

**Record of the  
Proceedings of the Queensland Parliament**

...  
**Legislative Assembly**  
**31<sup>st</sup> July 1861**  
...

Extracted from the third party account as published in the  
Courier 1<sup>st</sup> August 1861

---

The SPEAKER took the chair at 10 minutes past three.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION.**

Dr. CHALLINOR rose to make a personal explanation with regard to certain matters which he had attempted to explain on Friday last, but in which explanation he had been misunderstood when he was ruled out of order by

The SPEAKER, who said that it was against the practice of parliament for any hon. member to move the adjournment of the house for the purpose of stating what by the rules of the house he had been prevented from stating on a previous occasion.

**LIGHTHOUSE ON MORETON ISLAND.**

Mr. BLAKENEY, pursuant to notice, asked the Colonial Secretary—

"What was the amount expended on the painting and other repairs of the lighthouse on Moreton Island, and whether any tenders were called for said work previous to its execution?"

The COLONIAL SECRETARY stated that no painting had been done since February, 1859. Mr. Thompson had done certain repairs to the edifice referred to for £35. Mr. Thompson had men at work on the island at the time and therefore no contract was called for.

**JUDGE'S SALARY.**

Dr. CHALLINOR asked the colonial Secretary—

"Whether the draft of a bill for the better Administration of Justice in the Supreme Court, prepared by Mr. Justice Lutwyche, at the request of the government, contained any provisions for securing certain advantages to himself, to wit, £2000 per annum, as stated in an article which appeared in the 'Queensland Guardian' of the 3rd instant, headed 'The Judicial Dictator, Cromwell come again,' and signed 'M.P.'"

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied that the draft bill did continue the Judge in the same position as he held under the New South Wales government—viz., in the receipt of £2000 per annum salary.

**QUEENSLAND GOVERNMENT.**

Dr. CHALLINOR asked the Colonial Secretary—

"If the government have received, by the last mail, a copy of an act passed by the Imperial Parliament, relating to the Queensland Government, which act was introduced as a bill into the House of Lords by the Duke of Newcastle in March last, and if so, will there be any objection to lay it upon the table of this house?"

The COLONIAL SECRETARY stated that the government had not received the copy of any such act, but when it did arrive it should be laid upon the table of the house.

**MR. JUSTICE LUTWYCHE.**

Mr. MOFFATT, pursuant to notice, asked the Colonial Secretary—

"Whether any letters marked private, and written by Mr. Justice Lutwyche to his Excellency, as alluded to in a leading article of the 'Moreton Bay Courier' of this day; and if so, will he have any objection to lay the same on the table of this house?"

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that the government had no objection to lay upon the table of the house the unofficial correspondence between the Judge and his Excellency the Governor.

### LOAN BILL.

A message was received from his Excellency signifying his assent to this measure.

### CORRESPONDENCE.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY laid upon the table the correspondence between his Excellency and Mr. Justice Lutwyche, and moved that it be printed. The motion was put and passed.

### FERRITER AND JONES.

Mr. MACALISTER postponed his motion with reference to the claims of these two gentlemen for compensation, the report of the select committee not yet being out of the hands of the printer.

### INCORPORATION OF CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS.

Mr. RAFF, on behalf of Mr. Lilley, asked and obtained leave to postpone the motion standing in the name of the latter hon. gentleman.

### LATE CORONER FOR IPSWICH.

Dr.CHALLINOR, pursuant to notice, moved the following resolutions:—

"That an address be presented to the Governor, praying that his Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid upon the table of the house, copies of the following papers:—(1.) The proceedings of the inquest held upon the aboriginals shot at the Dugandan Scrub, on December 21st, 1860, and the letter addressed by the Coroner to the Attorney-General respecting that inquest. (2.) The proceedings of the magisterial enquiry respecting the death of the three aboriginals who were shot at Fassifern on the 24th December, 1860, and the letter addressed by the investigating magistrate to the Attorney-General in reference to it. (3.) The Attorney-General's letter to W.M. Dorsey, J.P., requesting that gentleman to hold a magisterial enquiry respecting the sudden death of one Patrick Burns, at Gatton, on or about May the 3rd, 1861, and the proceedings of the said magisterial enquiry. (4.) Certain correspondence between the late Coroner for Ipswich and the Attorney-General, arising out of special circumstances connected with certain inquests and inquiries held by the said Coroner."

