

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 3 NOVEMBER 1880

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 3 November, 1880.

Petition.—Motion for Adjournment.—Formal Business.
—Branch Railways.

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

PETITION.

Mr. MACFARLANE presented a petition from John Ferret, of Ipswich, with reference to the Gulland Railway.

Petition read and received.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. STEVENS said he moved the adjournment with the view of correcting the report of a short speech he made yesterday afternoon when the salary of the Curator of the Museum was under discussion. He did not attribute any great blame to the reporters, because he was hoarse and possibly had not spoken distinctly enough. He was reported to have said that "he was quite certain that what had been said by the Minister for Works was true—that to ventilate the supposed grievances of a Civil servant was to injure his prospects in the future." What he did say was that he was sorry to learn from the first speech the Minister for Works had made on the question, that if a Civil servant had his grievances ventilated in the House his future prospects would be damned in the eyes of the Ministry. That was the only deduction he could draw from the speech. He moved the adjournment of the House.

Question put and negatived.

FORMAL BUSINESS.

On the motion of the Hon. S. W. GRIFFITH, it was resolved—

That there be laid upon the table of the House, a Copy of the Charter-party of the ship "Scottish Prince," now on her passage from England to this colony with emigrants.

BRANCH RAILWAYS.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Mr. Macrossan) said that when he gave notice of the motion standing in his name he had not the slightest intention, as was supposed by the leader of the Opposition, of bunching these different lines together. It was a thing he did not approve of. He gave notice of motion in the way he did simply for the sake of brevity. He should read the whole of the motion, and then he would propose the lines one by one, so that the House might have an opportunity of expressing its opinion of each line upon its own merits. He moved—

That the Plans, Sections, and Books of Reference of the following Railways be approved, viz:—

- (1.) Brisbane to Sandgate, as laid on the table of the House on 20th October.
- (2.) Oxley to South Brisbane, as laid on the table of the House on 20th October.
- (3.) Branch Line from Sandgate Line to Racecourse, as laid on the table of the House on the 26th October.
- (4.) Maryborough to Burrum, as laid on the table of the House on the 27th October.

And that the said Plans, Sections, and Books of Reference be transmitted to the Legislative Council for their approval, by Message in the usual form.

The first line was the Sandgate line, a line which the people of Brisbane had been asking for for a long time, and the people of Sandgate had been just as anxious to have it. Last year the House approved of the making of this railway, and voted a sum of £52,000 for that purpose. Several lines were surveyed under the instructions of former Ministers, before Parliament approved of

the making of the railway. The lines ultimately were reduced to two main lines and a deviation from each of them. The line which was laid on the table of the House was the one that was first surveyed; and from an engineering point of view he believed it was the best one. It was the one which the engineer himself approved of, from an engineering point of view, from the very start. It left the present terminus at Brisbane at the steam-shed, and went under the road near the new Grammar School by a short tunnel of a chain or two in length, and then went through the Victoria Park, skirting that side of the park nearest the terrace until it got out to the Bowen Bridge road, which it crossed on the level into the Acclimatisation Society's grounds, and then on through Bowen Park striking in the direction of O'Riley's Hill; crossing to the left of that it went through Mr. Edmondstone's paddock, crossing Breakfast Creek in that paddock. It then followed the watercourse up the valley until it got to the road bounding the Sports Ground, and went across that road also on the level. He ought to have stated that it crossed another road between the Bowen Bridge and this road—a road leading up to the Bowen Hills—it crossed that on a bridge, which was the only over-bridge on the whole line. It cut through the corner of the Sports Ground—the portion nearest the Albion Hotel—and then went on to the road called the old Gypmie road, which it crossed, skirting round the side of the hill upon which Mr. Little's house was built—in fact, it was a continuation of the hill upon which was the residence of the hon. member for Enoggera. The line then continued round the side of that hill and crossed the Sandgate road making for Kedron Brook, which it crossed about ten chains above the Sandgate road; and from there it went on and crossed the Sandgate road this side of the German Station. It was intended to have a station at Bowen Park, another at the Sports Ground to accommodate settlement round Albion Hill and the village of Lutwyche; there would also be a station where the line crossed the road this side of the German Station. It then took a straight course from there across the Red Hills towards Nudgee, taking in all the agricultural ground of the Nudgee settlement until it came to the water reserve, about twenty odd chains from the St. Vincent's Orphanage. It then continued from that point through the water reserve and crossed Cabbage-tree Creek near the bridge on the main Sandgate road. The railway bridge crossed the creek so as to impede the navigation as little as possible. After crossing Cabbage-tree Creek the line turned a little to the right, and made across for Sandgate, and terminated there, as they entered the town on the right hand side of the flat, under the hill on which the Church of England stood. That was the course, as near as he could recollect, as it was on the plans on the table of the House. He could give hon. members particulars as to the different lines which had been surveyed at different times by himself and preceding Ministers. Before doing so he might as well tell the House that to arrive at something like an approximate estimate of the cost of the land resumptions required by the different lines, he had caused a valuation to be made by two competent valuers, one inside and the other outside the municipality, as far as the German Station. From the German Station he had had no valuation made, because the land from the German Station not being so valuable would not be a very great item in the expense, especially as he knew that a great portion of the land would be given for nothing. The line which was at present on the table of the House was marked No. 3, going by the Victoria Park, Bowen Park, and the Sports Ground. The value of the land

