. Two Downs squatters, notorious for their dummying, were issued with writs of ejection in 1874, on the grounds that their selected land had not been improved within the twelve months as required by the Act. The leases were forfeited for non-fulfilment of conditions. This ruling alarmed the Editor of the Brisbane Courier who argued that the real issue of non bona fide settlement had been ignored and that Tooth had been attacked merely as a selector who had failed to satisfy conditions, rather than as a squatter who had obtained land under false pretences.

Kent and Wienholt were also exposed as “dummiers” in 1875. Their practice of installing boundary riding employees as bailiffs on Jondaryan selections appears to have begun about 1873-74. G. Jones was a bailiff on Gray’s selection, P. Ryan on Hill’s, J. McDonald received £12.17s.1d. for bailiffing on Fraser’s selection, Donald Ross was on Craig’s, John Ross was paid £22 on Gray’s and W. Bryant worked F. Wienholt’s selection. In 1875 there were ten men employed as bailiffs on seven Jondaryan selections. Kent and Wienholt were accused of “wilful and deliberate evasion of the conditions of the Act of 1868”. An application for the fulfilment of conditions on one Robert Craig’s selection was rejected on the
grounds that fraud had been committed in its acquisition and that its abandonment should lead to its forfeiture.

The Crown alleged that Craig, Hodgson and Gray were not bona fide selectors but all employees or "confidential clerks" of Kent and Wienholt. A Mr Adams who was living on Gray's selection, when questioned by the Lands Commissioner, Mr Coxen, said that he and his brother had been engaged by Mr Williams of Jondaryan to look after "our several selections". Their rations were supplied by Dennis of Irvingdale, an employee of Williams of Jondaryan. When Adams had taken over some sheep to the selection no-one was in residence. He believed that some-one had been there but that they "had gone to Jondaryan".

A Mr Jones had signed an agreement to look after Mr Craig's selection. Mr Williams admitted to writing out this agreement but had done so, he said, only in his capacity as an agent for Craig. He had engaged bailiffs for Gray's, Hodgson's and the two Hill selections also, paid their wages, supplied their rations and paid the rents, all upon the instruction of his employers Kent and Wienholt.

The Courier described the whole affair as a "sham", a "piece of jugglery" and a "shift from hand to hand". Edward Wienholt admitted to the Attorney-General that if anyone were to take up land "he would prefer friends, in whom he had some confidence and who would probably not break up the continuity of the run, to strangers". As the Editor of the Brisbane Courier said:

Wienholt excludes some selector whom he supposes might be a troublesome neighbour. He does this by finding someone in Ipswich or Brisbane, who is willing to lend his name for the purpose. Craig never sees the selection, spends no money on it, all that he does with it is to make it the subject of some correspondence, in virtue of which Kent and Wienholt are to have the use of it. As to its eventual destination, we hear nothing — Craig has dummied the land, that is, Kent and Wienholt.

The jury ruled for the Crown and against Craig stating that he had not only forfeited the selection, but had never been in possession of it.

The pastoral tenants' assertions, therefore, that there had been no dummying on the Downs and that they had only taken advantage of the 1868 Act were revealed to be untrue. The "dummier" had become "a recognized institution on the Downs, and might be seen any day, walking about the streets of Dalby, Drayton and Toowoomba getting one pound per week and his board". There
were many squatters who, like Davenport and Kent and Wienholt were guilty of non-fulfilment of conditions under the Act. When these dummying cases were referred to the Privy Council, however, it was ruled that the Government itself was a law-breaker for continuing to receive rents from selectors who did not comply with the conditions. Once the lessee had paid rent, be it on a "dummied" selection or not, the Government had no legal right to withhold the title deeds. As the Toowoomba Chronicle remarked, the "Queen versus Davenport and the Queen verses others had become as notorious as Jarndice versus Jarndice in Bleak House but with what result?" The colony had spent "thousands of pounds on law expenses only to slow how grievously the people had been misled" — "to show the law was powerless to reach the dummier".

The consequences of pre-emption, selective purchase and the dummying system were, as Duncan Waterson says, "quite obvious by 1875". "Few runs had totally disintegrated and pastoralists such as Tyson, Taylor and Wienholt had even increased their holdings at the expense of their neighbours".

When Edward Wienholt entered Parliament as the Member for Western Downs in 1870 he made his political intentions quite clear. "It was necessary", he said, "for those who had a stake in the country to take part in its Government (to) protect themselves from great and unnecessary liabilities". Dubbed the "ultra/squatter of the Queensland Parliament", he had entered Parliament in defence of his own and his class's interest. The "liabilities" to which he referred were the attempts by the liberals to settle the small man on the land. He defended the rights of the squattocracy at a time when there was a great deal of anti-squatting and anti-Downs feeling.

He believed in the great principle of free trade and applied it as much to the land as he did to immigration, to education and to all fiscal matters. Economic protection of all kinds was, to him, suicidal and he advocated the abolition of all tariffs. He even opposed further railway construction because this would mean heavier taxation. In his opinion compulsory education was "unEnglish and opposed to the feelings of their race, and furthermore . . . it was unnecessary . . . the feelings of what was right would always be sufficient to impel parents to do that which was most for the advantage of their children". Immigration programmes, Wienholt told the electors of the Darling Downs in 1874, were "against the great principles of free trade". They would "lower the standard of prosperity of the working classes" whilst adding "to the wealth of the
other section of the community — the employers of labour". What Mr Wienholt had neglected to add, of course, was that five
sixths of the working class of the colony and not a few employers
had come out as assisted immigrants.

The opinions of Mr Wienholt, it was argued, "could not recom­
mend him to anyone with a shade of liberality". The Ministerial
press described them and him as antiquated and peculiar, his
peers thought him an eccentric and something of a political
anachronism, and the Brisbane Courier thought him "the very em­
bodiment of Darling Downs squatterdom". The feelings of many
of the non-squatting electors towards him can be best summed up in
this piece of poetry entitled "The Rival Candidates for Western
Downs":

And lo! now Wienholt to the front advances,
   (midst dubious smiles and interchanging glances)
The offshoot of the old and storied bond
The roost once ruled in a foreign land;
And here in Queensland, he'd revive their glory,
As ultra Squatter, and would/be Tory,
   (Though perfect gentleman) this truth he shows,
As doth the old bird, so the young one crows.
   'The time for him is out of joint', and spite
I fear he was not born to set it right.

Although the consensus of opinion was that Wienholt was "out of
his time", he was nevertheless widely respected for his political
honesty and earnestness. Though one might dislike his principles,
write the Editor of the Dalby Herald, one could not "but be struck
by the courage and temper of the avowal" and the fact that he
spoke from a "deliberate and severe conviction", albeit one which
the Toowoomba Chronicle lamented, was "worthy of a better
cause". His opinions were "openly and honestly expressed and
fairly and honestly acted upon". Sometimes, as with the immigra­
tion issue, he thought he was aligning himself with the working class
but always he was a faithful representative of the ultra squatting
party, defending the class position of himself and his peers. His par­
ticular views, however, set him apart from both liberal and conserv­
ative factions, and when he was re-elected in 1873, he was
regarded as "almost an independent".

In his second term of office as member of the Legislative
Assembly for the Darling Downs Wienholt continued to advocate
"the free trade principle with regard to the remainder of our
lands". He argued that squatters should give up land to
agriculturalists when it was required, but, in the meantime, he was consolidating and extending his own holdings by selective purchasing and dummying. He, Bell, Hodgson and Gore had all been forced to concede a certain amount of land under the Act of 1868 but were in the position to be able to surrender areas which were not too detrimental to their own positions. The squatters' political strength had always been out of all proportion to their actual numbers. This was because they were enfranchised in a population where so many were unenfranchised, their influence sprang from their legal and societal positions, and, because Members of Parliament were not paid, only men like squatters could afford the luxury of standing for Parliament. By 1865, however, the political climate was changing. There were a number of Western squatting parliamentarians also, the residents of Brisbane and Ipswich had been given the vote, there were greater numbers of immigrants and the Downs squatters had become recognized as a body of men with "regard to no other interest than their own". By 1869, however, even though Downs squatters were becoming more and more isolated, they were just as powerful. In 1871, the people, it said, were governed "by a Ministry of one class" and in the period 1874-79, the Downs received a greater proportion of Government spending than it had received before or since. There were those like Mr Pring, the member for Burnett, who maintained that it was "not fair to charge squatters with being anxious to take care of their own particular interest" when they were "doing what everyone else does; they are charged with sitting in the Legislature and voting for their own interests".

That some squatters did more than merely sit and vote in their own interests, however, is evidenced by the revelations about electoral malpractice. Waterson revealed that corruption amongst Returning Officers and their honorary deputies "made nonsense of the secret ballot and men were openly informed that an anti-squatter vote meant instant dismissal". Eton Vale and Westbrook employees were shepherded in to vote and some who voted independently were discharged and told to "apply to Mr Groom for sheep to shear". In the 1870 election for the Northern Downs those Ipswich men whose names were similar to northern electors' names were especially transported to Jondaryan to vote, although they did not have a vote amongst them. Telegraphic communication was cut and the squatters were successful in replacing Thorn with Bell as the Member for Northern Downs.

Edward Wienholt was certainly one of those squatters who sat in
the Legislature and voted in his own interests. He was not defending his free trade position as much as he was defending the class position of himself and his peers. He was said to have been the driving entrepreneurial force behind the Kent and Wienholt partnership. Fox, the official Queensland biographer at the turn of the century, described him as having “a buoyant sanguine spirit leading him to make big ventures with a dash and self-reliance which, nevertheless, was tempered by a native shrewdness which caused him seldom to make a mistake”. The combined Kent and Wienholt and Wienholt family runs in Queensland in the 1860s included Fassifern, Rosalie Plains, Goomburra and Jondaryan on the Darling Downs, Degilbo on the Burnett, Blythedale on the Maranoa, Mt Hutton on the Dawson and the agricultural estates of Rosewood and Tarampa. On the 11 June 1870 the Dalby Herald announced that the Wienholt Brothers had bought three more runs on the Maranoa. By 1876 the family had an interest in forty-eight Queensland runs and Edward Wienholt was one of the wealthiest squatters on the Darling Downs.

Apart from being landowners and cultivators, the Wienholt brothers were dealers in land, corn, hide, wool, timber and other agricultural produce, millers, mine and quarry owners and dealers in minerals, shippers and merchants. The Wienholt family had successfully combined their pastoral and commercial interests. It was these commercial skills and marketing expertise which Wienholt brought to the Kent and Wienholt partnership. William Kent was the managing partner, Edward Wienholt his man in London or on the Continent chasing the best price for Jondaryan wool and the best French wine for Kent’s table.

William Kent’s business interests were much more colonially based than Wienholts. As well as managing their runs, Kent played an active role as economic promoter of the Downs and of the colony as a whole. He was a committee member of, and helped keep financially alive, the infant Darling Downs Agricultural Society, later the Royal Agricultural Society of Queensland. He had particularly strong business and social links with Rockhampton, Toowoomba and Ipswich. Very proud of the progress which the colony had made, he was anxious to foster and protect colonial interests. Prospective businessmen were always trying to extract money from him for some new venture. In 1861 he bought five hundred pounds of shares in a cotton company which G. Faircloth of Ipswich wanted to establish and when it looked as though a Mr Blaxland’s dried meat concentrate venture might flounder through lack of support,
he lent his support to this also. Among his many correspondents were J.C. White of Widgee, a former manager of Jondaryan, J.P. Bell of Ipswich and G. Sandeman of Sydney.

He also made many friends and business contacts through his great love, horses. Racing was his favourite leisure activity and he closely followed the colonial racing circuit. According to a contemporary and an agent of Kent's, Nehemiah Bartley, "Kent of Fassifern and Jondaryan was never without a bit of blood on the course". His private Station account was full of horse transactions.

In 1869, in what could be seen as an act of faith in his adopted country, Kent moved from Hobart Town to "Euston" Toowoomba, described as "one of the finest residences in the country". No expense had been spared in setting up this elegant mansion we are told. Here the Kents lived a very public life. They were leading members of the Downs squattocracy and maintained their links with those of their own class through correspondence, clubs, visits and entertaining. "Euston" was the centre of this activity and, as the "Squire of Euston", Kent was regarded by the residents of Drayton and Toowoomba "as a friend, a neighbour, in its truest sense, and as one that at all times maintained his character as a thorough English gentleman".

When William Kent died at Euston on 6 February 1874 the Mayor of Toowoomba, James Taylor, J. Bell, William Graham and Edward Wienholt were among those leading Downs citizens who paid their last respects. It was reported that eight hundred attended his funeral; five hundred Downs residents plus his employees. It was "not too much to say", wrote the Darling Downs Gazette "that the name of William Kent was associated with all that was noble, manly and true". "The loss to the district", added the Gazette, "is almost irreparable, so widespread were his bounties, so exhaustless were his efforts to effect social and material improvements". Even allowing for the eulogizing which characterized this obituary, Kent seems to have been a thorough gentleman in the Victorian sense.

A year after Kent's death Edward Wienholt resigned from Parliament. His land views and his own squatting practices had not endeared him to the labouring classes. His resignation ended, according to Waterson, "not a promising political career, for only the Legislative Council could have accommodated one whose blatant dummying on Jondaryan, Irvingdale and Rosalie Plains was a colonial scandal". To mark his political retirement this literary "piece" appeared in the Toowoomba Chronicle:
Wamholt took unto himself a wife and being fond of travel and adventure he resigned his seat in the land. Dummiers regarded Wamholt as their friend and were anxious to find another to replace him. Wamholt's friends stolen our land and imprisoned our cattle and friends... and driven lots of our men from their lands. Is not the land God's heritage? stolen God's heritage to people by fraud, perjury and false declaration — driven men to stony ridges — without water.}

The public scandal did not end with Wienholt's resignation, however. In the election held to replace him, the cause of dummying was said to have “triumphed over bona fide settlement once more”. Through the use of paid canvassing agents, paid newspaper articles, paid men travelling through agricultural settlements offering selectors the loan of a milch cow or one or two hundred ewes for their votes, the promise of employment and the threat of instant dismissal for those who did not vote “correctly”, the dummiers' candidate Mr William Graham, ex-Manager of Jondaryan, was elected member for the Darling Downs. On Jondaryan and Cecil Plains “the serfs”, as they were euphemistically designated by one of the superintendents, had to vote according to the instructions of their employers or take the consequences. The coercion and purchase of votes would, according to the Toowoomba Chronicle, have “disgraced the most arbitrary landlord in England, Scotland or Ireland”. The difference there was that employers would have been subject to heavy penalties under the English Act. The squatters' reward for getting their special representative elected was the title deeds to greater than one hundred acres of dummied land.

Despite numerous petitions requesting a commonage at Jondaryan township Kent and Wienholt still managed to hold it, and, by April 1877, Edward Wienholt and the trustees of William Kent Junior were the largest owners of freehold land in Queensland, owning 93,764 acres. It had certainly paid men like Wienholt, Davenport and Bell to take an interest in politics. They had been determined to exercise what they considered to be their “proper” political influence and enacted legislation designed, as one colonist commented, “to establish a class of men to be lords, and another class to be vassals”. They believed in settlement, but of one class and were, according to the Herald, but “one removed from the
Southern planters in America before the war” — “an oasis of aristocracy amongst a wilderness of serfs”. The Liberal’s talked-about progressive policy of railway development had been a lamentable failure and emigrants swelled the ranks of the unemployed. By the time the squatters’ political strength had waned sufficiently for a Resumption Act to be passed, the most suitable land for agricultural settlement was already in the squatters’ hands. At the same time as the latter were claiming that the Downs “would not grow a straw”, they were freeholding as much land as they could afford. Once it was proven that this land “could grow from twenty-five to forty bushels of wheat an acre on the plains”, the argument of the monopolists shifted from one of the unsuitability of the Downs for agricultural settlement to that of there being “no demand” for such land. In some instances there was no demand but this was because the most suitable land had already been pre-empted or selected by the squatters themselves skillfully circumventing the clauses of the 1868 Act. They similarly used the 1872 Resumption Act to their own advantage.

Charles Coxen, the original licensee of Jondaryan and “a failed squatter who had made a reputation for himself as a land commissioner in the agricultural district and whose name was a by-word for fairness and understanding” was given the task of choosing more land for resumption in 1872. He reported, however, that “little land of a first class agricultural character” remained “unalienated in the Darling Downs”. The “best lands of the Downs were as a rule taken up by the Lessees of the runs” who had “as a matter of course selected the best land both on account of its quality and position”. The only remedy he could suggest for this was that power be “given to the Government to exchange land within the ten year lease for land sold to the Lessees”. He added: “In some cases it might be necessary to give two or more in exchange for one but if the object to be obtained is the settlement of a population on the land, that would be of little consequence.” On 7 April 1877 Kent and Wienholt proposed to the Minister for Lands that they exchange 23,654 acres of Myall Creek and North Branch water frontage on Irvingdale for one and a quarter square miles of the back-country of Jondaryan. They argued that the Irvingdale land was eminently suitable for grazing farms of homestead areas whereas the Jondaryan land was “entirely destitute of water and unsuited for settlement”. In May 1877 the Dalby Herald announced that negotiations were “pending between the proprietors of Jondaryan Station and the Government”. The former proposed to give up
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all the land between Bowenville and Dalby, including Irvingdale Station, with all their pre-emptives, conditional purchases and leased land. This gave a water frontage to Myall Creek of over twenty miles and a total acreage of 50,000 acres on which there were two dams and several permanent water-holes. Negotiations continued until Kent and Wienholt accepted the terms of the exchange on 13 August 1877. The people of Dalby held great optimism for this scheme, approved on 14 September, and another, the Allora Exchange, announced a few months later. In this proposal Edward Wienholt, proprietor of Goomburra, proposed that 20,000 acres of Allora land, which he described as “being in every respect suitable for selection”, be exchanged for 40,000 acres of land at Jondaryan. This exchange was approved on 10 June 1878.

Within twelve months of this transaction the true nature of the exchanged Jondaryan land, described by Kent and Wienholt as “entirely destitute of water and unsuited for settlement”, was revealed. A Public Meeting was held in Dalby and the Lower House petitioned to try and put a stop to “some of the most valuable land in the district” being placed in the hands of “a single firm of capitalists”. The people of Dalby were concerned that as a result of these exchanges, instead of their town being a thriving agricultural settlement, they “would soon be enclosed by the wire fences of the squatter”. The Mayor of Dalby also claimed that the terms of the Irvingdale Exchange had not been carried out as originally intended. A third of a large portion of the lands thrown open at Irvingdale, it was claimed, was utterly valueless. For this, instead of the waterless prairie as had been intended, the Jondaryan firm had received greater than acre per acre of some of the finest soil in the vicinity of Dalby. The Mayor of Dalby called upon the Government to annul the exchange, resume the land and substitute the west prairie land as originally intended. What had been heralded as a “great benefit to Dalby” in 1875 was now referred to as a “trick unequalled in the annals of land jugglery”. The Allora/Goomburra exchange was also viewed as having been effected to the “detriment of Toowoomba, Dalby and Jondaryan” because the exchanged land became “part of the Jondaryan freehold”, and represented a potential loss of 4,000 or 5,000 souls from their district. “Why”, the question was asked, “should the people of Dalby be sacrificed to the people of Allora?” A selector from Irvingdale East wrote that he “always was of the opinion that the station owners got the best of it; they have a knack of coming at what they require to suit themselves; but I never dreamed it could be so managed as to exchange from one locality to another, fifteen miles apart.”
Between 1877–82, in a number of “land exchanges”, freehold squatters transferred 49,278 acres of agricultural land to the Crown in return for 87,032 acres of pastoral land. The largest of these was the Goomburra Exchange whereby Kent and Wienholt freeholded 40,000 acres of Jondaryan, making Jondaryan the largest freehold property in Queensland.

