

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 10 JUNE 1873**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## ERRATA.

---

Page 91, second column, lines 34 to 40 inclusive, *read*—"I was very much struck, some months ago, on seeing a cartoon in *London Punch*, representing Mr. Gladstone as a steeplechaser taking a fence, '*Irish Education*'; and the legend was 'Will he *clear it*?' implying that if he did he would be a clever rider."

Page 158, second column, *omit* the last seven lines.

Page 194, second column, line 22 from bottom, *read* "preside" *for* "provide."

Page 225, second column, line 7, *read* "half-a-million" *for* "million."

Page 235, second column, following Colonial Treasurer's speech, *read* "Question put and passed."

Page 366, first column, line 32, *read* "Skinner" *for* "Sinclair."

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, 10 June, 1873.

Personal Explanation.—"Hansard."—Ipswich and Brisbane Railway.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. MILES moved—

That this House do now adjourn ;

and stated that his reason for doing so was to afford himself an opportunity of making a personal explanation respecting a letter which had appeared in the *Dalby Herald* reflecting upon him. After commenting upon the conduct of several other honorable members of that House, the letter in question said :—

"The honorable member for the Maranoa could not refrain from speaking on a subject which he knows nothing about, viz. :—He asserts that one of the reasons for opposing the present Government is in consequence of their giving the Dalby people £800 out of the general revenue of the colony towards the construction of a dam, in order to gain their support, whereas the fact is this: the corporation borrowed a certain sum from a special fund, in the same manner as the corporations of Brisbane, Rockhampton, Toowoomba, &c., had done, and for which the interest, at 6 per cent., has been duly paid, at least by this municipality, though the benefit of the construction of a dam or dams in the vicinity is not confined to the town itself, but extends to carriers and travelling stock from all parts of the colony."

Now, his remarks had nothing whatever to do with the erection of a dam at Miall Creek, at Dalby ; but he had charged the honorable Minister for Works with appropriating money

out of the vote for roads and bridges, in the expenditure for a dam at Roma, within the municipality of that town. He was still of opinion that he was right in making such a statement ; but if it was proved that he was incorrect, he would be very happy to make an ample apology to the honorable member.

The motion was put and negatived.

## "HANSARD."

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it was his unpleasant duty to have to report to the House, that in consequence of the laxity of one of the shorthand writers, "Hansard" was not ready to be put into the hands of honorable members. He had been informed, however, by the Government Printer, that after a consultation with the honorable the Speaker, such part of "Hansard" as was ready would be brought up and supplied to honorable members before the hour of adjournment for refreshment. He begged to call the attention of the honorable the Speaker to the repeated delay caused during the last session by the non-publication of "Hansard" at the proper time, and as that delay had, he believed, been caused by the same gentleman, he thought it was time the honorable the Speaker took some action in the matter.

The SPEAKER said that he was sorry to have to inform the House, that he had felt it his duty to suspend the shorthand writer in question ; with a view to his dismissal. He had since offered the appointment to a gentleman whom he had reason to believe was in every way qualified to hold it.

Mr. LILEY said he did not know of course what was the cause of the delay on that particular occasion ; but he thought that it would be as well to ascertain the cause—whether it was actual illness or what—at all events to pause before doing what might actually be the ruin of the gentleman in question.

Dr. O'DOHERTY : The honorable member for Fortitude Valley having placed before the House the possibility of the shorthand writer referred to being really seriously unwell, he had risen to inform the honorable members that he had seen the gentleman professionally, and that he was merely temporarily unwell, and would in all probability be able to resume his duties on the following day.

The Hon. A. MACALISTER believed that not only during the present session but also in all former sessions, the shorthand writers had been always blamed for everything that took place, and he had invariably found that they were not deserving of it. If the gentleman in question had been unable to attend to his duties, he should not be suspended too hastily, for if that was a reason for suspension they might find other officers who ought to have been suspended long ago.

The SPEAKER : He could only say that last session continual complaints were made to him about the reports in "Hansard," and that when he made inquiries, he found it was the

fault of the gentleman in question. On three or four occasions he had condoned the neglect of duty of that gentleman, and it was now only on the suggestion of the honorable the Colonial Secretary that he had taken the course he had.

Mr. MILES believed complaints had been made of other officers, and he would therefore like to know whether examples were to be made of them.

The Hon. A. MACALISTER: One is to be dismissed, and another to be pensioned.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY thought the matter was entirely in the hands of the honorable the Speaker.

Mr. STEPHENS would point out that there should not be any harshness towards the officer in question. It must be remembered that the duties of the shorthand writers were very onerous, being principally at night, and anyone who was at all acquainted with the nature of their duties, must be fully aware that they were quite entitled to their holidays. In fact, when there were committees sitting, he did not consider their reporting staff was large enough, and he could not blame any reporter, when committees were sitting, if he was behind time with his work. That, however, did not apply to the present case, as there were no committees. But it having been stated that the illness of the officer was only of a temporary nature, he would strongly deprecate any harsh action being taken.

The SPEAKER would inform honorable members that it was very far from his wish to be harsh towards any officer, but his attention having been called to the matter, it was his duty to take action accordingly. Nothing could be farther from his wish than to show any harshness.

Mr. FERRETT said that although this was an irregular debate, he could not help taking part in it, because, although it had come under his notice during the previous session that some little *laches* occurred, yet there could not be much excuse for any delay on the present occasion, seeing that the House had not sat since Thursday, and that the shorthand writer was thus allowed plenty of time; even if he could not have done his work, he could surely have got some one to help him. All of them were ill at times, and surely it would have been a small matter for that gentleman to have worked up what he had to do. If an officer had certain duties to perform, and did not perform them, and time after time had been warned, he certainly thought that some decided action should be taken in the matter.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS said it was a matter in which he did not take great interest himself, but he thought it was one which should be left to the honorable the Speaker, as he was the custodian of such matters. He thought that the primary duty of the shorthand writers was to report accurately the proceedings of that House, and that to see that they performed that duty was one of the duties of the honorable the

Speaker. But there was another thing to be considered, namely, a duty that was owing to the other reporters; because, if one gentleman was behind with his work, it put great difficulties in the way of the others; therefore, they should not allow their feelings towards one gentleman to lead them to obstruct the honorable the Speaker in his duty, and to prevent the other reporters carrying on their work as it should be done. There had been no pressure of work this session at present; and whatever was the matter with the officer in question, it could not be caused by the amount of work he had had to do.

#### IPSWICH AND BRISBANE RAILWAY.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS moved, pursuant to notice—

That the plan, sections, and book of reference relating to the projected line of railway between Ipswich and a point one mile and twenty-three chains eastward of Ipswich, and between Oxley and North Brisbane, as laid upon the Table of this House, be approved, and forwarded to the Legislative Council, for concurrence.

In introducing that motion, he thought it was necessary to refer to the remarks he made on the subject at the end of the last session, and which were pretty correctly reported, and could be found in "Hansard." He had then said, in moving the necessary motion for the adoption of the plans and sections he had laid on the table of the Brisbane and Ipswich Railway, that—

"One of the reasons why the Government had not brought down plans and specifications for more than fifteen miles of the line was that they had not fully satisfied themselves as to the route the remainder of the line would take, but that they intended to adopt the one which would prove most satisfactory and advantageous to the country; and if, after careful surveys, it should be found that the best route should necessitate the crossing of the river even two or three times, that course would be adopted."

Those remarks were made by him in consequence of some honorable members objecting to the anticipated movement on the part of the Government, which was to have surveys made different to the routes adopted by the engineers who formerly surveyed the line between Ipswich and Brisbane. The Government, however, had been imbued with the belief that a great saving of money could be effected by having those surveys made, and had considered it their duty to employ the best engineers they could find, and had instructed those gentlemen to ascertain the best line between the two places between which the line was to be constructed. The Government had at that time been as much alive to the fact as they were now, that it was their duty to do the best they could to ascertain the best route for the line to come—the best in every respect. They had done so, and the engineers had brought up their report, and he must say that in carrying out

that duty those gentlemen had not been in the slightest way guided by him (the Secretary for Works), and not one word had been spoken by any of the Ministers, or by the department, to the engineer, that could in any way be construed into a desire to influence his decision on the subject. He had pointed out last session that the Government intended to devise the best line for the benefit of the public generally, and as the result of the means they had taken to effect that, he had to lay on the table of that House plans of a line altogether different from that recommended by either Mr. Fitzgibbon, Mr. Thorneloe Smith, or Mr. Stephens, three engineers of note and experience, but who, in their surveys, he believed, had been acting greatly under instructions. In the present instance the engineer, on the contrary, had received no instructions, and had only recommended that line which he could consider best for the interests of the country. The result was, that the line was altogether a new route from the time it left Ipswich to where it arrived in Brisbane. The Government, after having heard the *pros* and *cons* of the question, the arguments used by the engineers, and the advantages likely to arise to the public by the adoption of the respective lines, had come to the conclusion—which, he believed, was the one, all independent-minded men would come to—that the line proposed by the Engineer-in-Chief was the best adapted to the interests of the public; certainly to the interests of the people of North Brisbane, which he believed was a most serious consideration, and, he believed, the one most advantageous to the whole colony. Three strong reasons could be advanced in support of those assertions. But, as he knew that the question was likely to be treated as a party one, and as there were many gentlemen interested in the matter, who possessed influence both in and out of that Chamber, he intended to reserve the chief portion of his remarks to meet the objections that might be raised in the course of debate. He would now, therefore, simply move the adoption of the plans laid on the table, and, in doing that, he might say that he firmly believed that he was doing his duty to the public, to the capital of the colony, and to the colony at large.

Mr. KING: It was his intention to move an amendment on the resolution which had just been proposed by the honorable Minister for Works; that was—

“That all the words in the motion after the word ‘That’ be omitted, with the view of inserting the following words:—‘That in the opinion of this House, the railway from Ipswich should be brought into North Brisbane, across the Corporation Bridge.’”

He wished to observe, that as a mere resident of Brisbane, he had no interest in the present question, except that which was felt in common by every member of the community. Since the formation of the railway had been

devised and sanctioned by that House, it was his wish to see it constructed in the best and most economical manner—in such a manner as would make it most convenient to the greatest number of people, so that the line should be productive of benefit to the colony, by a large revenue being derived from it. He did not consider that the extraordinary deviation proposed by the Government was calculated to answer any of those purposes. He did not think that the proposal to have the line crossing the river at Oxley, was calculated to serve the interests of so large a number of persons as if it was brought down to South Brisbane; nor did he think it would bring in the same large revenue as the southern line, inasmuch as from his own observation there was a very considerable population at Oxley, which population would be entirely cut off from the benefits of the railway, if the line was taken as proposed by the Government. Time was also, in his opinion, a necessary element in the construction of a work of that nature, and that should therefore be taken into consideration; and he believed that if the old surveyed line into South Brisbane was adhered to, and the railway taken across the Corporation Bridge, there was nothing to prevent trains from running into the station at North Brisbane before the end of the present year. If, on the other hand, the works were delayed until another bridge was built at the Oxley Pocket, he believed they would not have the railway completed for the next three years to come. He thought, therefore, that unless there were very strong reasons against it, the very fact that they would gain two years’ time, and probably more, by adhering to the old line, was a most important consideration. It seemed to him that in bringing forward a motion like that introduced by the honorable Minister for Works at the present time, there was something more than appeared on the surface. He thought that the intentions of the Government were deeper than appeared, and all honorable members knew how much could be done through railway deviations. Considering the manner in which railway extension had been forced upon the Ministry, it appeared to him that it would be perfectly in keeping with their character if, at the last moment, after obtaining possession of the loan, they endeavored to sell the people of North and South Brisbane, and the people of the colony generally, in regard to that line of railway. In connection with that, he would remind the House that the railway works had now advanced so far that it could be seen that the loan authorised for their construction would be insufficient for the purpose of completing them. The loan taken for both the Ipswich and Brisbane line, and the northern extension, was insufficient to carry out those works; and it was therefore perfectly evident that before those railways were finished, whatever Ministry was in

power, they would have to go down to that House and ask for another loan. It might be discovered when that time arrived that it was unfavorable to the floating of a loan, and they would thus be placed in the position of having the lines unfinished, and no funds to carry them on, and thus have to leave them in an uncompleted state in the bush. There was one circumstance in connection with the proposed deviation, or extension, to which he must direct the attention of the House, and that was the cost. He found that the cost of construction of our former railways had been something like £9,000 per mile, and that they were made in what were expensive times; that did not, of course, include the cost of the line over the Main Range, which was about £15,000 per mile. But, now they had about seven miles some odd chains of railway between Brisbane and Oxley, the cost of which was estimated at £125,359, or, including the land, at £134,118, which made the cost per mile at about £19,000. Having, therefore, made all their railways with the exception of the Main Range line at a cost of about £9,000 per mile, they were now asked to sanction the formation of a railway over the comparatively easy country between Brisbane and Oxley, at the enormous cost of over £19,000 per mile. Now, he had been instructed that it was a fact that a contractor had actually offered to make the whole line of railway from Ipswich to Brisbane for £150,000; and surely if a contractor could be found to carry out the work for that sum, there was no necessity for the enormous expenditure now proposed for only seven miles odd of country. That was not the worst, however, because the country had no security that it would not be called upon to pay a great deal more, for they were not dealing with any substantial tenderer, but there was merely a simple estimate put forward by a department, which that House was asked to sanction. It was his belief that the estimates which had been put before the House were delusive; he did not think, for instance, that the bridge across the river at Oxley could be completed for £35,000—in fact, in his own mind, he believed it was a false estimate—that there was not the slightest probability of its being completed for that sum, and that the amount was only put down for the purpose of misleading the House to vote for its being undertaken. There was no doubt, in his mind, that as soon as the vote was passed, the Minister would come forward and tell them that some alterations had to be made, and that it would be necessary to spend perhaps double or treble the amount of the original estimate. Now, as he said before, he spoke as a country member, as he had no special interest in Brisbane; but he contended, in the first place, that now that the formation of the line had been sanctioned, the people of Brisbane had a right to expect that it should be brought into the city—that they were entitled to have it completed and opened as soon

as possible, and that they should not be asked to sanction a deviation which would cause the construction to be delayed for three years. He would say again that the cost of constructing the proposed line was out of all proportion to the cost of railways in former years, whilst the House had been led to suppose that railways could be made much cheaper now than in 1864 or 1865; yet, in the face of that, the sum of £19,000 per mile was set down as the cost of the line between Brisbane and Oxley. He hoped that some other country members having an interest in the matter, would set their faces, and record their votes, against the enormous and unnecessary expenditure now proposed. They had been told that if the Government went in at all for railway construction, it would be for cheap railways, and yet it was now found that for the first line—and a most simple one—that they brought forward, they proposed to expend double the amount it had cost to construct the other railways in Queensland. He did hope that the country members would see the necessity of voting against an expenditure of £19,000 per mile on the line proposed, which expenditure would have the effect of retarding any further railway extension. It might be that the argument of honorable members opposite was—we have got the money for the construction of this railway, and if we do not spend it on that work, by-and-bye a cry will be raised for the formation of a railway to the Logan, or some other place, and the land will be taken from the squatters to pay for it. He hoped, however, honorable members would not look at the matter in that light, but would see that the money was spent as economically as possible, and for the benefit of the whole colony. Now, in dealing with a question of the present character, an honorable member, after considering the interests of the colony as a whole, must pay some attention to the interests of constituencies and the manner in which they would be affected by it. If, for instance, the Government took the line across the river at Oxley, the bridge would be thrown upon the hands of the Corporation with a large debt upon which they had to pay annually the large sum of £9,000 as interest, and that without any means of doing so. It must also be considered that, in the first place, when the bridge was undertaken it was built with the idea of accommodating the whole traffic from Ipswich and the southwestern parts of the colony; and it must also be taken into consideration, that after that bridge was commenced, the plan was altered by the Government in consequence of the pressure put upon it by the Ipswich people, and the Corporation were thus forced to expend a very large sum—£50,000—to put up a swing-bridge for the purpose of allowing sea-going vessels to ascend the river to that town. He would say, therefore, that if after that, the

Government put a bridge across the river a few miles higher up, great injustice would be done to the Corporation, and they would have a very fair claim to go to that House to be relieved of the very heavy expenditure with which they had been burdened for no reason whatever. He, therefore, thought, under all those circumstances, it would be the wisest course on the part of the Government, and the one most just to the citizens of Brisbane, that they should take over the bridge and utilise it for railway purposes. He believed the cost of doing that would be less than carrying out the plan proposed by the Government. He was informed that of the £55,000 set down as the cost of the land to be resumed on the south side, £40,000 could be taken off at once, as that had been put down for the purpose of swelling the apparent cost. He had also been informed that a very large amount of land had been taken which there was no necessity to take; for he believed that if it was the case that it was decided to take the line by South Brisbane, many valuable allotments could be easily avoided. If the cost of land on the south side was reduced by £40,000, and if honorable members would add to that the £37,000 saved in the cost of construction by following that route, they would have a sum of £77,000; and he believed, for something like that amount, they could take over the bridge from the Corporation, and make use of it for the railway.