resumptions required for that line was £5,467; the cost of construction, according to the engineer's estimate, was £60,635; adding the two items together—the cost of construction and the value of the land to be resumed—with the value of the severance included, the amount was £66,102. Hon. gentlemen would remember that £52,000 had been voted, so that there would be a deficiency of £14,102 to be made up by his hon. colleague the Treasurer before the line could be completed. He would now give the cost of the other routes upon the same principle of resumptions of land. Route No. 1, by the Valley, Bowen Park, and the Sports Ground, started from the present terminus, going through the present Grammar School grounds, skirting round Observatory Hill and across the vacant piece of land belonging to the Education Department near the Fire Brigade Station, across to Wickham terrace, down the watercourse which came from the hill at Wickham terrace, going behind Wickham street through the Valley, crossing Brunswick street, and taking a detour into Bowen Park, and meeting the line proposed by Bowen Park at a distance of two miles or more beyond the present terminus. The value of the resumptions of land for that route through the Valley was £17,903; the other resumptions were £5,467, the cost of construction £70,767, making in all £94,137. Hon. gentlemen would bear him out in saying that that route must be more costly owing to the number of streets it went through and the number of diversions that must be made in each street, and also the crossing accommodation that must be given to the people living in those streets. The balance required to make the route would be £42,137; in other words, it was in round numbers £42,000 beyond the present vote. Another route was *via* the Valley, Bowen Park, the River side, and the Hamilton. The resumptions were the same for the Valley; but for the other portions of the route they would amount to £2,394. That, added to the Valley resumptions and the cost of construction, which amounted to £97,935, made the total cost £115,233, or £63,000 more than the amount voted. Route No. 4, *via* Victoria Park, Bowen Park, Riverbank, and the Hamilton, following out the same estimates, would amount to £97,196, or £35,196 beyond the amount voted by Parliament. Hon. members would bear in mind that this did not include the cost of land beyond the German Station. Having given hon. members all the information which he had in his possession regarding the different routes surveyed at different times by the former Governments and the present Government, he had come to the conclusion that the line which would serve their purpose best, being the cheapest in the cost of construction, was the one at present on the table, which cost £66,000. However advisable it might be to take the line by any other route, it would not be advisable to expend a larger sum of money in making a railway from Brisbane to Sandgate. The amount required to take it by the most costly route would be £8,000 or £9,000 per mile, which was far beyond the means of this country, he believed, for a line which would to a very great extent be simply a line for passenger traffic and holiday-seekers and pleasure-seekers going to the sea-side. He had little more to say on the matter: he believed he had given hon. members full information. The hon. member for North Brisbane had just reminded him that there was a survey made crossing Breakfast Creek near the present bridge. That was the route he was speaking of—only it crossed Breakfast Creek at a different spot. The line spoken of by the hon. member for North Brisbane crossed Breakfast Creek close to the bridge, turned to the left, and, instead of going down, went up parallel with the creek and crossed the Sandgate road above the Albion

Hotel. That line had been abandoned because of its steep grades. The river-side line crossed Breakfast Creek also near the bridge. That was the one which he had spoken of as costing by estimate £115,000. As there was likely to be a pretty fair discussion on the merits of the different lines, he would now content himself with moving—