Of the Acts and Ordinances of the Queensland Parliament in 1862 all but five were related to Crown Land. Indeed, the land question was the great preoccupation of the Queensland Parliament and the fact that it was was a reflection of the belief that it was time that the pastoral tenant gave way to the small man. Unlike the situation on the American frontier, the early occupation of a major portion of the “economic” land in Queensland led to the temporary end of the frontier in the American sense. Access to this fundamental resource was closed fairly quickly, and, unlike the American frontier which “was on balance an egalitarian force, the Australian frontier tended to foster conflict”. According to official Government literature everyone, be they capitalist or labourer, had an equal opportunity for advancement in Queensland. The “poorman” did not exist, or, if he did, his existence could be attributed to one of three causes — drunkenness, illness or infirmity. In Queensland, it was argued, labour was “wealth” and each man reaped what he sowed “for the soil is our own”. But the Downs was not the working man’s own; more often than not it was his employer’s who had successfully retained it by evasive measures, both lawful and unlawful. By 1870 there was considerable disillusionment amongst the labouring classes whose material and social position fell far short of their expectations. Even those who had managed to save sufficient to invest in a block of land found that their access to it was, in many instances, blocked by their employers. Poems similar in spirit to that of “Queensland is a Pastoral Country” began appearing in newspapers and magazines.

Myself and a score of the Murphys,
Blood Relations of all the O'Tools,
Came to Queensland and thought it was wisdom
To find ourselves grinned at for fools.
By jabers! I wish I had Jordon
Tied fast round the neck to a tree;
For saying such bunkum in Ireland,
I’d make him done capers for me.

By 1880, of the land selected in Queensland between 1868–74, a third of it had been selected by ninety run-holders. Jondaryan's
proprietors were the largest owners of freehold land in Queensland and Jondaryan was the largest freehold run. Ownership of such vast acres of land had conferred on Jondaryan’s proprietors and managerial class an awareness of their own unique position in Downs society. They enjoyed a position in Jondaryan’s hierarchical structure which allowed them control over their employees and access to and control over political and legal mechanisms of influence and authority. It was their experience of this power and their insistence on their right to control the labour market and retain control of their land which was to remain a continuing source of conflict between themselves and their employees. The emergence of a selector/shearer group in the Dalby district added another dimension to this conflict.
Selection and the Selector/Shearer

The labouring man’s dream was to own land, and, for the 403 “selectors” in Queensland in 1875 this dream had become a reality. Of these, 56 per cent had settled on the Darling Downs and 9 per cent in the Dalby district. “Still they come”, wrote the Jondaryan columnist for the Toowoomba Chronicle in 1877 “— not the Russians but men on the look out for land”. The number of selectors in the Dalby district, in fact, peaked at 224 in 1877. For many of these selectors, however, their yeomanic dream was to become something of a nightmare. Sixteen months after these “batches of Victorians and others” had come to East Prairie, 30 per cent of them were petitioning the Government for “relief”. The total number of selectors in the Dalby district was reduced by half and within thirteen years there were five selectors on Jondaryan compared to the seventy-two there in the optimistic wave of the mid-1870s.

The opposition which the environment posed to the small selector proved even greater than that mounted by the squatter. The selector who had overcome squatter resistance in the form of pre-emption, outright purchase and dummying was unable now to overcome the problems of blocks which could not be profitably cultivated and were too small to graze. In the very notion, in fact, that a peasantry on the British model could be planted in an environment like that of Jondaryan’s was sown the seeds of its failure. The soil, climate, quantity, and more particularly the distribution of rainfall favoured the pastoralist above the selector. Pre-mechanization, wool-growing was the best use to which this land could be put. Selection lots were offered at acreages on which wool could not be profitably grown. The failure of the legislators to be cognizant of this and of what was happening locally, and their clinging to the notion that the small agriculturalist should and could be established, resulted in the selec-
tor floundering between two worlds, the pastoral and the agricultural.

When the Commissioner for Lands for the Darling Downs was asked in 1871 if all selected land on the north side of the railway line between Toowoomba and Dalby had been taken up by bona fide selectors or Crown Tenants, he replied, "But how would you draw that distinction?" The Supreme Court of Queensland and the Privy Council in England established just how this distinction would be drawn and the titles to 37,530 acres or 142 selections of suspected dummied land in the Dalby district were suspended. It was known, for instance, that the Dalby district had the highest proportion of dummied land. When questioned about the residential status of seven East Prairie selectors in 1874, the Lands Commissioner was only able to assert definitely that one was a bona fide selector, one he was uncertain of, and five were known to be "dummies". East Prairie selectors Solomon Cock and Charles Williams, for example, were known to be the employees of Kent and Wienholt of Jondaryan, Williams as Manager and Cock as Overseer. Although Jondaryan's proprietors nominally held only seven selections or 8,954 acres, another 14,934 acres of first class pastoral land were held in the form of the dummied selections of the Grays, the two Hills, the Frasers, the Craigs and the Hodgsons. Almost three times as much land had been selected on Jondaryan as on Jimbour and, of this, 62 per cent was first class pastoral, 36 per cent second class pastoral and only 2 per cent agricultural.

That there was so little agricultural land selected is not surprising. As the Commissioner for the Darling Downs explained in 1871, "homesteads" were "on the increase" but these, he went on to say, "lamentably are taken up as pastoral land; there is very little agricultural land left". By 1874 four fifths of alienated land had been taken up as second class pastoral land and not agricultural. By the mid 1870s there was simply very little unalienated land which satisfied the basic qualities of permanent water and some good arable land. Certainly the Toowoomba and Warwick districts had had some success in growing hay, maize and potatoes but agricultural penetration in the Dalby district had been very limited. This was because, in the opinion of the Commissioner, the large plains nearer the Condamine were not "adapted to agriculture". Those selectors in the Dalby district faced the problem of having agricultural sized homestead blocks which were not suited for agricultural cultivation. The country was "worthless for settlement at any rate, at the maximum acreages allowed by Government".
Government had fixed these areas in an attempt to stop speculation, but the effect was to prevent the viable use of the land.

In August 1875 P. Landy bought two conditional purchases of Jondaryan land through the Dalby Land Court.\(^{12}\) Within two years, on the outskirts of the Jondaryan township and in the Jondaryan horse paddock, could be seen the houses and tents of the “batches of Victorians and others” who had arrived to take up their selections on East Prairie, Rosalie and Jondaryan. Their houses and tents were said to resemble “ships and boats at sea with their sails set”.\(^{13}\) Of the twelve east prairie selectors one was Italian and five were from Victoria. The selectors in the Dalby district seemed to be mostly Victorians with a sprinkling of New South Welshmen and South Australians. The German migrants had chosen to settle on the more promising agricultural blocks in the Toowoomba-Warwick region. Christian Donges typified the progress of these German selector forty acre men.

Born in Germany in 1842, Donges emigrated with a group of townspeople to improve his economic circumstances. He was a nominated emigrant and was contracted to serve McLean and Beit at Westbrook for two years after his arrival in 1862.\(^{14}\) From here he went to Jondaryan where he began lambing at 15s. a week then shepherding at £40 per annum. The shepherding rate offered at Jondaryan at this time was the same as that offered generally in Queensland, whilst the wages offered for the skilled trades were higher than those offered elsewhere.\(^{15}\) Within eleven years Donges had saved sufficient money to purchase twenty acres of land at Drayton. Donges’ saving capacity was a reflection of his frugality (he spent nothing on subscriptions, entertainment etcetera) and his planning and good management (he bred and grazed seven horses on the Station). It was not a reflection of his increased wage over his thirteen year service period at Jondaryan because, when he left in September 1876, he was still receiving £40 per annum.\(^ {16}\) In fact, between August 1870 and March 1872, his wage fell.\(^ {17}\) However, compared to the wage Donges would have received in Germany for similar work he enjoyed a much higher standard of living and saving capacity than he would have had in his homeland.

Jondaryan resident employees and their families fared particularly better in this respect than their itinerant or contract counterparts whose nominal or “signed on for” wage was often reduced by a quarter or a third by fines for poor workmanship, high store prices and associated costs and varying methods of payment. Even so, a shearer could clear 8s. a day and this was a good wage when it was
considered that a good day’s wage for a man in Europe was 2s.6d. a
day.\textsuperscript{18} It was news of these high wages that had attracted immigrants
to the colony. What they had not been told, however, was that this
was a seasonal wage and had to carry a man and his family through
perhaps six months of unemployment. “Those who pretend”, wrote
a contemporary, “that the demand for labour is always in excess of
supply, that no man who is willing to work need be idle, assert what
is not fact”.\textsuperscript{19} Stamer maintained that for six months out of every
twelve there were hundreds of men scouring the countryside look­
ing for work. These men, unlike resident employees, found it dif­
cult to lift themselves above the labouring stage.

A comparative statement of the income of an Irish and a New
South Wales family in the 1840s revealed that the Irish family had
an income of £20 per annum and the colonial family an income of
£100.\textsuperscript{20} In the 1850s it was recognized that Australia had a standard
of living above that of the rest of the world, with the exception of
New Zealand. By the 1870s it was said that the “man who works in
Queensland is . . . sufficiently fed. The man who works at home is
too often very insufficiently fed”.\textsuperscript{21} “Meat three times a day”
Trollope added, “is the normal condition of the Queensland
labourer”.\textsuperscript{22} Beef and meat were much cheaper in the colony\textsuperscript{23} than
in Britain and horse and rabbit seldom used. It was established
that in England the normal ration of the Queensland worker would
have cost 12s. a week — more than he could earn altogether.\textsuperscript{24} It
was true that the prices of groceries and clothing from the Jon­
daryan store were between $3\frac{1}{3}$ per cent and 50 per cent above
Queensland prices generally in the 1860s, but despite these in some
cases excessive charges, in terms of his material state, the resident
station employee was in a better position than his counterpart at
home.

The Fuller shepherding family on Jondaryan, for example, had a
combined “gross” income of £126.6s.6d. in 1862\textsuperscript{25} and, after
deductions for store purchases, a “net” income of £22.9s.7d. The
storekeeping family the Wockners saved significantly more\textsuperscript{26} in this
year and Alfred Blinco, the carpenter, and his family saved three
and a half times as much as the shepherding family. Blinco too,
because he was a contract worker, had to buy his rations from the
store, whereas the others had their beef, flour and sugar supplied.
The overseeing family, the McLeods, as well as receiving their £170
per annum enjoyed the managerial “perk” of a family allowance\textsuperscript{27}
and a net income of £84.6s.6d. They were the family with the
greatest earning and saving capacity on Jondaryan. Thus there were
those resident station employees who, by the early to mid-70s had the means to invest in a small block of land. Like Christian Donges they expected to fulfill their rural dream. Unlike Donges most failed by the 1890s.

Within a few months of selectors moving onto East Prairie and St Ruth they were described as “men and women in the greatest state of privation and poverty”. They had ploughed and sown but had not reaped and did not expect to do so. They sent a deputation to the Minister for Lands asking for a reduction in the price of their land from 30s. to 20s. an acre. The reasons they gave for requesting this reduction were that they had to get firewood from eight to thirteen miles away, there was no water and to find it wells had to be sunk to a great depth and at great cost, and, if water could be found, it was usually impregnated with salt. Two to three hundred sheep had died as a result of drinking brackish water and one fellow, a Mr J. Saw had been buried alive by five tons of soil while helping a fellow-selector make a reservoir. Like the Rudds of “On Our Selection”, the East Prairie selectors had been forced onto “the prairies and waterless ridges”. When Dave Rudd asked his father why he had not taken up a selection on the plain “where there were no trees to grub and plenty of water, Dad would cough as if something was sticking in his throat, and then curse terribly about the squatters and political jobbery”. Frederick, an east prairie selector, had sunk a 270 foot well only to find brackish water and that he still had to walk his cow three miles every morning for a drink. When flood followed drought in 1876-77, even worse features of the land were revealed. The country had been so badly eaten out by the pastoral tenants’ sheep that, instead of improving after rain, it simply became inundated. Some families were not able to walk outside of their huts for ten days and a large crop of wheat was destroyed because of water lying on it for so long. Some selectors, with the permission of Kent and Wienhold, were able to move their stock to high ground. Others had to watch as their stock perished in numbers. As William Graham, ex-Manager of Jondaryan, said of the country, it was “too dry in dry seasons and too wet in wet seasons”. What in fact was needed was an “expensive water supply for dry weather and an equally expensive system of drainage for wet weather”. Whilst Allora averaged twenty inches of rain in the summer months and Toowoomba and other points along the Main Range averaged ten to twelve inches, the Prairie averaged only three point seven eight. It was the quantity, but even more importantly the uneven distribution of rainfall which led selectors by 1879 to conclude that the
Prairie lands were agriculturally useless because they were “beyond the rain cycle of the Main Range”. The unsuitability of this district because of its erratic climatic conditions had been recognized ten years previously: “Finer land there was not in the country, but a good season would not be obtained once in three years. The crops might look well today, but in three days a hot wind would utterly destroy them.” In July 1879 J.P. Bell of Jimbour announced that his 200 acre wheat crop was in fine condition but, by November, it was showing signs of rust, thought to have been brought on by sudden and extreme changes from cold to wet and dry to wet.

After sixteen months of selecting experience, the fourteen East Prairie, five West Prairie and eight St Ruth selectors had come to the conclusion that their land was “totally unfit for agriculture and only in favourable seasons suitable for grazing”. They demanded a reduction in the price of their land which, although recognized as being “not fit for agriculture”, was fixed at 30s. an acre. The soil was of excellent quality but a black, porous clay which necessitated getting over the plains for planting and harvesting as quickly as possible. Cultivation was therefore not possible until the tractor was used for this purpose. Intensive capitalization in the form of dams and fences and later mechanization required capital; capital which the selector did not have and could not afford to raise.

If the selector did manage to grow, say, a small crop of maize, the market distance to the railhead was probably prohibitive because of the careful placement of the squatters’ selections. Pre-empted land and the small number of branch lines to the railhead resulted in the selector having to, in the case of the Rudds at Emu Creek near Toowoomba, “pull” their produce to the railway station. Carriage costs, high for the pastoralist, were practically prohibitive for the small man. James Taylor had two hundred tons of oaten hay to send to Brisbane in 1871 but the freight charges were “too high to send it down”. Another marketing problem was that there was “no crop for which there was a constant and payable demand”, and, whereas wool did not spoil on a long journey, agricultural produce did. The delay in monetary return for his produce also severely disadvantaged the small run. By the time his cheque, the size of which, in the case of wheat had been determined by the Down’s milling monopoly, was forthcoming and the storekeeper’s bill deducted, all he probably “got out of it was a bag of flour”.

Either way the squatter could have been said to have “won”. If he were successful in keeping the selector out his lands were secure. If the selector came in, for all the above reasons, he became the semi-
dependent of the squatter. He did so because his pitiful selection existence forced him to supplement his income by seasonally working for the squatter. His seasonal income was, in fact, crucial for his survival. It enabled him to pay his debt to the storekeeper, in most cases his most immediate and only source of credit. All agricultural communities were, according to selector S. Mee, "under the thumb of the moneylender". The selector's children were not educated because he could not afford to educate them and because he needed their help as labourers on the selection. Mee described the lives of these selection children as "as joyless and hopeless as the worst phases of factory life in the old country". The only hope for many of these selectors was to work seasonally for the squatter. Dan Rudd implored his father over and over again to go shearing or rolling up or branding — "anything rather than work and starve on the selection". It was finally the failure of their corn crop that drove Dan Rudd up country. He and many others became part of a unique Downs selector/shearer group. These men combined their labouring skills with land ownership to become a semi-dependent workforce with a relationship to their employers different from their western shearing counterparts.

On the Downs squatter and selector depended on each other. The selector's supplementary income was crucial for the selector and his dependent family and enabled him to pay his debts. On the other hand, the squatter, who had thought the selector an intruder to be shunned, was, by 1874, finding him "very useful indeed" and "the very best class of workman". In fact, the selector was performing "nearly all the work that was required on the stations". Many of the men who sheared at Eton Vale, for example, had small farms near Warwick and elsewhere. The fierce antagonism that had existed between the two groups had been replaced by an interdependent relationship with the squatter's money being as important to the selector as the selector's labour was to the squatter. The selector was, in fact, preferred on the Downs to the nomadic bush worker as a source of labour. The former's reliability and dependence, compared to the latter's wandering beggary, attracted the squatter. By engaging the local selector who had "a home to go to", the squatter was also spared the expense of supporting the labourer for the non-shearing months of the year. Not only was the squatter assured of a more reliable and economical labour force but also one that was less free to bargain for better wages and conditions. When Francis Adams concluded in the early 1890s that there was "no room for any class inter-mediate between the large wool-
growers and the shearers", he had not seen the Downs selector/shearer group as the bridgers of this gap between the "huge monopolies of capital and labour".

By 1878 only those selectors living in the Toowoomba and Warwick districts, however, were considered to have been a success and even these only to have made "a fair living". Others were said to have been in "struggling circumstances", which appeared "to increase as we go west". The twenty-seven East Prairie, West Prairie and St Ruth selectors who petitioned the Government for relief in this year could easily have numbered fifty times as many according to one politician. The principal cause of hardship of these petitioning selectors was identified as the "upset price of the land", which was said to have been "far in advance of its value". The burden of this upset price, even at the small acreages allowed by the Government, plus the 30s. an acre rent per annum, plus the cost of improvements, placed most small men in immediate and heavy debt. Despite this hardship the Government insisted on this price, committed as it had been throughout the period to the need to sell land for a "sufficient" price — sufficiently low to attract settlement and yet sufficiently high to deter speculation and swell the Government coffers. The selectors' response to the Government's rejection of their demand for a reduction in the price of their land from 30s. to 20s. an acre was to form an Association to "carry on a constitutional guerilla warfare with the Lands Department" and to "vindicate their rights".

This selector association insisted that squatter and selector were not antagonistic classes but that the "interests of both classes" were "identical". They both, it was claimed, wanted "the good and equitable distribution of the land laws", the "settlement of the population", and an end to the "nomadic state of things". A provisional committee of the Selectors' Association, consisting of two East Prairie selectors, two West Prairie selectors and a single St Ruth selector was set up in August 1878 and two months later a Jondaryan branch of the Darling Downs Agricultural Association was also established. It must be noted, however, that this selector association arose out of the specific hardship of the East Prairie, West Prairie and St Ruth selectors. Despite the numerous similar problems which the selectors shared, there was not a single viable selector organisation formed to represent their interests. The explanation for this failure to band together probably lay in fierce regionalism, equally fierce individualism, ethnic differences and the demands of selecting which left little time or energy for political meetings.
Of the fourteen East Prairie selectors who signed the petition for relief in 1878, only five were still there in 1892. The number on West Prairie had been reduced to five and the number on Jondaryan to five. To become a small farmer or grazier in colonial Queensland had not been easy; to remain one had been just as difficult. Even those who had managed to weather all the problems of selection did not satisfy the yeoman farmer ideal. The Brisbane Courier recorded its disappointment with the "civilizing effects" of selection in June 1879: "They do just what the squatter did — run a fence round a bit of his run and substitute their stock for his, depasturing them in exactly the same manner." Selection had not increased the productive capacity of the country as had been envisaged.