During the short period for which he had held a seat in that house he had given abundant proof that he could stand any amount of snubbing with regard to his conduct, or opinions as a member of parliament. But when his conduct in other matters was called into question, he felt it due to himself to rebut false statements when they were made. He had been accused of publishing frivolous charges against certain individuals, and to rebut this charge he had put this motion on the paper of to-day. The correspondence called for would clearly show that during his coronership he had discharged his duty without fear or favor, and with strict impartiality. In order that he might be in a position to defend himself against the charges which had been made, he asked the house to grant the motion. (The hon. member here gave the state of the various letters and replies to them, which he wished produced.) If the house denied it, he would state the purport of the communications to which he referred. (No, no.) He wished to prove indisputably that he had conducted himself blamelessly in his official capacity, and he thought that he had a right to demand at the hands of the house, as one of their member, the means of vindicating his conduct.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL opposed the motion as establishing an inconvenient precedent, although, personally, he had no objection to produce the documents asked for. He could not perceive how the motion would benefit either the house or the public, and he believed it to be brought forward principally to gratify the pique of a private individual. The hon. member had been an officer of the government, had resigned and become a member of the house, and he now asked for a quantity of voluminous documents connected with his position as an officer of government, in order that he might found upon them a two hours' speech. He (the Attorney-General) of course inferred that the hon. member intended to found a substantive motion upon them, else there would be no use in producing them. What good could be attained by producing the documents with reference to the affair in the Dugandan scrub? An inquest had been held over

which the hon. member had presided, and the jury had returned a verdict that the man died of a gunshot wound. Again, the evidence taken in the Fassifern affair had all been published in the papers, had been investigated by the hon. member himself, had been investigated by a select committee, and had been debated by the house. He (the Attorney-General), as grand jury, had also investigated the matter. What then could the public gain by the republication of this evidence? If he (the Attorney-General) could see that any good would arise from it, he would not hesitate to produce the documents called for. The hon. member had said that he wished to show that his whole conduct in his judicial capacity had been correct. With the exception of one remark made in that house, he (the Attorney-General) had never cast a single doubt upon the honorable member's conduct as coroner. He said then as he said now, that the honorable member had no right to make public correspondence between himself and his superior officer. The very publication of that correspondence might have tended to frustrate the ends of justice, which the honorable member professed himself to be so anxious to meet. Indeed, in answer to a question of the honorable member for Maranoa, he (the Attorney-General) had said that he thought the honorable member had acted wrongly, but that it was an error of judgment, and therefore he had not thought fit to represent the matter to the Executive. But what did he get for this? Why, the honorable member (Dr. Challinor) turned round the other night and abused him like a pickpocket. Again, what end could be attained by publishing his letter to Dr. Dorsey. He would tell honorable members what was in that letter. Dr. Dorsey had written to state that a man had died on the station, and to ask why no inquest had been held. He (the Attorney-General) had written in reply, to state that he would write to the coroner, but that it was in the power of any magistrate to hold an inquiry into the cause of the death. As to the fourth clause of the resolution, he had in his official capacity so much correspondence with the hon. member, that he did not know the particular correspondence referred to. He hoped that the house would not assent to the motion, as it would involve undesirable expense without any proportionate benefit to the public or the house.

Dr. CHALLINOR had asked for the production of the correspondence simply that he might be able to defend his character as a coroner, which had been defamed in the public prints. The hon. member then proceeded to cite instances to show that in the case of death on Dr. Dorsey's station, and in the Fassifern affair, he had not departed from the line of conduct which, as coroner, he had invariably adopted in all similar cases. The documents asked for, if produced, would utterly disprove the charge of private pique which had been brought against him. He thought that it was certainly a matter of public interest that an officer of the crown against whom false charges had been made, should have the opportunity afforded him of disproving those charges.

The question was then put, and negatived without a division.

### MASTERS' AND SERVANTS' ACT.

This act, with amendments, was received from the Legislative Council.

On the motion of the COLONIAL SECRETARY, the consideration of the Legislative Council's amendments were set down as an order of the day for to-morrow.

### PUNT AT ROCKHAMPTON.

Mr. FITZSIMMONS moved, pursuant to notice—

"That this house will, to-morrow, resolve itself into a committee of the whole, to consider of an address to the Governor, praying that his Excellency will be pleased to cause to be placed on the supplementary estimates for 1862, a sum not exceeding £400, for a punt over the Fitzroy, at Rockhampton."