Mr. THORN would most decidedly support the amendment which had just been moved by the honorable member for Wide Bay; and were it not for the fact that he would be put down as an obstructionist, he would further move that the whole question be referred to a Select Committee. Now, as he had stated a few evenings ago, a great hardship would be inflicted upon a large number of industrious people in East Moreton if the line was taken across the river at Oxley, and also a large population residing south-east of where the line would cross the river. If the line was taken to South Brisbane, the people of Oxley, of Bulimba, of the Logan, and even of Fassifern, would avail themselves of that line, and that was the way in which that House should look at the question; whilst, where the line would cross at Oxley, there were only some half-dozen settlers. Why, only that very day, when passing by Oxley, a petition was being hawked about against the north deviation, and he believed that, during the week, meetings would be held in all those places. He was surprised that the honorable Minister for Works should attempt to deprive those people of the advantages of railway communication. Again, he had been informed that the same valuator had been employed to value the lands in South Brisbane and those through which the north deviation would go; and if that were the case, he could easily believe that a cooked estimate could be made, in order to make the South Brisbane lands appear too valuable. He had heard Mr. Jones, the

engineer of the Brisbane Bridge, give some evidence at the bar of the Legislative Council, to the effect that that bridge could be so altered, at an expense of £10,000 or £15,000, as to make it available for railway purposes, and with that knowledge he was certainly at a loss to conceive why the Government should expend £35,000, or more likely £40,000, or £50,000, or even £100,000 on a bridge at Oxley. Seeing the small amount that would be required, he could not understand why the Corporation Bridge should not be utilised. He would not go over the objections which had been raised, and the arguments put forward on either side, but would conclude by saying that if the line did not come by South Brisbane, the inhabitants of the city would eventually bring a pressure on the Government to make them take the Corporation Bridge, and throw it open as a free bridge, the same as the one at Ipswich. If the line was not taken by South Brisbane, then all he could say was, that the inhabitants of Brisbane would alone have themselves to thank for it.

Mr. FYFE said he knew very little of the lands through which the various lines of railway would come; but according to what he considered was a practical common-sense way of looking at the question, the terminal station should be as near as possible to the heart of the town, in order to afford the most accommodation to the inhabitants. He should vote, making use of the knowledge at his command, for the terminus being near the Treasury, on the vacant land there; or, if that could not be carried out, he thought the site on the Grammar School reserve would be preferable to any other.

Mr. EDMONDSTONE said that in rising to speak to the amendment of the honorable member for Wide Bay, he must state that he considered that it was the duty of a Government always to study vested interests in all such cases where those interests were not repugnant to the general interests of the colony, and were for the benefit of a locality. Now, in the present instance, there had been no studying of vested interests, in fact, the whole thing had been done away with; in fact, the deviation proposed by the Government flew away altogether from a thickly inhabited portion of a thickly populated district. He would say that that deviation was diametrically and unmistakably opposed to the interests of the people of East Moreton generally. A Government had a right to follow the old adage, of doing the greatest good to the greatest number, but in the present instance he would assert even from the engineer's report, that the country was anything but as good a country to bring the line through, as the line of country first selected. He was not now advocating that the line should come in either at North or South Brisbane, but was merely following what had been said by the honorable member for Wide Bay, that through the action of a

former Government they had caused the citizens of Brisbane to be put to an enormous expense in connection with the bridge, and that, therefore, it was their duty to recoup the citizens a portion of that expenditure, which was not brought upon them by themselves, but entirely by the Government, and by the honorable the Treasurer, who was one of the principal movers in the matter of the alteration. By that alteration a delay was caused, from the effects of which the people of Brisbane had suffered for years. If that alteration had not been insisted on, the bridge would have been completely finished long ago—long before the stoppage of the Bank of Queensland, and there would not be the enormous debt which was now resting on the shoulders of the citizens of Brisbane, but only a very small one, probably not one-third. He would say that, leaving those matters alone altogether, it was the duty of the Ministers, in their acts, so to work as to promote the benefit of the greatest number, which, however, they were anything but doing at the present time. In respect to the line of railway, he believed that not having it to go to South Brisbane was an idea which had emanated only in the minds of the present Government, which idea seemed to gather strength, and now the line was to come over another route. Then, again, if another bridge was to be built, why should it not be taken across the river where it was exceedingly narrow? and if it was erected near the gaol, only one span would, he thought, be necessary. He thought, also, that there was quite as practical a route by which to bring the line, and one much nearer than that proposed; and if honorable members chose to look at the plan as laid before the House by the Engineer-in-Chief, they would see that it was quite possible to take the line across the river near the gaol. He would ask, what good the Government were doing by driving such matters so quickly through the House? There was no particular hurry that he was aware of, and if the Government had given notice that the matter was to be brought forward in a couple of months, they would have allowed the people plenty of time to consider the matter. He would not say that the plan of the honorable Minister for Works was not a right one, but the people should have had time to consider the advantages possessed by the two routes. All that was wanted, was to have the line into Brisbane, and he would say, as he said before, that it was immaterial which way it came so long as it was taken the most eligible way. But there was a difference of opinion as to which was the most eligible way, and therefore he thought the Government had no right to force the matter as it was being forced now. If it was to be decided, it should first be referred to a Select Committee. The main portion of the line had been determined upon, and it would not take long to settle the remainder. That was the proper course

to take, not only as regarded Brisbane but the whole colony; for everybody was taxed for those railways, and had a right to see that the most economical system was adopted, and one which would be for the interest of all. He was perfectly of the opinion of the honorable member for Wide Bay, that £40,000 could easily be saved by bringing the line along the old survey, and putting on one side what was due to the inhabitants of Brisbane on account of the expenditure incurred by them in the erection of the bridge. He would ask, were their interests not to be thought of, or Brisbane generally to be thought of? One-sixth of the whole population were within the municipal boundaries, and were the vested interests of those persons, and of those residing between South Brisbane and Oxley, and extending out to the Logan and elsewhere, to be ignored? The Minister for Works and the Government were doing what they ought not to do, in pressing this question upon the House at the present moment. Instead of keeping them in the good graces of the country, their course of conduct in reference to the railway would cause them to be looked upon with the greatest possible disgust. The question was brought up and pressed upon the House at a time when honorable members who thought as he thought could not well resist it. Amongst other gentlemen with whom he had spoken of the railway, he mentioned the Surveyor-General, who had stated that the erection of a new bridge would cost £90,000. Surely the Government should be advised against increasing the debt of the country by another £100,000 for building another bridge; for his impression was that that sum was nearer the mark of what the Oxley bridge would cost than the £35,000 put down in the estimate. He sincerely hoped that the Minister for Works would not press this question to a decision on this occasion, but that he would leave it open for awhile, so that all matters connected with the railway should be understood, not only by the Ministry, but by the House, and by all parties in the southern district of Queensland who were most interested in it.

Dr. O'DOHERTY: Representing the constituency that probably would be most intimately affected by the course that the House would adopt on the question under discussion, he must confess, he said, that he rose to give an opinion upon it, as it was placed before the House by the Minister for Works, with very great diffidence. The honorable gentleman had stated—and he (Dr. O'Doherty) for one was inclined to give him the fullest credit for it—that in preparing the plan which was now submitted to the House, he was influenced by no other motive than that of placing before honorable members the best means of bringing the terminus of the railway into the capital of the colony in such a manner as would be most judicious to all the parties interested in the line. It would have been a



much more acceptable course for the honorable gentleman to have adopted, if, having the views he had expressed, he had candidly come forward and put before the House the reasons why he, as a Minister of the Crown, and the members of the Government, had come to the decision they had come to.

The Hon. A. MACALISTER: Hear, hear.

Dr. O'DOHERTY: What was the position in which honorable members were placed? A report and plan, of about a page and a-half, by one engineer out of four or five professional men who had reported on the line, was placed before honorable members. Bear in mind, that this was absolutely the first time that the question was put before the House, as to the most economical and efficient way which the line ought to be brought into the capital.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: No, no.

Dr. O'DOHERTY: Although the Minister for Works contradicted him, this was the first time the House were ever called upon to decide as to the exact route by which the railway should be brought into Brisbane. He was perfectly aware that it had been discussed in the House before.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Hear, hear.

Dr. O'DOHERTY: But it was never put before the House, as now, with estimates as to what the cost of the respective lines would be, and so forth. This was the first occasion that data, or anything approaching to data, were placed before honorable members, upon which they could form anything like a rational conclusion as to the vote they should give in this matter. He thought he echoed the opinion of the majority of honorable members when he saw that that was not a fair position to put them in; nor was it fair for the Minister for Works to act in such a way. The honorable gentleman had postponed his statement, which he (Dr. O'Doherty) insisted he ought to have given to the House at first, to meet the objections of honorable members. Was that the course which a Minister, anxious to accomplish what he stated he desired, should take to get the House to give a fair and impartial judgment in this matter? Was it not the course that a man who had formed a foregone conclusion would adopt? He would hold over his reasons! After due consideration by him, as the head of the department, and by the Executive—upon the reasons put forward by the honorable gentleman to his colleagues—of the question; after consideration extending probably over weeks; the honorable gentleman, instead of coming forward with those reasons before the House, and with data to assist honorable members to form a correct opinion, threw his resolution upon the table, as a colleague of his did a former measure, for them "to worry." He (Dr. O'Doherty) wished to goodness he could form any other opinion of the honorable gentleman's conduct. By the very way the question was brought before

the House, he candidly confessed that he was not in a position to form any proper opinion upon it. Was he to be called upon, in a matter involving the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of pounds of public money, by the Minister for Works, to give an opinion upon it without a single item of information, or a reason, from him as a Minister, as the proper director of the House? He maintained that the honorable gentleman ought to be able to lay before the House every detail, every iota, every scintilla of information that was required. There was not a single particle of information of the estimate of cost, except the few items given in the report of the Chief Engineer, which had been laid on the table:—

"I estimate that the cost of the works of construction of the two lines would be as under:—

Line to North Brisbane	... £125,359 12 0
Line to South Brisbane	... 88,272 9 6"

That officer said, further, that the larger sum was due to the cost of the bridge over the river at Oxley, which would be £35,000. But, what reason did it afford to him (Dr. O'Doherty), that he must subtract £35,000 from the cost of the northern line, that the northern line was necessarily the best? He threw back the fact, which was evident to every honorable member, that though the line was brought into the city by the route that Mr. Stanley had marked out, yet the Corporation Bridge must inevitably be taken over by the Government by a payment of public money of £120,000 or £130,000. No honorable member could tell him that the course the Government adopted in reference to that bridge, about five or seven years ago, had not stopped that work—a reasonable work—from being pushed on, at a reasonable cost. It would have been finished years ago, to the enormous benefit to the city, north side and south side, if it had not been stopped by the Government; and an additional expense of £40,000 or £50,000 would have been avoided thereby. Now, the Minister for Works asked the House to pass a measure which would render that bridge utterly useless, and which would seriously damage all the property on the south side of the river. He (Dr. O'Doherty) was only putting this forward as an argument to show that it was a monstrous thing for honorable members to be asked to give such a sudden and hurried decision upon a question of such importance as the one before the House. Was it of no consideration that property which had been invested in on the south side of the river should be affected detrimentally? That was a matter of the greatest possible interest and importance to the House. At first sight it appeared that by the taking of the railway from South Brisbane, by carrying it across the river near Oxley Creek, the interests of that portion of the city were utterly destroyed; and, not merely that, but, so far as the bridge itself was concerned, the only traffic that could enable the Corporation to pay for it was diverted.

Mr. STEPHENS: Hear, hear.

Dr. O'DOHERTY: Was that a matter to be pooh-poohed by the House? He said it was the action of the Government which had delayed the completion of the Corporation Bridge, and which had so very largely increased the cost of that work. He guarded himself in the most careful manner in regard to his action on this occasion. He had no information whatever as to the plan laid before the House, which they were asked to approve of; or, indeed, as to the other plans which had been suggested by the engineers who had been engaged to make surveys; he had no data before him upon which he could form anything like a safe or sound judgment; and he appealed to the good sense of the Minister for Works and the Government that, before asking the House to come to a decision upon the resolution moved, they would state candidly and fully the grounds upon which they had founded the conclusion that the northern line should be adopted—why they considered it the most economical route. If they wished to deprive their action of all resemblance of being a party move, that was only a fair thing to do. If the House should get from the Minister for Works a statement, giving in the fullest manner the views of the Government upon the subject, he (Dr. O'Doherty) would, for one, be prepared, after a few days' adjournment—when honorable members would have had time to have fully considered the subject—to give such an opinion, and to vote, as in his conscience he would believe to be for the interest of his constituents. He felt that it would be only a fair thing, under the circumstances, that the House should hear from the Government, before being called upon to vote, a full statement of their reasons for the motion before the House. If the Government would not give any reasons, such as the occasion demanded, he should walk out of the House and refuse to vote, rather than be forced to give an opinion which he could not justify.

Mr. HANDY said he was at the same time sorry and glad at the debate that had taken place, and at the course his honorable colleagues for Brisbane were taking. The interests of his constituents were vitally and essentially involved in the present question, and he was gratified to have found that the vote he gave a few days ago was proved to have been a correct one for a representative of North Brisbane. The honorable member for Wide Bay had moved an amendment to the effect that the railway should come to the south side.

Mr. KING: No such thing.

Mr. HANDY: And cross the bridge to the north side. He understood it so.

The Hon. A. MACALISTER: You have been dreaming.

Mr. HANDY: He had not been dreaming. He was wide awake. He had understood the honorable member for Wide Bay to appeal to the representatives of the country consti-

tuencies to support the bringing of the railway into South Brisbane and across the bridge to North Brisbane; and he hoped the country members would not listen to such an appeal. He hoped that they would say instead, Bring the railway along the north bank into the centre of the city. He meant to show his reasons for what he advocated. He was sorry to have seen his senior colleague for Brisbane, Mr. Edmondstone, second the amendment. Being convinced that he was right, he wished it to be on record that he was as certain as that he existed, that if ever that railway came to South Brisbane, it would never come to North Brisbane.

Mr. EDMONDSTONE: Why not?