The greatest mistake that had been made with respect to land settlement in Queensland was that the situation had been interpreted politically and not economically. Anti-squatting feeling had been allowed to dominate all practical thinking as to the productive capabilities of the land. As had been the case in the 1840s and 50s, the capital demands of settling the land had ensured that the pastoralist would win over the agriculturalist. No amount of independent spirit could conjure up the capital necessary to reverse this situation. The environment demanded big capital and favoured the big man over the small man. "Some country", as the Editor of the Dalby Herald remarked in 1875, by its very nature defied "the single handed labour theory"; the country around Dalby was some such country and no amount of legislation could enforce cultivation here. It was something like "trying to grow cabbages by Act of Parliament". The failure to establish small men on the Downs and particularly around Dalby in the 1870s was due partly to the villainy of the squatters, partly to the folly of legislators, but mostly to "the ineluctable fact that large sheep runs paid better than small farms".

9 per cent of Queensland selectors, however, had settled in the Dalby district. Those who supplemented their income by seasonally working for the squatter belonged neither to the pastoral capitalist class nor the pastoral labouring class. They occupied an intermediate position between the squatter and the shearer. At a time when pastoral management was becoming less personal, capital was being concentrated in fewer and fewer hands, and rural society seemed to be polarizing, the Downs selector/shearer filled the middle ground.

Although few in number, the selector/shearer's presence on the Darling Downs was significant. It symbolized the shift in power that was slowly taking place. The squatters, although they were to retain
their political dominance until the 1890s, were having to share their political power with "smaller" men. As in the Riverina, the gap between Master and Servant was to some extent bridged by the emergence of the Downs selector/shearer. In the West this gap was growing wider with the greater capital demands of land use. The selector/shearer's state of transition from employee to employer partially isolated him from the new ideas of bush unionism. He had a home to go to, a family, and a more heightened sense of individualism. He was also, though, less free to bargain for better wages and conditions than his Western shearing counterparts. Downs squatters, in fact, used this restricted mobility to force down wages in the 1880s.

This selecting/shearing group formed the fourth real division in Jondaryan society, and, although their world "view" was less radical than their womanless, propertyless and voteless Western shearing counterparts, they had a more radical world view than Jondaryan's resident employees. They experienced the same sorts of controls as the latter without the countervailing benefits. The Union provided them with the opportunity of avenging old scores. Of those who withdrew their labour at Jondaryan and Jimbour in 1889, 90 per cent were "respectable selectors and their sons".
Conclusion to Part II

By 1884 only 1.68 per cent of the land held in Queensland was cultivated. Certainly a yeomanry could not be established in an environment like that of Jondaryan’s in the 1870s. Wool production was the most economic form of land use and demanded that a peculiar relationship be set up between land, labour and capital. In the 1840s this capital had been provided for the most part by English and Scottish gentlemen with British capital to invest and convict labour at their disposal. This input and British market demand had created rural capitalist enterprises on the one hand, and a rural proletariat on the other. Jondaryan Station was one such enterprise, and, as has been shown, it exhibited some of the characteristics of a close-knit, ordered and hierarchical rural English village.

William Kent and Edward Wienholt, with their business and rural skills, the crucial ingredient of financial backing from “home”, good seasons and high prices, were able to amass large profits and consolidate their land-holding positions.

Legislation designed, as one colonist commented, “to establish a class of men to be lords and another to be vassals” applied particularly where land was concerned. Squatters either pre-empted “the eyes out” of their runs or became big selectors themselves, obstructing the movement of employees to employer rank via the medium of lands acquisition. Those who did become small selectors were confronted with an environment which favoured the big man above the small man and forced the selector to eke out a miserable selection existence by working for the local squatter. Thus, although the employee had broken out of his working man status, he was still dependent on the squatter for employment and the squatter was assured of a reliable labour source. The selector/shearer’s state of indebtedness tied him more closely to the station structure than the nomadic bush worker, who was more free to bargain for better
wages and conditions. Whilst the itinerant shearsers at Jondaryan, tiring of the "arbitrary bearing of the managers of this station towards the men" and claiming that conditions here were worse than at any station on the northern Downs, were calling for the formation of a shearsers' union, resident Jondaryan employees were quite content with their "lot". They were totally dependent on their employers but enjoyed compensating benefits and the security of belonging to a village community. It was, in fact, their loyalty to their station masters, together with a residential franchise qualification which fairly effectively excluded the shearer, as well as electoral "rigging", which maintained the political dominance of the squatter.  

Thus the Jondaryan "men" in the late 70s and early 80s were four distinct working groups, each of which occupied a particular place in the Station's social structure, bore a particular relationship towards their employers, and responded in its different way to the type of control which the management of Jondaryan exercised over its population. Their response was not only dependent upon their place in the social structure and how closely they were tied to it, but also on how conscious they were of conflict of interests between themselves and their employers.
Part III
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Worker Resistance

The confrontation between capital and labour, between employer and employee, that occurred in the Queensland pastoral industry in the early 1890s was a product of the nature of pastoral capitalism itself. The very highly structured and unequal society that evolved to serve the pastoral industry created an inbuilt tension between rural capital and rural labour. The "controls", both internal and external which capital exercised over labour within that structure exacerbated that tension and potential for conflict. For fifty years minor confrontations took place but were defused by a high level of economic activity, a high standard of living, examples of social mobility, concessions squeezed from capital and, above all, by a belief in the identity of interest between employer and employee as each strove for greater material wealth. In 1890, however, labour realized the limited extent of this compatibility and the notion of social conflict overrode that of social consensus.

The production of wool demanded that a peculiar relationship exist between land, capital and labour. Those who had sufficient capital to "buy" sufficient land and the labour of others to produce wool economically were naturally in a position of power over those who chose to sell their labour. They chose to exercise this power in their own interest to try, firstly, to procure as cheap and tractable a labour source as possible, and, secondly, to maintain a monopoly of land ownership. The Masters and Servants Acts of 1845 and 1861 were legislative expressions of their power, as were the types of men chosen to implement their provisions. Employers brought with them to the colony notions about the respective positions of Master and Man and the necessary capital to ensure that these respective positions would be maintained.

But what of those who sold their labour? They had also emigrated in hope — in the hope of greater material wealth and an improved
social position. "We have come sixteen thousand miles to better our condition", wrote James Galloway, a stonemason from England. Whilst the employer wanted to buy his labour as cheaply as possible, his employee wanted to sell it for as much as possible. The working man believed that he had a right to a fair wage for his labour and decent living and working conditions. He also believed that he had a right to own land, the most obvious and important form of wealth in a pioneering community.

This inbuilt tension between employer and employee burst into overt or open conflict when men found the conditions under which they had to work harder to bear than usual. Minor confrontations between pastoral employer and pastoral employee had occurred on the Darling Downs since the 1840s. In the 40s employees had struck over being supplied with paint-tainted tea and had begun to march to Brisbane before being stopped by squatters, a settlement being reached, and the men agreeing to return to work. Shearers on Jimbour Station struck in October and November of 1867 because of generally unsatisfactory shearing conditions. Charged with breaking an agreement, and withdrawing their labour rather than referring their grievance to the Court, they were fined by the Dalby Police Court. Employee resistance to the "one-sided and arbitrary agreements" under which they had to labour was often met by Court action and heavy fines. Of Jondaryan it was said, "if anything can show the need of a shearers' association, it is the treatment of men at this Station . . . They are not regarded as men at all, but as machines and are threatened with the terrors of the Masters and Servants Act if they dare show the inherent spirit of a true born man to resist tyranny in whatever form it comes."

Striking was the most direct way in which the labouring man attempted to "resist tyranny". The forms of resistance which the labouring man displayed towards his working environment can be divided into the direct and indirect, or the active and passive. The passive were intemperance and pretended insanity. The direct were individual and collective acts including arson, theft, attacks on property and person, meeting together to fix wages and striking.

The labouring man's most immediate response to his working "condition" was intemperance. Drunken bouts were primarily a response to the absence of other leisure pursuits and the lack of female company. They were also a response to hard work, enforced sobriety and a controlled work situation.

In an environment which was without leisure activities and females, there was little else to do but "spree" with mates. There
were travelling circuses, concerts and shows which occasionally
called in at Jondaryan and these were very well patronized by resi­
dent employees, but there was no entertainment provided during
the shearing season. The men were there to “get the wool off” and
not to be entertained. Management was aware, also, of the produc­
tive advantages of a predominantly male environment. No women
meant no “distractions” at a time when the men were there solely to
work. As well as women interfering with the efficiency of the shear­
ing operation, they were costly dependents who needed rations and
accommodation. If management was not prepared to provide what
the men regarded as decent or moral physical conditions for them,
they were less likely to provide them for their dependents.

“Downing the cheque” was also a response to months of hard
work and isolation. In January 1848 the inhabitants of Brisbane
Town, Moreton Bay and the Darling Downs were calling for greater
police protection and Courts of Quarter Sessions to protect them
from the many “disorderly characters at present engaged in sheep
shearing”, who, during the ensuing months, would retire “to this
place to dispose of the money they have.”

The most common
offence to come before the Brisbane and Ipswich benches in the late
50s was that of being “drunk and disorderly”. Even in the early
60s, “drunkenness” was one of the three most common charges to
be heard before the Court of Petty Sessions, Toowoomba. The
only seasonal workers allowed alcohol on Jondaryan were the
washers who, because they had to stand in the water for hours,
were supplied with the occasional nip of rum. Under their agree­
ment shearers were forbidden liquor whilst shearing and were fined
for drunkenness. Old shepherds were known to drink themselves to
death on “doctored” grog and, until the 50s, the name “hatter” was
used to denote a shepherd made “cranky” by grog and isolation.

The manager’s residence, however, was not complete without a
wine cellar or considerable quantities of spirits or both. In an endless
round of visiting, copious quantities of wine, brandy, sherry,
madeira, beer, soda water and lemonade were consumed by squat­
ters and their peers. William Kent’s house accounts were full of
entries for the purchase of “wine, rum etc.”. The total amount
spent on liquor for the house in 1860 was £174.9s.2d., for 1861,
£77.12s.9d., for 1862, £339.8s.4d. and for 1863, £284.8s.9d.

Enforced abstinence during working hours for the shearers
relegated the consumption of alcohol to a leisure time activity
indulged in at the local public house or in combination with other
leisure-time pursuits such as race meetings. There were at least four
Worker Resistance

drinking establishments in the township of Jondaryan by the 1870s — the Railway Hotel, the Jondaryan, Hartley’s Public House and Mrs Power’s. The Queensland working man was more likely to take tea with his evening meal than beer or wine as was the habit in other countries. He was also more likely to drink in a public house which excluded women than to drink at home.

Contemporary commentators were pleased to note that as shepherds became fewer in number in the 1860s and 70s, women greater in number and public houses more accessible, practices such as “downing the cheque”, “shouting” and “lambing down” became less common. The honourable member for Western Downs was happy to report that shearers and washers were “getting to be a more respectable class of men than formerly, and instead of knocking down their cheques in public houses, they now took their money home and spent it on their families”.

Forms of individual direct action taken by Downs employees against the person and property of their employers included the murder of one overseer and the attempted murder of another, the mixing, losing, abandoning and killing of sheep and arson. William Kent was forced to employ a night watchman in his Rosalie shed for the 1861 shearing because of a previous arson attempt.

In 1854 a meeting of all shearers and washers was called at Drayton to “fix the price of shearing and washing for the oncoming season, and other labour interests”. This meeting was in response to the formation of the Northern District Agricultural and Pastoral Association. Downs squatters had realized that the “total want of union” amongst themselves had “left them assailable from all quarters”. It was proposed that this Association be formed “to rescue the Squatting interest from the stigma of dis-union” and so that “the consideration of the best means of obtaining supplies of labour” could be discussed. In the 1860s depression, the response of 26,000 persons to conditions for the labouring man in Queensland was to leave the colony. Most went to New South Wales and California.

The late 60s early 70s was a time of economic slump for the colony and particularly for western squatters. This was the result of over-investment. Although British investors had lost confidence in wool growing during the 1840s depression, gold had restored that confidence in the 50s, and the 60s saw a heavy inflow of British capital and labour for key social utilities, railway development and pastoral expansion. Unlike those on the Darling Downs where this capital had been channelled into Station improvements, particularly
fencing, outer squatters had used capital in a more speculative and unprofitable way. New stations were taken up and equipped in a year or two in more marginal areas where costs were greater, labour more scarce and returns the same. As stations went bankrupt and Sydney mortgagers moved in, men were turned away without being paid for months of hard work. Mobs of destitute swagmen, more destitute, it was argued, than labourers in England, were roaming the countryside.

With the exception of the more remote areas of the colony, the wages offered at Jondaryan during the 1860s were the same as, or slightly higher than those offered elsewhere. In the late 60s shearers and washers in Western Queensland were paid 3s.6d. to 5s. and 5s. to 7s. per diem respectively, whilst at Jondaryan the rate was 3s. to 3s.6d. and 3s.6d. a day respectively. In fact, a feature of the scale of wages offered for all occupational groups at Jondaryan throughout the period 1863-93 was their relative stability. In the more skilled trades there was a tendency for wages to fall but generally wages stayed the same or rose. The most spectacular "rises" were for shepherding, which rose from £40 to £60 per annum; storekeeping, from £52 to £80; and horse-driving from £40 to £60 per annum. Over the 30 years period the wages of washers, pressers, dumpers and "penner-uppers" rose; the wages of "picker-uppers", rollers, stowers, sweepers and shed boys remained the same; and classers' fell. Overall, however, there was not nearly as much fluctuation as one might have expected and it seems likely that Connell was correct in arguing that the "wage structure was governed more by custom, and less by supply-and-demand than is often supposed".

The only exceptions to the relative stability of wages over this period were the years 1873, 1883 and 1893, when the shearing rate offered at Jondaryan was 4s. a score and, in early 1872, when the rate fell to 2s.6d. This drop in the shearing rate was at a time when prices for sheep, cattle and wool were amongst their highest and Jondaryan was one of the best managed and profitable stations in the country.

By the early 70s Jondaryan was reaping the benefit of continuity of ownership and William Kent's very selective buying and breeding programme. Kent had very early recognized the poor quality of imported bulls and the value of "sticking to the jumbucks". He would often visit neighbouring colonies and return with some "aristocratic new blood in the shape of several splendid rams". The KW wool brand, taken from 150,000 mostly merino sheep, was famous in the markets of the world. The JJ1 horse and cattle brand was also a
hallmark of fine quality stock. As well as income from fine combing wool Jondaryan had diverse markets for its stock. Fat sheep were driven overland to Victoria, maiden ewes and young rams were in high demand for stocking northern runs and Jondaryan was also a fattening depot for cattle sold locally on the Darling Downs.

The output of the Jondaryan shed, under the watchful eye of the General Manager, Mr Williams, and the wool sorter, Mr Cummings, was about fifty bales a day. The wool was shorn increasingly in the grease,34 railed to Brisbane and shipped to the London market. In 1873 176,000 sheep, plus 24,000 on behalf of Messrs Graham and Forbes went through the Jondaryan shed. The average weight of the fleece was 3lb 2oz at an average price of 13d. to 15d. per pound for greasy wool.35 The season started in October, stopped for a few days over Christmas and then continued until about mid-January.

Before shearers signed on for the season they had to provide their own rations, their rations and extra stores required by them during shearing being charged at “very high rates”36 and for products of the “very worst quality”.37 Tins of jam which sold for 5d. in New South Wales sold for 1s.9d. at Jondaryan and potatoes which were 6d. to 8d. per hundredweight in New South Wales sold for 12s. per hundredweight at Jondaryan. Although prices were inflated by distance, even allowing for the extra expense of carriage,38 these prices represented a considerable profit for the proprietors of Jondaryan.

Employees could see that the profits of the run were allowing their employers a trip to the Continent and “travel with the comfort and not to say the splendour of a real Duke”39 while they were expected to live in “Calcutta-like habitation”.40 Shearers demanded to be housed at least as well as an imported bull or horse. Accommodation at Gowrie, Westbrook, Eton Vale and Jondaryan was described as “wretched”.41

Resident employees had better living and working conditions than their itinerant or contract counterparts. Jondaryan was their home and William Kent their patron or benefactor. He displayed a certain moral responsibility for the welfare of his employees. They responded with a respect for hierarchy and authority and an old world loyalty. This relationship eliminated the need for binding agreements of the kind which the shearers entered into. For itinerants or contract workers there was little attachment to Jondaryan. It was just another shed or job, not their home.

The result was a “spirit of discontent amongst working men, and feelings of bitter hostility towards “employers”, which, one shearer commented, “if continued and provoked” would “not be without
The Darling Downs, 1846. (From W. Baker's Australian Atlas, ML Ref: X980.11/2, reprinted courtesy Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales.)
Emigrating from London to Jondaryan. Clockwise, from top left: Ship, “Agnes Rose” (London to Sydney in ninety days), Australian Steam Navigation Company (Sydney to Brisbane), by rail from Ipswich to Jondaryan (after 1868) and the Paddle Steamer S.S. “Hawk” (Brisbane to Ipswich). (Reprinted courtesy John Oxley Memorial Library, Brisbane.)
A labour agreement entered into by Robert Campbell and a Chinaman, dated 24 September 1851.
(ML Ref: Ac 38/4, reprinted courtesy Mitchell Library, State Library of New South Wales.)
Robert Tooth's pre-emptive purchases. (Reprinted courtesy Queensland State Archives, Brisbane in Letter 2336 of 1865 LWO/A26.)
A squatting map of the northern Downs. (Reproduced courtesy John Oxley Memorial Library, Brisbane and published by J.W. Buxton, Brisbane, 1864.)
The Jondaryan Station Woolshed about 1870. (Reprinted courtesy John Oxley Memorial Library, Brisbane.)

Jondaryan Station about 1870. (Reprinted courtesy John Oxley Memorial Library, Brisbane.)
The station storekeeper/book-keeper:

1. Rise at 5 a.m., get in killers and do butchering.
2. Serve out stores.
3. Run up the horses.
4. Carry rations to out-stations.
A resident employee — Thomas Evans, born England 1853, farm overseer Jondaryan, 1873. (Reprinted courtesy John Oxley Memorial Library, Brisbane from May, S., ed. The Diary of A. Neame 1870-97, unpublished manuscript.)

The station "Team". (Reprinted courtesy John Oxley Memorial Library, Brisbane.)
The Jondaryan Washpool about 1870. (Reprinted courtesy John Oxley Memorial Library, Brisbane.)

Wool harvest time at Jondaryan. (Reprinted courtesy John Oxley Memorial Library, Brisbane.)
Boating on Jondaryan "Harbour" below the Homestead. (Reprinted courtesy John Oxley Memorial Library, Brisbane.)
"Jack the Giant Killer": Wienholt's Castle and the squatter's opposition to selection.
(Reprinted courtesy John Oxley Memorial Library, Brisbane.)
The Jondaryan shearing team, 1872. (Reprinted courtesy John Oxley Memorial Library, Brisbane.)

Jondaryan Homestead and residents, 1888. (Reprinted courtesy John Oxley Memorial Library, Brisbane from May, S., ed. The Diary of A. Neame 1870-97, unpublished manuscript.)
Charles Williams. (Reprinted courtesy John Oxley Memorial Library, Brisbane.)
FOR SALE
15 FARMS, Forming the First Section
OF THE
JONDARYAN ESTATE
DARLING DOWNS, QUEENSLAND.

AREAS:
FROM
146 to 1233 Acres.

RAINFALL.
The average for the past twenty-three years, ending December 31st, 1900, is 50.17 per annum.

THE LAND
is situated within a radius of four miles of the A and W. Railway with a frontage of five miles to it, the Jondaryan Railway Station being a mile to one side, and Rockhampton about two miles to the other side. There is also a Railway siding about midway between.