That the line from Brisbane to Sandgate as laid on the table of the House on the 20th October be approved of.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he did not know what other hon. members would have to say with regard to the line proposed, but he was only able to concur in one part of the arguments of the Minister, and that was that it was desirable that there should be a railway to Sandgate. If the engineers set themselves out to find out the worst route they could not have found one worse than that now proposed. For his part, as a resident of the metropolis, knowing how desirable it was to have a railway made, he believed it would be infinitely better not to have a line than to have the one proposed. Hon. members who were not familiar with the country would find it hard to follow the route of the line as described by the Minister for Works. There was no plan showing the way the line would go, and there was no general plan of the district which would show the wonderfully circuitous route the line would take. The Minister talked about the line going straight. His (Mr. Griffith's) idea of it was that it went straight at a right-angle from a previous point. The only justification for the construction of a line to Sandgate was that it would command a large passenger traffic. If a railway to Sandgate were taken by a reasonable route he believed it would pay handsomely. From the plans laid on the table hon. members could not tell whether the line ran straight or turned round at an angle of ninety degrees—they could not tell the direction of it unless they knew the allotments by number. The route of the line, as far as he could make it out, was this;—in following him hon. members must recollect that the line was intended to collect passenger traffic. It commenced at the present railway station, the point to which it was going being, by the ordinary roads, on the opposite side of the town, so that it had to get from one side of the town to the other. Then instead of going through the town it went right round it. That was a curious point. Passing through the Valley over Breakfast Creek a considerable amount of settlement was approached, which settlement was divided into two groups—the first up by the Albion and the second down by the Hamilton. The population there was likely to increase largely, because the locality had the advantage of being close to a wide and long reach of the river, which was always perfectly ventilated by sea breezes. By the divergence of the line for about a quarter of a mile all the traffic from those two places might be caught, but the line had been carefully taken away through a long salt marsh, so that it could not be availed of by the people at the Hamilton. The population there at present was considerable; probably 500 or 600 came into town every day, and in a short time there might be three or four times that number. Having avoided that large centre of population, the line went to German Station, going as far away from the Racecourse as it could be conveniently taken. One of the great reasons urged in favour of a line to Sandgate was that it would join the Racecourse to the city by rail; but instead of having a line passing directly by the Racecourse, there was to be a branch line, which would make the distance to the course much greater than it would be by a direct line. Having got to German Station it would be supposed that the line would be taken

in a straight line to Sandgate, but instead of that it was turned round to the right, and after going a considerable distance it was brought back again by a turn to the left. The latter part of the line crossed perfectly flat country, and, as far as he could judge from the plans, the route over that country would make the line longer than a semi-circle would be. The part of the country over which it was to pass was not likely to be more thickly populated than it was at present. The land was cut up into small farms. The line would go over swampy land between Eagle Farm and the mouth of the river. It was taken considerably out of the way to cross a large creek, whereas if it were taken in the direction of the ordinary road it would cross the head of the creek where very little if any bridging would be required. Having got well to the eastward—or seaward—there was another considerable turn to the left—in fact, the last six miles of the line resembled as near as possible the letter “S.” He had had something to do with directing some of the surveys for a line to Sandgate. When he first went to the Works Office the surveyors were surveying, amongst other lines, a line to German Station—the same as that now adopted up to that point. At that time no one had heard of a route *via* Nudgee, which was so entirely out of the way of the Sandgate road, and which was a place where there was no great amount of settlement. When he was considering the surveys which had been made he wanted to know why the line should cross Breakfast Creek at a place where it could not command the Hamilton traffic? Everyone must know that if there was a station near the Breakfast Creek Bridge the people from both sides would come into town by the railway. By his directions another survey was made so as to make the line cross the creek as near the road-bridge as possible. That was done, the route after the creek was crossed being a turn to the left from which the line would run along a gentle slope on a gradient of he did not think more than 1 in 50 anywhere. The survey was not completed whilst he was in office, but so far as it had gone no great difficulties had been found. The Minister had not told them what a line on that survey would cost, but he had said that it was abandoned for engineering reasons. It was ridiculous to say that, because, as he had said, the surveys made showed that the line could be taken over the hill at a gradient of not more than 1 in 50. The line now proposed would cross the hill at about the same place as the survey he was referring to, and he could not see why the detour could not be made. He knew that Mr. Stanley had a fancy for running the line over this salt marsh, where there would be no traffic and where no station would be required. For all practical purposes on the route now proposed the nearest station to the Hamilton would be about as far from there as it was from the Hamilton to Brisbane. At one time he was inclined to think that after crossing Breakfast Creek the line might be taken down by the river. The Minister said that that route had been surveyed, but it had not been adopted because it would be too expensive. If a line could be taken by that route as far as the Racecourse at a reasonable price he believed it would be the best route, because that part of the river was sure to be thickly populated because of its salubrity. That route might have been properly abandoned on account of the expense; but, as the line would be purely a passenger one, what they had to consider was not so much what would be the first cost as what annual interest on the cost would be earned. He had no hesitation in saying that, as far as he could form an opinion—and he was a tolerably long resident—a line down there would

return a greater percentage on the cost of construction than would the line now proposed. Perhaps he could best describe the route of the proposed line from German Station to Sandgate by saying that a straight line would go from where he was standing across the table to where the Minister for Works was sitting; but instead of following such a course the line would, as it were, go off to the right, go round behind the Speaker's chair, and turn again so as to reach the terminal point. Considering that the country was perfectly level, he must confess that he did not understand that sort of thing—he could not understand what on earth such a roundabout course was adopted for. The line would be perfectly useless for a greater part of the distance unless a rival township was to be started. It had been always supposed that a line to Sandgate would form part of a line connecting the farming district of the Pine River with Brisbane, but the line proposed carefully avoided that, unless it was intended that they should get to Pine River by going first of all in an opposite direction. Every possible objection which could be taken to any route to Sandgate could be taken to the line proposed. Did the Minister expect that he would get any intermediate traffic except from German Station? The line would be no convenience to people residing in the Valley, as they could walk into town almost as quickly as they could go by train.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The station will be only a quarter of a mile away.