Mr. HANDY: That was his conviction, and he would give his reasons for it, beyond any doubt or wavering. He must vote against the railway coming to South Brisbane in any shape or form. The honorable member for Wide Bay had said the Corporation Bridge was made to aid the traffic between North and South Brisbane; and the honorable member for Brisbane, Dr. O'Doherty, had said that the traffic would be destroyed if the railway came down to the city on the north side of the river, and that there would be no traffic on the bridge. That was fallacious reasoning. Before the question of the railway coming to North Brisbane was ever agitated, the bridge was stopped; and the bridge was originally projected for the purpose of communication between North Brisbane, which was the city—South Brisbane was not the city—and the agricultural country between this and Ipswich. And, whether the railway should ever be made or not, that traffic between East Moreton and Brisbane must come to the bridge; which was that for which the bridge was built. The argument of his learned colleague, Dr. O'Doherty, was that the Government proceeded upon the report of one engineer against the reports of four or five engineers. It was painful to have to refer to it again, after having done so the other day, when he used an Executive minute of the honorable member for South Brisbane as a Minister who did try to get the railway to the south side, and who did not succeed. The honorable member for East Moreton, as well as his colleagues for Brisbane and the honorable member for South Brisbane, all meant to support the railway on the south side; and he found that the whole Opposition were now bound to bring it there irrespective of reason or fact; and by them the cry had been raised, "The greatest good for the greatest number," and "Vested interests." Well, why not look to "vested interests"? He would answer the question, in this way:—For one pound that was invested in South Brisbane, there were ten thousand pounds invested in North Brisbane. Why not, then, look to the interests of the merchants, the business men, the shopkeepers, the property-holders of North Brisbane, as well as those of South Brisbane and East Moreton? The question was, now,

which was the capital? North or South Brisbane? Was he to ignore the vested interests of his constituents for those less valuable of the other side of the river or in the country? £40,000 was now being invested in new mercantile establishments, warehouses, and other most expensive property, in a single street. Was he to ignore the interests of his constituents for the interests of others who were not in the city? He was quite aware that when the railway was projected westwards, people bought land between this and Oxley, for the purposes of speculation. They would not now get the price of their land. But was theirs a vested interest? He (Mr. Handy) represented the vested interests of North Brisbane, not of South Brisbane; and he was bound, as a representative, to look after the interests of his constituents in this matter. He was not bound to look after the vested interests of South Brisbane and of the people between North Brisbane and Oxley; but of the people of the city. If the utility of both lines was considered, the northern had the preference over the southern. If the railway was built on the south side, the traffic of East Moreton would not come into the city by it. While the farmers had their own carts and teams, and good roads, they would use them for carrying their produce to so near a market, and would not use the railway. The honorable member, Dr. O'Doherty, had said that if the railway should not come to the south side, all the property there would be destroyed. Well, if the railway did not come to the north side all the property here would be destroyed.

Mr. THORN: A free bridge.

Mr. HANDY: He did not believe in a free bridge. That was a bait thrown out. The House had yet to see if the railway was to come over the Corporation Bridge. It was not very likely that a bridge which had cost about £60,000 more than it ought to have cost would be taken over by the Government at the original cost. He believed the honorable member for South Brisbane was the cause of that extra cost; he was in the Municipal Council at the time.

Mr. STEPHENS: No, not at that time.

Mr. HANDY: The Government would be insane to take the bridge over for £120,000 or £140,000. Even if the railway should come over the south side, it was to be considered whether the Government ought to take over the Corporation Bridge. The honorable member for West Moreton, Mr. Thorn, had crossed the House to join the Opposition; yet he had been most ungenerous to Brisbane. Only last session he was so. The moment he (Mr. Handy) saw that honorable member join the representatives of South Brisbane and East Moreton, he suspected him; and now he saw that there was reason for distrust. Only last session the honorable member tried all he could to get the railway down to Cleveland, passing by North Brisbane altogether.

Mr. THORN: No, he never did.

Mr. HANDY: In fact, the capital was to be connected with the main line between Ipswich and Cleveland only by a little by-way. Now, the honorable member only came over to the Opposition and joined the southern representatives who were opposed to the railway as proposed, to create discord. If the railway should be made to South Brisbane, the question was, would it ever cross to North Brisbane? or, would it be extended to Cleveland, or to Lytton? Once let it go to South Brisbane, and that would be the difficulty hereafter. The moment he saw the honorable member for West Moreton, Mr. Thorn, join the honorable member for Ipswich, he knew their union was not for the interests of the people of Brisbane; and now he saw the two working for the railway to South Brisbane.

Mr. THORN denied that he ever did what the honorable member asserted.

Mr. HANDY: The honorable member had expressed an intention of supporting the amendment, which was decidedly opposed to the making of the railway on the north bank of the River Brisbane.

The Hon. A. MACALISTER: No, no.

Mr. HANDY: The honorable member for West Moreton seemed to be less generous to North Brisbane than he (Mr. Handy) was to Ipswich. The resolutions before the House affected the line at Ipswich, as well as at Oxley and at North Brisbane, as he found that the line now working, and coming down the bend of that muddy water, the Bremer, was a mile and a quarter longer than the line intended to come through Ipswich. He found that the expense of constructing that deviation would be about £17,000; but then must be considered the saving in distance, and in wear and tear and working expenses—about £853, which was a sum equivalent to the interest on the extra expenditure. He should support that expenditure; therefore he was more generous than the honorable member for West Moreton. He would assist the people of Ipswich; but the honorable member would not assist anyone at all. The honorable member for Brisbane, Mr. Edmondstone, had said it was the duty of the Government to study the best interests of the largest number, and that was just what they were doing by the resolution. He had said further that the Government were bringing the railway through wild country. That was no argument against the proposed line. A railway was for the purpose of opening up country; and the line on the north side would not only command a passenger traffic, but other traffic. On the north bank of the river there was plenty of land suitable for sites for private residences; while on the south side there was not an allotment. From Oxley to the south bank was seven miles forty-eight and a-half chains; and to the north bank, as proposed, seven miles sixty-one chains; so that the difference in length of the two lines

was about the sixth of a mile. Then came the consideration that the construction of the line on the north side would be the least expensive, from the nature of the country. Again, the cost of the land and property to be resumed was, on the south side, £51,569; and on the north side, £8,841; the difference being £42,728 in favor of the line on the north side. Now it might be fairly argued that those who advocated the south line wished to put that sum of money into the pockets of the gentlemen who wanted to sell their land at good prices to the Government.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Hear, hear.

Mr. HANDY: He commended the Government for bringing the line down the north side of the river, for the very reason that it came through Government land.

Mr. EDMONDSTONE: Only a small portion.

Mr. HANDY: £8,841 was the value of all the property to be resumed on the north side, as against £51,569 on the south side.

Mr. THORN: Cowlshaw's estimate.

Mr. HANDY: Speaking in the interests of the whole colony, as well as in the interests of North Brisbane, of which he was the representative, he was bound to support the original motion. The north line would be the cheapest in every way, and the most efficient for all purposes:—

"The total estimated cost, combining the cost of engineering works, and value of land, &c., will, therefore, stand thus:—

Line to South Brisbane	...	£139,842	2	6
Line to North Brisbane	...	£134,201	8	0

Difference in favor of Line  
to North Brisbane ... £5,640 14 6"

Then, to bring the line from South Brisbane to North Brisbane, if that line should be made, say, it would be necessary for the Government to take over the Corporation Bridge; that would be £200,000 additional cost to the country. He did not think the representatives of the people would be justified in voting for that expenditure. That was another reason why he was in favor of bringing the railway across the river at Oxley into North Brisbane. If the line was brought into South Brisbane, no honorable member would ever see it come into North Brisbane. The cry would be, that as the city required a system of sewerage, the sewage would affect the river, and that there would never be deep water for large ships to come up to the terminus, and that the railway must be continued from South Brisbane to deep water somewhere else. But the cheapest way of giving effect to that would not be to continue the line to Cleveland or Lytton, as anyone who had travelled over that country would see that it was of the ruggedest description. The proper line was as proposed, as, from the terminus in North Brisbane, it could be extended through York's Hollow, and round by Breakfast Creek to near Eagle Farm Flats, where there was abundance of deep water.

It was said, if that was done, the merchants and others would have to build warehouses lower down on the river. The merchants of Melbourne did not build warehouses at Sandridge. Their goods were landed from the ships alongside of the railway pier, and brought in trucks up to their warehouses in the city. Viewing the whole subject dispassionately, as he did, he should be very much surprised indeed, if the line from Oxley to North Brisbane was not adopted. He hoped that no honorable member for the country would be carried away by the plausible arguments of the honorable member for Wide Bay. The Government were bound to find the cheapest way into Brisbane for the extension of the main line of railway from Ipswich; and, in every respect, the most economical and effective line was that crossing the river at Oxley, and down the north bank. As to the bridge, that was another question, to be considered on its own merits. When the vote should be taken, he hoped to find the resolution, and not the amendment, carried.

Mr. STEPHENS said he agreed with the remarks of honorable members, that the House ought to have some further information from the Minister for Works, before being called upon to adopt the motion, or even to debate the railway question. He had not the most remote notion, when he came to the House, that the question would come forward to-day, as there were three other important motions on the paper before the one now brought under discussion. The House would abnegate their functions if they decided upon the motion at this sitting. The other night he had reason to point out that the Government had concurred in the utter absence of all checks in the expenditure of £480,000 upon the construction of the northern line; and that the House were without information as to the manner in which the works were to be carried out. The House had no information to show if the works would be completed for the money voted, or that they would not cost £200,000 more. The only papers that had been laid on the table, showed conclusively that the Chief Engineer of the northern line had made it a part of his bargain that he should be entirely without control; so that though the money was voted, proper control over its expenditure was not exercised by the Government. It was, therefore, important that now the House should do their duty, and demand the fullest information. Putting the figures together, which he found in the reports before him, he learned that the cost of the seven and a-half miles of railway from Oxley to North Brisbane, was estimated at £134,201, and that the works at the Ipswich terminus, including the deviation, were £41,011, making a total of £175,212. The vote which the House had granted, and which was included in the Loan Act for the railway from Ipswich to Brisbane, was £192,000. The two reports, therefore, proposed works which would absorb £175,212

out of the £192,000 voted for the whole line. He had endeavored to ascertain what was the estimated cost per mile of the line which was approved of last session. Of course he could not get at the real cost, but he wanted to get at the cost of the fifteen miles of the line between Oxley and the point near Ipswich, which was approved of and in course of construction. The vote was at the rate of £8,000 per mile; and if he put down any excess, it was not his fault, because information was not furnished by the Minister for Works. That was the average for the whole length. Of course the end mile, which included the terminus, would cost more than any other mile; but, independently of that, he wished to know the cost of the rest of the work not included in the two reports before the House. The fifteen miles in the middle of the line, he should estimate at £8,000 per mile, being £120,000, which was to be added to the figures in the two reports, £175,212, making a total of £295,212. The total vote for the railway was only £192,000. Therefore, the House were now asked to pass a vote which would involve the expenditure of £100,000 not yet provided for. The Government were wrong in concealing that fact when introducing the railway question to the House. It was the duty of the Minister for Works to have told them, and they ought to have had it from him in his speech, before being called upon to debate the question at all. As to his having reserved himself to answer the objections urged against the motion, he (Mr. Stephens) was quite sure that there was not a single honorable member who would object to his speaking in reply, whether the honorable gentleman had the right to do so or not. There was a wonderful deficiency in the report on the alternative line. He found in the accompanying lithograph that there was a line going back from the river at South Brisbane, but there was no reason given for it in the report, and no information as to its estimated cost. There was nothing to show that it had been fairly tried. In the map there was a dotted line, but all other particulars were thrown overboard. He was puzzled entirely. It might be an error in lithographing the map which made the dotted line go at the back of the Normal School, where the ground was high; but in the report the line was described as going in front of the school. He merely mentioned this as showing that there was carelessness somewhere in getting up the report:—

"I found, however, that the apparent advantage gained by passing through less valuable property would be more than counterbalanced by the extra cost of construction due to the increased length, the numerous street crossings to be provided for, &c."

He asked, if any honorable member could believe that? It was simply a statement that had slipped in by mistake. It had been said that the valuation of the land at South Brisbane, £51,569, would be reduced to £12,000,

if the line did not come so near to the river and valuable frontages. Of course, he had not seen the valuations, and he could not speak with any confidence on the point. But that was only another proof that the House ought to have full information about it. There was something like £30,000 or £40,000 difference. Did any man in his senses believe that it would cost such a sum to construct about half-a-mile of railway by going further back? That was at the rate of £60,000 a mile. There was another reason given against going back from the river on the dotted line:—

"Another, and in my opinion most serious, objection to this alternative line, is, that the ground upon which the station would require to be placed is under flood level."

The only answer to that was, that the House wanted further information. There was the curious fact, that the line took the most valuable street frontage in South Brisbane, and the river frontage, also, to the bridge. At the other end, leaving the town, it followed the road leading to the main Ipswich road, went through the water reserve, and then to the main road, and took in all the valuable frontages, until the last house was reached, when it turned into the bush.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: It avoided engineering difficulties.

Mr. STEPHENS: Not a bit. He should like to have information from the engineer upon that question. He saw no reason why he should go upon the frontages at all, or why the line should not go further back at the same level. It had been said in debate, that the north line must be adopted, because the station was in the centre of the city. The fact was, that the terminus of that line, at the Green Hills, beyond the Grammar School, would be further away from the centre of the city and the warehouses and wharves of Brisbane than the terminus of the south line, or the alternative line at the southern end of the bridge. He had no hesitation in saying that. If the undertaking was in the hands of a company, who wanted to make money, the terminus would be placed at that end of the bridge. However, the question was simple enough now. The motion and the amendment were both in favor of making the railway; and, if the latter should not be carried, he should vote for the former. In fact, he should vote for both. The Minister for Works would find no one connected with South Brisbane who would vote against the railway coming into Brisbane. The House were now bound to deal with the question. He held that it was advisable, with either line, that the terminus should be in North Brisbane. The House had no correct estimate of the cost of bringing the railway across the Corporation Bridge from the south side. There was no question of engineering difficulty, nothing except cost as to bringing the line across George street to some spot near Adelaide street; which, at all events,

was a quarter of a mile nearer the centre of the city than the proposed terminus of the north line. Instead of there being any objection to the Government taking over the bridge, in the event of the south line being adopted, he could state that none of the ratepayers would object. It would be a very good thing for the ratepayers. But if the House adopted the line proposed on the north side of the river, it would leave the bridge a debt upon the city. How long it might be so, was a question; it might be a few years, or six or seven years; but the time would come when the Government must take the bridge over. But, meantime, the citizens would have to bear the burden in the shape of heavy rates to pay the debt. If the railway was on the south side, it did not need much argument to show that it would attract a great deal of cross country traffic. An honorable member had told him that all the ridges on the north side had an easterly aspect, whereas the ridges on the south side had a westerly aspect. It struck him (Mr. Stephens) as very funny that the ridges should not have two aspects, and a man be free to choose which he liked. He had travelled over a good deal of the country, and he knew that the most magnificent views, in all respects, were on the south side; and equal to anything that could be found on the north side for villa sites and private residences. However, that was a small matter. The Corporation Bridge was constructed under the authority of an Act of Parliament; and the Corporation had undertaken its construction, not so much with the idea of getting the local traffic as because the bridge was in continuation of the main line of road from the western interior to the metropolis. The Government of the day interfered with the Corporation and stopped the progress of the work, in order to compel an alteration which should admit of sea-going vessels passing the bridge to get up the river beyond Brisbane; and insisted upon a swing bridge being included in the design. If the report recommending the northern line was adopted, and the traffic diverted from the bridge which was to provide the revenue to pay for the work, that only strengthened the claim of the Corporation upon the Government. There was no getting out of it. The alteration of the original design and the swing bridge made the work most expensive, as they involved extra cost; and the delay threw the Corporation over the time when the Bank of Queensland failed. The Colonial Treasurer knew the circumstances, as he was in the Government at the time, and insisted upon all the alterations being made. If the Government now erected a bridge half-a-dozen miles above the town without a swing, which, in the case of the Corporation Bridge, was insisted upon by the Government and the Parliament, then it showed that that swing was utterly unnecessary. And that was another reason which strengthened the claim of the Corporation upon the consideration of

the Government. He (Mr. Stephens) was perfectly easy about the matter. He stood in the position of being very well pleased whichever railway line was carried by the House. If the amendment was carried, the city would get a free bridge almost at once; and if the motion was carried, the free bridge was only a question of a few years. He would point out that the House, as guardians of the public purse, ought not to go to any extra expense now, for the purpose of avoiding the taking over by the Government of the Corporation Bridge. The justice of the Parliament, he foresaw, would see that it should be taken over some time or other: of that he was perfectly certain. It had been remarked that certain honorable members who opposed the motion, and certain influential persons, were largely interested in property in South Brisbane. He was not aware of any such persons in the House, or of any influential persons outside, who were not in much the same position as himself: the property he held in North Brisbane was very much more valuable than that which he held on the south side. So that it was not wise to bring in that consideration in the discussion of the question. He must again protest against the way in which the motion was brought forward by the honorable the Secretary for Public Works. Honorable members were called upon to vote in the dark. Neither that honorable gentleman nor any other member of the Government had taken a proper part in the debate to give the House information. They were entitled to more information than was before them, especially when they were told that the vote of to-night would involve another £100,000 of loan.