The land comprises open Downs, lightly timbered ridges and rich open railways, in watered with numerous wells. Wheat, Barley and Lucerne are grown successfully on the Land.

PRICES,
which are very moderate, may be obtained upon application to Agents.

Payments of Purchase Money
Extending Over a Period of 12 Years.

TERMS AS FOLLOWS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>One-Fifth Cash</th>
<th>Balance of Purchase Money</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>5 per cent.</td>
<td>5 per cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>5 per cent.</td>
<td>5 per cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>5 per cent.</td>
<td>5 per cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>5 per cent.</td>
<td>5 per cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>5 per cent.</td>
<td>5 per cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>5 per cent.</td>
<td>5 per cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>5 per cent.</td>
<td>5 per cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>5 per cent.</td>
<td>5 per cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>One-third of</td>
<td>One-third of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>2nd of</td>
<td>2nd of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>3rd of</td>
<td>3rd of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>Balance of</td>
<td>Balance of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subdivision of Jondaryan. (Reprinted courtesy John Oxley Memorial Library, Brisbane.)
results". Particularly resented was the notion that the shearer was “a machine to be hired for a special time and a special purpose and . . . sent about his business”. Tired of employers who had “no regard for the moral and social conditions” of their employees and who “were now enjoying the fruits of their labours in other parts of the world”, shearers at Jondaryan were calling for the formation of a Shearers’ Association.

By this time, however, the blame for the poor moral and social conditions of pastoral employees had begun to shift. “Local managers,” it was said, “could not get any money for improvements in living conditions for the workers.” The blame fell on the more impersonal pastoral agency and bank which were gradually replacing the individual squatter as lessees. “The individual squatter,” lamented Bartley, “is nowadays a relic of the past, for with a few exceptions the stations are held either by banks or by combinations of so-called squatters.”

The capital demands of squatting or land usage in Queensland had always been such as to demand squatting partnerships and the involvement of southern and London banks and companies. Indeed, a feature of pastoral occupation in Queensland in the 40s and 50s had been absentee landlordism and the resident manager. This trend, however, became more exaggerated in the 70s and 80s, particularly in western Queensland, where there was a much greater degree of speculative run-holding than on the Darling Downs. The trend by 1876 was that so many runs had been mortgaged by banks and pastoral firms that it was “hard to tell the squatter from the company manager”. Labour was less able to view capital as a monolith. There was the “pure merino”, the struggling outer squatter or his manager, the colonial capitalist and the British capitalist. “Capital” was increasingly labour’s enemy and mortgage finance the cause of the impersonalization of employer-employee relationships in the pastoral industry.

Even on the Darling Downs Australian banks nominally held sixty-five pastoral leases by 1885-86. It was this increasing trend towards institutional management which was said to be leading to greater disaffection between employer and employee. Some companies begrudged “every dollar spent on working expenses” and wanted “cheap labour to pay interest on the capital invested” and a “big dividend to the share-holder”. The best manager was one who “cut working expenses down to the lowest”. The land was not only having to pay profit to the landowner but interest to the bank, to the loan and mortgage company and to the English
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Investor. Lack of secure land tenure, overcapitalization, interest rates of 17 per cent and more, higher costs and lower returns had resulted in a much less efficient and profitable industry and one which, employers claimed, could not afford to pay its employees higher wages or offer them better living conditions.

On Jondaryan, although the death of William Kent affected neither the shearers' rate nor their standard of accommodation, it did have a depersonalizing effect on working relationships. The structure was, in a sense, no longer bound together by paternalism. Even though William Kent never resided at Jondaryan he did take a keen interest in the welfare of its employees. Dubbed the “Squire of Euston” and the patriarch of Jondaryan, he was particularly missed by his resident employees for his benevolent overseeing. Edward Wienholt was much more “remote” than Kent and Charles Williams, although much less “distant” than Wienholt, who was no substitute for Kent. Other changes evident at Jondaryan in the 70s and 80s were a reduction in the size of the workforce, the appearance of a couple of new occupational groups and a slightly more complex life for its employees.

Whereas Jondaryan's average resident population in the 60s was 171, in the 70s it was 95, and in the 80s and 90s it had fallen to 68 and 55 respectively. This reduction in the permanent workforce was largely the result of the replacement of shepherds by fences and boundary riders. The average number of shepherds employed in the 60s was 134.7, in the 70s was only 66, and by the 80s was halved again. The average number of residents plus itinerants involved in a Jondaryan shearing, however, had actually risen a third from 99 in the 60s to 123 in the 70s. It fell slightly to 90 in the 80s. The number of contract workers employed on Jondaryan also fell to a third of what it had been in the 60s. This was despite the appearance on Jondaryan of a couple of noxious weeds which necessitated the hiring of teams of cutters. Bathurst burr was so bad on Jondaryan in 1878 and so many cutters were employed that it was necessary to hire a burr cutters' cook.

Bathurst burr made its appearance in the 60s and was so bad in 1863 that there were thirty cutters employed. It reappeared in the late 70s early 80s and was such a menace between 1885 and 1888 that seventeen contractors had to be employed and twenty-one areas declared burr infested by the Divisional Board. By the end of the 80s the thistle, prickly pear and rabbit had joined burr as frequently discussed problems at Divisional Board Meetings.

The Jondaryan employee was no longer just a part of Jondaryan
village, but a member of the wider Jondaryan community as well. Like many Australian townships Jondaryan township’s seed was a carriers’ camp, its sprout a pub and its nourishment the neighbouring run and spending power of its employee. With the coming of the railway, it acquired its own identity and distinct social hierarchy. Jondaryan, in the County of Aubigny, parish of Jondaryan, electoral district of Dalby, postal township and railway station, had a population of ninety in 1876. Clergymen, policemen, storekeepers, publicans, a schoolmaster, telegraph officer and a station master were amongst its leading citizens. Indicators of the township’s becoming a “more important community”, “more civilized” and more independent of the station were the head station’s blacksmith setting up a shop in town, the increasing number of exhibitions taking place at the school as well as at the woolshed, a petition to the Minister for Lands for a town common, moves to have a chapel erected in the town, and town and head station cricket matches. However, the fact that the Station Church of St Anne’s became the town’s place of worship, that the Jondaryan manager allowed town animals to graze on the run, and that Charles Williams was a community leader, patron of the school and member of the Divisional Board, all indicate the degree to which the town was still dependent on the head station. A poor clip or a bad season for Jondaryan meant a depressed economy for the township.

The money lending spiral in the pastoral industry left the manager and the employee battling for the residuum after interest. “It is the interest that kills” became a familiar catchcry. The inflow of British capital not only meant a weakening of the strength of the indigenous capitalist class; it also meant a weakening of the position of the indigenous labouring class. If the capitalist as an employer of labour was not getting sufficient return for his capital then this meant contracting opportunities for labour. The working man believed that he had a right to a much greater share of the fruits of his labour. “The absentees and the banks, the rent-robbor and the profit-mongers are bloated and swollen with dividends, while the men who make those dividends do not usually earn enough to marry on.” It was this belief in the right of every man to earn a comfortable wage and the fact that “the sheep kings, with very few exceptions, treated the men as serfs” which led to the emergence of organized labour in the mid-80s. More immediately, it was the notice given by the Central District squatters that rouseabouts’ wages were to be reduced to 25s. which led to the shearsers organizing at Blackall at the end of 1886 and the registration of them as the
Queensland Shearers' Union the following year. Greater competition and drought had led to falling wool prices and a lower return on money invested. It was as if employers believed that the profits that accrued depended upon the extent to which wages could be depressed. The shearer for his part found no fault with his wage as such but his work was not continuous and, with the likelihood of deductions for bad shearing, talking loudly, singing or swearing, agistment fees, compulsory hospital subscription, and the fact that he could be discharged and paid off at any time, his income was far from stable. "We formed Unions to protect ourselves" became something of a slogan.

Bush labour had been slower to organize than the skilled trades in Queensland and even in 1888 pastoral unionism lacked the sophistication of that in the Southern colonies. As in Britain and in the other colonies, the precursors of trade unions in Queensland were the friendly societies. By 1876 there were between forty and fifty of these societies in Queensland; their approximate membership was between four and five thousand. Their function was to promote self-help and independence amongst their members and as such their raison d'etre was totally compatible with consensus liberalism which emphasized that workers should be self-reliant. They also heightened the consciousness of the working man by separating him from "the lower orders" and contrasting his position with that of his social superiors. They both divided and heightened the labouring classes' consciousness at the same time. The Friendly Societies Act of 1876 brought these benefit societies under the control of the Queensland Government. Ten years later trade unions were similarly registered and made lawful under the Trade Union Act of 1886.

Bush unionism was about the right of every man to earn a comfortable wage and the notion that social reform within the capitalist system was possible. It was about "one-sided agreements", exorbitant charges for rations, "raddling" and a second price. "Frequently a man worked every day in the week . . . (and) found his meagre tobacco and store accounts were about equal to his earnings. No wonder they rebelled." The problem that concerned trade unions in Australia was not the accumulation of wealth but the distribution of this wealth. This was very important because material wealth was viewed as a pre-condition for happiness. Some really believed that God had placed men in Australia to end poverty, and, once a comfortable living standard had been achieved, all else would be added unto them. As Geoffrey Serle remarked, "working class consciousness would only come when opportunities were denied it".
Shearers had struck at Jimbour in 1867 because management had restricted their earning capacity. Employers were now attempting to force down wages.

The organization of bush labour spread south and west to the Downs, where, in 1888, 300 men were enlisted, some of whom were Jondaryan shearers. The following year colonial reaction to the London dockers' strike reflected the prevailing colonial belief that the reconciliation of employer and employee could be achieved by the application of reason.

It was this prevailing belief in the identity of interest between employer and employee — that every employee was, in fact, a "prospective capitalist" — which defused the potential for conflict between capital and labour. Their incompatibility was fairly obvious: "so long as it is in the interests of masters to secure labour as cheaply as possible, so long as it is in the interests of men to secure work at the highest possible wages, so long will there be disputes". The fact, however, that many British migrants found themselves in an improved material state and surrounded by some examples of upwardly mobile people served to reinforce this idea of an identity of interests.

Although labourers were not in as independent a position as they had hoped and very often had been told they would be in, they were nevertheless in a much better material and social position that their English, Scottish, Irish or European counterparts. Most received sufficiently high wages to satisfy their immediate material needs and some to save a little. The wage differential between occupations was not as great and neither was the risk of unemployment. Phenomena like the gold rushes, though more competitive than cooperative served to reinforce the working man's notion of equality of opportunity. Working men had organized to protect themselves and to elevate their position.

There was no questioning of the belief that existing differences between employers and employees could be resolved by discussion and within the mechanisms of the existing system. Pastoral employees were primarily seeking security and an improved position within the capitalist system, not rejecting it. They believed in cooperative action for the collective good. Socialism, in the opinion of Eddie Lane, was "unknown" and books of a radical nature "rare" at a time when to "fear God and honour the King" was the "very foundation of material and spiritual life". Even in Brisbane in the mid-80s there was, according to Lane, "little opportunity" "to become associated with any radical organization (none existed) or
the few craft unions or waterside and seamen’s unions, unless working in these occupations”. The Bellamy Society, started by William Lane in 1887 when Looking Backwards was in the “boom”, met in G. Merchant’s hop beer factory in Bowen Street. Bellamy and Henry George were, according to William Spence, part of a great deal of literature read in the “Back Country”. Spence, Secretary of the Amalgamated Miners’ Association of Australia and New Zealand and honorary secretary of the Australian Shearers’ Union, claimed that the belief in socialism was very widespread, especially in New South Wales and Queensland; it was just that men differed as to what it should be. Trade unions, he said, certainly gave the necessary lead to socialism in their attempt to improve “the condition of the masses” and by spreading the idea that the wealth produced by labour was not fairly divided. He was of the opinion, however, that these ideas were more the natural outcome of the ideas of a democratic community than the influence of any special teaching or writing. Whilst Queensland as a capitalist society was not, in Humphrey McQueen’s words, “possessed by some natural socialist ethos”, there was at the same time a spirit of co-operation or mateship amongst bushmen bred of isolation and dependence. As Manning Clark says, this dependence was a necessary condition for survival rather than an ideal.

In the “back country” there was a desire for change although a certain vagueness as to what this should be. But whatever it should be, the feeling was that it had to be evolutionary and “decidedly constitutional”. Spence insisted that there was “nothing like a revolutionary feeling in any part of Australia”. Bushmen possessed no concept of the Marxian model of the inevitability of class conflict. In fact, the process seemed one of emulation rather than rejection, and the harmony of capital and labour “apparently increased in labour’s eyes, in direct proportion to unionism’s successes”. Their goal was the same — an improved material state. The object, therefore, was not to abolish capitalist enterprises but to regulate them in the interests of labour.

Trade Unionism was the institutional body responsible for doing just this. It tied itself to capitalism and the State and sought to involve Government directly in equitably distributing accumulated wealth. Politicians such as Samuel Griffith sought to create the impression that Government was actively involved in doing just that. “The relationship between Labour and Capital constitute one of the great difficulties of the day. I look for a recognition of the principle that a share of the profits of productive labour belongs of right to the
Griffith set up the Political Reform League in 1881 to look at taxing coloured labour and the payment of members of Parliament. As pockets of working class men began to influence the outcome of local elections it became incumbent upon politicians at least to "make sympathetic noises of support" towards the working man about issues which concerned him. There were "Lib-Lab" politicians at this time who courted the worker's vote at election time and then abandoned him later in the House. Such betrayal, and the realization that the more liberal sections of capital were using them "against the more conservative sections of capital", led to labour's realization that the "time for concerted political action has now arrived". "Class questions require class knowledge to state them, and class sympathies to fight for them. Land, Commerce and Capital are all cared for in our Legislative Assemblies, but Labour, the source of all wealth is only fought for . . . direct representation of Labour is both just and necessary". If working men had "class interests" it was "better that they should look after them than that other people should supply the guardianship". In 1885 the Trades and Labour Council was set up to achieve better representation for the working man in Parliament.

Without the payment of members, however, Parliamentary representation for the working man was seen as a vain hope.

The working classes are often taunted that they do not send men of their own order to Parliament instead of squatters and importers. But the working class recognize the fact that without payment of members, manhood suffrage is a farce. Payment of members is the very lever of manhood suffrage and to expect a Parliament packed with squatters and importers, capitalists and monopolists of every kind, their natural allies the lawyers, to concede a reform that would break their power and destroy their interests, is not natural . . . Parliament will never make itself honest; the people must do it.

As early as 1860 there was agitation through the Moreton Bay Courier for the representation of labour in the House and advocacy of the payment of members in the Dalby Herald in March 1871. But even with "payment of members" the labouring man could not hope to change the composition of the squatter-dominated Parliament whilst "whole armies" of men were unenfranchised. The Redistribution Act of 1872 fairly effectively denied the franchise to pastoral workers and seamen. The colony was seen as radical enough without the granting of "one man one vote", which would have meant "the enfranchisement of whole armies of idle and vicious nomads . . . the lazy sundowner, the spieler, would
all be enfranchised". Unenfranchised pastoral employees were becoming increasingly aware of their own peculiar class position.

Working men were a diverse body of people but shared similar interests and similar experiences of their working position. They became the labouring or working class when their consciousness of their inferior position prompted them to display "a disposition to behave" as a separate group whose interests differed from those of their employers. The key factor in the shaping of class consciousness was not social stratification per se, but an employer’s or employee’s experience as a dominate or subordinate in a variety of conflict situations, increased by the degree to which he felt able or unable to shape the course of his life. The notion of conflict is an important one in the determination of class. There is not as much necessity to draw a distinction between a class in itself and a class for itself as there is to draw a distinction between social position and class. It is consciousness that converts position into class, a consciousness which is the product of social stratification, a worker’s experience of his position and other non-Marxist factors such as ideological conviction.

Social stratification is about categorization. Social class is about status, power and consciousness. Jondaryan’s lessees or managerial class enjoyed a position in Jondaryan’s hierarchy of social roles and functions which allowed them control over their employees and access to, and control over, the political and legal mechanisms of influence and authority. It was this experience of their power which led them to become conscious of themselves as a ruling class. Although pastoral employees’ “relation to the means of production” or their working experience was fundamental to their awareness of themselves as a separate group, the productive relations into which men enter into voluntarily or are born is not “the only criterion by which consciousness can be seen to be developing”. What men believed about themselves and their position in society was often just as important as their actual physical conditions, perhaps more so. An indicator of this consciousness was the growth of the trade union movement.

The Brisbane Omnibus and Tramway Employees’ Union, the Bricklayers’ and the Federated Seamen’s Union of Australasia were the only unions registered in Queensland in 1888, but, by 1889, the number of registered unions had grown to thirty-three. All but five of these had shown an increase in funds within the next twelve months, and all but seven an in-
crease in membership. The union which showed the most remarkable increase in both membership and funds was the Queensland Shearers' Union, which, at the beginning of 1888 had a membership of 929 and at the end, 1,967. By the end of 1889 its membership had increased to 2,907.

Pastoral employees, unenfranchised because of the residential and property qualifications of the franchise, were thus organizing in the bush and "ready to discuss theories of social and political economy". They wanted change, but differed as to what this should be. "They are readers of George and Hyndman", claimed Lady Luggard, and "Bellamy's Looking Backwards is to be found in every shed". Fed by the ideas of Bellamy, George, Gronlund and others, the labouring man wanted unionism to deal not just with wages and the eight hour day but with the broader economic condition of man.

The pastoral employee believed that by virtue of his being a Queenslander and an Australian, he had a right to determine with whom he worked and with whom he shared Queensland's wealth. From the first Intercolonial Trade Union Congress in 1879, continual reference was made to the labour movement's opposition to assisted white and non-European labour. At the fifth Congress held in Brisbane in 1888 it was made quite clear that opposition to Chinese coolies was both on a job-competitive and racial basis. "Nobody wanted them there except a few capitalists. It was a racial question and a white population must be upheld at any cost."

The Seamen's Union was particularly concerned about Chinese labourers "ousting white men from ships and monopolizing to a great extent employment on the sea". Employees of the Australian Steam Navigation Company refused to work in 1878 unless the Chinese were removed.

There were usually two to four Chinese working on Jondaryan in any one year. The number employed, however, peaked between 1863-65, and 1887-90. They worked primarily as shepherds in the 60s, as lambers and washers in the 60s and 70s, and as gardeners in the 80s. Because these occupations were not particularly attractive to Europeans, the Chinese in turn, posed no real threat to Europeans and, in fact, by allowing Europeans to occupy positions of greater status, enhanced European's mobility. There were, however, a few Chinese who did work as burr cutters, cooks and rollers, one who classed the wool and a couple who shore at Jondaryan. Shearers particularly resented sharing the board with a Chinaman and feared that his presence would depress wages. The
historical impression has been that the wages paid to coloured labourers were much lower than those paid to whites. Whilst this was true with respect to indentured labourers and may have been true for other places, at Jondaryan they received comparable wages. This was not, of course, true for Aborigines, whose status was not deemed sufficient for monetary remuneration of any kind. By introducing this type of labour employers not only created a large labour pool from which to draw but one whose consciousness was divided. It was the principle of "divide and rule". Limiting working class consciousness was one way of containing it. Not only was Jondaryan's labouring group divided according to occupational caste, but also divided according to race. But whilst the introduction of the Chinese had the divisive effect of pitting European against non-European, it had the unifying effect of binding unskilled workers in the mining, sugar and pastoral industries together in their opposition to coloured labour. The 1880s had seen the growth of four major industries in Queensland — shipping, shearing, sugar and mining — all dependent on unskilled labour and all united in their opposition to the employment of coloured labour. "No kanaka labour has been a watchword — all have united to crush a common enemy." It was this united opposition which tied Australian racism to nationalism and to the labour movement.