Mr. GRIFFITH said the people could get into town by bus for 3d., and they would not have the trouble of walking considerable distances to the railway station at one end and from it at the other end. He was surprised and glad to hear that a line could be made through the Normal School reserve, under Wickham terrace, and down the Valley for so little as £30,000 more than the proposed line would cost. If a line by that route could be made at such a cost, it would be about as good a speculation as they could go into. Everybody would use the line if there were a station nearer the centre of the town than Roma street. By adopting such a line they would not only bring the railway into the heart of the city, but they would have facilities for diverting it at Petrie's Bight so as to have access to the wharves. A splendid opportunity appeared to offer itself to carry out such a desirable work at a very reasonable cost indeed. The connection with the wharves would pay, and undoubtedly the Sandgate line would pay much better. It was not to be expected that people would go long distances to railway stations when they could accomplish the journey much quicker and cheaper by other means. It seemed to him a pity that the Minister had not adopted the route to which he had been just referring. He could never assent to the notion of taking a line to the seaward side of Brisbane from the Roma-street station. The traffic at a station at Petrie's Bight would be something enormous, but to meet the requirements of the traffic from and beyond the Valley they would have to run a greater number of trains a-day than they ran to Toowong. The Minister had said that to make the line proposed it would be necessary to raise a little more money than they had. If it was necessary to raise money, why not raise the £30,000 and have a good line whilst they were about it? He noticed that the Minister had told them the cost of a line to Sandgate by the route now proposed, but he had not told them what the cost of a direct line from German Station to Sandgate would be. Of course, the cost of the line by the route proposed would be greater, because it was longer.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: No; less.

Mr. GRIFFITH: What, for the semicircle line?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is the shortest and the cheapest line.

Mr. GRIFFITH said a line to take in Nudgee waterhole must be nearly a semicircle.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The line does not go to Nudgee waterhole.

Mr. GRIFFITH said if he was wrong in his information it was not his fault. What he had complained of previously was that there were no plans before the House which would enable hon. members to see where the line would go. He was satisfied that if the line proposed were made it would be found before long that they would have to make another line by a different route, and holding that view he could not see how he could do anything but vote against the motion. As far as he could make out, the distance of the Racecourse from town by the branch line would be about five miles. His opinion was that a line could be made to the Racecourse three miles in length. Did the Minister think that people would go to the Racecourse by rail when they could go by omnibus as quickly and at a cheaper rate? If the Minister wished to bring about such a result as the Brisbane members voting against the line so as to absolve the Government from the promise they had made to make it, he could understand such a proposal as that which had been made being brought forward. The Premier told them yesterday that he would abandon a Bill because the Opposition would support it, but he (Mr. Griffith) could not help thinking that on this occasion the Government wanted the Opposition to vote against their proposal. He was anxious to see a line made to Sandgate, but he could not approve of the line proposed; he thought they would be much better off without it, and unless he heard a great deal better reasons advanced in favour of it than he had heard he should vote against it. On the 10th June, 1873, when the question of adopting a line of railway from Oxley to Brisbane was before the House, the Minister for Works, in order to satisfy hon. members and put them in full possession of the facts of the case, moved that the House resolve itself into committee to examine the Chief Engineer. That course was adopted, and the House after hearing the evidence of the engineer were in a position to deal with the matter. It was a question whether a similar course ought not to be adopted in this instance. He should be very glad if the House were put in possession of full information. They ought to choose the route which would command the most passenger traffic and which would bring in the best interest on the money expended.

The PREMIER (Mr. McIlwraith) said that the Engineer-in-Chief was within the precincts of the House, and if any hon. member wished to examine him he (Mr. McIlwraith) should have no objection to his being called to the bar of the House.