He thought it was unnecessary to make any speech, as the motion had been virtually assented to by the house yesterday.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN objected to the motion. The hon. member, both this session and last, had been very forward in scrambling for public money for his district. The new Municipalities Act would confer a large revenue upon the corporation of Rockhampton, and they ought not to experience any great difficulty in raising the sum of £400.

Mr. RAFF opposed the motion for similar reasons to those advanced by the previous

speaker. If the money asked for were outside the boundary of Rockhampton, the motion would be less objectionable, but as it was to be spent within the municipality, he thought that the corporation should be called upon to furnish it.

Dr. CHALLINOR expressed his opposition to the motion upon the ground that the endowments conferred by the new Municipalities Act, and also the £1000 voted by the house for a wharf at Rockhampton, conferred sufficiently liberal assistance upon that municipality.

Mr. BLAKENEY supported the vote, and warned hon. members that this centralising policy would recoil upon their own heads. The towns of Brisbane and Ipswich had received great advantages which had not been received by the new municipalities. It was bad policy to oppose this small grant, as it would give a great handle to those who complained of "centralization."

Mr. WATTS defended the motion, and adverted to the grant of £3000 given last session to the municipality of Ipswich for the repair of certain streets. If such paltry sums as this were refused, and the towns to the northward did not get their fair share of revenue, separation would take place much sooner than it otherwise would. He would remind the hon. members who had referred to the Municipalities Act, that that act, whilst it conferred upon the older municipalities half the revenue derived from the land sales, gave to the new municipalities only one-third of such revenue.

Mr. R. CRIBB thought that the virtuous indignation expressed against "centralization" by the hon. member (Mr. Blakeney) savoured much of that gentleman's style when addressing a jury. Although the government of New South Wales had expended some money in placing punts and ferries at Brisbane and Ipswich, yet the tolls arising from these had for some years been received by the same government. If the tolls arising from this proposed punt at Rockhampton were to be received by the government, he (Mr. Cribb) would vote for the motion. If, however, the corporation were to receive the tolls, he thought that the corporation should find the punts. At the same time, he would have no objection to vote for the present motion, if the sum were reduced to £200, as he conceived that this would be quite sufficient for the purpose proposed.

Mr. FERRETT would support the motion, as he thought that the house had, yesterday, affirmed whatever principle was involved in it. As to the exact amount of money requisite, that would be a matter for consideration when the house went into committee. With the centralising policy of the Sydney government fresh in their recollection, he thought the remarks of some of the honorable members who had opposed the motion displayed very bad taste.

Mr. FITZSIMMONS would not blame the honorable member for North Brisbane (Mr. Raff) for his opposition, as that hon. member, since he had by opposing the vote for the bridge over the Brisbane got into bad odour with his constituents, endeavoured to redeem his character by opposing every demand for money made by any country district. Scarcely any item had been brought forward for the benefit of the Northern districts which that hon. member had not opposed. The matter was not of much importance to himself (Mr. Fitzsimmons) as he would much prefer to see a bridge built over the river. He had asked but for a very small amount, and he had had no idea that it would be opposed. He regretted that the conduct of the house on this occasion would confirm the charges brought against them by the Northern newspapers. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) Those papers, which had already commented upon the centralising policy being now pursued, were read all over the country, and the merits of the subjects upon which they treated discussed throughout the length and breadth of the land. Queensland had shown to the North a fair example in demanding separation, when its prosperity was being blighted by the centralising policy of the Sydney government. The government held the land upon both sides of the river where the punt was required, and would not alienate it. No one would go to the expense of building and working a punt knowing that the government would not part with this land. Let the government alienate this land, and he would guarantee that not a single sixpence would be asked from them to defray the cost of a punt. He was sorry that the members for Brisbane and Ipswich invariably made a point of opposing all demands from the northern districts, as their conduct would only tend to accelerate a crisis which must eventually come.

The question was then put, and the motion carried without a division.

## EDUCATION COMMITTEE.

Mr. MOFFATT, as chairman of this committee, brought up evidence and a progress report, which were ordered to be printed.

### BRISBANE BRIDGE BILL.

Mr. BLAKENEY moved the second reading of the Brisbane Bridge Bill, and was proceeding to explain the powers sought to be conferred by it, when

Mr. MACALISTER rose and begged to ask the opinion of the Speaker as to whether the bill was a private one or not.

The SPEAKER, after reading the preamble, stated that he was not aware that a bill to confer powers on a corporation for the erection of a bridge could be considered as a public one. He then read several cases from May's Parliamentary Practice bearing upon the subject, and proceeded to observe that, although several bills introduced into parliament by the corporation of London, were some of them public and some private ones it appeared from the preamble that the bill before the house came under the head of a private bill.