These feelings were aired in the Worker, the labour movement's official organ. The working man's confidence in his ability to wring concessions from capital had grown with the greater unionized strength of labour. In December 1889 the Queensland Shearers' Union of over 3,000 members was recognized as "one of the leading industrial organizations of the colony". By 1890 Albert Hinchcliffe had created a central branch of the Australian Labour Federation and had effected a federation between the Queensland Shearers' Union and the Brisbane Wharf Labourers' Union. Enthusiasm and confidence were the prevailing characteristics as organized labour increased its strength relative to capital. But still, in April 1890, the movement believed in evolutionary change rather than revolutionary activity. Even William Lane, the man hailed as galvanizing into life "the bacilli of discontent", preached that labour could redress the imbalance between itself and capital through the Parliamentary system: "today the world stands on the verge of upheaval! . . . change must take place . . . organisation of labour and the Parliament which represents the State should work together for the gradual re-adjustment of the unbearable conditions of labouring and for the gradual modification of the incompetence of
capitalism".129 What Karl Marx had predicted would happen to capital in the 80s happened. Greater competition between capitalists, bigger capitalists, and bigger capital requirement meant that capital was concentrated in fewer and fewer hands. The trend was the simplification of rural society into two classes. The consensus was that these two classes were opposed, but opinion varied as to how basic this opposition was and how best it could be overcome.

Trade Unions were expressions of this "organized antagonism between employer and employee"130 and as such were in an ambivalent relationship to the system. The very existence of unions testified to employees' belief in the doctrine of social harmony but their actions placed them outside of it. They were blamed for attempting to destroy the "proper" relationship between master and man; one which employers had struggled to maintain for forty years. Employers clung to the notion of economic orthodoxy. They insisted that the free flow of the labour market regulated a fair wage for labour and that the introduction of the cash nexus131 had destroyed the warm relationship between employer and employee. Unions were naturally the focal points of conflict in a society which exalted the doctrine of social harmony. Their very pragmatism meant that there would not be a transformation of the social order, but their very existence embodied the vision of a somewhat different society.132 As E.P. Thompson argued, whilst trade unionism was an indicator of working class strength, it also indicated how closely it was tied to the system and to the status quo:

each advance . . . involved the working class far more deeply in the status quo. As they improved their position . . . they became more reluctant to engage in quixotic outbreaks which might jeopardize gains . . . Even the indices of working class strength — the financial reserves of trade unionism and co-operatives — were secure only within the custodianship of capitalist stability.133

The economic crisis in Queensland in the late 70s "swept working class organization into oblivion".134 Its prosperity depended upon general economic prosperity. Piecemeal reforms wrung from the system tied unionism more tightly to the system.

Whilst Marx had correctly forecast the strains and stresses which capital would undergo in the 1880s, he had been much less accurate in his predictions about the alienation of the impoverished rural proletariat. There was an attempt to maintain a reserve army of the unemployed which employers could use to depress wages and weaken the bargaining position of their employees. Indeed they pressed hard for the importation of Asian indents to depress further
the labour market and divide it racially. What Marx did not see, however, was that in Queensland labour, although aware of its unequal position, was not so “impoverished” that it could not organize to fight for a fairer distribution of wealth. Marx had underestimated the levelling effect of the immigrating experience and the high expectation and improved material condition of the colonial labourer. Economic prosperity, which had taken the edge off working class discontent, had also created conditions for the growth of trade unionism and would eventually bring into being more direct forms of class confrontation. Unionism was as much a reflection of the strength of labour as it was an indication of its weakness. The apparent eagerness of employers to embrace unionism was both a reflection of the extent to which colonial society had internalized views of labour’s high status and a fear of its strength. The legalization of trade unions was a means of monitoring the comparative strengths of labour and capital and, by harnessing labour to the system, of exercising some control over it. The fear of men like Samuel Griffith was that one would become more powerful than the other. The Jondaryan “Affair” of May 1890 was a test case for their relative strengths.
The Jondaryan "Affair"

There are anxious watching faces
'mongst the workers of the South.
There's hope in many bosoms,
    There's a prayer in many a mouth.
We are waiting for the issues as the
    moments bring them forth,
And we send a hearty greeting to our
    Brothers in the North.

E.J. Brady (Worker, May 1890)

The Jondaryan “Affair” of May 1890, whilst basically about the issue of “freedom of contract” versus “closed shop”\(^1\) was “the climax of a host of past skirmishes”\(^2\) between Jondaryan’s management and its shearers and between pastoral capital and pastoral labour.

Labour’s response to “tyrannical agreements”, “Calcutta-like habitation”\(^3\) and political impotence had been diffused by the stratified nature of the workforce, a comparatively high standard of living and what Raymond Williams has referred to as the “ideology of improvement”\(^4\). Also, the greater capital demands of growing wool in the 1880s made it increasingly difficult for labour to identify the “enemy”. By the late 80s, however, labour became increasingly aware of its own particular “class” interests, the inability of others adequately to represent those interests and its own inability to wring concessions from capital. Trade unions were the institutional expression of this awareness. The Queensland Shearers’ Union believed that the working man had a right to a much greater share of the fruits of his labour. Pastoralists maintained that in the tougher economic times of the late 80s the industry could not afford to offer its employees higher wages and better conditions. It was this belief in the right of every man to earn a comfortable wage, and the fact that “the sheep kings, with very few exceptions, treated men as serfs”\(^5\), which led to the formation of organized labour in the 80s.
Trade unions, the expressions of "organized antagonism between employer and employee", became the focal points of conflict in a society which exalted the doctrine of social harmony. Economic prosperity, as well as taking the edge off working class discontent, had also created the conditions for the growth of unionism. Unionists began to demand the right to determine not only the conditions under which they worked but with whom they worked. The Queensland Shearers' Union insisted that no coloured labour be employed and insisted also on the "union labour only" principle. Jondaryan's management insisted on its right to employ whomever it wished be it union or non-union labour.

By 1888 the organization of bush labour, which had begun on the Barcoo in 1886, had spread to the Darling Downs, where three hundred men were enlisted. Forty-three of the fifty-two stands in the Jondaryan shed were occupied by union men. It was generally recognized, however, that union penetration on the Downs had not been as great as in the west. The explanation lay in the different nature of the shearing population and the consciousness of employers.

Mobility was a factor which distinguished the Downs shearers from his Western counterpart and one which effected consciousness. According to one labour leader, mobility itself was radicalizing: "It would make the Archbishop of Canterbury himself a bit of a 'Radical' to tramp twenty or thirty miles a day with all his worldly possessions rolled up on his back, ready to work and not knowing where to find occupation." There were "hundreds of men in the West" who were "unmarried" and had "no homes and no associations". It was this womanless, propertyless and voteless state which bound these fellows together. Their mobility enhanced this solidarity. Together for long periods in the bigger sheds and moving about from shed to shed, these men had the time to reason out their differences and come to fixed conclusions and understandings. The extension westward in the 80s of three main lines of railway gave shearers much greater mobility and meant that they could work for many more months of the year in a nomadic cycle. They could start, for example, in the early sheds like Jondaryan and Gowrie on the Downs and then move on to the later ones on the Warrego and Barcoo. As the "iron horse" became more and more "tethered to the West" and shearers' mobility increased, so, too, did their "professionalism". For this "inert mass of casual labour", however, the struggle for survival was "getting yearly and yearly more severe" and the conditions under which they had to work
Ironically the western shearer’s very mobility which tied him to his equally “uncivilized” mate was the cause of his weakness vis-a-vis his employer. As Adams remarked, a strike was “often broken by the penniless Anglo-Australian shearer, the hero of the ‘knocked-down’ cheque” who at times was compelled by absolute want to accept “whatever terms he could get”. This was why unionism was so important to these men. It afforded them the protection they needed and the critically important strike pay and unemployment benefit.

Shearers on the Downs in the 1870s and 80s were a much more “responsible” and “civilized” class than the Downs shearers of the 50s and 60s. The member for Western Downs remarked that “instead of knocking down their cheques in public houses, they now took their money home and spent it on their families”. The selector, whom the squatter sought to keep out in the 60s, became his most reliable labour source in the 70s. In the 60s squatters had had to employ men a month before the commencement of shearing to secure their services. In the 70s and 80s the selector/shearer, dependent on working for the squatter to pay his debt to the storekeeper, would come back to shear year after year. The days of the old-type bushman shearer were gone. The type who mortgaged his future earnings to the station storekeeper, departed uproariously to the nearest township and, at his favourite pub, “knocked down” the squattorial cheque was a phenomenon of the past. Closer settlement on the Downs had not only resulted in new neighbours for the squatter but had put an end to his dependence on outside labour. Many of the selectors around Dalby depastured sheep and supplemented their incomes by shearing or fencing for neighbouring stations. The squatter realized that the selector “whom he considered an intruder, a thief to be hunted out at any cost”, was “one of the best friends he ever had”. The Downs selector/shearer found himself in an ambivalent position. Denial of access to the land had been one of his major grievances against his employer and this grievance had been partially satisfied. As in the Riverina, the gap between master and servant in this respect “had to some extent been filled”, whereas in the western areas this gap was growing larger with the greater capital demands of land use. The Downs selector/shearer’s state of transition from employee to employer to some extent isolated him from the new ideas of unionism. He saw his long term interests as better served by trying to maintain good relations with pastoralists. Shearing was his part-time work, not his life. He had a home, a family and a more heightened sense of
himself as an individual. Some had no need of the Queensland Shearers' Union. For others, unionism could claim only their limited involvement. There were those amongst the Downs selector/shearer group, however, for whom the Union provided the opportunity of avenging "old scores." They joined the Union. Ninety per cent of those shearers who withdrew their labour at Jondaryan and Jimbour in September 1889 were in fact "respectable selectors and their sons."  

By the 1889 season most western sheds were shearing "union", although some employers were still "holding out" in their opposition. In 1889 at Buranda on the Warrego, Barcoo shearers tried to shear to Queensland Shearers' Union rules but the owner would only shear to Amalgamated Shearers' Union rules. Two shearers clashed, the police were called in and three Queensland Shearers' Union men were arrested. "We went back to the Barcoo," wrote Julian Stuart, "with our minds made up to alter things next season." The tactic being used by many employers was that of playing off one union against the other.  

The Amalgamated Shearers' Union had been formed at Creswick in Victoria by David Temple for the same reason as the Queensland Shearers' Union had been formed — to fight an attempted reduction in wages by pastoral employers. New South Wales graziers attempted to reduce the shearing rate from 17s.6d. to 15s. per 100 in 1886. The Amalgamated Shearers' Union of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Tasmania and New Zealand insisted that the rate be 3s. a score with rations, and 4s. a score without, and that the men be paid either in cash or cheque on the local bank with the discount allowed. It was the opinion of the Shearers Record that the graziers preferred the man who drank to the steady man who had "his cheque and (was) independent", for as long as a man drank in town he would come back "dead broke, fit to be made a tool of for another period". The Union agreed that a man should be fined for bad shearing or for breach of an agreement but maintained that men who were discharged should be paid in full up to the time of their dismissal. Any member forced to leave work as a result of circumstances beyond his control should be similarly paid, a doctor's certificate being sufficient proof of the reason for his absence. Amongst its other rules the Union insisted that, weather permitting, a shearer be kept fully supplied with sheep and that no shearer be compelled to shear wet sheep. Also a shearer should not work longer than a forty-eight hour week, should be allowed free agistment for two horses, should not be charged more for rations
than their cost price plus 5 per cent for carriage, and should be pro-
vided with “proper accommodation, firewood, cooking utensils and
good water free of charge”.

As such, the rules of the Amalgamated Shearers’ Union and the
Queensland Shearers’ Union were very similar. The most outstand-
ing difference between the two was the Queensland Shearers’
Union’s insistence on the “union labour” only principle. It was this
difference and a “serious dispute” between the two Unions con-
cerning border jurisdiction which employers used to try and divide
the labour movement. The tactic of playing off one union against the
other was the tactic being used by many employers. The rule of the
Amalgamated Shearers’ Union which insisted on union rates and
conditions but not the “union labour only” principle better suited
employers. The Amalgamated Shearers’ Union wanted to amal-
gamate with the Queensland Shearers’ Union but retain its
independence with respect to this matter. This caused considerable
friction between the two unions. William Spence emphasized the
separateness of the two unions when he appeared before the Select
Committee on Strikes in 1891. The Queensland Shearers’ Union,
he said, was a “separate body” whose agreement differed from
that of the Amalgamated Shearers’ Union. The closed shop princi-
ple was a big issue with the QSU whereas the ASU only insisted that
shearing be done according to union rules. The QSU would not
work with non-union labour.

In late 1889 the QSU made a firm stand against the employment
of Chinese rouseabouts and the Queensland Pastoral Employers’
Association sent a telegram to an ASU Conference to the effect that
it would be happy to shear under ASU rules in preference to QSU
rules. By the 1889 season, however, most western sheds had con-
ceded to the demands of the QSU and were shearing “union”. The
“real tug of war” was being carried on on the Downs.

Darling Downs “pure merinos” refused to give up their master
status without a fight. Unionism and the insistence on the “union
labour only” principle was too great a threat to their authority. In the
past their response to what they had seen as employee indolence
and independence had been fines, deductions, dismissal, refusal to
pay and threats with the rigours of the Masters and Servants Act.
This internal authority had been propped up fairly adequately by the
political and legal system. Employers had also sought to maintain a
more “tractable” labour source — one which would depress wages,
racially divide the group and, by introducing unskilled labour at the
bottom of the socioeconomic pyramid, allow indigenous white
labourers to move up the ladder, thereby creating the feeling of upward social mobility. Employers also met together informally to fix the price of shearing to prevent shearers riding from station to station, holding out for a higher price. The Northern Downs District Agricultural and Pastoral Association had been formed to rescue the squatting interest from the “stigma of dis-union”. Regional jealousies, however, prevented the formation of any other formal employer organization until 1889.

Although more economically vulnerable and not as socially entrenched as their British counterparts, Downs squatters nevertheless enjoyed social and political security in the 1860s and 70s. Their position, however, was increasingly challenged in the 80s. They were forced to share political power, their economic position became less secure, land legislation posed a threat, and the ideas introduced by large numbers of British immigrants and the increasing organization of labour also challenged their “aristocratic” position. Squatters felt an increasing need to defend their position as it became less influential. As Jondaryan township’s urban hierarchy of shopkeepers, teachers, clerks and merchants waxed, the influence of Charles Williams and Jondaryan Station on the township waned. Although still economically and politically vital to the township’s survival, the station and its manager had assumed less importance. The growth of the mining, shipping and sugar industries in Queensland in the 80s made the colony less dependent on the pastoral industry and its executors, the squatters. The “middle man”, because his prosperity was tied to closer settlement, joined the “small man” in his cry for an end to land monopoly. This shift in power away from the squatter was only very gradual, however. The number of squatter parliamentary representatives on the Downs between 1873 and 1893 was much the same as it had been prior to the 70s. The crucial difference was that now they were not the only representatives.

On 3 August 1888 the Queensland Shearers’ Union was formed at Blackall. Two months later the Queensland Employers’ Association was formed in Brisbane “to conserve the interests of capitalists engaged in squatting and pastoral pursuits and any other inland industries”. Whilst the unionization of pastoral employees can be seen as a response to their social and material position, as well as to the extent to which they felt powerless to influence the course of their own lives, the formation of this Association was a defensive move to try and counter the growing strength of unionized labour. It was this shift in power away from themselves that squatters feared, and the growth of unionism symbolized this shift.
Prior to the 1886 Trade Union Act any combination of workers which interfered with "the perfect freedom of trade" was unlawful and not entitled to "property or land protection under the law". Most employers were happy with the status quo; they maintained that the free flow of the labour market regulated a fair wage for labour. It was a Parliamentary Committee of the Trades and Labour Council which was responsible for having the Employers Liability Act and the Trade Union Act passed. Employer opposition to the growth of unionism took the form of the use of non-union labour and, if necessary, the use of force to uphold their right to employ whomever they wished — be they unionist or non-unionist.

Downs squatters not only used the tactic of playing off one union against the other but also tried to "play off" Downs shearers against western shearers. Pastoralists met in Toowoomba determined to cut the price of shearing. They reasoned that by shearing later than in the west they could offer Downs shearers a lower shearing rate and, if they refused to sign on at that rate, tell them that the west was finished and shearers "were coming in". Mr Daniels, member for Cambooya, claimed that there were some regular Downs shearers who were "out of work all season" in the mid 80s. Others, threatened with a market flooded by westerners, were restricted to shearing cancered or wet sheep and were fined for being late. The rate offered at Jondaryan in 1888 was 3s. per score compared with 3s.6d. a score between the years 1883 and 1886. By November 1889 however, shearers were receiving up to 4s. a score. More important than this gross wage, however, was the net income of shearers at Jondaryan over these years. A shearer's net income was his wage plus any gratuity, less any expenses he might have incurred such as his store account, the cost of extra beef, the cook's wages and the cost of various subscriptions. Shearer I. Wells' net income over the period 1884-87 fell. In 1884 his "take-home" pay was £17.18s.5d. and in 1887 it was £16.12s. But the real point at issue between Jondaryan's shearers and its management, as with other Downs stations, was not economic. Squatters like Gore were, in fact, presenting shearers with fair agreements and, in some cases, offering higher than the union rate. The real cause of antagonism on the Downs was not employer attempts to reduce wages or "tyrannical agreements" but "control".

Downs squatters were determined to retain control in their own sheds. The object of the Employers' Association was that members should remain masters in their own sheds: "We agreed to shear under our own rules." The Association claimed that its pastoralists
would employ unionist and non-unionist alike, but the Queensland Shearers' Union maintained that employers had their own "reference" system which included boycotting those men who organized or showed too much "independence".\textsuperscript{45} Downs squatters insisted on their right to employ non-union men. In response shearers refused to "sign on" at Jondaryan, Rosalie, Jimbour, Warra and Bon Accord in early September 1889.

According to the \textit{Toowoomba Chronicle} "all practical shearers on the Downs were on strike in September 1889, "calmly waiting the issue".\textsuperscript{46} "Old" as well as young shearers "went out", including 90 per cent of the selector/shearer group. Jondaryan and Rosalie shearers formed a general camp near the Jondaryan township and striking shearers from Jimbour, Warra and Bon Accord camped at Jimbour. Within a week, however, many sheds were full and Jondaryan and Jimbour were almost full. The Union was defeated and it was a victory to the squatter.

The strike had begun with sheds like Jondaryan and Jimbour having only a handful of shearers to clip each day. "At this rate," commented the \textit{Toowoomba Chronicle}, "the season will end about the Greek calends."\textsuperscript{47} The day after the union men refused to sign the station agreement at Jondaryan, Charles Williams, the manager, started shearing with fifteen\textsuperscript{48} shearers and thirteen learners. Within a week, however, there were forty on the board and shearing was progressing satisfactorily on the Downs.\textsuperscript{49} Squatters had little difficulty in finding men willing to sign their station agreements. At Glengallan, Canning Downs, Bon Accord, Logie Plains, Kurrowah and East Talgai the sheds were full and at Yandilla, Jimbour, Jondaryan, Cecil Plains and Rosalie Plains management was managing to get the clip off.\textsuperscript{50}

The squatters' reaction to the 1889 strike was to refuse to sell rations to unionists and to order them off their stations.\textsuperscript{51} They made no attempt to meet with the striking men and had, it was claimed, police "armed to the teeth"\textsuperscript{52} to keep order in the camps. The shearers' response to their defeat was that if the squatters were successful in getting their wool "off", they would "meet the same thing next year".\textsuperscript{53} Downs squatters did indeed "meet the same thing" the following year. This time they were forced to the conference table. The issue was the same but the outcome different, and the reason — federated labour.