Mr. DICKSON said he thought when the Premier rose that he was going to reply to the remarks made by the hon. member for North Brisbane. He must confess that he felt himself placed in a peculiar position. He should like to know, supposing that hon. members on that side of the House approved of these plans, whether the Government would withdraw them. Judging from what took place yesterday, it appeared that when the Opposition approved of any measure the Government got alarmed and withdrew it; and he was afraid that that might be done if other members on his side approved of these plans. His constituents were undoubtedly anxious that a railway should be constructed from the city to Sandgate, and thereafter extended to Caboolture. It had long been a hope—unfortunately a deferred hope—of some of his constituents that such a line would be con-

structed, and he should be very sorry to do anything unnecessarily which would tend to delay the execution of this project on which they had set their minds. If the railway were carried in the right direction it would be a profitable speculation to the country—if it tapped the centres of population it would be one of the most profitable lines in the colony. The points which he desired chiefly to see connected with the Sandgate line were the Exhibition, Bowen Park, the Racecourse, and German Station. He did not believe in a loop-line to the Racecourse. A direct line to the Racecourse would command a large traffic at all times. The Racecourse was used for other sports than racing, and other meetings were held there which attracted large numbers of people, and he was convinced that a considerable amount of revenue would be derived from the traffic to the course. He should have been better pleased if the line itself had been taken to the Racecourse, and if the continuation from German Station could have been carried along the main road. He believed that road would offer every facility for the economical construction of such a line as was contemplated by the Railway and Tramways Bill. No large resumption of land would require to be made, and he knew of no place where such a trial could be made under more favourable circumstances than over that six or seven miles of country. A large population who would have been greatly benefited were settled on both sides of the road. Had the proposed line taken the route which he had suggested it would have been to his mind an unexceptionable route so far as the direction taken was concerned. He was still prepared to say that, with the exception of the connection with the Racecourse being by a loop-line, and the divergence from German Station, the line met with no objection from him. It was impossible to carry the railway to every man's door, and some parts of the district must be left in the cold. The Minister for Works had, he believed, given a large amount of attention to the matter, with a desire to carry out the work as economically as he could, and to convenience the settlers as far as was practicable within the limits of expenditure he had assigned to himself. He (Mr. Dickson) had pointed out the demerits of the line, but still he was not prepared to vote against it simply because the Minister for Works had chosen to make a divergence to the east from German Station, instead of carrying the line along the main road to Sandgate. He believed the line was one that would pay, and he regarded it as the commencement of a line which would ultimately connect the metropolis with Gympie, and afford convenience to a large number of settlers in intervening districts who were now prevented from getting access to the metropolitan markets through absence of means of carriage. The Minister for Works, in his remarks, made an observation which might be taken to imply that he (Mr. Dickson) was interested in or would derive benefit from the proposed construction of the line. At the risk of being considered egotistical, he must reply to that remark. The hon. gentleman said that the line in proceeding through the Albion district would run along the range on which the residence of the hon. member for Enoggera was situated. It certainly did run along a remote spur of the range on which he (Mr. Dickson) lived, but the hon. gentleman would admit that the route had been selected without the slightest regard to his convenience or benefit. In giving his vote he should do so on purely public grounds, and without the slightest view to private interest or personal convenience. No part of the line would be within, he believed, a couple of miles of his house, and it was more convenient for him to adopt means of con-

veyance which would take him direct to Queen street. He would take this opportunity to point out that suburban travellers experienced great inconvenience from the remoteness of the Roma-street terminus from the centre of the city, and he expressed the feeling of a large number of residents of Toowong and Milton when he said that a great deal of trouble and inconvenience would be saved if the line were extended and a passenger platform erected somewhere nearer the heart of the city. He was of opinion that the proposed line would pay very much better if the Minister for Works could see his way to bring passengers further into the city. In many cases it cost persons travelling along the railways as much to be conveyed to their destination in town from the station as they would have had to pay to vehicles for conveyance from their residences to their respective places of business, and he felt convinced that the suburban traffic would never be the benefit to the State it should be until measures were adopted of bringing passengers into the city. Whilst doing the Minister for Works the justice of believing that, with the professional staff at his command, he had obtained information which justified the hon. gentleman in making the divergence from German Station, it would be satisfactory to the country to know the reasons for that divergence, and also why the railway had not been carried along the road. In the present state of the labour market, however, he should be sorry if anything occurred to prevent the construction of suburban lines. Therefore, though in details he differed from the Minister for Works, he should deem it his duty to support the motion. He congratulated the hon. gentleman on having fulfilled the promise he made in connection with this matter. If a commencement of the line were made as early as possible it would be a step in the right direction, and he had no doubt that the suburban railways now to be initiated would be found to fully answer the expectations of the supporters of branch railways, and would prove a great convenience to the travelling public.