Mr. BLAKENEY remarked that the objection urged was just what he should have expected from a representative for Ipswich remembering as he (Mr. Blakeney) did that when a sum of money proposed by the government for the erection of a bridge over the river Brisbane, the item was opposed by one and all of the members for that town and district. By the 4th clause of the Crown Lands Alienation Act, the Executive were empowered to grant for public purposes, with the consent of the legislature, and it was in pursuance of that act that the corporation came to that house to enable the government to concede them a tract of land in South Brisbane, which would enable them to erect a bridge to connect North and South Brisbane. Mr. Blakeney then remarked upon the extracts read by Mr. Macalister from May's Precedents, which he said did not apply to the present bill, which asked for a transfer of land to enable the corporation to complete the bridge, and read passages from pages 612 and 623 to prove that the bill was not to be considered a private but a public bill. Were the bill for the particular benefit of the Brisbane corporation, it would be a different matter but the powers asked for were to complete a great public highway to the interior.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN thought the arguments used by the last speaker were specious and showy, but they were based upon false premises. The question was not as to the power of the legislature to grant the land, but whether the bill was a public or a private one. He insisted that the bill was a private one, that its introduction should have been published in the *Government Gazette*, and submitted to a select committee.

Mr. MACALISTER did not intend when he asked the question to raise such a discussion, but knowing the general knowledge possessed by the Speaker of parliamentary law, and his great experience on the subject, was desirous of obtaining his opinion.

The SPEAKER said that, on reading the preamble, he was at first inclined to think that the bill must be considered as a private one, but on a further consideration, finding that it was partly a public and partly a private one, and as the matter was involved in so much doubt, it would be better to leave its decision to the house itself.

Mr. BLAKENEY then moved the second reading.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN, to settle the matter, would suggest that the question as to whether the bill was a public one should be left to the house.

Mr. R. CRIBB thought that the house had already decided the bill to be a public one by passing the first reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY at first considered the bill as a public one, and as such was inclined to treat it; but looking at the case as forming a parliamentary precedent, it would be perhaps better to decide the question by a resolution of the house.

Mr. BLAKENEY would leave the matter to the house.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL on looking over May, found many similar bills to have been introduced as public, and thought that if the bill were to be considered as a private one, it would be thrown over this session, because it would be impossible to comply with the standing orders.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN begged to move that the bill be treated as a private bill, so as to settle the question at once. So far as he was personally concerned he did not care in which way it was regarded.

Ayes, 7.

Mr.	B. Cribb	
	Fleming	
	O'Sullivan	
	Macalister	
Dr.	Challinor	
Mr.	Moffatt	} Tellers.
	Ferrett	

Mr. BLAKENEY, after reading over the powers to be conferred by the different clauses, said that he had made a calculation of the quantity of land now unsold in South Brisbane, and found that there were 445 allotments, of which, after deducting 45 for reserves, it was proposed to give two-thirds, or 266, to the corporation of Brisbane. At the present upset price these were worth £6650 but as their value would doubtless be doubled by the erection of the bridge, the total value of the land granted to the corporation would with the half the proceeds of the remaining allotments, namely 133 (estimated at the same rate) amount to £16,625. The corporation had already entered into correspondence with contractors in Sydney and Melbourne, and received several very pleasing replies, especially one from Melbourne offering to erect a bridge with stone piers for £30,000. He trusted that the bill would be passed, and the bridge erected, and that the feud between Brisbane and Ipswich would no longer exist.

Mr. MOFFATT was sorry to appear as an opponent, but could not consider that any arguments had been adduced to show that the bridge was necessary, or that it was necessary for the convenience of traffic to the interior. He also thought it was undesirable that the government should aid the corporation by the grants sought as by a sum of money. It was very undesirable that the bill should be introduced at so late a period in the session when there was barely time for it to pass. His opinion was that it was essentially a private bill and that many matters contained in it should be referred to a committee. Neither was there any provision whatever relating to the navigation of the river, as the first clause might be construed to relate to navigation by boats only, and thus prevent large vessels from going up to Ipswich. (Laughter.) He thought, therefore, that plans and specifications for the proposed bridge should be laid before the house. No doubt that there were large portions of land in South Brisbane which would be increased in value, but it must be remembered that as the land asked for comprised two-thirds of that land, and that by the Municipalities Amendment Bill one-half the proceeds for the remainder was to be granted to the corporation, this increase in value would be of little benefit to the revenue of the country. If the lands of the country were to be given away in this manner for bridges and other purposes, there would be no means of defraying the expenses of the country but from the customs returns and taxing the squatters. He hoped that the house would pause before they affirmed such a principle, and moved that the bill be read that day six months.