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS:** No.

**MR. STEPHENS:** It would be advisable now, and he pressed it upon the honorable member at the head of the Government, not to proceed with the motion to-night. He would get on quite as pleasantly if he did not force it. If the amendment should not be carried, honorable members on the Opposition side of the House must vote for the original motion. They were glad to get the railway.

**MR. CRIBB** was understood to say that the question before the House resolved itself into two important bearings: First, which was the cheapest mode of bringing the line into Brisbane; and secondly, whether, if the line was taken along the south side of the river, would it convey as much traffic as a line on the north side? Those were the two questions to be considered. He saw that honorable members generally were in favor of taking the line into North Brisbane, and therefore it was a question, which was the cheapest way of doing that—whether that proposed by the Government, or that supported by the Opposition. It had been stated that a line on the north side of the river would not secure the same amount of traffic as one on the south side, and also that the cost of construction would be greater on

the north side. Now he had it from pretty good authority, from memoranda put before him, that the expense of construction to South Brisbane would be £88,000, and for resuming land £51,000, or a total of £139,000. But, if they took the expense of the line proposed by the Government, the works would cost £125,000, and the cost for land £8,000, which, together, would make the sum of £133,000, or £6,000 less than the South Brisbane line would cost. The honorable member who moved the amendment evidently did not intend that the terminus should be on the south side, but that the line should cross over the bridge, which he (Mr. Cribb) understood would cost from £120,000 to £140,000, and to be made available for railway purposes would require an additional expenditure of £25,000, bringing the total cost of that line to about £300,000. They would then have to add the expense of making a terminus, and, again, how they were to take the line to the back part of the town without an enormous expenditure, he could not conceive, as it would have to go through the most valuable property in the city. On the other hand, the line proposed by the Government would cost £133,000, and would, he believed, afford as good accommodation as a more expensive one; he believed, in fact, that it would be by far the cheapest. Then, as to the question of traffic—which would pay the best, the line on the north side or that on the south side? and in order to ascertain that, they had to look at the country through which the two lines would pass. Taking the line by Oxley, they would have to go through a large extent of very poor land, totally unfit for agricultural purposes. There was no application for land there, as there was none fit for produce, and all the produce that was grown could be easily taken across the river from the crossing place there. On the other hand again, there was no doubt that the northern line would supply by far the largest passenger traffic, because it possessed the best residence sites; in fact anyone going there would be astonished at the increase in the number of buildings, and the rapidly increasing settlement there was in that direction. That would be a source of revenue that could not be obtained on the south side. There was another thing in connection with the railway that honorable members should take into consideration, looking at the large commercial connection of this colony with the mother country, and that was, the immense coal beds in existence near Ipswich, and all around the district. Now, if the railway was taken over the Corporation Bridge, vessels would not be able to ascend the river, and, consequently, a great injustice would be inflicted upon the parties concerned in that trade; whereas, if the line crossed at Oxley, the vessels would be able to go up through the swing bridge, take in coals at once, and ship them into the vessels at Brisbane, which would be a very great convenience.

But if the vessels could not go up, the coal would have to be taken down to wharves in Brisbane, and the cost of it would be very much increased; so that he contended, on that ground also, much was to be said in favor of the route proposed by the Government, and that it would be the cheapest line and the best for traffic; the best for the colony generally, and more especially for the people of Brisbane. Again, a question had been raised by honorable members of the Opposition respecting the Corporation Bridge, and a great deal of blame had been cast upon the Ipswich people because that bridge had cost so much money, and because so much delay had taken place in its completion. But he would ask honorable members to look at the actual facts of the case. One of the members for Ipswich introduced a Bill for the erection of a bridge between North and South Brisbane: specifications and plans were sent down, and it was stated that the cost would be £35,000. There was no jealousy between Ipswich and Brisbane on the subject, but the representatives of Ipswich took care that a clause should be inserted in the Bill that the bridge should not interfere with sea-going vessels—that vessels coming up to load with coal should be able to do so. Well, he did not see that there was anything against Brisbane interests in making the proposition that there should be a swing bridge, except that the Brisbane people wanted to tax the captains of vessels by keeping them there. And what did the Brisbane people do with the plans? Why they altered them, increasing the size of the bridge; and then, not contented with that, they wanted to do without a swing bridge, which was contrary to the Act; and then the Government very properly insisted that the Act should be carried out in its real intention. The Brisbane people had endeavored to deceive the Ipswich people, and to do without a swing bridge, so as to shut out sea-going vessels altogether; and also put themselves to great expense in increasing the size of the bridge, and caused a great deal of delay. It was now said that the swing bridge caused a great deal of delay and cost a great deal of money, as the time was not suitable for raising money, and all that was put on to the Ipswich people; but the size of the bridge was increased by the Brisbane people contrary to the Act, and it was stopped—not by the Ipswich people, but by the Brisbane people themselves—by their own act. He would not detain the House longer, but would conclude by saying that he considered the route proposed by the Government was the best as regarded traffic and convenience, and also for the interests of the country generally.

Mr. HEMMANT thought that the settlement of the question before the House had been very much simplified, in consequence of the expression of opinion by honorable members on both sides, that the terminal station should be in North Brisbane. If the question had

been discussed some years ago, there was no doubt that it would have been proposed to have the terminus at South Brisbane. It did appear to him, however, as well as to other honorable members near him, that they had hardly been supplied with sufficient data upon which to arrive at a correct conclusion; and, as there was no pressing urgency to come to a decision that evening, he thought they should have some further information. The honorable member for Wide Bay, for instance, had suggested that the Corporation Bridge should be utilised for railway purposes, and it would be desirable to have more information than they had on that point, such as the levels. With the view to obtain that information, he would move, as an amendment—

The SPEAKER: The honorable member cannot move an amendment.

Mr. HEMMANT would then simply state the purport of the amendment he would propose if the honorable member for Wide Bay had not got his amendment; it was, that the House, not being in possession of sufficient information to enable them to decide on the comparative advantages of the two routes by which the railway could be brought into South Brisbane, or North Brisbane—with a view of obtaining that information—an adjournment of the discussion should take place. As he could not put that, he had no doubt that if the Engineer-in-Chief was examined at the bar of the House, evidence could be given, more especially as to the expense of taking the line across the present bridge, and also in regard to the terminus. Whether the railway went across the bridge or not, it was very clear to him that the Government would have to take over the bridge from the Corporation, inasmuch as the Corporation were, some years ago, led to believe that the railway terminus would be on the south side, and they looked to that as being one of the sources from which they would derive revenue. He could scarcely agree with the honorable member, Mr. Cribb, as to the guilelessness of the people of Ipswich; for he believed that it was to the honorable the Colonial Treasurer that the people of Brisbane were indebted for the delay in the construction of the bridge, and also for the increased cost of that work.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: No, no.

Mr. HEMMANT: If that was not the case, perhaps the honorable member would correct him; at any rate, the prevailing impression was, that some years ago, after the contract had been entered into for the erection of the bridge, the honorable member came forward and proposed that a clause should be inserted, by which there should be a swing bridge. Now that swing bridge was no part of the original design, and no part of the contract of the Corporation; and it was in consequence of the clause for a swing bridge being put in that all the delay and increased cost had been caused. There was no mention of the swing

bridge in the plans which received the approval of the Executive; and it certainly was rather late in the day—after the Corporation had sent home their instructions for the bridge—that so important a matter as a swing bridge should be made part of the plan.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: These plans have received the approbation of the Executive.

Mr. HEMMANT: He thought that whether the present Government did so or not, no successive Government would be able to resist the demand of the Corporation to be relieved from the incubus, especially as it was due to the action of the Government that it was incurred. He would draw attention to the extreme importance attached to the wharfage. He thought that that had been very much overrated, as he did not see, with the exception of coal and other heavy minerals, that water accommodation was so very necessary. It was not at all likely that, in the case of trains coming into the town with goods going to five or six different ships, those goods would all be taken to the one wharf. It was not at all likely that any of those goods would be discharged at the Government wharf, and that merchants would send round some distance to get perhaps a few bales of wool; and the same rule would apply to the up traffic—however, that was a matter of minor importance. But he did think that they were bound not to do anything in a hurry, which would prejudice certain existing interests. There was no doubt that a very large portion of the country between South Brisbane and Oxley had been purchased with the understanding that the railway would be taken that way, and if the line could be taken that way without detriment to the country, it should be taken. It was well known that property had been sold at very high prices indeed, always on the understanding that the line would pass that way; also at Oxley. He did not use that as an argument why the line should pass that way, but simply as another argument why honorable members should have more information before they came to a decision as to which route should be adopted. There was no fear of the work standing still in the meantime, or of all those evils occurring which had been prognosticated by Ministers a week ago. But whether they came to a decision that night or a week hence, was not a matter of such very great importance; but it was of importance to that House that honorable members should be in possession of the fullest information. Certainly, if Mr. Stanley or the other engineers were examined at the bar of the House, they would be able to give information which could not be obtained in any other way. He himself knew nothing of engineering, but it did strike him that a better way could be found of getting to Brisbane than that now proposed—than by following the serpentine routes on the plans furnished to honorable



members. He thought that they ought to have some information, supposing the amendment of the honorable member for Wide Bay was carried, as to the cost of taking the line from the bridge to a suitable terminal ground, and as to what would be the value of the property to be resumed; upon that point they had no information at present. If they had to deal with Queen-street property at all, the price would be almost prohibitory; and unless that could be avoided, the only thing to fall back upon would be the line they were now considering; but again, he thought they should have fuller information than they at present possessed. Not a single member of the Government had addressed the House at present, but it was not to be supposed that a matter of such importance would be decided without honorable members first having the fullest information. Having had that, they would be able to give a more conscientious vote, than the information they at present possessed would enable them to give.

Mr. LILLEY said he was not going to address the House at any length or in detail upon the question now before it, because he confessed he was very much in the position described by other honorable members, in not having before him what he thought sufficient information to guide him in deciding the best route. His mind was quite free from any bias, and he was open to conviction, but with other honorable members he started from the conceded point that the terminus must be at North Brisbane. At the same time, he must say, that he could hardly vote for the amendment of the honorable member for Wide Bay;—at all events he did not wish to be placed in the position of having to vote for it that night, without having some more information to guide them as to the expense of bringing the line into North Brisbane. As to the engineering part of the question, he could not say anything; but if he had an opportunity of questioning the engineer, Mr. Stanley, he would then be in a position to make up his mind clearly, and to give a conscientious vote in the matter. He could hardly believe that there was so much difficulty, even with the little light he had on engineering matters, in having the line brought over from South to North Brisbane—in fact, he knew it could be done; but then it might be at very great cost, more so perhaps than if the line crossed at Oxley, as was proposed; and might be attended with considerable difficulty. But he had no information on the subject. He thought it would be as well if honorable members had more information. At the same time he would not delay the settlement of the matter for long, as there was some reason in getting it decided as soon as possible, so as to prevent any suspension of the work. He thought, at any rate, that a few days' delay would not be wasted if they examined Mr. Stanley at the bar. Whilst he did not conceive that there would be any great difficulty in the way of

connecting North and South Brisbane, he thought that there was some in connection with the line on the northern side. In the first place, he did not think they could put aside the question of the Corporation Bridge, as the honorable member, Mr. Cribb, wished them to do. That bridge had been beyond question a very heavy work—it was one which had been done with the sanction of the Government of the day—and if it was now left to the Corporation, it would be for many years a very serious burden on the people of Brisbane. He thought they should not hurry the matter without first seeing whether it would not be possible, without imposing a heavy burden on the whole colony, to relieve the people of Brisbane of such a portion of the burden as was caused by an alteration of the plans by the Government. He would suggest something of the sort, especially as it was proposed to convert the railway bridge at Oxley into a passenger bridge as well.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Only foot passengers.

Mr. LILLEY: Yes, he saw, on reference to the report, that it was intended for foot passengers only, but he had not noticed that at first. Well, that would not be a very additional expense, and, therefore, his argument was less strong than it would otherwise have been. But, still, he thought that if they could get the railway into North Brisbane by way of South Brisbane, without any very great expense, and without great engineering difficulties, they should adopt that route. He did not think the land on the north side was of such immense value for agricultural purposes, at all events, as compared with the south side, where there was a considerable population, and plenty of good sites for residences—in fact, just as good as on the north side. In almost all respects, there was very little to choose, except that the south side had a priority of claim as regarded vested interests, and that there was a reasonable belief on the part of the Corporation, when building their bridge, that it would be a link between the main line of railway and North Brisbane. He had no interest in land on either side; and, therefore, he could give a perfectly unbiassed opinion. He believed that the people of North Brisbane generally, did not care whether the line came on the north or on the south side, provided the very important matter of their bridge could be fairly dealt with. He believed that was the state of feeling—that there was no strong feeling as to either the north or south side; but he thought it was a reasonable request to make, that the House should have some further information on the subject, and so far as he was concerned, his opinion would be guided after hearing the evidence of the engineer. He had certainly a very strong feeling that the bridge should not be cast as a perpetual burden on the people of Brisbane. It was not his intention to enter again into the vexed battle of the bridge; there

was no doubt that the plans were altered, and there was no doubt that the Government had a right to require what they did; but at the same time there was also no doubt that by the change of plan, the Corporation were under the necessity of enhancing their expense, and going into a far greater expenditure than was originally intended—that the bridge, in fact, had cost at least £50,000 more than it would otherwise have cost. He was free to form a perfectly unbiassed opinion on the matter, but with several other honorable members he would like to hear more upon it. He would like to hear something from the Government about the bridge matter, and then he would like to hear something more from the engineer, as he observed from the report, that Mr. Stanley had not stated that there was any insuperable difficulty in the way of getting the line from the south side to the north side. Indeed, he could not conceive that there would be any; for although he was not an engineer, he had read sufficient to lead him to think that there was no difficulty in the way which could not be overcome; the question was as to cost—whether that would be insuperable. In all railway matters, the House was to a great extent in the hands of their engineers, and they must necessarily resort to those authorities in all such professional matters. But their experience in times past had been, that even with the very best engineering skill—and there was no doubt that at the time of the first railways they had professional skill of no mean character or experience—they had gone into the adoption of plans in too great a hurry. He might say that there had not been a single line of railway made according to the original plans, and he thought that that might be put forward as a very good reason for asking that the House should have an opportunity of getting more information from the Engineer-in-Chief. He had been told that the adoption of one line or another was a matter of urgent necessity; and if that be so, they should have all the best information they could, to avoid making a blunder.