Mr. GROOM said if a railway to Sandgate was to be constructed it would be just as well to construct it so as to accommodate the largest possible number of passengers. Having heard the statements of the Minister for Works and the leader of the Opposition, he was inclined to favour the route proposed by the latter gentleman. Even if the other route did cost £32,000 more, that was after all a small sum compared with the benefits which would be conferred not only upon the city but also upon the colony. This railway was not to be constructed for to-day, or for the convenience of the present population only, but was to last after the present members of the House should have passed away. As a country member, and one who had not been to Sandgate more than three or four times, he could speak without any local prejudices; but he knew there was a general desire on the part of most people to get to the sea-coast, and he desired they should have means of doing so. It should also be borne in mind that the town of Brisbane was extending. When the present suburban line was first initiated there were, he was informed, only five houses in Toowong, and hon. members could see now what that town had become, and forecast what it might be twenty years hence. The same development might be expected to follow the construction of lines in other directions. The cost of the two alternative routes had been stated at £62,000 and £94,000, and it was worthy of consideration whether it would not be better to adopt the more expensive route, seeing that it would pass through the most populous part of Brisbane—Fortitude

Valley—and accommodate the largest number of persons. To test the feeling of the House on the subject, he moved that all the words after "that" in the first motion be omitted, with a view of inserting—

This House approves the route No. 1, mentioned by the Minister for Works, *via* the Valley, Bowen Park, and the Sports Ground.

After hearing the speech of the leader of the Opposition he thought it would be better and wiser to adopt that route. In looking forward fifty years to the probable increase of traffic, the sum of £32,000 appeared a very small matter. Hon. members might draw a lesson from what was now going on in Sydney. The Legislature there had been considering which would be the best route by which to carry a line to the Circular Quay. At an early period in the history of the colony that work might have been done at a comparatively small cost, but now sums from a million to a million-and-a-half were spoken of. The same thing might take place here if the construction of a line through the populous part of the city were delayed for a long time. He was glad that the question had been discussed apart from party considerations. If the House was not prepared to adopt the route he suggested they might leave the adoption of a particular route an open question for the present. The route the adoption of which he proposed would offer equal facilities for the construction of a branch line to Caboolture.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Mr. Palmer) said he supposed the hon. member, before putting his amendment, had studied the effect of it; if not, he would tell the hon. member that the effect would be to completely shelve the Sandgate railway for this session. There were no plans, sections, or books of reference for the No. 1 route, and they could not be prepared in time to be approved by the House this session. He did not know whether the object of the hon. member was to shelve the line, but that would be the effect of his amendment if carried. He could inform the House, notwithstanding the disparaging hints and assertions of the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Enoggera, that the Government were perfectly in earnest and quite prepared to go on with the work at once if the plans, sections, and books of reference were approved; and it was a question for the House to consider whether the plans were to be approved and the work proceeded with, or whether the question was to be shelved for the session. With respect to the particular line, he could say for himself that if he had the choice this line was not the one he should have selected. But hon. members must remember that it was a very good plan to cut the coat according to the cloth, and that the sum voted for the construction of the Sandgate line was £52,000, being £4,000 per mile, which was considered ample when the amount was put on the loan vote. In any calculation that might be made it was necessary for the Government to keep as near to that loan vote as they properly could. Route No. 1, which the hon. member proposed for adoption—and which could not be adopted this session—would cost just £42,137 16s. 10d. more than the amount voted on account. The No. 2 route, which in his opinion was so far superior to any of the others that there was no comparison between them, would cost £115,233, or more than double the amount voted. That was the route by the river and the Hamilton—a route which was in his opinion incomparably better than any of the others. Route No. 3, by Victoria Park and Bowen Park, the plans of which were on the table of the House, was the only route that could be adopted this session. It had been selected, not because any member of the

Government supposed it was the best possible route, but because it was the best that could be adopted under the circumstances and with the means at the command of the Government. Hon. members would be pleased to recollect that every one of the routes which had been proposed so far would start from the present terminus in Roma street. No line had been surveyed to go round Petrie's Bight, nor had any such line been taken into calculation at all.