In the words of Albert Hinchcliffe, foundation member of the Queensland Typographical Association, Manager of the \textit{Worker} and Secretary of the Trades and Labour Council, the "living object
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The “lesson”54 of the Printers’ Strike that had occurred five months before the Downs shearers’ strike was “the necessity for a new system of organization”.55 That “new system of organization” was the Australian Labour Federation, formed by carpenters and builders, of which Hinchcliffe was President. The Printers’ Strike of April 1889 had been a humiliating defeat for the Queensland Typographical Association and the Trades and Labour Council. Employers had had no trouble in finding non-union labour and the Association had dissipated its strength in unemployment benefits and strike pay.56 The objectives of the Australian Labour Federation were to amalgamate the strengths of organized unions, to organize unions where they did not exist, to protect members against black-listing, to win the “closed shop” issue and to substitute fair industrial arbitration for strikes and lockouts:57

The strike is barbaric, brutal, pain-making entered into with heavy hearts by thinking men and endured because there has hitherto been no other way out. There are strikes all over the country like Chinese firecrackers necessary, indeed, as things are but not necessary if through federation we worked along scientific and massive lines.58

The London Dockers’ Strike was the first major test for the Australian Labour Federation and as such was vitally important to the success of the Jondaryan strike of May 1890.

The London Strike and the “extraordinary unlimited sympathy”59 which the dockers’ plight evoked in the colonies opened a new chapter in the relationship between labour and capital. Whereas prior to the strike it was thought to be subversive and dangerous for anyone in authority to favour the combination of working men, colonial popular support, and in particular employer support of the London dockers, was seen as an endorsement of the “great principle of combination of workers, of trade unionism”.60 Strikers who had been previously regarded as “dangerous anarchists” were now “heroic philanthropists”.61 A wave of optimism and confidence broke over the union movement. It seemed that the differences between labour and capital were in fact reconcilable and could be overcome by the application of reason. Headlines such as “Labour’s Struggles”, “What Workmen Are Doing” and “Trouble in all Parts of The World”62 were indicative of labour’s euphoria at the end of 1889. The federation of labour was booming all along the seaboard. There was a newly formed General Labourers’ Union and the Premier had promised to stay immigration.63 E. O’Sullivan, a New South Wales parliamentarian, in comparing the positions of labour in Australia and Great Britain, came to the conclusion that in no
other country except Australia was “labour so well organized, its position and demands so much respected”. Hinchcliffe attended meetings of the Carriers’, General Labourers’ and the Shearers’ Unions to discuss federation and in December 1889 the three thousand members of the Queensland Labourers’ Union joined the ALF to try to resist a reduction in wages by employers. A month later Hinchcliffe visited the Central and Western districts and created a central branch of the ALF of 6,300 shearers, rouseabouts and carriers. It was the unionization of rouseabouts which employers seemed particularly to fear.

By the end of 1889 there were four employer unions and a sudden increase in their capital. There had been no attempt to form a Labourers’ Union on the Darling Downs but pastoralists feared that this was not too far away. Federated labour, “pretty well organized” in the west and central district, was “still pretty weak” on the Darling Downs. On 22 February 1890 the Evening Observer carried a report that the Jimbour shed had accepted “under persuasion” the rules of the Shearers’ Union. Jondaryan’s proprietors, however, were amongst those who still refused to shear “union”. Glengallan and Ramsay’s Eton Vale were other “strongholds of blackleg labour”. Charles Williams of Jondaryan agreed to pay union rates but would not employ union men. In the manager’s words, it was “not a question of wages, but rather one of union”.

“Jondaryan was an early shed”, wrote shearer Stuart, and “we tried to get the Queensland Shearers’ Union rate but could not, and the manager tried to play off one union against the other”. Mr C. Clarke, bush labour organizer, registered the Union’s frustration with the management of Jondaryan: “all through last year this shed waged inexorable war against union labour, in fact they won’t give a man work of any sort upon the Station if he belongs to a society”. Forty-three union shearers were employed in the Jondaryan shed in 1888 — none there in 1889. Jondaryan’s manager employed non-union shearers, insisted upon his right to do so, and, as far as the Union was concerned, typified the Darling Downs squatters’ long displayed antagonism to unionism. The Queensland Shearers’ Union banned shearing at Jondaryan in May 1890. The Union emphasized that it recognized that wool from Eton Vale, Glengallan and Felton was just as much a product of non-union labour as was wool from Jondaryan but that Jondaryan, in the heart of “pure merino” country, and one of the largest stations on the Downs, was a test case for non-union wool. “This is the answer of Queensland labour to the challenge of the pure merinos of the
Darling Downs.'" The ALF in fact believed that "the Darling Downs squatters decided to make a test case of non-union shearsers, and selected Jondaryan station, adjoining a railway and, more easily handled, as the battle-ground". Certainly Kent and Wienholt, the Marshalls and the Slades, the Hodgsons, the Ramsays and the Tysons were in a much stronger economic position than their western counterparts to mount such a challenge. Also these Downs men always seemed to have access to "free" labour, Downs unionists being the worst organized. In spite of their comparative strength here, however, of particular concern to employers were moves to form a rouseabouts' union on the Downs, and the capitulation of both Jimbour and James Tyson to union demands. The QSU believed that Jondaryan's management, in its opposition to union demands, was being backed "financially and otherwise" by the Squatters' Association.

The Queensland Shearers' Union was beaten at Jondaryan. According to Stuart the manager "got a lot of riffraff from Brisbane who 'tommy-hawked' the wool off somehow". Even without this imported help, however, non-union Downs shearers and resident Jondaryan employees would have had no trouble in getting the wool "off". Unlike the year before, however, this was not the end of the dispute because it was at this point that the new principle of federated labour, co-ordinated by Hinchcliffe of the ALF, was put into effect. Local teamsters refused to haul the "black" Jondaryan wool to the railway. After some delay, however, the station teams got it there. Then, "beaten by the squatters on the Darling Downs, unionism fell back onto the waterside". Acting upon the principle that an "attack upon one union is an attack upon all unions", Brisbane city carters refused to handle the wool and when it finally reached the wharf, the waterside workers said it would "stay there till the day of judgement and a day or two after, if the owners of Jondaryan did not give an undertaking to grant QSU rates and conditions "henceforth and evermore".

The ALF described the Jondaryan strike as "the industrial crisis upon which the future of the labour organization in Queensland and Australia so vitally depends". It appealed to unorganized workers to break down old narrow trades unionism and fight "the battle of labour at large". The Melbourne Trades Hall Council, the New Zealand Seamens' Union, the Coal Lumpers' Union of Newcastle, the Adelaide and Hobart Trades and Labour Councils and the Port Adelaide Working Mens' Association responded to the call. The Toowoomba Chronicle warned that the dispute threatened to
“develop into the most injurious conflict between capital and labour” that had “ever disturbed the industrial prosperity of Australia”. It added that a challenge by labour “so large, so confident and so unflinching in its terms” had “never before been put forward in Australia”.

Employers sought to divide the labour movement once again by playing off one union against the other. The Queensland Pastoral Employers’ Association invited the ASU to form a branch at Charleville and Barcaldine. If such a branch were formed, it said, the “representatives of six million sheep” guaranteed their support and “to shear under your rules”.

Squatters, shippers and shearers met in the office of the BI & QA Company in Mary Street, Brisbane, on 13 May to try and settle the dispute. The Darling Downs and Western Land Company was represented by Bell and Hannington, the Mercantile and Agency Company by Donkin, the Union Mortgage and Agency Company by Walsh, B.D. Morehead and Company by Barnes, the New Zealand Loan and Mercantile Company by McDonald and the Mercantile Bank of Sydney by Hudson. The shipping company whose cargo the wharf labourers had refused to load onto the “Jumna” was represented by Mr Munroe. Charles Seymour was there on behalf of the Federated Seamen’s Union, Mabbott for the Brisbane Wharf Labourers’ and Messrs Clarke and Taylor for the QSU. Spence, President of the ASU, was invited to participate in the conference to reinforce the idea of the unity of labour. The two unions had decided to sink their jealousies during the dispute. Of the ASU the Worker said, “she does not care whether Queensland leads or not so long as Australia moves”. Spence pledged five thousand men to patrol the Queensland border to prevent “free labour” being brought from the southern colonies. The Eidsvold Labourers’ Organization, awaiting the outcome of the meeting, maintained it could supply, if required, £1,000 and 360 fully equipped horsemen at two hours notice. The Printers’ Union reacted excitedly to what it described as “such a rallying of unionists”. “Such a rallying”, it said, “in defence of their fundamental principle (had) not taken place before, and the result (had) been a capital demonstration of what (could) be accomplished by a complete confederation of all labour”.

Settlement of the dispute was delayed until such time as the manager of Jondaryan, Charles Williams, could meet with members of the Darling Downs Pastoralists’ Association, because, as he explained, although his shed had been acting individually as far as the
management of his shed was concerned, "they had been acting collectively as far as employing non-union labour was concerned". The Darling Downs Sheepowners' Association, of which Williams was a member, had met in Toowoomba the year before and had fixed the price of shearing at 20s. per 100 and agreed to shear under station rules only: "That this meeting agrees to employ union shearers under station agreements, with free action as to all other labour." Mabbott of the Wharf Labourers' Union had been informed that the reason for Jondaryan's opposition to shearing "union" was an attempt to form a rouseabouts' union there. Mr Lumley Hill of Burns Philp & Company maintained that Jondaryan's manager and other squatters objected to union attempts to set wages for all station hands. But despite union insistence to the contrary, Williams maintained that Jondaryan had not been selected as a test case by pastoralists, was not supported financially by other members and, in fact, he could not understand why his station had been singled out when others were also refusing to shear "union". Spence conceded that Jondaryan was in fact just "one of a number of employers who refused to employ union men, and who sought to destroy the union in every way in their power".

Twenty-four members of the Darling Downs Pastoralists' Association met in the dining room of the Club Hotel in Toowoomba on 15 May and elected three representatives to attend the second Brisbane meeting to try to resolve the dispute. At this conference employers finally conceded the demands of the ALF until such time as another conference could be arranged between the Sheep Owners' Association of the Darling Downs and the QSU. The bargain struck by the shippers, squatters and labour delegates was that the pastoralists would "employ only Union shearers provided satisfactory agreement and rules can be arranged between the Sheepowners' Association of the Darling Downs and the QSU". The 190 Jondaryan bales held up in Brisbane were loaded onto the steamer Barcoo bound for Cooktown. From here they were transferred to the Jumna which set sail for London. The victory "at" Jondaryan was hailed as a "great trades union victory" and as the "most important step yet taken in Australasia". It was the first occasion upon which such diverse unions had demonstrated their allegiance to the federation principle. As such it was something of a personal victory for Albert Hinchcliffe. He managed to apply maximum pressure to employers short of a general call-out. He ensured that employers were not only being "pressed" by the labour movement but by the mercantile com-
munity as well. He recognized that the weakness of employers lay not with the old Queensland squatters who had “been there from the very first” but with the mercantile community who would “feel the total loss of a year’s clip”. One squatting agent maintained that men like Kent and Wienholt, James Tyson, Hodgson and Ramsay and Marshall and Slade were financially capable of “laying up their wool” of even providing their own ships, and were “not at all afraid of their position”. It was the mercantile community that was afraid and putting pressure on the pastoralists for an early end to the dispute. Hinchcliffe was able to use this fear to labour’s advantage. He was also able to gain the support of the London dockers and, most importantly, the ASU. Spence’s presence at the Brisbane negotiations effectively put a stop to pastoralists being able to play off one union against the other and healed the rift between the two unions. The Worker printed an apology for its “misrepresentations” of the ASU and for disturbing the harmony between the two unions “by injudicious statements”.

But perhaps most importantly of all, Hinchcliffe throughout the “Affair” retained control of the various unions. Referring to the dispute years later Hinchcliffe made the point that it was “the only industrial dispute of which the ALF had had full control”. This control and federated labour’s success, however, were to be very short-lived.

Prior to the Jondaryan “Affair” there were only two small employer organizations in existence, one on the Darling Downs and one at Barcaldine. After the Jondaryan “non-union wool difficulty” the Queensland Employers’ Union was just one of the employer organizations formed to oppose the aggressiveness of new unionism. The “universal organization of labour demands, in the public interest”, wrote the Editor of the Darling Downs Gazette, “the universal organization of capital. The world is divided into these two powers and neither must be allowed to get the complete upper hand”. He added: “The world has got along badly enough all this time that Capital has been top dog, but the chances are that it will fare worse when labour assumes that enviable position”. In the social world as in the political, a balance of power was thought to be “essential to the preservation of harmony”. Jondaryan was the “trumpet call to action” for employers. By the end of 1890 employer organizations included the Brisbane Employers’ Association, the Queensland Employers’ Association, the Federated Employers’ Union of Queensland and the Pastoral Employers’
Union of the Darling Downs. In addition there were Employer Unions of the Maranoa, the Townsville and the Maryborough Districts, and the Toowoomba Employers' Association. The decision to form an Association "embracing the whole of the stockowners and employers of labour in Queensland" had been made at the Downs pastoralists' meeting to try to settle what became known as the "famous Jondaryan bales."

With an over-inflated sense of what labour could now do, and blind to organized capital's determination that "such a tyranny may succeed for a time, but only for a very brief time", Spence was convinced that a blockade of non-union wool would succeed in New South Wales and set about to repeat the Jondaryan campaign. "To the southward and eastward," he said, "are two hundred thousand men ready to federate, men who feel as we do, and think as we do and act as we do, men who stood by us to fight the Jondaryan wool." The ASU had begun discussions about "non-union" wool in 1888 but had taken no action on the issue because five sixths of the sheds had been unionized and employers had conceded the Union's four principal demands. By 1890, however, pastoralists in New South Wales and Victoria had still not accepted the "closed shop" principle, and the Jondaryan "Affair" focussed attention on this discontent. Spence claimed that union men were being "boycotted at every opportunity" and that non-union men were being "landed free of charge at the squatters' door", armed with rifles and revolvers and paid union rates. Similar organized efforts by employers "to crush unionism" had led to a "decided stand" in the north and it was this "step taken in Queensland, and which had proved successful there" that the ASU wished to see "followed up throughout every district and colony where it becomes necessary". There was, according to the ASU, "no question of wages, hours, or conditions of working. It is a straight-out fight for existence as an organization".

The maritime strike of August 1890 indirectly arose out of the Jondaryan "Affair" and was about the "fundamental principle of trade unionism". Melbourne employers refused to negotiate with maritime officers about a wage claim whilst the latter were affiliated with the Melbourne Trades and Labour Council. The ALF supported the strike by the officers because of its commitment to the "closed shop" principle and because of its indebtedness to the ASU and other southern associations for their support during the Jondaryan "non-union wool difficulty". In its optimism following Jondaryan, labour thought it could "draw a cordon of unionism around
In the maritime strike of August to October 1890, however, labour was soundly beaten by organized capital. The defeat, the Worker claimed, was in “retaliation for the Jondaryan affair”, and because “Capital has never forgiven its organizing employees”. The Mackay Standard and the Brisbane Courier both recognized that the tyranny of labour would succeed “for a time but only a very short time”. One of the leaders of the London dockers’ strike described labour’s defeat in the maritime strike as “inevitable” because it did not have “grass roots” support and was therefore easily broken by “scab” labour.

Although Queensland pastoral employees were only called out for a matter of days in the dispute, the maritime strike marked a departure from labour’s previously held belief in an identity of interest between capital and labour. By resolving itself “into a trial of strength between capital and labour, regardless of all other issues”, the maritime strike had demonstrated that capital, far from allowing itself to be “squeezed” any more, was attempting to take away from labour the right to combine. “For the first time in the history of colonial unionism,” noted the Australian Typographical Journal, “the line between these opposing interests was clearly drawn.” Samuel Griffith agreed: “at present capital or employers are practically one army, and those who work for them are practically another army” and, according to the Worker, the blame for this situation rested firmly on the shoulders of capital: “If Capitalism had done no wrong, if it had sought to secure fair conditions of labour and to guard against the poverty that follows unemployment, we should have had no such revolt against it as that which to-day stirs the Caucasian world to its centre.” The mood had changed, the language had changed and Queensland labour prepared to resist the “wild effort being put forth by capital to force labourers once more into the servitude from which unionism alone redeems it”.

On 8 December 1890 the annual meeting of the QSU condemned the Pittsworth Agreement, drawn up at Pittsworth after the Jondaryan “Affair” as a “departure from the principles of unionism”. The Union claimed that the agreement should have been submitted to the Blackall executive before being accepted. Even the Darling Downs executive protested against the terms of the agreement, saying that the shearers’ delegates to the conference had not been duly authorized to accept its terms on behalf of the Union. It was decided, however, that the agreement having been made, should remain in force for a year, but only on the Darling Downs and that it should only be “applicable to the Darling Downs Pastoralists’
The squatters, however, had decided to repudiate the Pittsworth Agreement and at the beginning of the 1891 season refused to shear under union rules. In January 1891 shearsers at Logan Downs refused to shear under any agreement other than that of the QSU. Central Queensland unionists struck and formed camps outside the sheds. Downs selector/shearers who had been so active in the 1889 dispute and the Jondaryan “Affair” of May 1890, decided at a meeting in Toowoomba on 23 March 1891 that they would “be no party to any such action as was being taken out west”.

This decision and the QSU’s repudiation of the Pittsworth Agreement reflected the differences between Downs selector/shearers and their western counterparts. Mr Reid, member for Toowong, commented that “the men on the Downs (had) never been too much in touch with the men in the West, and the men out West objected very strongly to some of the clauses of that Agreement”.

The Darling Downs Gazette claimed that the Agreement had only been allowed to remain in force for a year on the hint of the Downs shearers seceding and forming an independent union if they were “too much thwarted and bossed by the Blackallites”. Downs shearers refused to be drawn into another strike even though pastoralists had gone “back from the Agreement”. In making a stand the year before, it seems, Downs shearers felt they had “gone far enough”. Their bargaining power was perhaps compromised by their dependence on the squatter for work and on the storekeeper for credit. The Darling Downs selector/shearer’s consciousness was fashioned by the same issues as his western counterpart but, being tied to the land, tied to his family and tied to the station structure, he was less free to bargain than the western shearer. And so, even though the squatter refused to shear under the Pittsworth Agreement, the rural proprietor, the selector/shearer, would not be drawn into the 1891 strike.

At every shed on the Downs pastoralists “went back from (the Pittsworth) Agreement”. Colin McIntyre, shearsers’ delegate, went to every shed but the squatters rejected it. As the Week astutely commented, the Pittsworth Agreement had “settled nothing beyond agreeing to refer the matter in dispute to another conference”, and the few months since the Jondaryan crisis had given employers an opportunity to improve their organized strength relative to labour. The divisive issue was still the same — unionists believed that no man should be allowed to work unless he belonged to “their organization” and pastoralists believed that every man should “be free to work without molestation”, whether he
belonged to a trade union or not. There was still considerable debate about whether the pastoral industry could afford to pay its employees higher wages, Spence arguing that squatters had never been “better off” and squatters listing their financial burdens as taxes, drought, rabbits, falling prices and the purchase of land. Pastoralists claimed that they had not attempted to reduce wages but had merely set a limit on what they were prepared to pay. “Not to grant an impossible demand”, they argued, was a very different thing “from making an actual reduction”. Unionists argued that rouseabouts had previously been paid 30s. and there had been a reduction in their wage. But in the 1891 shearer’s strike, as had been the case the year before, the conflict was not about “economics” but about control, the control which squatters feared they were losing in their own sheds.