Mr. CLARK said he had never heard, since he had been in that House, a more humiliating confession than that just made by the honorable member for Fortitude Valley; one, too, that was cheered by the honorable member for North Brisbane;—namely, If you relieve my constituents from the charge of the bridge, we do not care where you take the line.

Mr. LILLEY: No.

Mr. CLARK: Now, it appeared to him that such a statement as that was rather *infra dig.*, and it showed him that some honorable members opposite were prepared to sacrifice the interests of the whole colony for the sake of the citizens of Brisbane. There was no doubt that the bridge was as great a mistake as the Town Hall, and he had not the slightest doubt that in course of time the honorable members for Brisbane would have their city relieved of the incubus, and that they would

shift the burden on to the shoulders of the country—there was no doubt of that. He therefore thought that the question of the bridge should be laid aside, and the question of which way the railway should go, inquired into apart from that. As regarded the proposition of the honorable member for East Moreton, it was well known that it was simply made to defer the settlement of the question.

HONORABLE MEMBERS of the Opposition: No.

Mr. CLARK: So shallow was the pretext considered by honorable members on his side of the House, that it would not be entertained for one moment. The question would have to be settled that night one way or the other. For his part, he should not hesitate to vote for the line on the north side from Oxley, for it was well known that it would cost as much to take the line from the south side to the north side as would make the whole line from Ipswich by the other route; so he thought that settled the question—it did so, at least, as far as he was concerned. He had heard some honorable members talking about wharves, but he thought that that was a great mistake, and that the line should not go to the wharves, but as near as possible to where the centre of population would be in a few years; and if the line was taken the way proposed by the Government, it would be to a site to which the population was rapidly extending, and tramways could be laid down to take goods from the station to the wharves. He should not say more, as he thought it was perfectly well known which side the line would go.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS said that without speaking to the amendment of the honorable member for Wide Bay, he might state that the Government were perfectly willing to allow Mr. Stanley, the engineer of the line, to appear at the Bar of the House, for the purpose of being examined; at the same time, it must be understood that it was not for the purpose of deferring the settlement of the very important question now before them, as it was of the most urgent necessity that those advices should be sent home.

The SPEAKER informed the honorable member that if the course suggested was approved of, it would be necessary that the amendment of the honorable member for Wide Bay should be withdrawn.

Mr. KING, *by leave of the House*, withdrew his amendment.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS moved—

That the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of allowing the Chief Engineer to be called to the bar of the House, and to give evidence.

Mr. KING suggested that Mr. Jones, the engineer of the Corporation Bridge, should also be examined. He had been informed that that gentleman was within the precincts of the House.

The question was put and passed, and the House went into committee.

Mr. KING said he would suggest that as the House were to have the Chief Engineer before them, they should have the Bridge Engineer as well.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS said he was quite prepared to carry out the promise that he had made to the House; and he thought that would answer all purposes.

Mr. KING: He was told that the Bridge Engineer was in the House.

An HONORABLE MEMBER: Hear, hear.

The question was then put and passed, and the House resolved into a Committee of the Whole.

HENRY C. STANLEY, Esquire, C.E., was then called to the Bar, and examined:—

1. *By Mr. Lilley:* Mr. Stanley, I observe by the plan you have appended to your report, that you bring the railway on the southern side, down to a point on the river at South Brisbane? Yes, that is so.

2. Have you continued your survey from the south to the north side? I have not, Mr. Lilley.

3. You have made none? No; there is no survey across; none further than South Brisbane.

4. I do not see how it comes that you have made no survey for the purpose of bringing the line from the south to the north side, from that point? My reason for making no survey that way was, that I found, upon examining the ground, that no suitable site could be obtained for a station in North Brisbane, by approaching it across the present bridge, without going through a great deal of very valuable property. In addition to that, I may say, that a very considerable sum of money would be required to make the bridge available for railway purposes. The sum has been put down at £25,000.

5. Then you did not think it necessary to make the survey for those reasons which you have stated in your answer? Yes; I thought they were sufficient reasons to make it unnecessary to carry the survey that way.

6. Then you do not venture to say that there are any engineering difficulties that could not be overcome in bringing the line from South Brisbane to North Brisbane, from the point indicated on this map? I do not say that there are any insurmountable difficulties in the way of bringing the line that way; but if it was brought so, you could not get a good line, and it would be a very expensive one.

7. But you never surveyed it for the purpose, of course? No; I have had no detailed survey made. I have examined the ground with that object in view.

8. Now, will you tell me what expensive property you have to go through, to get to the place where you have fixed the station now on the north side? The first valuable property that the line would pass through, is between the end of the bridge and George street. [*Map on the table referred to.*]

9. What property is that? At the back of the Treasury Hotel. From that you cross George street and enter the property lying between the lane at the back of the Town Hall—Burnett lane—and Adelaide street. You would then cross Adelaide street into the Water Reserve.

10. Well, now, if you please, if you built an addition to the present bridge, could you not carry

the line higher up the river, by the Police Barracks, and so avoid ———? You might do so, Mr. Lilley, by introducing a five-chain curve from the end of the bridge; but that would bring you through the Lands Office.

11. Before you could hit the Treasury square? I have a plan here [*produced*], showing the line in pencil, with a five-chain curve. But a very serious objection to that is, that you would have an open level crossing at the end of Queen street, at a long skew.

12. That would not enable you to reach the Barracks? You could get to the Barracks by aid of introducing that five-chain curve.

13. That would hit the small cottage in which the Survey Department is at present conducted?—Could you not avoid that?—If the five-chain curve takes you into that, that is, so far, the only obstacle in the way? As far as the Government are concerned.

14. Then it would be only through that piece of Government property? Yes.

15. Through the old cottage used as the Survey Office, now? It would take the whole block of buildings there, fronting George street.

16. *By Mr. Macalister:* The George-street property, or the back of it? The George-street property.

17. *By Mr. Lilley:* You will make that five-chain curve from the bridge, as I understand you? Starting from the northern end of the bridge, you would have to introduce a five-chain curve. That curve would land you in the middle of the block of buildings used as the Lands Office.

18. Then you mean the building with the clock in it? Yes.

19. You could not avoid that? Not without using a very much sharper curve.

20. The trains would come in there necessarily at a slow rate: could you not make a shorter curve? I think it would be objectionable at an important station like Brisbane.

21. You would necessarily come up with a gradient from the south side of the river, and under any circumstances the speed would be slow. Would that be an insuperable difficulty?—Could you not reach the Police Barracks by a sharp curve? I have already said you could get there; but you could make no good arrangements for station purposes, with a curve of only five or six chains, without any straight. I fail to see how the shunting could be done, under such conditions, with expedition and economy, in such a cramped space.

22. Where do you propose the station at the Grammar School?—Suppose you keep to the northern line, you propose to bring the railway down the north side of the river and have the station on the Grammar School ground? Yes.

23. Could you not reach that easily from the bridge through the Police Barracks? Not without going through a great deal of valuable property. You would take the whole frontage to the George street——

24. From the Barracks, fronting George street? And beyond that.

25. What property is there that you call valuable property, there? I should call any property fronting George street valuable, Mr. Lilley.

26. There is a small shop at the corner—Murnane's shop: is that valuable property? That would be taken.

27. Then, all the ground is vacant after you cross the street—none of it is sold? I am not prepared, Mr. Lilley, to say whether it would be feasible to bring the line, as regards level, from that point to the Grammar School. I have made no survey.

28. You have made no survey to ascertain that fact? No.

29. Now, is it not a fact that your main reason for recommending the northern line is the liability of the southern side to floods?—Is not that so?—At least, I gather so much from your report? I point that out as an objectionable feature connected with the southern line.

30. Is not that almost the only one?—What other great difficulty occurs to your mind? That is one of the most important—that the line is very subject to floods; and, another objection is, that there is there but a very inconvenient site for a station.

31. That is, assuming it is on the south side? That is the line I understand you to refer to.

32. I am judging between the two lines, without reference to the station at all. Is it not the main reason which induces you to prefer the north side, that the south side is subject to floods? I have said in my report that I consider "There is no very material difference between the two lines, although what little difference does exist is, I consider, rather in favor of the line to North Brisbane; and, upon the whole, from the sounder formation generally obtained on that line, as well as its greater immunity from flood waters, I believe it would be found the most economical line to maintain."

33. Those are the principal grounds? Yes.

34. Now, "the sounder formation," you say. Why do you consider the formation on the south side unsound?—What is the difference?—What would be the effect?—Would the formation be affected by the floods? Yes; because the line passes through more flooded country.

35. Well, now, are you aware of the periodical occurrence of floods—how often they happen? I am hardly in a position to answer that question, Mr. Lilley. I have not been sufficiently long a resident of Queensland.

36. Now, what extent of flooded country do you pass on the north side?—I think you say half-a-mile;—is it not? There is about half-a-mile of embankment on the north side, and a mile and three quarters on the southern line.

37. Whereabout is that half-mile on the north side? At Milton. The low-lying land at Milton, between the distillery and the crossing of the main road.

38. You seem to have carried your line on the south side across the frontages of almost all the valuable allotments. Can you tell me how you came to do that? That line was surveyed with the view of bringing the terminus as near to the end of the bridge as possible.

39. Could you not have avoided that, and kept on —? I endeavored to do so. I found that it was the most economical line to take. In reference to that question, I should like to explain, that the reason for taking the line along those frontages is that there is not sufficient width between Stanley street and the river to keep the line at the back of the buildings. If you go along there at all, you must take the whole property. You encroach so much upon the buildings

that if you take part at all you must have all for the line.

40. Could you not go to the other side? You get into very low-lying land there—flooded land. It is higher near the river bank than at the other side of Stanley street.

41. Have you taken into account, or considered in any way, the probability of bringing the line across the bridge; that is, without any alteration whatever, except adapting the finished structure to the Ipswich line? I have gone into no detailed estimate of it; but I have considered the question, as I have alluded to it in my report: the last paragraph.

42. What are your reasons for thinking that you could not use the bridge to bring the railway across? I have not said that it could not be used; I do not think it would be advisable to do so.

43. I want to know if you think——? It could be used. The line could be brought across the bridge.

44. That is, without adding to the structure at all; merely to cross? No. You would require to make certain alterations, Mr. Lilley.

45. Without making any addition? You would have to introduce an additional girder. The two girders at present are only designed to carry a roadway. If you go and add a railway, you must increase the strength of the structure. That would be expensive.

46. It would not cost £25,000? I have not gone into the figures.

47. Is it not a fact that you never dreamt or thought of bringing it across from South to North Brisbane? I did consider the matter; but I did not think it advisable to recommend it.

48. Then you did not think it advisable to do so?—Is that so? Yes; I had sufficient data to form an opinion upon.

49. What was your data? I know from conversations that I had with the bridge engineer, that it was his opinion that it would cost £20,000 or £25,000 to strengthen the structure sufficiently to carry the railway across.

50. You were one of the witnesses on the Royal Commission. Are you aware that the engineer told us it could be done for £7,000 or £8,000? I am not aware of it; but his statement to me was very different.

51. You say he told you that it would cost £20,000 or £25,000? From £20,000 to £25,000.

52. Now, did he tell you so?—Did you ask him whether another row of piers alongside, to carry the railway, could be made for much less? No; he did not refer to it.

53. Did you think of it?—Did it ever occur to you? If you mean to add an additional row of piers, it would cost more.

54. If he ever said that it could be—said it before the Commission, or anywhere else—is that correct? I cannot reconcile that he said so with the conversations that I have had with him, Mr. Lilley.

55. Then you did not enter into the matter? I have already stated, Mr. Lilley, that I did not enter into any calculations.

56. Therefore, you could not say?—The question has never been submitted to you?—Then you will not state to us whether one amount or the other will be accurate? No; I am not prepared to say so at the present moment.

57. Did it occur to you, the station being in the Treasury yard, at all? Yes; I have a line shown on the same plan that I was referring to before.

58. How would that answer?—There would be hardly room there? The five-chain curve would land you in a street beyond the Treasury yard.

59. Near St. John's. How did you come to fix upon the site near the Grammar School for a station? I found that there was a large area of vacant land there that presented a very suitable position for a station.

60. Did you not think of bringing it up further into the town?—You know the waterholes? Yes; I have had a survey made there.

61. What objection is there to it? The position is not so good, from an engineering point of view, as the one I have recommended. The land lies low, and you would require to make station yards upon an embankment, necessitating expensive foundations for buildings and future extensions, and expensive sidings.

62. Whereabout have you fixed the station at the Grammar School?—Is it before you reach the Grammar School? It is in the vacant land that lies between the western boundary fence of the Grammar School and the Barracks—the fenced-in land below the officers' quarters.

63. There is a great deal of flood there, sometimes. Are you aware of that? It is only a small gully. I suppose a small bridge would carry off all the flood.

64. All the flood—all the drainage from the back ridges of North Brisbane, comes down there. Are aware of that? I am not aware of that.

65. Is that the only place you have thought of or tried for a station? I examined the whole of that locality. That is the position I consider most suitable.

66. *By the Colonial Secretary:* Mr. Stanley, if the railway was to cross the bridge, would you have to follow that semi-circular line that is dotted on your plan or not? It would have to follow that very nearly, in order to get on to the bridge.

67. To get a sweep? If you go at right angles you cannot get on to the bridge, Mr. Palmer.

68. Of course not. Would that line go through sound ground, or flooded ground? It would go through a good deal of low-lying flat land behind Stanley street.

69. Can you tell me what the depth of water is on that land in flood time? There would be from seven to twelve feet of embankment.

70. I understand that the carrying of a railway across flooded land of that description is enormously expensive, both in cost of construction and of maintenance. Is that the case? Yes, it is.

71. Enormously expensive? It adds very considerably to the expense both of construction and maintenance; and it is particularly objectionable for a terminal station.

72. Can you tell me the difference of level between the south side and the north side, at Queen street? Speaking from memory, about eleven feet, Mr. Palmer.

73. What is the length of the bridge? Between 1,000 and 1,100 feet. I am only speaking from memory.

74. The rise, I take it, would be about 1 in 100? 1 in 90, I think.

75. Is it advisable, coming into a terminal station, to have a rise of that description? I do not think a gradient of 1 in 90 is objectionable. It would be better, of course, if you could have a level line.

76. Is it usual to bring railways across a swing bridge? It is never done if it can possibly be avoided.

77. Would it materially interfere with traffic if the swing bridge is changed? It certainly would.

78. Materially? Materially.

79. I suppose you were aware that the Act of Parliament insists upon there being a swing bridge? I understand so.

80. Could you, in carrying out the suggestions of the honorable member for Fortitude Valley—if you put in a set of piers alongside the present bridge—continue the swing bridge? I think not. I think, if you were to utilise the present bridge, you would require to use the swing bridge as now designed. You could not widen the swing.

81. Now, if you came in across that bridge, as proposed, and any extension of the railway down to deep water below, at the flats, is afterwards required, or considered necessary, would there be any great engineering difficulties in going on—greater than from the proposed site for the station at the Grammar School? As far as the character of the ground is concerned, I see no great difficulties with regard to engineering works; but it would necessitate your going right through the heart of the town.