Mr. GRIFFITH: The Minister for Works gave statistics for the cost of one.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the hon. gentleman did nothing of the sort. The Hamilton and river route came in at the German Station, and all the other routes of which plans had been made met together at the Exhibition Grounds. That was the common meeting place of all the proposed lines. The question before the Government was principally one of expense. With regard to the assertion of the leader of the Opposition that the proposed line would not tap any of the thickly populated parts of the suburbs, he must take leave to differ from the hon. gentleman, as there was no more thickly populated part—save Fortitude Valley—than the district about the Albion. A very large population was settled there. The station at Bowen Park would be about a quarter of a mile from the heart of the Valley, and would enable the Valley population to take advantage of the line to go to the races or to Sandgate. He had tried very hard in his humble way—not being an engineer—to persuade the Minister for Works to order his engineers to make the line itself go round the Racecourse; but the hon. gentleman was assured by Mr. Stanley that there was an insuperable difficulty, and that if he got down to the Racecourse he could not get up again. He (Mr. Palmer), though not an engineer, was pretty well certain that he should find a way of getting up again; and he had a very strong opinion that it would yet be done. The Government had been bound to accept the route which came nearest to the money voted, and he hoped hon. members would have the kindness to remember that if this line was not approved of—with such small deviations as were always allowed in plans such as these—nothing could be done this year. It must be that or nothing. He did not believe the line was half as bad as it had been represented by the leader of the Opposition to be; he had seen the trial plans, and he saw no turns at right angles. Very few lines ran straight, and a certain amount of deviation was sometimes necessary so that the rails could be kept on the natural surface, with a view to saving the cost of making cuttings. The line would pass through pretty thickly settled parts, and eventually, when more money was available, it might be possible without any very great difficulty to make a loop-line starting from Roma street, touching at Petrie's Bight and joining the main line again at Bowen Park. From the time when he joined the Ministry he had determined that as far as he could he would cause this line to Sandgate to become an accomplished fact. The Ministry had never entertained the intention imputed to them by the leader of the Opposition when he said they wanted the Brisbane members to vote against the proposal, so that they might say they had kept their promise to the ear and tried to evade the sense of it. If those hon. members chose to vote against the motion and got a majority to support them, they must take the consequences. He sincerely hoped they would not—that the Brisbane members would show more common-sense, and that the plans would be approved. It was not a perfect plan, nor did it pretend to

be, and it was not the line he should have liked. But they had to be guided by circumstances, and he believed the proposed line would be a useful and, he had no doubt whatever, a paying line.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he should like to hear Mr. Stanley examined on the subject.

The PREMIER said he suggested that some time ago, but no member took the slightest notice of it. If the hon. member desired to have Mr. Stanley examined he would move a motion to that effect afterwards.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he wished particularly to point out—and most hon. members would agree with him—that it would have been as well if they had the alternative plans laid on the table. Parliament had been in session many months, and hon. members might have had an opportunity of comparing the different plans, instead of having one bald plan put before them, and being told that they must either take that or nothing. He did not believe in the plan proposed, and agreed with the Colonial Secretary that it would have been much better to have adopted one of the other plans, even if they had to pay more for it. It was no argument whatever to say that although other plans were better the one before the House was less costly. Probably, even, it might be better in the end to spend a larger sum in getting a line which would bring in more revenue than the one which they were asked to accept. The Colonial Secretary had said they must cut their coat according to their cloth, but that rule hardly applied in its strictness to railway making. Were they not spending large sums in railway construction all over the colony?—and what was true in one instance must be true in another. The proposed line was not, in his opinion, the proper line to Sandgate. If he had his own way he would first try the experiment of suburban railways, to see if they would pay, before pushing on as far as Sandgate. If that was done it would result in increased settlement around Brisbane, and a considerable increase in the railway returns. They were asked to accept the proposed line or nothing. If that was the position they were to be forced into he would rather see the making of the line postponed for twelve months than vote for a line which would afterwards be found to be a mistake. There would be plenty of time before the close of the session to bring forward the alternative plans. He was not, of course, speaking as an expert, but his own opinion leaned towards a line *via* the Hamilton. He objected to the Government coming down at the tail end of the session, and telling members that if they did not choose to accept that particular scheme the blame would be on their own heads. The blame rather rested with the Government, who might have laid the various schemes on the table two months ago. If that had been done the House would have been in a fair position to judge of the respective merits of each proposal. He certainly should not support any line to Sandgate unless it was clearly shown to him that it would tap the great centres of population outside of Brisbane. The proposed line did not appear to do that, and the interests of the residents in the Valley and on the other side of Breakfast Creek were neglected. It was not a scheme that would commend itself to the intelligence of the House. It ran through low-lying land on which there was no probability of immediate settlement, and neglected good country which would at once be settled upon if a railway were made in the direction he believed it could. The Colonial Secretary had cast a slur upon the Chief Engineer by saying that Mr. Stanley had said that if he got the railway to the Racecourse he would never get it out

again; whereas if he (the Colonial Secretary) was the engineer he would manage to get it out somehow or other. He (Mr. Morehead) believed the Colonial Secretary would succeed. That was a distinct slur upon the Chief Engineer for the southern portion of the colony. The Government had no right to force the House into the position of adopting the proposed scheme or nothing, and which many of them did not believe to be the best of those submitted to the Minister for Works, and then to say that if they rejected it the onus would be thrown upon them of refusing to make a railway to Sandgate. That was a position into which he declined to be put, and he still hoped that the Government would give them an opportunity of comparing the different routes surveyed. One particular objection to the proposal was the line to the Racecourse, which would only be used half-a-dozen days in each year, and would be left to rust during the remainder of the three hundred and sixty-five. If it was made a direct line touching at or near the Racecourse it would be continually used, and used with great advantage to the public throughout the year. The idea of a loop-line to the Racecourse was to him an absurdity—there would be a mile and a-quarter of line lying useless, except during the few days in each year when racing was carried on, and it would be an utter waste of public money. If the main scheme was carried he should oppose the loop-line to the Racecourse on that ground. If the Racecourse traffic was worth anything—and he believed it would be—a direct line to it ought to be made without the absurdity of a loop-line, the necessity for which, according to the remarks of the Colonial Secretary, had arisen from the stupidity of the Chief Engineer.