The growing strength of federated labour was too great a threat to employer authority. The fear was that “control” would be taken from the squatters’ hands and placed in the hands of an “irresponsible radical democracy”. Employers saw new unionism as “aggressive and arbitrary” and themselves, the owners of land, as the “first line for the socialistic attack”. It is called the “working man’s paradise”, wrote a pastoralist in the Review, “and still the pastoralists who offer these terms are threatened with extermination”. Labour, on the other hand, became more and more convinced that it was not the freedom of their men which employers cared for, “but rather the value of (their) labour”. They began to argue that the wealth produced by this labour should be more evenly distributed instead of being “frittered away by the lordly magnates on the Boulevards of Paris, Monte Carlo, (and) London”. They left to their Queensland bailiff “the task of screwing as low as he (could) the workmen who now demand a free and unfettered conference in regard to the conditions under which they shall work”.

Throughout the 1891 strike Downs stations sheared on, having access to their usual supply of “free” labour. The situation in central Queensland was quite different with union shearers forming camps outside the sheds and the government assisting employers by granting railway passes to “free” labourers and sending in the militia to keep the peace. “Here was armed Australia made into armed camps, Nordenfeldts and Gatlings and Ninepounders and melodramatic magistrates reading the riot act to unarmed men.” The Reverend W.E. Hillier described the Jondaryan strike as a “mistake”, the maritime strike as a “blunder” and this strike as “an idiotic suicide”. Labour was soundly defeated and “the decisive
factor” in its defeat, according to Brian Fitzpatrick, was “the participation of governments”. During the strike Hinchcliffe bitterly addressed a telegram to Mcllwraith as the “resident head of the Government and a member of the Pastoralists’ Association”. Squatters were seen to be backed by a government which, instead of acting as a negotiator to bring the two sides together, stepped in to support capital. This came as no surprise to some: “The Pastoralists’ Agreement was a one-sided agreement and the Government of Queensland was backing them up. Why? Because it was part and parcel of the Pastoralists’ Executive. Parliament was composed of land monopolists, sugar planters, pastoralists and members of the Federated Employers.” Spence said there seemed to be “a small ring of capitalists” who appeared “to own the whole country”. He had “met them again and again as pastoralists, as mine owners and as shipowners”. Even the Brisbane press was seen to be an “organ of the Government, of capitalism” and to be fighting against labour’s interests. The publication of the Worker was a response to this. Chief Secretary Morehead’s response to the Worker and the “Jondaryan letter” to his Government was a newspaper postage tax of half a penny.

Labour was much less of a monolith than capital and its position was weakened because of it. Employers were able to pit union against union, unionist against non-unionist and to use government as their ally and final arbiter. It became quite evident during the 1891 strike that associations of workers did not have as much claim upon the government as associations of the rich and powerful. Unionists referred to the government as “the executive committee of the employers” and criticized it for bringing in the gatling guns and nine pounders instead of bringing the two parties together. Morehead, whom Adams described as “as much the born leader of colonial squatters as Lord Salisbury of English landlords”, referred to union leaders as “irresponsible agitators”. Despite protests that the government should not have interfered on behalf of any one section engaged in a purely industrial struggle, it became obvious that the “banks controlled the Pastoralists’ Union and the Pastoralists’ Union directed the Government”. Unions reacted bitterly to what they saw as employer and government abuse of power. The way in which pastoralists used their new-found strength and the “law and order” issue to crush unionism in 1891 was contrasted with the conciliatory approach which labour claimed to have adopted before and during the Jondaryan “Affair”.

 Strikes were considered to be the “bane of all labour”. The
successes which labour had won in Queensland prior to 1890 gave it no reason to believe that differences between employers and employees could not be overcome by the application of reason and without resort to the strike weapon. Even William Lane, editor of the *Worker*, and a man whom many believed was responsible for embedding the "bacilli of discontent" in workers, was very critical of strikes, saying that they were a needless dissipation of union strength. The Reverend Hillier estimated that the Jondaryan "Affair", the maritime strike and the 1891 dispute cost the union movement enough money to buy thirty stations, four million sheep and fifty gold mines. Instead, he said, it had suffered a drought, two floods and three strikes. "Jondaryan" was cited many times as proof of the movement's preference for the conciliatory approach and evidence of its "restraint".

During the Jondaryan crisis, when, it was generally acknowledged, labour was "all-powerful" and had had its "feet on the necks of the squatter", the ALF had called for a conference, met the pastoralists in a conference and come to a resolution, even offering to pay the shipping company's losses. Even though the Pittsworth Agreement had contravened the rules of the Union, the instruction had been that the Darling Downs Agreement was not to be interfered with for a year. A season later the Union not only met with the same conditions but with a much better organized opponent as well. The restraint which the Union had exercised when it was "all-powerful" and its attempts to prolong social harmony for as long as possible were seen in marked contrast to united capital's determination to crush unionism. Prior to "Jondaryan" and whilst reformist pressures had brought evident returns, labour had continued to believe in the compatibility of itself and capital. In fact, Charles Seymour of the Seamens' Union went as far as to argue that employers were "as much under the lash as the employee". "Capital," he said, "was not the enemy of labour, but its right hand when properly used." There were no basic incompatibilities between capital and labour. It was only when labour was improperly used by capital that trouble arose.

Denying the working man a decent standard of living constituted "improper use". Henry George in his 1879 work *Progress and Poverty* demonstrated how wages were not drawn from capital but from labour. George's idea, that the wealth produced by labour was not fairly divided, was a popular one. The boom of the 1880s and the growth of the pastoral, mining and sugar industries created an "inert mass of casual labour", which, consciously or unconscious-
ly, employers tried to keep dependent and vulnerable. Employees, on the other hand, wanted sufficient income to liberate themselves from their marriageless, homeless state. Theorists like George and many labouring men believed that the solution to their depressed material condition lay in their settlement on the land. What some advocated was a Single Land tax to shift the “fat landholder”. Land nationalization was to be the panacea of the working class’s ills. William Dunne in the Observer identified the workers’ common foes as immigration and land monopoly. At the root cause of the unequal distribution of wealth in Queensland was the wholesale monopoly of the best and most accessible land.

The Darling Downs was extolled as one of the finest agricultural areas in the world. Its timberless alluvial plains, fine climate and access to markets marked it as the most obvious choice for a close, thriving agricultural settlement. The railways, however, ran “for the most part through large freehold pastoral estates, and neither the land nor the railways (were) doing what they (were) capable of”. Two million acres were said to have been tied up among fifteen owners. One corrective to this “wholesale monopoly” was the Land Act of 1884. Another was the Act of 1894. These Acts were passed “mainly with the object of regaining possession of the Darling Downs”. The Public Lands Department was confident that the Agricultural Lands Purchase Act was “the key with which these lands are to be opened”. Applications were invited from “persons willing to dispose of freehold estates” under this Act. Edward Wienholt, proprietor of Jondaryan, offered his estate of Goomburra at 50s. an acre, saying that “a more suitable piece of country cannot be found on the Darling Downs for settling a prosperous farming community”. A report commissioned by the Land Board, however, was of a different opinion. It recommended that only the westerly third of this estate be considered for repurchase as the other two thirds were too far from market and railway facilities — “bad land”, unsuited to the requirements of the farmer. The good third, however, was never repurchased because Wienholt and the Government could not agree on a purchase price. In fact the repurchasing acts were not a success and labour, in spite of its weakened position or perhaps because of it, once more took up the issue of land settlement.

Labour wanted the government to purchase all the land along the railway on the Darling Downs and to impose a land tax. The imposition of a penny in the pound land tax by the government, however, had more to do with a “gaping Treasury chest and a swelling
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deficit” than Samuel Griffith’s conversion to Henry George’s philosophy. The 1891 Crown Lands Act was an attempt to raise more revenue from land alienation. By 1896 27,000 acres had been acquired in the Warwick, Toowoomba and Ipswich districts, but it was not until 1898 that the Land Commissioner was optimistic about the progress being made towards closer settlement, and could report that the area selected had been 300 per cent above that of the previous year”. In September 1899 the Brisbane Courier carried an optimistic report from Oakey on the Downs that the area under wheat, barley and maize production had increased “amazingly”. One month later the same newspaper reported that the farmers on this repurchased land were “humbly beseeching” the government because of their inability to meet their “engagements” due to a severe frost. Settlers now needed a “frost-resistant” as well as a rust-resistant strain of wheat. Labour, still talking about securing land “for the small man”, had yet to learn the lesson that some concession had to be made to the Queensland environment. No amount of repurchasing and land taxing would change the nature of pastoral land. Only the advent of irrigation to water drought-stricken land, rust-resistant strains of wheat and tractors to get over the land quickly could do this.

As well as denying the working man access to the land and denying him a just share of the profits of his labour, “lib-lab” politicians were accused of hoodwinking workers into the “belief that they could be fairly and honestly represented by capital”. Prior to the strikes of the early 90s and believing in the compatibility of itself and capital, the union movement had expressed the view that “co-operation, together with political power, would settle all labour disputes”. Labour’s agitation for direct representation had begun as early as 1860. At each Inter-colonial Trade Union Congress the desirability of having its own representatives in Parliament instead of “land monopolists, sugar planters, pastoralists and members of the Federated Employers” was reaffirmed. In 1888 Christy Clarke, shearsers’ organizer, collected a fund from shearsers to “put forward” a labour candidate. “The days of the non-political trade union” were past according to Charles Seymour, and the “formation of a Labor Party an absolute necessity” for the future. The passing of the Payment of Members Act of 1889 at least ensured that if labouring men were elected they could afford to stay there. This movement for “direct labour representation” and the formation of a Labor Party was given great impetus by the maritime strike and the 1891 shearsers’ strike.
After the maritime strike the call for "direct labour representation" was louder than ever. It had become obvious that despite employers' repeated assertions that they were ever ready to refer industrial disputes to open conference, they did not have the slightest intention of doing so as long as they "could obtain free labour". The working man felt betrayed by politicians who had courted his vote at election time and then abandoned him later. There was now a determination that "those who betrayed them should never get the opportunity of betraying them again". "In no other colony," lamented Bowman of the ALF at the 1891 Ballarat Congress, "are the wage-earners so disenfranchised as in Queensland, and the pure merino capitalist class so directly represented in Parliament and Cabinet." All that was left for labour to do was to "get hold of all this machinery of state" and use it for its "own ends". "It is the intention of the Union," wrote the Shearers' Record, "to organize the Labor Vote in the country for the next General Election in February 1892 with a view of rooting out of our Parliament the monopolists and class representatives." Jondaryan shearers contributed 2s. each towards an election fund in October 1892. T.J. Ryan, secretary of the QLU and nominated by the ALF, stood for Parliament in a Barcoo by-election in 1892. His campaign leaflet read "In Parliament There Are Now Seventeen Squatters and Graziers and not a Single Working Bushman! Vote for Ryan and give Bushmen a chance!" "Sent to jail and irons in 1891", Ryan was "sent to Parliament in 1892". Advocating "arbitration before the gatling gun", he joined Glassey, Hoolan and J.B. Hall as the "first distinct Labor Party in the House".

Griffith's reaction to Labour's political success was to have the Electoral Act amended to insert stricter residential clauses and to reduce Parliamentary salaries from £300 to £150. Instead, therefore, of greater numbers of working men getting onto the electoral rolls, "thousands were removed". According to the Darling Downs Gazette, of the eight hundred names put on the roll after the maritime strike, ten were recorded. Pastoralists who, in March 1891, appealed to country electors to form "a powerful country party" "to stem the Socialistic force", had little to fear from this force in 1892.

The Strikes of 1890-91 had been a disaster for organized labour. The union movement collapsed in late 1891 and the registrations of both employee and employer unions were cancelled in 1892-93. Prior to this labour unions had had a combined membership of 21,145 and capital of £10,338. In response to the successful for-
formation of labour unions there were thirteen employer unions by December 1891. Their membership increased from 239 at the beginning of 1891 to 680 at the end, and their capital from £2,271 to £7,507. The principal increase had been in the Pastoral Employers' Union, whose membership had doubled from forty-eight to eighty-two. It had a capital surplus of £3,369.203

The formation of unions throughout the colonies had coincided with economic recovery. The years 1882-86 had been a time of drought, speculation and high interest rates. 1886-91 saw better seasons and lower rates. Men could only organize when they had the financial resources to do so. In 1890-91 Federated Labour's membership increased by 9,351. Its funds increased only slightly but "considering the extremely heavy drain caused by the strikes", it was "surprising that there was any surplus at all".204 The total strike pay of registered unions had been £14,664.205 These strikes had cost at least £69,370 in strike pay, maintenance of camps and other indirect payments.206 On 29 June 1892 the registrations of the QSU and the QLU were cancelled, a month after the cancellation of the registration of the ALF. There were now separate "Financial and Membership Statements" for employee and employer unions. This "falling off" trend continued during the second half of 1892 with employer unions reacting to the registration of employee unions by the cancellation of their own unions. The Pastoralists' Association cancelled its registration on 29 June and the Pastoral Employers' Union of the Darling Downs changed its name to the Darling Downs Pastoralists' Association.

Economic conditions in Queensland in the early 1890s continued to deteriorate207 as did the conditions under which the labouring man had to work. By 1893 there were large numbers of discharged station hands and labourers wandering about the streets of Dalby208 and there were "so many unemployed walking about the country only too glad to get work"209 at whatever rate it was offered to them that labour was obviously in no position to strike for higher wages and better conditions: "To say that we have anything like liberty in Queensland is to say what is very wide of the mark. We have one-sided liberty which allows the strong all the advantages of the law, and the weak to be forced into accepting whatever terms the strong may propose to them."210 It was relatively easy for employers to procure non-union shearers and carriers. As E.P. Thompson has argued, working men came to fear not the machine but the loss of the machine.211 Economic depression, far from raising consciousness, was detrimental to the success of organized labour. Not
only did depressed economic conditions deprive men of the financial means to organize but also “brought the masters and men closer together, and exhibited demonstrably their mutuality of interests”. 212

Working men still believed, however, that “true liberty” meant “more than being allowed to accept employment at starvation wages. We say that a man has a positive right to have a say in the conditions under which he shall labour”. 213 Pastoral employees expressed that right once again in 1894 and, in the opinion of Mr Reid, Member for Toowong, would continue to do so: “While capital and labour are separated, and while employers hold the means of production and human beings at their disposal, and drive men by starvation to sell themselves for a bare subsistence, there will always be disturbances.” 214 The state began to recognize the inevitability of such disputes and its responsibility for the setting up of a Board of Conciliation and Arbitration to which these “grievances” could be referred.

The union movement had been discussing the need for some “system to enable disputes between master and man to be adjusted on more equitable principles” 215 since 1886. As early as July 1890, after the Jondaryan “non-union wool difficulty”, proposals for conciliation were submitted by the Labor Federation to the Chamber of Commerce. The Federation believed that conditions of labouring should have been “considered in a conciliatory manner by fully representative bodies and permanently settled for a period of two years by the mutual adjustment of differences”. 216 Laissez-faire and “freedom” for employees had meant the freedom to accept the conditions imposed on them by employers. It was this limited freedom and unequal situation which labour looked to the state to redress. Out of a New South Wales Royal Commission “to investigate and report upon the causes of conflicts between capital and labour” came an Act authorizing Conciliation and Arbitration in that Colony. Whilst the Commissioners concluded that they were not prepared to recommend any scheme for the reconstruction of society, they did think that much could be done to mitigate conflicts by this “simple addition to our established institutions”. 217 Three years later in the Queensland Parliament the general feeling seemed to be that Queensland should also be “going in for state interference”. 218

By 1895 the “completeness of the collapse” 219 of unionism was evident. In 1891 the net income of registered unions had been greater than £20,000; in 1895 it was less than £1,000. Membership which had been 22,000 was now 250. In fact, the only “active
labour unions” were now those which “partook more of the nature of benefit societies” and the income, expenditure and membership of employer unions was “trifling”. These unions had come into existence for temporary purposes and, these purposes having been satisfied, they now disbanded.

The Jondaryan “Affair” was something of a watershed for both capital and labour. It served to crystallize their major differences up until that time and to delineate the form that their conflict would now take. It acted as a focus for past grievances and as an alarm which alerted capital to the newly-demonstrated strength of federated labour. Employers set about organizing and improving their strength relative to labour. Its real significance, of course, was that labour won “at” Jondaryan. Organizing employers, however, were not about to be taught another lesson by their employees and, amidst cries of “remember Jondaryan” and euphoria about non-union wool, labour was soundly beaten by capital in the maritime strike of August to October 1890. Just as Jondaryan had demonstrated what federated labour could achieve, the maritime strike reaffirmed the greater strength of capital. It also marked a departure from labour’s previous belief in an identity of interest between labour and capital. By resolving itself into a trial of strength between capital and labour, it demonstrated that capital, far from allowing itself to be “squeezed” any more, was attempting to take away from labour the right to combine. For the first time the line between these opposing interests was clearly drawn. The incompatibility of labour and capital was further born out, and labour’s “enemy” more clearly identified, by the 1891 shearers’ strike. Labour was not only opposed by capital but by a Government which allied itself with employers against employees. The working man could never again believe that he could be fairly represented by capital. Labour’s defeat in the 1891 shearers’ strike heightened its determination to capture the State in its own class interests. Two years later Queensland had its first three party system. Labour was not to “capture” Parliament, however, until 1899 and then for only a few days.
Conclusion

The most important themes to emerge from this study of Jondaryan Station on the Darling Downs are "structure", "control" and "resistance". They are particularly important because, as Glen Lewis noted, the major themes of non-violence, anti-authoritarianism, and the notion of Australia as the lucky country have all tended to immunize Australia and Queensland against class analysis.1

The economic demands of squatting on the Downs in the 1840s were such that only those who were financially "well-off" survived. Although this did not always mean that the "survivors" were well-connected, it nearly always did, and the exceptions were a more common feature of squatting in the 1850s than in the 1840s. Common backgrounds, a common goal and the severe test of pioneering welded Downs squatters into a "cohesive, identifiable and closely-knit caste".2 The binding tie of property was further cemented by inter-marriage and an extensive kinship system which gave Downs squatters a political and social influence out of all proportion to their actual numbers.

The arrival of the new squatting breed of the 50s did not mark a departure in Downs squatting style. The Towns, Wentworths, Campbells and Toohs shared squatting, merchant and business interests and became part of the identifiable Downs squatting establishment. In fact, as Duncan Waterson noted in his study of the Darling Downs, the Toohs of Jondaryan and James Taylor "in some ways excelled the original 'Grass Dukes' at their own game".3 As the decade drew to a close, it was evident that kinship networks were so well established that it would be increasingly difficult for more men like James Taylor to emerge.

The notion of equality of opportunity which many pastoral employees brought with them to the Downs, limited as it was in the 1840s, was even more restricted in the 1850s. The notion was sup-
ported, though, by the much improved material condition of the labouring man and the comparative structural fluidity of Downs society.

Gold field rhetoric served to reinforce the notion that rapid mobility in this new society was possible. The fact that most miners were unsuccessful little affected the notion. The few who became rich overnight strengthened it.

Ironically, the discovery of gold in Victoria did more for consolidating the wealth and position of the landed on the Darling Downs than for creating opportunities for their employees. Tooth of Jondaryan made a great deal of money out of selling mutton to hungry miners. Unlike Victoria, where “gold” wrought considerable social and economic change, on the Downs it consolidated the wealth of those who already had it.