82. At an enormous expense? At an enormous expense for the resumption of property.

83. Then, I thought I understood you to say to Mr. Lilley, that to get from the bridge to the terminal station, anywhere nearer than the site of the Grammar School, it would require a curve of five chains radius. Is that the case? That is what I show upon this plan.

84. And a level crossing at the head of Queen street? Yes, a level crossing at a very long skew—a long angle.

85. A level crossing in Georgestreet?—A level crossing in Georgestreet; another in Adelaide street.

86. That would be two? That would be three: Queen street, George street, and Adelaide street.

87. Are those level crossings desirable in a city? They are always considered most objectionable.

88. And very dangerous? And very dangerous.

89. *By Mr. King:* What is the extent of the flooded ground in South Brisbane over which the line would have to come? Are you referring to the alternative line?

90. The dotted line? 33 chains under flood level.

91. That is not an unusual extent under flood level on the Queensland lines, is it? Well, there are places where there is a greater extent, and no very great loss or damage has resulted.

92. And it is not extremely expensive to construct a line at those places? It has always caused very greatly increased expense for maintenance wherever the line is below flood level.

93. I understand that you have not examined the bridge with a view to ascertain the cost of adapting it for the railway, yourself? I have gone into no detailed estimate.

94. I see, in his examination before the Council, that the bridge engineer estimates the cost of adapting the bridge to carry the railway at £7,000; and he offered to take a contract for that price. I suppose you do not dispute the accuracy of that gentleman? As I said before, I cannot reconcile it with the statements he has made to me privately.

95. £7,000, if done at once; £10,000, if for taking up the flooring after it was finished. That was given in evidence before the Upper House. Is there any provision made, Mr. Stanley, for a swing in the railway bridge across the river at Oxley? No; no provision for a swing bridge. It is considered that the height above the water level is sufficient to allow vessels to pass under it.

96. Is it sufficient to allow sea-going vessels to pass the bridge? I believe it is.

97. Have you made any survey with the view of connecting the proposed terminal station at North Brisbane with any of the wharves? No; I have made no survey with that object in view.

98. You have not anticipated that it would be necessary to connect it with the wharves in Brisbane? I have suggested, in my report, that it might be done by forming tramways down the centres of the streets, if it was considered desirable to do so.

99. *By Mr. Handy:* In the dotted line you have marked on the south side, is the cost of building on that curve to the end of the bridge included in your estimate of £88,272; or is it excluded? That estimate is for the line to the end of the bridge, parallel to the river.

100. There is one running along parallel to the river? The estimate is for that.

101. Then the building of the dotted line would exceed £88,272? It would.

102. Could you give an estimate of how much more? Do you mean in addition to that line?

103. In addition to the estimate you gave? The estimate for the alternative line, from its point of divergence from the first survey to the end of the bridge, is £13,771 for works; and Mr. Cowlshaw's estimate for the land required, is £35,080; being a total of £48,851.

104. In excess of the estimate you have already given for the line to the bridge? Yes; £48,851.

105. And then, to make the railway available to the end of the bridge, you would have to expend £48,851 more than the estimate given in your report? Yes; that is, if you make the two lines.

106. Bringing in this dotted curve? But, I suppose, if the line was to be made across the bridge, you would make the alternative line.

107. Not to have the station? The station would require to be back from the river on the dotted line.

108. Besides the expense of crossing the bridge? Yes; that is not included, of course.

109. Nor the expense from the bridge to the Grammar School, or to any other place? No; that is not included.

110. *By the Secretary for Public Lands:* You say there would have to be three level crossings? Yes.

111. No protection? They would require to be protected.

112. What is the usual way adopted of protecting them?—By a gate across Queen street, when trains are passing? Yes.

113. The same across Adelaide street and the other street? Yes; that is the usual way.

114. By that five-chain curve, as has been suggested, from the bridge, you pass, first, through the Church of England property? Yes; the Church of England property is the first.

115. What is the next? The name of the Crown grantee is Lynch, on allotment No. 3. Then the Treasury Hotel, and then the land lying between that and Gray's place.

116. You see no way of avoiding going through that valuable property? I see no way of doing it—no preferable way.

117. As to the swing bridge, Mr. Stanley, what arrangement would have to be made in regard to trains crossing, if vessels were passing? The vessels could not be allowed to pass when trains were due. Either that, or the trains would have to be stopped.

118. How many minutes before trains were due would it be necessary to stop vessels? The rule is, to have the crossing clear fifteen minutes before the train passes. That is the ordinary rule.

119. *By Mr. Graham:* Putting all questions of detail aside, Mr. Stanley, would the line to the proposed terminus in North Brisbane cost the country a larger sum, independently of the cost of the bridge, if brought from South Brisbane, than if brought by the north side of the river? Very considerably.

120. Would such a line be in any way better adapted than the other for the public convenience? In my opinion, not nearly so convenient.

121. *By the Hon. A. Macalister:* What is your reason for your last answer? The reasons which I have given in detail in the course of my examination: the level crossings—

122. It would not be so convenient in an engineering point of view? Exactly; and the

123. Is that your reason? And the station arrangements, as I have mentioned, would not be so convenient for the public.

124. But you are not talking about the public convenience? I presume that would affect the public convenience.

125. What; the engineering convenience? No; the station arrangements.

126. Do you mean the position of the station? The station arrangements.

127. What arrangements? The buildings and the space for shunting. The space is so limited that there would necessarily be great delay in arranging the trains.

128. Is that in South Brisbane? I am talking of North Brisbane. I gather from your interrogations that is what you mean, Mr. Macalister.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS interposed, and called the Chairman's attention to the manner in which the witness was questioned by the honorable member for Ipswich. He could not follow the examination, however much he might try to do so.

The Hon. A. MACALISTER said he conducted his examination to suit himself; not to please the Minister for Works. He would not be interrupted by the honorable gentleman.

Examination resumed.

129. *By the Hon. A. Macalister:* I believe the Brisbane Bridge is to some extent at an angle,

is it not?—It does not run in a direct line to Queen street? Not in a direct line to Queen street; but at a slight angle.

130. Is it that fact that induces you to think a five-chain curve will take you through the public buildings in George street? I have ascertained that fact by trying it on the plan.

131. From the northern end of the bridge? Yes.

132. In fact, at an angle? That has very little to do with it.

133. As the bridge stands as it does, could you not very easily run into the Treasury yard?—What difficulty would there be in running in there? You could run into the Treasury yard; but you would have a five-chain curve the whole way throughout;—you would get no straight in the line. I think, if you look into the plans, you will see it, and get a better idea of it, Mr. Macalister. [*Plans displayed on the table and examined by honorable members.*]

134. Mr. Stanley, I think you stated, in answer to Mr. Lilley, that you do not consider the bridge, as it stands at present, sufficient to take a train? I believe it would have to be strengthened.

135. Do you mean, Mr. Stanley, a train containing goods and passengers? Any train.

136. Would it take a passenger train?—Would it take a passenger carriage with a locomotive in front? You must regulate the strength of the bridge according to the weight of your locomotive.

137. Very well. You know the weight of a locomotive, I suppose?—The weight of a locomotive is fourteen tons. You know the weight of a passenger carriage?—Would the bridge carry those two? Well, I am not prepared to say definitely that it would not, Mr. Macalister; but I am under the impression that as the bridge has only been constructed for an ordinary roadway, it would not be strong enough to carry an engine. But it is a matter that can be settled by calculation.

138. You stated, in answer to Mr. Palmer, that the Act of Parliament requires that there shall be a swing bridge. Do you know that as a fact? I think my answer was, that I understood it was the case.

139. You understood it. Supposing, now, that instead of the Act requiring a swing bridge, it simply required that the bridge should be capable of permitting sea-going vessels to go up: how would that be affected by the bridge you propose to put across the River Brisbane, six miles further up?—Would sea-going vessels be able to pass under your bridge, six miles above? I have never measured the height of their masts, Mr. Macalister; but I am told on the point, on good authority, that the tallest mast of any ship that goes up the Brisbane River is 43 feet.

140. I am not talking about vessels that go up the Brisbane River now. I presume that they all pass under the present bridge without a swing? We have ten feet greater headway.

141. Take one of Harris' ships—the "Harmodius": would she pass under the bridge? I have never measured the height of her masts. I cannot answer.

142. The vessels that pass under the bridge are not sea-going vessels. The question I put to you is, whether sea-going vessels will pass under the bridge? I cannot say.

143. What is the height?—42 feet, is it not? I have been told that 43 feet is the height required for the largest schooner that goes up the river. We have 47 feet clear headway at low water, and 42 feet at high water spring tides.

144. Will you tell us the height of the Brisbane Bridge? 31 feet 6 inches at spring tides.

145. Then, if a sea-going vessel cannot go under your bridge with all her masts, it will be perfectly useless to have a swing bridge here? That depends on the size of her.

146. I say, if a 500-ton ship wants to go up to Ipswich, can she pass under your bridge? I should say I—

147. Have you any doubt about it? I have never actually measured the height of her masts.

148. Do you know the height of a 500-ton ship's masts?—Are they more than 42 feet high? I should think so.

149. Did you survey the line between Oxley and Brisbane yourself? It was surveyed under my direction.

150. I merely ask a question, if you will give me an answer. Did you measure it yourself?—Did you take the survey? I did not. It was taken under my own directions. I chose the route from my own observation.

151. How many surveys have been made from Oxley to Brisbane? On which side of the river do you refer to?

152. On both sides. Have there been made any on your side? We made three trial surveys.

153. Is that a trial survey you made? That is the third of the surveys—the result of the three trial surveys.

154. How many have been made between Brisbane and Oxley? Fitzgibbon's original survey; Smith's survey; the three on the northern side. That will be five surveys.

155. Now, Mr. Stanley, have you made any survey on the south side? I have made a careful examination of the ground and a partial survey.

156. What do you call a partial survey? After examining the ground between Oxley and South Brisbane, by the different routes that have been surveyed, I came to the conclusion that the best line was that originally proposed by Fitzgibbon. But I was of opinion that certain improvements could be carried out in it. I had some trial surveys made near Oxley with that object in view, and I afterwards adopted Fitzgibbon's survey into South Brisbane.

157. Now, how far did you survey about Oxley? Between the end of the line now under construction and the crossing of the creek.

158. That is about a mile and a half? Yes. I made no alteration in the survey beyond that.

159. You made no survey after that? I made no alteration.

160. Is that Fitzgibbon's survey that you have shown on that plan to South Brisbane? Yes, to a certain point; that is, the Alice-street ferry.

161. You have given an estimate here, that the line to South Brisbane will cost £139,842 2s. 6d. Have you made these estimates up in detail? Yes, sir.

162. Have you got them with you? I have.

163. Have you any objection to lay them on the table?—

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was impossible for the Government to allow that.

Those estimates would be taken advantage of by the contractors for the works.

The Hon. A. MACALISTER: How could they be taken advantage of by the contractors, when the Government had none?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: They had contractors. They had no monster contractors!

The Hon. A. MACALISTER: He should like to see them. He should like to see a contract with anyone.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The honorable gentleman should, in the examination of the witness, confine himself strictly to what was before the House, and not occupy their time.

Examination resumed.

164. *By the Hon. A. Macalister*: Mr. Stanley, your saving in your estimates appears to arise from the cost of land in South Brisbane?—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS called attention to the fact that the previous question was unanswered.

The Hon. A. MACALISTER: It was answered.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The shorthand writer had no answer to it. He (the Secretary for Works) called attention to the manner in which the examination was conducted. He had been trying to keep up with the honorable member's questions, but he could not do so; they were calculated to lead to confusion.

The Hon. A. MACALISTER: He had not the slightest objection to the answer being recorded.

Examination resumed.

165. *By the Hon. A. Macalister*: Mr. Stanley, consider the question put again:—Have you any objection to put the estimates on the table? I can do so, Mr. Macalister, on receiving permission from the honorable the Minister for Works.

166. But you will not do it, without that permission? I cannot do so, sir.

167. Is there anything that would lead to the conclusion that you are consulting the public convenience in your plans? Have you made any comparison of the amount of traffic there would be on the line by the north side and that by the line on the south side? I think, if you refer to my report, you will find that I have adhered to the question strictly from an engineering point of view.

168. In point of fact, you have made no estimate of the traffic at all? No, I have not; I was not called upon to make any.

169. You say a level crossing is usually considered dangerous? In the heart of a city it is.

170. Have you ever known them in the heart of a city? I cannot carry my recollection to any.

171. Have you had level crossings without gates at all? I do not recollect any instance.

172. Have you ever been in Geelong, in Victoria, or Peterborough, in England? Not at either place.

173. I presume that a train coming into a station, although not in the heart of a town, does not come at full speed? No, the speed is slackened.

174. Then, if a train was coming into a town, the pace could be slackened if the train was going to pass a common coach? There would be the danger of frightening the horses.

175. Yes, but that would arise even if there were gates? No, because the horses would not come into such close contact.

176. You believe, then, that level crossings in towns are objectionable? That is generally the opinion of engineers.

177. You presume that 33 chains of the line at South Brisbane would be liable to be flooded? I said that about 33 chains of that alternative line at the back of Stanley street would be affected by floods.

178. Is that Mr. Fitzgibbon's line? No, my own, that I surveyed lately.

179. That would require to be raised, you say, from 7 feet to 8 feet, on account of the floods? From 7 feet to 12 feet.

180. Have you ever seen a flood that high? I took it from the flood level of 1864.

181. At what point did you find it? South Brisbane.

182. At what point? I obtained it near the ferry steps at South Brisbane; there is a mark there.

183. How high were those steps above the level? I can give the height of flood level on reference to the section of the alternative line.

184. Did you ever see a flood at South Brisbane as high as twelve feet? No.

185. Or seven feet? No.

186. Have you ever seen a flood there at all? No, I have never seen a flood there.

187. You are aware that there has been a flood at South Brisbane? I am aware there has been a flood there.

188. Have there been floods since 1864? Yes.

189. You say you have the flood level of 1864? That has been the highest known.

190. Then because there was a flood there in 1864, you think that that would not be a proper way to carry the line? I say it would be an objection, but I did not say the line could not be carried there.

191. What part of the line is it that the level is so low? The land lies to the west of Stanley street.

192. How could there be anything to prevent your carrying the line a few feet further back? You might take it further back, certainly.

193. And get out of the flooded land? Not altogether.

194. But you could take it partly out of this flooded country? It would take it longer round.

195. You have frequently seen the low country at Rosewood flooded? Yes.

196. It has never done any damage? Yes, it has.

197. Not at this particular time? No; during the flood time.

198. Then all that would be required would be an embankment? Exactly so.

199. And to make it strong enough to bear the trains, even in flood time? Yes.

200. At what do you estimate the cost per mile of this line from Oxley to Brisbane; you give the total as £125,359 12s.? That is on the north side?

201. Yes? The total cost would be £134,201 8s.; the distance is 7 miles 31 chains. I have not run out the cost per mile; but it would be easy to do so.



202. Have you yourself made that estimate? It is in part mine; I am answerable for the estimate of the works, not for the land.

203. I see, for the line by South Brisbane, you have put down a sum of £139,842 2s. 6d.; is that your estimate? Partly; but that includes the cost of land, for which I am not responsible.

204. Does that estimate of yours agree with that of any other engineer? I cannot compare it, for this reason, that the estimates given previously to mine included the whole line from Ipswich to Brisbane, whilst this is only a portion of the line.