Mr. FLEMING seconded the motion.

Mr. R. CRIBB rose and said that the remarks made by Mr. Moffatt did not apply at all to the principle of the bill, but only to the details. Besides, the bridge being required for the convenience of a large population, it was a part of the leading thoroughfare of the colony. As to the inconvenient period of the season at which the bill had been brought in, he would remind the house that it arose from no fault of the corporation, but from the grant proposed by the government having been refused by the house.

Mr. WATTS agreed with Mr. Moffatt that there was no clause showing that the navigation of the river would not be confined to boats, and would ask the house what reason there was to suppose that in thirty or forty years ships of a thousand tons might not be able to reach Ipswich? (Laughter.) He had seen stranger things than this happen in other countries, and would be no party to the passing of the bill unless some clause were introduced compelling the placing of a drawbridge in the centre through which ships of the largest tonnage might pass to the head of the navigation. (Laughter.)

Mr. BLAKENEY, in answer to the observation of Mr. Watts, read the latter portion of the first clause—"Provided that, before such bridge shall be commenced to be built, a plan and specification thereof shall be laid before, and approved of by, the Governor and Executive Council; and provided also, that no bridge erected by the said Municipal Council, shall be so constructed as to obstruct the navigation of the River Brisbane;" and observed that the hon. member must have but little confidence in the government if he supposed they would not require the placing of a drawbridge in the centre. The bill also provided that the bridge must be erected to the west of the present ferry, so that the navigation of the river should not be impeded. Should the predictions of Mr. Watts be realised by the removal of the Seventeen Mile Rocks, and the deepening of the Bremer, the bridge would be no obstacle to the passing of large ships up to Ipswich. The fear entertained by the member by whom the bridge was opposed, that the bridge would be the means of shutting out Ipswich from Brisbane, was childish. There was no such feeling on the part of the members for Brisbane, who had supported the vote of three thousand pounds for a bridge over the Bremer, although this support was not reciprocated. The principle upon which the bridge over the Brisbane was to be constructed was totally different to that respecting the one on the Bremer, the cost of that being defrayed out of the exchequer of the whole colony, while the one he asked for would be obtained from the proceeds of land in its neighborhood. In such matters hon. members should act for the public generally, and not allow petty prejudices to influence them in their duties. He hoped that one benefit would arise from the £15,000 being refused for the pontoon bridge, and that was the erection of a bridge that would be an ornament to the city, and a credit to the colony.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN certainly agreed with the proposition of the hon. member, Mr. Moffatt, as there were no plans, specifications, or date by which they were to judge of the proposed bridge. As to the portion of the clause relative to the impeding the navigation, it might be said that the navigation was not impeded if a dingy could get up the river. Mr. Blakeney referred to the opposition of country members to the bridge, but he would remind him that many of them had property in South Brisbane for years, and yet voted against it. The colony before separation had always been fighting against the extravagance of New South Wales, but they had never heard of that government advocating the construction of a bridge to the North Shore. It had been said that this bridge would conduce to the traffic to the interior, but the house must remember that the river was navigable for fifty miles, and it was at the head of the navigation that the traffic to the interior commenced. The object in erecting the bridge was to meet the tramway, (Cries of "Oh, oh.") He would refer to the evidence given last year before the committee on internal communication, in which the gentleman with whom the tramway originated, stated that there was fine country in the colony which was well adapted for tramways. Where he derived his experience he could not say, that gentlemen having only gone up to Ipswich by steamer and returned by coach. The only principle involved in the advocacy of the bridge was the cutting off of fifty miles of navigation. He could trace the kindly feeling shown to the bridge in Brisbane to the feeling in favour of the tramway, the terminus of which was proposed to be made at a part of the river, from which would shortly be seen a second Parramatta line, running along the banks of the river. He had not the

slightest idea of seeing the tramway completed, even if all the land in the colony was granted to it.

Mr. LILLEY here objected that the hon. member was out of order, the question before the house being the bridge, not the tramway.

The SPEAKER ruled Mr. O'Sullivan out of order.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN then concluded by saying that as the ulterior object of the bridge was to connect the tramway with Brisbane its effect would not be to improve property in South Brisbane; and, notwithstanding the remarks of honorable members, he believed the question to be the same as decided by the vote on the £15,000 proposed for the bridge.