As the 50s drew to a close, Downs society had largely solidified structurally. Downs squatters modelled themselves on the English landed gentry and had assumed a dominant position within the community. Jondaryan station exhibited many of the characteristics of a well-ordered and hierarchical English village. The hospitality offered there, like the appearance of the head station itself, reflected the differences in status within the community. Marriage bound men like William Graham and Charles Williams to Kent and Wienholt and insulated them from the “lower orders”. Jondaryan homestead, the manager’s residence, a splendid dwelling compared to the rough accommodation around it, symbolized an ideal in gracious living. It also symbolized the social distance between the manager and the men.

The labouring man’s experience of the type of control which the management of Jondaryan exercised over its employees led to differing responses. Resident employees found security, limited mobility and compensating benefits for their dependence. Shearers found the need for an Association and a consciousness of their class position — a consciousness which attempted to force mutual accommodation on their employers.

The labouring man’s solution to his material and social condition, namely, the cessation of immigration schemes and the settling of the small man on the land, was quite unacceptable to the squatter, who had no wish to return to his position of the 1840s. The suggestion that the labouring man should be settled on the land was a direct challenge to squatters’ hegemony. Just as Downs squatters had brought their “proper” influence to bear politically to secure a supply of the right type of labour and to secure the right decisions on local
Benches, they used the legislature to retain control of their own land. Legislation designed, as one colonist commented, “to establish a class of men to be lords and another to be vassals” applied particularly where land legislation was concerned.

By April 1877 Edward Wienholt and the trustees of William Kent were the largest owners of freehold land in Queensland and Jondaryan was the largest freehold run. According to one contemporary, Downs squatters were but “one removed from the Southern planters in America before the war” — “an oasis of planters amongst a wilderness of serfs”.

But however much this “wilderness of serfs” believed agriculture to be morally and productively superior to pastoralism, there was some country, as the Editor of the Dalby Herald noted, which, by its very nature, “defied the single handed labour theory”. Selectors who overcame squatter resistance in the form of pre-emption, selective purchasing and dummying could not overcome the problem of blocks which could not be profitably cultivated and were too small to graze. There were some labouring men, however, who did escape from employee status to employer status via the medium of land acquisition. Their meagre selection existence, however, forced them to eke out their income by seasonally working for the squatter.

The Jondaryan “men” of the late 1870s and early 1880s were four distinct working groups, each of which occupied a particular place in the Station’s social structure and each of which responded in its different way to the type of control which the management of Jondaryan exercised over its employees. Their response was not only dependent upon their place in the social structure and how closely they were tied to it, but also on how conscious they were of any conflict of interests which existed between themselves and their employers.

Certainly the man who had adapted himself to new work in the “bush” and had left his more familiar city environment, would generally, unlike in England, be assured of employment. He would also be assured of much higher wages. Jondaryan’s shepherds and “generally usefils” earned £40 per year plus rations, which, it was estimated, would have cost the worker 12s. a week in England, which was more than he could earn altogether. Initially, therefore, in terms of his material position, the Jondaryan worker was better “off” than his counterpart at “home”. In terms of his position in the social order, however, things had not changed very much.

Those who had turned their backs on, or who had been expelled by the old social order were naturally determined to create a new
society, free of the old world restriction of class. But there were others who had emigrated for different reasons and with different aspirations.

Because the Napoleonic wars had reduced the number of appointments being made, British upper class families began to emigrate to all parts of the colonial world, in the hope of an immediate improvement in their social status. Families like the Leslies, forced to live at home in reduced style, could no longer compete with their aristocratic brethren and so emigrated to New South Wales, where the competition was less fierce, and they were able to maintain a higher standard of living at a reduced cost. There were other families like the Campbells and Tooths of Jondaryan who were looking for a place to invest. The aim of all these Downs pioneers, whether of noble, yeoman farmer or merchant background, was to expand their small capital into large capital as quickly as possible, and return to England. Edward Wienholt, in fact, spent a great deal of his time in England. Far from rejecting the old social order, they wanted to recreate it on the Darling Downs.

The labouring man, however, had not emigrated to be caught up in the same “condition” as he had left behind. He believed that he had a right to a fair wage for his labour and decent living and working conditions. He also believed that he had a right to own land and had no desire to live in the type of stratified society which monopolistic land ownership created. This tension was exacerbated by the types of control which Jondaryan’s management exercised over its employees.

The labouring man’s response to his environment ranged from the passive state of intemperance to the more direct acts of arson, theft, attacks on property and person, and striking.

The “consciousness” which led Jondaryan shearsers to withdraw their labour in the late 1880s was not only a product of their position in Jondaryan’s social structure and their experience of that position, but the degree to which they felt unable to shape the course of their own lives. The notion of conflict is a very important one in the definition of class. It is also a very important theme to emerge from this study.

Social stratification is about categorization. Social class is about status, power and consciousness. An indicator of this consciousness was the growth of the trade union movement, and the union which showed the greatest increase in membership and funds in the late 1880s was the Queensland Shearers’ Union.

The Union argued that the working man had a right to a much
greater share of the fruits of his labour. Pastoralists maintained that in the tougher economic conditions of the 80s, the industry could not afford to offer its employees higher wages or better conditions. The Queensland Shearers' Union insisted that only union labour be employed. Employers insisted on their right to employ whomever they liked, be they unionist or non-unionist. It was about this basic principle of freedom of contract, and squatters retaining control in their own sheds, that Jondaryan became the test case for the relative strengths of labour and capital.

Although more economically vulnerable and not as socially entrenched as their British counterparts, Downs squatters nevertheless enjoyed social and political security in the 1860s and 1870s. In the 1880s, however, although retaining their "collective domination", they were forced to share political power, their economic position was becoming less secure and the increasing organization of labour challenged their "aristocratic" position. It was this shift in power away from themselves that squatters feared, and the growth of unionism symbolized that shift.

This fear of the loss of control was confirmed by labour's victory "at" Jondaryan in May 1890. Almost immediately, however, and in retaliation for the Jondaryan "Affair", capital set about crushing the newly-demonstrated strength of federated labour. The collapse of the union movement by the mid-1890s was evidence of its success. The role which Government played in bringing about this success convinced labour that it had to capture the State for itself. It could no longer trust capital adequately to represent its interests. The Labor Party was both an expression of this distrust and of the working man's belief in his right to determine his own future. The differences between employer and employee were now legitimized and the means of resolving this conflict, institutionalized.

In the way of all human beings, Australians have needed to indulge in myth-making. In the way of all myths, these have become true by convincing Australians and Queenslanders that they have always been anti-authoritarian, independent and not class conscious. If our frontier "condition" has, as historians have argued, left a lasting impression on our national character, then it is important that we interpret the past in terms of our actual historical experience rather than in terms of our ideal conception of it.

Those who came to Jondaryan station certainly envisaged a community which would offer equality of opportunity and independence for all. What they found, however, was a well-structured society in which their opportunities and their in-
dependence were prescribed by their employers and the environment. Pastoral occupation demanded a large capital outlay and further capital investment for maintenance and improvement. That the land laws did, despite numerous attempts to the contrary, favour the "big" man was due to the harsh reality of the environment. Government, the landless, and, it seems, some Australian historians, have never really accepted the fact that so few could control so much. They go on believing that Australia is, and always has been, the land of the yeoman farmer.

Jondaryan station, whilst it exhibited many of the characteristics of an English rural village was not a microcosm of English society. Its proprietors formed part of the Downs landed aristocracy, or, more correctly, quasi-aristocracy, but, as such, they provided no more than a rudimentary insight into the nature of traditional European conservatism. They were economically and politically more vulnerable than their British counterparts. They were wealthy, but not privileged in the English sense. Their very act of emigration had, to some extent, reduced the gulf between master and man. This gulf had been further reduced by the high standard of living enjoyed by the labouring class and the chance of occupational and social mobility. This mobility, however, was controlled by Jondaryan's management, who sought to maintain the "proper" relationship between employer and employee. The different ways in which Jondaryan's labouring groups responded to this control, and the covert and sometimes overt conflict between Jondaryan's management and employees brings into question the whole notion of our peaceful links with the past and "mateship", as it has come to be interpreted in Australian historiography.

Manning Clark was right to argue that mateship was, and is, a phenomenon born of isolation and dependence. As Wilkes suggests, it is no more than the expression of tribal solidarity in a harsh and alien environment. When one looks at the tribe itself, one finds it is divided, and at times, openly hostile. Russel Ward never claimed to be doing more than documenting the process by which the nomadic bush worker acquired the status of a national mystique. What historians should concern themselves with is not the process of documentation, but the reality of the stereotype itself. The notion that all bushmen were "mates" has prevented any real examination of the structures within which they lived and the relationships within those structures. It is hoped that this study of Jondaryan station has shed some light on this neglected area.

Insofar as the history of one place cannot be repeated in the
history of another, this study is limited, and the story of Jondaryan must stand alone as "one atom of our national experience". However, it is obviously not entirely unique, and the forces which shaped Jondaryan station may be the same as those which shaped other pastoral communities. If similar local studies are undertaken our image of rural Queensland may be altered and, if, as historians have argued, our frontier experience has been so important in determining our national ethos, we may have to rethink the character of Australian society.

Societies live by myths and the social historian should be sensitive to them. But, they are abstract to an ahistorical degree, emphasizing aspiration rather than action. Our whole notion of egalitarianism needs re-examining, and our picture of the past supplemented, and at certain points, corrected.

* * *

At the turn of the century Jondaryan was still managed by Charles Williams and was still a huge sheep run carrying 130,000 sheep. Williams managed the Jondaryan Estates Company, formed in 1895, until his death in 1913 when his son-in-law, and the grandson of the original William Kent, took over and managed Jondaryan until 1945. William Kent III, like his grandfather and Charles Williams before him, was conscious of his wider role in the Jondaryan community and was Shire Chairman from 1919 to 1945.

The first subdivision of Jondaryan was not until 1908 while the last occurred after the Second World War. This subdivision left Jondaryan station almost as it is today. Mr and Mrs Kent bought the homestead block of approximately 2,400 acres and, on the death of her husband in 1952, Mrs Kent sold her block of 1,060 acres but owned and still lived in Jondaryan homestead. Jondaryan homestead is now the home of Hon. J.A. Elliott, M.L.A., the great great grandson of the original Mr William Kent. The Jondaryan woolshed is a major tourist attraction, thousands visiting this "living museum" each year.
## Appendix 1

### Plotting Jondaryan’s Growth 1843-1851

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Licensee</th>
<th>No. of residents</th>
<th>Nature of bldgs</th>
<th>Acres under cultiv.</th>
<th>Stock</th>
<th>Extent of run</th>
<th>Quality of soil</th>
<th>Watered</th>
<th>Wooded</th>
<th>Distance nearest station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOV. 1843</td>
<td>Charles Coxen</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3 huts</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>cattle sheep</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>20 miles</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>Oakey Ck.</td>
<td>thinly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>Charles Coxen</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2 huts</td>
<td>4 stables</td>
<td>cattle sheep</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>9 x 8 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Morris &amp; Lyons</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>slab &amp; bark</td>
<td></td>
<td>cattle</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>10 x 6 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAN. 1847</td>
<td>Campbell &amp; Andrew</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td></td>
<td>cattle sheep</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>20 x 6 miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR. 1848</td>
<td>Campbell &amp; Andrew</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cattle sheep</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>65,000 acres</td>
<td>badly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Gilchrist &amp; Andrew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cattle sheep</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>128,000 acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Commissioner of Crown Lands Itineraries and Record Books 1843–1848. New South Wales State Archives.)
Appendix 2 (a)

Acreage of Jondaryan 1843-1892

YEAR

0 1840 1850 1860 1870 1880 1890 1900

ACRES \times 1000

150 100 50

155,484 128,000 115,859 100,000 76,800 65,000 46,080 38,400 12,800

(Jondaryan Station Records)
Appendix 2 (b)

Sheep Population on Jondaryan 1843-1892
## Appendix 3

### Runs Leased by Jondaryan’s Proprietors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Jondaryan, Irvingdale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Jondaryan, Irvingdale, The Swamps, Clifton, Ellangowan, Glengallan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Jondaryan, Irvingdale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Jondaryan, Irvingdale, Myall Creek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Jondaryan, Cooyar, Lagoon Creek, Mt Hutton, Goomburra, Gladfield.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Jondaryan, Rosalie Plains, Cooyar, Lagoon Creek, Mt Flinders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>Jondaryan, Irvingdale, Rosalie Plains, Lagoon Creek, East Prairie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Jondaryan, Rosalie Plains, Taroom, Woondul.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Jondaryan, Rosalie Plains, Taroom, Woondul, Dalgangal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Jondaryan, Rosalie Plains, Taroom, Woondul, Goomburra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Jondaryan, Degilbo, Rosewood, Tarampa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Jondaryan, Rosewood, Tarampa, Degilbo, Stanton Harcourt, Mt Flinders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(New South Wales and Queensland Government Gazettes.)
## Appendix 4

### Wienholt Family Holdings, 1876

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maranoa</th>
<th>Mitchell</th>
<th>Burnett</th>
<th>Darling Downs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Wienholt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wienholt Brothers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.W.A.E. Wienholt</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kent and Wienholt also leased 6 runs giving the Wienholts a total run "interest" of 48.  
(Bailliere's Queensland Gazetteer, 1876, pp. 208-271.)
Appendix 5

Jondaryan's Resident Employees and Their Wages 1863-1893
(Remuneration in pounds per annum unless otherwise noted.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>1863</th>
<th>1868</th>
<th>1873</th>
<th>1878</th>
<th>1883</th>
<th>1888</th>
<th>1893</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseer (H.S.)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storekeeper</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelwright</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddler</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groom</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary-Rider</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailiff</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumber and Generally useful</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>44 + %</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse-Driver</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith's Mate</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single man's Cook</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ploughman</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Boy</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen Boy</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drover</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£4</th>
<th>£2.10s.</th>
<th>£2.8s.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>per 1000 per week</td>
<td>per 1000 per week</td>
<td>per 1000 per week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay-Maker and Mower</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr-Cutter</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thistle-Cutter</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Jondaryan Station Records)
## Appendix 6

### Jondaryan’s Woolshed Employees and Their Rates of Pay 1863-1893

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>1863</th>
<th>1868</th>
<th>1873</th>
<th>1878</th>
<th>1883</th>
<th>1888</th>
<th>1893</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overseer (Pounds per week)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4s.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classer (Shillings per 1000)</td>
<td>25s.</td>
<td>£220</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>20s.</td>
<td>15s.</td>
<td>15s.</td>
<td>15s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearer (Shillings per score)</td>
<td>3s.6d.</td>
<td>3s.6d.</td>
<td>3s.6d.</td>
<td>3s.</td>
<td>3s.6d.</td>
<td>3s.</td>
<td>4s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washer (Shillings per day)</td>
<td>5s.6d.</td>
<td>3s.6d.</td>
<td>5s.</td>
<td>6s.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Penner-Upper’ (Shillings per week)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10s.</td>
<td>20s.</td>
<td>23s.</td>
<td>25s.</td>
<td>25s.</td>
<td>27s.6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Picker-Upper’ (Shillings per week)</td>
<td>12s.</td>
<td>10s.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10s.</td>
<td>2s.</td>
<td>10s.</td>
<td>1s.9d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller (Shillings per week)</td>
<td>20s.</td>
<td>20s.</td>
<td>20s.</td>
<td>25s.</td>
<td>20s.</td>
<td>4s.6d.</td>
<td>4s.6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presser (Shillings per bale)</td>
<td>1s.</td>
<td>10d.</td>
<td>6d.</td>
<td>6d.</td>
<td>10d.</td>
<td>1s.5d.</td>
<td>1s.4d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumper (Pence per bale)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6d.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11d.</td>
<td>10d.</td>
<td>9d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stower (Shillings per week)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>25s.</td>
<td>25s.</td>
<td>4s.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweeper (Shillings per week)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>20s.</td>
<td>20s.</td>
<td>20s.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shed Boy (Shillings per week)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>15s.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9s.</td>
<td>2s.</td>
<td>2s.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Jondaryan Station Records)
Appendix 7

Shearing Rates at Jondaryan 1863-1893

[Graph showing shearing rates with bars for each year from 1860 to 1900, indicating fluctuations in shearing rates over the period.]
Appendix 8

Number of Sheep Shorn at Jondaryan 1863-1893

YEAR
(Jondaryan Station Records)

NO. OF SHEEP X 100,000

1860 1865 1870 1875 1880 1885 1890 1895 1900

113,438 122,686 99,034 98,991 134,451 118,982 113,419 113,419 116,820
84,478 98,991 137,028 177,467 164,709 162,597 113,419 113,419 96,247
Appendix 9

A Comparison of Food Prices at Jondaryan, Brisbane and in New South Wales in 1862

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity (Per Pound)</th>
<th>Jondaryan</th>
<th>Brisbane</th>
<th>New South Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flour</td>
<td>6d.</td>
<td>1.4/5d.</td>
<td>1.4/5d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>8d.</td>
<td>8d.</td>
<td>2½d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea</td>
<td>4s.</td>
<td>2s.6d. to 3s.</td>
<td>1s.6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>2s.</td>
<td>1s.8d.</td>
<td>1s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef</td>
<td>3d.</td>
<td>3d.</td>
<td>3d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Jondaryan Station Records, Queensland Statistical Register and Coghlan, T.A. *Labour and Industry in Australia*, London, 1918.)
## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Brisbane Courier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DH</td>
<td>Dalby Herald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDG</td>
<td>Darling Downs Gazette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FML</td>
<td>Fryer Memorial Library, University of Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRA</td>
<td>Historical Records of Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHRC</td>
<td>Jondaryan Historical Research Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.S.</td>
<td>Jondaryan Station Ledgers and Journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JWA</td>
<td>Jondaryan Woolshed Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML</td>
<td>Mitchell Library, Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBC</td>
<td>Moreton Bay Courier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSWGG</td>
<td>New South Wales Government Gazettes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSWSA</td>
<td>New South Wales State Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSWVP</td>
<td>New South Wales Votes and Proceedings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OML</td>
<td>Oxley Memorial Library, Brisbane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QGG</td>
<td>Queensland Government Gazettes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPD</td>
<td>Queensland Parliamentary Debates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPL</td>
<td>Queensland Parliamentary Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSA</td>
<td>Queensland State Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QVP</td>
<td>Queensland Votes and Proceedings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMH</td>
<td>Sydney Morning Herald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Toowoomba Chronicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSL</td>
<td>Victorian State Library, Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Warwick Argus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Ex &amp; T</td>
<td>Warwick Examiner and Times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Jondaryan Station on the Darling Downs has played a significant role in Queensland history since the land conflicts and strikes of the 1890s. Now listed by the National Trust, Jondaryan is today a tourist attraction, where the quaint atmosphere of colonial squatting life is displayed.

In this absorbing case study, Jan Walker questions some egalitarian myths about the acquisition and availability of land, and reveals the unequal power struggles between squatter and selector, capitalist and worker. She takes a close look at the working of the "Masters and Servants" legislation, the life of shearsers and station hands, and the feudal village structure of the Downs "squattocracy" with its rigid class divisions. The book details the growing rural discontent and the development of union activity, which pressed for improved working conditions.

At the heart of the conflict was the desire of the more affluent settlers to maintain the class structure and the power they had been accustomed to in Britain, by transplanting this lifestyle to the bush colony. Jondaryan Station: The Relationship Between Pastoral Capital and Pastoral Labour 1840–1890 thus shows the reality behind the tourist image, presenting the whole social spectrum of the late colonial period, from the "master" to the most humble servant.