205. Have you compared that portion of the line? No, not that portion.

206. *By Dr. O'Doherty:* There are just one or two questions I should like to ask you, Mr. Stanley, to set myself right in reference to this bridge. I see that one reason given by Mr. Jones, in his evidence before the Legislative Council last session, in order to bring the railway across the bridge, is that it would be necessary to have an additional row of piers placed along the upper side of the bridge nearest the North Quay, so that the girder could be placed along the upper side of the present bridge. Now, supposing that arrangement carried out, I presume that the inconvenience you speak of, namely, running a level crossing across Queen street, would be obviated, inasmuch as the train would come out without touching Queen street at all; the difficulty you speak of—of trains crossing Queen street—would, in fact, be altogether got rid of? There would, in that case, be no level crossing in Queen street; but there would, instead, be one on the North Quay.

207. With regard to this flooded portion of South Brisbane, I presume that flooded country is really only very objectionable where there is a large and strong rush of water; you are perfectly aware that, excepting in the case of floods like that of 1864, the flood water is only that descending from the little hillocks around South Brisbane—that there is no rush of water? I should suppose it was the back water from the river.

208. In ordinary floods, I mean; excepting in great floods, it is nothing more than the rain water running down from the little hillocks? Yes.

209. Would that affect the construction? Not that only.

210. The back water from the river would not be so injurious as any great rush of water? Certainly not—not so injurious as a rush of water against the line.

211. Would the knowledge of these things lessen the probable cost of the estimate you have made? In my estimate I have allowed for no more works than I consider necessary on account of the level to which the flood rises.

212. *By Mr. Hemmant:* In your report you assume the station to be near the Turkish Baths? The position I have recommended for a station is in land lying between the Grammar School and the Barracks; an alternative survey has been made with the view of bringing it nearer to Queen street—to the old water reservoir in Albert street.

213. In answers given by you in reference to this subject, were you supposing that the station would be in the same place, if the line was brought by the south side, as if it was brought by Oxley? There were several spots as to which I was examined; one was the Treasury square, another

the Police Barracks in George street, and the third the old water reserve I have just mentioned.

214. Has any estimate been made of the value of property that would have to be resumed, in the event of the line crossing the bridge and coming to the water reserve? No; none.

215. Has any survey been made to avoid passing through all that valuable property at South Brisbane? Two surveys have been made at South Brisbane—one parallel with the river, and the other at the back of Stanley street—to avoid the river frontage, and in order to get to the bridge; in getting to the bridge there was no line to avoid the low land.

216. You have stated that one of the objections in taking the line to the bridge is the swing bridge; now, is it your opinion as an engineer, and your experience of steamers and other vessels passing under the bridge, that that swing bridge will ever be used? I think that is hardly a question that I can answer.

217. What greater facilities would be offered for getting to the deep water at Eagle Farm Flats by having the station at the Grammar School Reserve, and by having the station opposite to the Baths? I am only speaking from my recollection of the ground. No survey has been made, but I believe that a line could be more easily got from the position I have suggested—from the bridge near the Orphanage and down York's Hollow, as a line taken the other way would have to pass through a great deal of valuable property.

218. You told the honorable the Colonial Secretary that if the southern route was adopted, you would have to pass through part of the city; now would it not be as practicable to go from the waterhole opposite the Turkish Baths, as from the place you propose, opposite the Grammar School; is not that almost a dead level? I found, in preparing these sections, that there was a difference of level of thirty-eight feet between the waterhole and the site proposed as a station, near the Grammar School; so that you would have that to rise in a distance of about thirty chains, giving a gradient of one in sixty.

219. You would, under any circumstances, have to raise the station ground? I am allowing for that; you have various streets to cross in going that way.

220. What streets? Ann street, Turbot street, and Roma street.

221. *By Mr. Thorn:* In making this survey from Oxley to North Brisbane, had you *carte blanche* from the Minister, or was it a *sine qua non* when you received your instructions that the line should go that way, and not by South Brisbane? I was perfectly untrammelled in any way. I was instructed to find the best and most available line.

222. But you made no survey from the South to North Brisbane? No, I had no instructions to do so.

223. *By Mr. Stephens:* I think I understood you to say, that you did not take into account the traffic that might arise from the Logan? No, I made my report simply from an engineering point of view.

224. Did you or not take into account the public convenience as regarded traffic? I did not; I did not consider it was my business to do so.

225. Was the public convenience and advantage, and drawing traffic to the line by enabling

us, by means of this railway, to carry on a coal and other export trade, taken into account at all? As I have stated, the only thing I had to consider was the engineering features of the two lines.

226. I would like to have a little more information respecting the dotted line at South Brisbane. I think you said that the greater part of it was from seven to twelve feet below the flood level? I did not say the greater part; I gave the exact distances afterwards.

227. Would you be kind enough to give me the number of chains that there are, twelve feet under flood level? I am not prepared to give that information now, but I can supply it to-morrow.

228. Can you tell me where any one point is situated? I think, on referring to my report, you will see that I state that an embankment would be required, varying from 7 feet to 12 feet in depth.

229. You do not mean to say that it is from 7 feet to 12 feet under flood level? No, the embankment would require to be from 7 to 12 feet.

230. Can you give me the length of line represented by the dotted line from Stanley street to the bridge? Eighty-three chains.

231. The total length is 83 chains, of which 33 are under flood level? 33 chains are subject to be affected by flood water.

232. In how many places does it pass through a swamp? I cannot give that information from this section; all this low-lying land that you see in this section, is swampy ground.

233. Have you examined it yourself? Yes.

234. The whole 33 chains is swampy ground? No; I am not prepared to say that.

235. This same length of 83 chains—what is the cost for land and work separately? The cost for works is £13,771, the cost of land has been valued by Mr. Cowlshaw at £35,080—that £35,080 includes a portion of the river frontage, which it was intended to resume for the purposes of wharfage in connection with that line, between the bridge and Towns and Company's wharf.

236. What is the estimate of the 64 chains which you state is the length of the river bank between those places—I mean for works? £3,908 for works up to the end of the bridge.

237. Did I understand you to say that you cannot give the cost of the dotted line without the wharfage allotments? I have not got the information here.

238. And, at the other end, where the dotted line and the other line join, there is some Government land on the river bank; could that be made available without purchasing that from Towns' wharf to the bridge? At this moment, I do not recollect where there is any Government land; there is a reserve shown on this plan, but it does not front the river.

239. Have you ever looked at any of the published maps of Brisbane? Yes; this one I got from the Survey Office.

240. There were 15 miles of railway adopted last session, can you tell me what was the estimated cost of it? I cannot do so without the permission of the Government; my estimate has never been published.

241. Then, the public have no information whatever as to even the estimated cost? I am not prepared to answer that question.

242. But, you say, it has never been published? My estimate was furnished to the Government, but it has never been published.

243. What was the amount? That I cannot answer without permission.

244. *By Dr. O'Doherty*: In one answer to a question I asked with regard to trains passing over the bridge, you said that if the idea of Mr. Jones was carried out, the train in crossing from the bridge on to the north side would not have to cross Queen street—would that materially affect the course of it from that marked here?—if the train came into North Quay, would you have to cross Adelaide street? To avoid crossing Adelaide street you would have to introduce a double curve of five chains each way, or what we call an S curve.

245. Would that be an objection? I should consider it a great objection near to a terminal station.

246. *By Mr. Griffith*: Is there any difference in the level between the Brisbane end of the bridge and the corner of Queen and George streets? I should say that there was a considerable difference, but I have not the levels.

247. Could you say about what? I should not like to say how many feet.

248. Would there probably have to be a bridge under George street, instead of a level crossing? No, the length is so short that you could not get sufficient height for your line under George street.

249. Would it be possible to have a level crossing, if there is so much difference, without cutting George street? There has been no survey made, but from my knowledge of the ground I should say you could not cross this street without making a level crossing.

250. If the line came over the bridge there would be no level crossing in Queen street, but on the North Quay? Yes.

251. Where, if the line came across the bridge, would you propose to make the station? I have made no proposal.

252. Could not you take it to the present proposed site? Yes. I have mentioned that, but it would incur going through a great deal of town property.

253. By having a sharp curve would it be necessary to cross any streets to get to the water-hole, except Adelaide street? George, Adelaide, and Turbot streets.

254. What property would it have to go through—are there many allotments? A great many buildings, all of which are not shown on this plan, which is an old one.

255. Would it be necessary to purchase the Treasury Hotel, if the line went by a curve from the upper end of the bridge? No, you would avoid that.

256. Where would it cross George street? By introducing an S curve, it would cross by the Police Barricks.

257. Would it not be rather an over-road bridge in George street instead of a level crossing? I have not the levels, so I cannot answer that question. I believe it would be a level crossing.

258. You say that in South Brisbane you could take the dotted line further back—have you measured it? Yes, it could be done, but it would add to the length.

259. Would it be more than 20 chains at the outside? I could not answer that question without measuring it.

260. Would it reduce the cost of land very considerably? I cannot say that it would or not; I do not know what land it would go through without making a survey.

261. Could not the £13,000 that you have estimated for the purposes of construction of that alternative line be diminished by varying the route? I can hardly say that it would, without going into a survey and taking out the quantities.

262. Have you only made one trial survey? I ran two or three preliminary lines before I adopted that.

263. You said that from Oxley you adopted Mr. Fitzgibbon's line right into South Brisbane; when was that made? In 1866, I think.

264. Have you ever considered the possibility of taking that line so as to avoid some of the allotments fronting the road between the end of it and Oxley? What particular part do you refer to?

265. Along the Ipswich road, say for about two miles out of South Brisbane—where all the allotments appear to front the road? That could be done, but only by getting into much heavier cuttings; the ground rises there considerably.

266. Or by crossing the road? You get into frontages on the other side.

267. Have you made an estimate of the cost from Mr. Fitzgibbon's estimate or what? From my own calculations.

268. *By the Secretary for Public Works:* Mr. Stanley, in recommending this plan of bringing the railway into North Brisbane to the Government, you have been actuated, I think you say, solely by engineering reasons? Solely.

269. And you are prepared, as Chief Engineer of this portion of the railways of the colony, to stake your professional reputation on the recommendation you have made? I am prepared to do so on the recommendations I have made in my report.

270. I mean as far as the cost of the line and the correctness of the surveys you have furnished to the Government? Certainly.

271. Objection has been taken to your estimate of the cost of the bridge across the river at Oxley; have you reason to believe that your estimate of £35,000 is a fair one, and that it would meet the outlay? I have every reason to believe that it will; the estimate has been prepared with care.

272. Have you any other reason to guide you in thinking that it is sufficient? I have.

273. Will you state what is that other reason? I showed my estimates to Mr. Jones, the engineer of the bridge, and asked his opinion of them, and he stated that he was so convinced that my estimates were sufficient, that if the Government would let him the contract at those prices, he was prepared to take it.

274. Do you know sufficient of Mr. Jones to justify you in thinking that he would be competent to take that contract? From his important position as engineer for the bridge, and from his connection with an important firm at home, Messrs. Brassey and Co., of Birkenhead, I have every reason to think so.

275. Regarding this mode of entering the town by the bridge now in course of construction, do

you think it would be desirable from an engineering point of view, to enter the station with such a curve as would be necessitated—namely, five chains—if that bridge was used? It would be highly objectionable.

276. You could not possibly recommend it as an engineer? I could not possibly recommend it as an engineer.

277. Have you reason to think that the traffic manager would object to it? I am perfectly certain from what I know of his views on these subjects that he would.

278. And as the engineer entrusted with the construction of an important line, such as that between Ipswich and Brisbane, may I ask you if you would consider it would be extremely undesirable to enter Brisbane by the present bridge? I believe to enter North Brisbane by the present bridge would be objectionable as regards engineering features, and also costly.

279. *By the Hon. A. Macalister:* You have repeatedly stated that a five-chain curve is objectionable? In entering the station at Brisbane.

280. Is it not a fact that you propose to enter Ipswich by a five-chain curve? No, it is not; that is on a siding.

281. Did Mr. Jones inform you that he was prepared to contract to build the bridge at Oxley for £35,000? He said that if the Government offered him the work at my schedule prices, he would be prepared to take it.

282. Have you prepared specifications for that bridge? No; it is not usual to do so in making a preliminary estimate; Mr. Jones said he would undertake to do the same class of work as the Brisbane Bridge.

283. You had some conversation, but you did not show him the working plans? No specifications, but only the drawings.

284. Supposing the line was adopted, how long would it take you to make those specifications? I could not say; perhaps several days.

285. Supposing you had them prepared in time to go home by the next month's mail, when do you suppose it would be done? I should say within two years.

286. You are quite sure of that? Yes; I believe it would.

287. *By Mr. Lilley:* And when could the line be finished from Ipswich to South Brisbane, assuming you had to go that way, to the end of the bridge? I think we might complete the works within eighteen months.

288. Taken the other way, when do you contemplate the completion of the line on the north side? I think that would be regulated by the time occupied in the construction of the bridge.

289. Two years? I stated that I thought it could be completed within two years from the time of sending home the plans and specifications.

290. Then there would be a difference of six months? About that.

291. *By Mr. Stephens:* How many miles of the 23 miles between Ipswich and Brisbane have been commenced? Something under 15 miles.

292. The total length is about twenty-four miles? Yes.

293. Then there are nine miles more than have been commenced? Yes.

294. When did you commence the work? Early in February.

295. Would it take eighteen months to complete the other portion? Yes.

296. When do you anticipate finishing the fifteen miles approved of last session? That depends upon the decision come to with reference to the Ipswich end of the line.

297. How long do you anticipate it will take to finish the eight or nine miles? About eighteen months.

298. *By Mr. Griffith*: How long would it take to make the line over Brisbane Bridge? I cannot say.

299. *By Mr. Thorn*: How much wider is the Brisbane Bridge roadway than the Ipswich Bridge roadway, exclusive of foot passengers? The available width?

300. Yes? I cannot say exactly the available width.

301. Are you aware that if sufficient space was taken off for railway trains, there would be sufficient left for general purposes? I cannot say, as I have not got the drawings by me.

302. *By the Hon. A. Macalister*: Upon the Ipswich Bridge, do not the rails stand on the cylinders; or, is not one of them outside? I believe they are above the cylinders. They are not overhanging.

303. They are not? No; I believe not.

304. You will undertake to say they are not overhanging? I believe not; but I should not like to give a positive answer from memory.

305. Can you tell us what is the width of the cylinders of the Ipswich Bridge at the top?—Is it 3 feet 6 inches? It is 8 feet diameter.

306. Yes; nearly 8 feet diameter. But I want to know from you, whether two rails, 3 feet 6 inches apart, are not outside the cylinders on the Ipswich Bridge? I think not, Mr. Macalister; but I could not answer the question correctly without referring to the plans—not from memory.

On the motion of the SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS, leave was given to the Witness to retire.

The House resumed, and the Chairman reported that evidence had been taken by the committee.

Mr. MACDEVITT said he did not take the credit to himself of having investigated the merits of the two lines of railway. But there were several honorable members who professed to take an interest in it, and who were anxious to have the advantage of every opportunity to obtain information that would enable them to come to a decision upon the question, and to fortify themselves in the course they might adopt. With that object, and to gain a little more time to consider the evidence which had been given before the committee, he moved the adjournment of the debate.

HONORABLE MEMBERS on both sides of the House: No, no.

Mr. MACDEVITT said he would withdraw the motion for adjournment.