Mr. GORE thought it would have been better to have brought forward the bill at an earlier period, but would support it.

Mr. RAFF could not see that the principle involved in the bill was the same as decided by the house on the previous vote, the present bill being one to grant the corporation certain lands, and to empower them to raise money by mortgage on them.

Mr. EDMONDSTONE thought that by passing the bill a precedent would be established for similar applications for public works and other places. The idea of the bridge being designed for the benefit of the tramway was absurd, a bridge connecting North and South Brisbane having been talked of for twelve or thirteen years. The way some members had treated the corporation of Brisbane was anything but liberal, seeing the great improvements made by that body in the city, with the small means at their disposal. As to the obstruction of the river no man of progress had ever entertained such an idea, nor was it believed in by those who used the argument by way of opposition. The main object of the bill was to enable the corporation to borrow money, the present act being such as to prevent any money-lenders making any advance to the corporation. As a proof that the bridge would be self-paying, he would mention that the present lessee, whose lease would expire in May, refused to give it up under £400 or £600. Were the bridge erected he believed the tolls would be sufficient to pay off the capital in a few years.

Mr. FERRETT opposed the bill on the ground that the bridge was not required, and believed that a steam ferry would answer all the purposes for years to come. He also believed that it would not be self-paying.

Mr. WARRY thought the time of the house had been occupied as usual, to a very unnecessary extent. How the honorable member for Maranoa could dispute the arguments of the honorable member (Mr Edmondstone) who enjoyed a very large municipal experience in the affairs of the city, he was at a loss to understand. If the government chose to give two-thirds of the profits of unalienated lands towards the construction of a bridge between North and South Brisbane, why should the honorable member, who knew little or nothing of proceedings within the bounds of civilisation, object? (Hear, hear.)

The COLONIAL SECRETARY supported the bill, although he would have been far better pleased had the original proposition for granting £15,000 towards the construction of the bridge been carried into effect. Under this arrangement he thought the tolls would have paid for the cost, and that the traffic embraced would have been more than commensurate with the income received by the government. Still, as the matter now stood, he was disposed to favor the principle of the bill, as being most likely to carry out the object without infringing any principle of parliamentary action. With regard to the charge that he had endeavored to stop vessels of 1000 tons from reaching Ipswich, he begged to state that such was not the case. (Laughter.) On the contrary, it had been his earnest endeavor as far as possible to facilitate navigation to all the leading townships of the colony. With regard to the general principles of the bill, he saw no ground for objection; but in reference to details, he might deem it necessary to propose some alterations in committee.

Dr. CHALLINOR opposed the motion, contending that the arguments advanced in favor of the proposed bridge applied with equal force (so far assistance might be expected from the government) to the deepening of the rivers Brisbane and Bremer, near Ipswich. The latter, he said, was more a highway to the interior than the former, and if the motion now proposed were carried, the Ipswich people, by the same rule, would be entitled to claim next session a



corresponding amount in favor of a similar work at Ipswich. He would therefore vote for the amendment.

The house divided with the following result, the question being "shall the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the question :—

Ayes, 14.  
Mr. Edmondstone  
Watts  
Lilley  
Haly  
Blakeney  
Gore  
Colonial Treasurer  
Attorney-General  
Mr. Warry  
R. Cribb  
Raff  
Fitzsimmons  
Richards

Noes, 8.  
Mr. Macalister  
Dr. Challinor  
Mr. Ferrett  
Fleming  
O'Sullivan  
B. Cribb  
Royds  
Moffatt

The amendment was therefore negatived.

Mr. BLAKENEY moved that the consideration of the bill in committee be fixed for tomorrow.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN moved that the consideration of this bill in committee stand over until Wednesday next, in order to allow hon. members ample time to study the important matters involved in it.

Mr. MOFFATT expressed a similar opinion.

After some discussion,

The COLONIAL SECRETARY intimated that in his opinion the most of the parliamentary business would be got through in the course of next week, so as to allow of the parliament being closed immediately. He therefore thought it would be desirable to proceed with the business as speedily as possible.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN eventually changed his amendment to the extent of substituting Tuesday for Wednesday.

The house then divided with the following result:—Ayes, 14; noes, 7.

The motion for committing the bill the next day was therefore carried.

The house adjourned at ten minutes past six o'clock until the next day at three o'clock.