Mr. GRAHAM said he had a few brief words to offer, to which he called the attention of the honorable member for Kennedy, who was a country representative, and therefore one of those who had been so strongly appealed to by the honorable member for Wide Bay, and particularly as the honorable member for

Kennedy was absent from the House during the examination of the witness. He had put two questions to Mr. Stanley, which, with that gentleman's answers, he should state to the honorable member for Kennedy, and they would be quite sufficient proof to the honorable member of the propriety of the course which was taken by the Government. The first question which he had put to Mr. Stanley was—Whether the line, putting all details aside, to the proposed railway station in North Brisbane, would cost the country a much larger sum, independently of the cost of the bridge, if brought by South Brisbane, than if brought by the north side of the river? And Mr. Stanley's answer was—That it would cost much more. The second question was—Would such a line be in any way more convenient for the public than the other? The answer was—That it would be less convenient. That settled the question. The whole examination tended to show that, whatever the expense of carrying the railway to the river at South Brisbane might be, there was not the shadow of a doubt that to bring the line thence to North Brisbane would cost the country £100,000 or £150,000 more. Therefore honorable members from the country, who had no interest whatever in the question, should vote for what was best for the country. He supported the proposal of the Government.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he apprehended that this was not a party question; nor was it a question entirely of engineering; nor was it a question entirely of cost. But it was a question of very considerable importance to the country, not for the present so much as the future; because all knew that if the railway was constructed not in the most suitable manner and not in the way best adapted to the requirements of the capital of the colony, it would be necessary before many years were over to come down to the House again to ask for an alteration and extension of the line at a time when the cost would be necessarily increased. He thought it would be better that, if any different line than that proposed by the Government were to cause some increased expenditure, the House should not therefore be deterred from considering it. However, it appeared to be a foregone conclusion with honorable members that there was only one line to be adopted. He thought the House had not been treated fairly by the Government in this matter. It had been most ingeniously contrived that they should have the fullest information upon one line; but, upon the other, as was well known to every honorable member, the Government wished to afford no information whatever. They were told that there was no alternative between the north line and the South Brisbane line. If they looked at Mr. Stanley's report they would see that they had not to consider the question, whether the line ought to come by South Brisbane or not; as it was a question they were not in a position to

decide. Yet it was upon record that a bridge could be constructed alongside the Corporation Bridge for £15,000, while the bridge to be erected across the river near Oxley was to cost £35,000. Was not that a matter of very serious consequence?

Dr. O'DONERTY, by way of explanation, said he had just read over the evidence of the bridge engineer. It had been suggested to the engineer that a new railway bridge would cost £50,000; and, in answer, he had stated that it would cost very much less than that to make an addition to the present bridge.

Mr. GRIFFITH: It was not a question of the Brisbane Bridge at all, but whether the railway was to come here by way of South Brisbane or not; whether it was to come by Oxley, to get all the traffic between that place and South Brisbane, where a large population was settled; or whether it was to cross the river and come by barren ridges, where no communication could be formed with any other part of the country. Fortunately he was, in this matter, as disinterested as any man could be; because he believed that his constituents did not care which way the railway came. He had just listened to the evidence given before the committee, and he had not made up his mind, nor had he proper time to do so, now; but he must give his vote. If the House rejected the motion of the Government, upon those who opposed it would be the odium of obstructing the making of the railway. Parliament had been summoned so late, that if the House did not now settle the question, the men, they were told, would be knocked off work. But where was the necessity for that? The House might delay the question for even a week, to get information. No; they must swallow all that the Minister for Works told them, or incur that odium. From the evidence, it appeared that there were certain advantages in the railway coming by South Brisbane. Many honorable members seemed to think that there was a fight between the two divisions of the city. It might be remembered that there were two sides to the river. But it seemed to have been argued throughout that one side was to be made and the other ruined by the railway. Both were affected. In the matter of wharfage accommodation, did any honorable member suppose that the limited space around the small pocket that formed North Brisbane would be sufficient to accommodate ships loading and discharging cargo some years hence? On the south side, when the line might hereafter be extended to the Logan, there was wharfage accommodation right round Kangaroo Point; on the north side, there was the advantage of all the river frontage to Teneriffe, to Breakfast Creek, and down to Eagle Farm. Yet the House were told, now, that because it would cost a few thousand pounds more than was estimated in the report, they were not to take all those considerations into account; they were just to jump at what was offered. Of the enormous

sum of £51,000 put down for land at South Brisbane, it appeared that £42,000 was for that strip between Stanley street and the river, which every honorable member knew was quite unnecessary, as, if the railway was taken further back over high land, the expense would be very much less. Then came the difficulty of the bridge. He wanted to know why that which was so objectionable for Brisbane, a curve of five chains radius, was considered the very thing for Ipswich? That was one of the things that ought to be explained. To a certain extent the House were bound to keep faith with the public. He did not think any honorable member could say that the public faith had not been engaged in the bringing of the continuation of the railway from Oxley to South Brisbane. That was a question that the House heard nothing of now; but it ought to be taken into consideration. There was little chance of any such motion being carried, but as he thought the House ought to have additional information and further time to discuss the subject before them, he felt obliged to move the adjournment of the debate until this day week.

*Question*—That this debate be now adjourned.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY observed that it had been stated on behalf of Ministers that if there was any strong inclination on the part of honorable members to adjourn this debate till to-morrow, there would be no objection to such a course. That offer was not accepted, the general opinion was that the debate should go on and be finished to-night, and it was a little too late for the honorable member for East Moreton to expect to carry his motion. He agreed with the honorable and learned member that this should not be made a party question; it was one that, he believed, should only be looked at as the honorable member for Clermont had looked at it. The House were simply to decide what was best for the country at large. Feeling that, he should say a few words on the reasons which determined him as a member of the Government in supporting the plan for the railway coming down the north side of the river from the crossing near Oxley Creek. But, before doing so, he might be allowed to refer to some statements which had fallen from the honorable member for South Brisbane, that this question had been hurried in consequence of Parliament being summoned so late. So far from that having anything to do with the present question, he could only inform the House that if they had met earlier, the Government would not have been ready to go into the railway question any sooner than now, because the surveys and reports of the engineers had only been completed since the session was opened. Every exertion was no doubt made by the engineers and their staffs to complete the surveys in proper time; but it was utterly impossible to complete a proper survey, after taking the

trial surveys, and to go into the subject thoroughly, as they had done, any sooner. He said, therefore, that the meeting of Parliament had nothing to do with the question. He might say further, that last session he stated to the House that he had no intention of calling Parliament together earlier than May or June, unless something very pressing arose. As to the five-chain curve, which the honorable member for East Moreton had said was so very objectionable at Brisbane, while it was not so at Ipswich, the difference was this: the five-chain curve at Ipswich was merely a siding curve—it was not the main line, as it would be at Brisbane. If he understood the plans of the engineers properly, the line came into Ipswich on an eight-chain curve, and the only five-chain curve was to enable the trains to run over the bridge to the workshops at Ipswich. The honorable member for East Moreton had taxed the Government with not keeping public faith. What public faith had to do with making the railway—with bringing the line into Brisbane—he (the Colonial Secretary) could not understand. The south side was never determined on—nothing was done about the carrying out of the line, until last session. The public faith was never pledged to the south side. The honorable member for South Brisbane, he had no doubt, had pledged the public faith over and over again, so far as he could individually pledge it, to bring the railway into South Brisbane; but that went for nothing. The honorable member, or any other honorable member, was never authorised, in any way, to pledge the public faith as to which side of the river the line was to come. It was, therefore, ridiculous to tax the Government with a breach of faith, or to talk about it at all. They put the plans of the Ipswich and Brisbane Railway on the table last session, and then it was distinctly stated by the Minister for Works that the Government did not lay them on the table as final—that they would not be adhered to—that changes might take place at either end. The plans were produced to enable the Government to get on with the work where there could be no doubt or dispute as to the line. He (the Colonial Secretary) approved of the line on the north side from no party motives, and, he needed hardly to add, from no personal motives. It did not matter to him a farthing which side of the river the line came down. He went into the railway question with a clear feeling on his part that he would decide according to his best judgment upon seeing the plans. Three weeks ago, if anyone asked him to state, on his honor, which side of the river he was prepared to support, he could not have informed him; nor did he endeavor to make up his mind either one way or the other until he had the engineer with all his plans before him in his office, and that officer's explanations, to guide him. He then came to the conclusion, as every member of the Government did—not all together, but

upon examination of the plans—that the north line, crossing the river at Oxley, was the proper one to support; and, believing that, and feeling that it was the unanimous decision of the Government, he held that it was the duty of the Government to propose it for the adoption of Parliament. He had a great deal of confidence in the Chief Engineer, under whose direction the survey of the line had taken place; who was quite aware that he was utterly untrammelled in the survey he was to make; who had no directions, except to find the best line into Brisbane. He approved of the line further, because he believed that, with the increase of the trade and commerce of the colony hereafter, it would be absolutely essential that the railway should be extended to deep water; and he believed that the best termination of the line at present, whence it could be easily extended to deep water, was the proposed station near the Grammar School—chosen by the Chief Engineer. Through the saddle of the hill at the back of the Orphan School and along York Hollow, the line could be extended, without encountering any engineering difficulties whatever, to deep water, where ships of almost any tonnage likely to come to this port could lie to receive or discharge cargo. The House ought to take this into consideration in deciding upon the terminus. The honorable member for South Brisbane had told the House over and over again—at all events, they had been told it—to-night, that sooner or later, the Government must relieve the Corporation of the bridge. If the Government were driven upon the horns of a dilemma; if they found that it was absolutely necessary that they should take the bridge over, and make it a free bridge, or that they should buy it for the purpose of adapting it for railway purposes; he would say, of the two, buy it out-and-out, and let it be a free bridge.

HONORABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: But, do not throw away money for the purpose of adapting it for railway purposes. He thought the evidence given to-night had shown the difficulties of getting over that bridge, and getting into the heart of Brisbane, were almost insuperable. It had been said by Mr. Stephens that a railway to the moon was a mere matter of expense. Engineering difficulties were always to be surmounted. But he (the Colonial Secretary) said that the taking of the railway down Queen street would be more expensive than the line from Ipswich. He thought that might be studied by the House. Although he was not quite certain, he thought that such a thing as a level crossing through a town was not allowed at home; and it should not be allowed here. The lives of a great many of his fellow-citizens would be inevitably sacrificed in the course of a year, if level crossings were allowed at the corner of Queen street, and in George street, and in Adelaide street; and they

were, he thought, very much more valuable and important to be considered than any amount at which the advantages of a line coming by that route could be estimated. Some endeavors were made by the honorable member for Ipswich, Mr. Macalister, to show that the making of the bridge at Oxley would stop sea-going vessels from passing up the river. He (the Colonial Secretary) should like to know how such vessels were to get up there? The river would have to be dug out, before they could get up there. He could, however, tell honorable members that he had been informed, by experienced nautical men, that the largest schooners trading to this port would be able to go up the river and pass under the railway bridge with their topmasts housed. The height of the masts of the largest was not more than forty-two feet, and there was a clear roadway of forty-seven feet under the bridge at low water. So that any vessels which were likely to come up for coal could conveniently pass that bridge. But it was not necessary that they should pass the bridge, and go twelve miles further up the river, as the coal could be brought from the pits by the railway to shoots where the vessels could load. The bridge would not at all injure the navigation of the river. The ordinary steamers which ran on the Brisbane would have no difficulty whatever in passing under the bridge at any time of the tide. The House had been told that time was a matter of very great consideration in the railway, and so it was; but not in the way in which the honorable gentleman had put it. In his (the Colonial Secretary's) opinion, it was of importance that the Government should not hurry on the construction of the line too much. He remembered a time of great distress in the colony caused by the number of navvies who had been brought here to rush on the completion of the Toowoomba Railway, and who had been turned adrift and were idle when that work was done. The colony was put to enormous expense to keep those men from want in relief camps; and, in the end, the greater part of that labor left this colony never to return. It was not the proper way to carry on the public works—to rush them on by importing labor which, when the railways were finished, would find no market. It was, he thought, much better that they should go on quietly and steadily, so that the country would be enabled to absorb the labor gradually as the works were completed. That would be better than to have a repetition of what took place in 1866-7. He had very great confidence in the Engineer-in-Chief. The estimates which that officer had placed in the hands of the Works Department, for the portion of the line now in progress, he had very good reason to believe would not be exceeded. The progress of the works was satisfactory so far. Although they had been retarded by bad weather, yet the Government had every reason to believe that the works would be

completed within the estimates made by the engineer. That being so, it gave them increased confidence in his other estimates. He believed that the design of the north line was the best, and on that ground he supported it.

Mr. FERRETT was understood to say that he was almost at a loss to decide upon the best of the two lines which were under the notice of the House. His idea heretofore was, that the south side was the proper route for the railway from Ipswich to Brisbane, and also to deep water; but as the matter was put now, it was only a question of bringing the line to North Brisbane. That had altered his views to some extent, because, if the line was to be brought to North Brisbane by way of South Brisbane, and to come over the present bridge, that did away with all that had been previously done. With regard to the bridge question, especially the proposed structure at Seventeen-mile Rocks, he did not think the Government ought to be parties to stopping the navigation of the river, so long as that high road should be required by the colliers. It should be borne in mind that our great coal beds were above the site of the railway bridge; and any vessel requiring to go up to load with coal should be able to do so. The remark had been made, that no sea-going vessel could get up, without the river being dug out. Why not as well dig out the river, there, where coal was, as dig it out at Brisbane? He did not see why one part of the colony was not entitled to that as well as another. It seemed to him that every attention was always paid to Brisbane, but none to the navigation further up the river. A dredge was purchased years ago expressly to dredge the river where required all the way to Ipswich. What was done with that dredge? It was sent somewhere else, and the dredging was stopped. A second dredge was provided for the Ipswich navigation, and it was afterwards sold, and the money realised was spent chiefly in dredging the river below Brisbane. He was at a loss how to vote; but he could not think of voting for a railway to be brought over the present bridge into North Brisbane.

Mr. MILES said he thought he should on this occasion vote with the Government. He should do so, simply because he was extremely anxious to see this question settled. The Ipswich Railway had been a vexed question for seven or eight years past, in fact he was a member of the House for about that time, and public business had been retarded by that question, and more political capital had been made out of it than of all other subjects that had come before the House. In voting for the line coming by the north side of the river, he was, to a great extent, voting in the dark. The House had no information as to the actual cost of the south line, but he should vote for the motion of the Government, in order to have the question done with. The Minister for Works had very

disingenuously reserved another portion of the Ipswich line, which would come before the House to-morrow. Upon that he (Mr. Miles) was not quite sure that he would be in accord with the Government. But, for the present proposal, whatever it might cost, it would be well for the country to have it settled, once and for all, so that the Minister for Works should not be able to make any more political capital out of it. If he should act in accordance with his own feelings, he would vote against both propositions of the Government, because he believed that the proper place for the terminus of the line was on the south side of the river—if the extension was to be reproductive—where wharves and stores could be erected for receiving and discharging goods and produce. But it was no use his taking up the time of the House in arguing upon those matters. This was the last card that the Minister for Works had to play, and he wished him well out of the game the honorable gentleman had kept up so long. The country would be benefited, whatever the cost, by the settlement of the question of the railway extension from Ipswich. The prosperity of the country had been retarded by it being kept open so long. Those were his substantial reasons for supporting the motion.

The question of the adjournment of the debate was put and negatived, upon a division:—

Ayes, 8.	Noes, 20.
Mr. Griffith	Mr. Palmer
" Thorn	" J. Scott
" Stephens	" Ramsay
Dr. O'Doherty	" Walsh
Mr. Macalister	" Miles
" Edmondstone	" Thompson
" King	" W. Scott
" MacDevitt.	" Cribb
	" Handy
	" Royds
	" Graham
	" Fyfe
	" Bramston
	" Lilley
	" Bell
	" Wienholt
	" Hemmant
	" Buchanan
	" Ferrett
	" Clark.

The original motion was then put and affirmed.