The PREMIER said the hon. member for Mitchell considered it was the duty of the Government to put a number of alternative schemes before the House, so that the House might choose from among them which it would accept. He did not think it was the duty of the Government to do anything of the sort. The Government had decided upon a certain line, and they asked the House to accept it or not as they thought proper. Such a thing as a demand for alternative lines had never been heard of in the House before. The House last year included in its loan vote a railway to Sandgate, thirteen miles in length, at the rate of £4,000 a-mile. The cost of the line was therefore limited as nearly as possible to £52,000. Had the House been told at that time that the railway would cost from £8,000 to £10,000 a-mile it would never have received their assent, and it certainly would not have been proposed by him. Acting on that vote the Government had done all they possibly could, and he believed they had got a very good line. From an engineering point of view the line proposed was the best of the four, and although it was objected that it did not go through centres of population, it should be remembered that the suburbs of Brisbane were so sparsely populated that it was a matter of very little concern, when it came to a question of an extra £4,000 a-mile, in what direction it went. He believed the population along the proposed line was as great as along that of any of the other lines surveyed; and then there was the saving of £4,000 or £5,000 a-mile to be taken into consideration. He believed that it was far the best way to get out of Brisbane. Apart from the enormous expense, he did not believe in cutting up the city; and that the route proposed was the best engineering route he had not the slightest doubt. The part of the line where it left the main road and turned towards Nudgee was the only part which he doubted. To satisfy himself on the point he drove there, and was

convinced that the Chief Engineer was perfectly justified. By an extra length of 50 chains the line left a barren place and went through a country where there was settlement all the way. So far as the character of the country was concerned the best route had been adopted, and the extra 50 chains enabled it to be completed at a less expense, which was also a great advantage. It was to some extent a disadvantage to make the line half-a-mile longer, but it took it nearer to population and through country which was much more likely to be settled. But they were losing sight of the main question, and that was, were they deliberately, after coming to the conclusion to spend £4,000 a-mile on the railway, going to decide, without considering the finances of the country, to spend £10,000 a-mile upon it? Hon. members need not deceive themselves—the line would not pay: he himself believed it would be one of the worst-paying lines in the colony. Suburban traffic was one of the most difficult things to make pay on account of the vast expense that was necessary to construct the railway; and it required a very large amount of traffic indeed to make it pay—indeed, suburban traffic had never paid on a railway in the hands of a Government. The fares would be down to nothing. He did not believe the line would pay working expenses through the influence that would be brought to bear on the Government to lower the fares. It was of no use saying that one particular line would pay better than another. None of them would pay, and the more expensive the line the worse it would be. The route which seemed to meet with most general acceptance by hon. members—*viz* the Valley, the Racecourse, and the Hamilton—would cost £115,000, or more than double the amount which the House had authorised the Government to expend upon the line. Would the country approve of such an expenditure on a railway which after all was only a luxury? It was not required for business purposes; it was simply a luxury to the city and suburbs of Brisbane. He held that the country would not approve of such an expenditure. At a general election no candidate would dare to tell his constituents that he was prepared to pay £10,000 a-mile out of the revenue of the colony for a railway from Brisbane to Sandgate. The debate, as far as it had gone, had furnished another proof that Brisbane was over-represented in the House. Every hon. member seemed to represent the capital—even those who only resided in it during the time they attended to their parliamentary duties. The very fact that it was not the town members alone who wanted to ignore the conditions on which the vote was passed last year showed that Brisbane had an influence in the House which it ought not to have; and when it was remembered that the city was represented by two of the ablest men in the House, it had an unfair advantage which he was sorry to see it get. The Government had done their duty in putting before the House the best line they could to Sandgate, and they had limited the expense, as nearly as possible, to the amount voted for the purpose. The line was intended as an outlet from the city of Brisbane to the sea-shore, and it was never intended as a suburban line. If it was made into a suburban line it would be a perfect sink of money, and not only would it not pay interest on cost of construction, but there would be a deficit in the working expenses. As some hon. members had expressed a desire to have the Chief Engineer examined before the House, he would move that Mr. Stanley be called to the bar of the House to be examined on the subject.

Question put and passed.

Mr. H. C. STANLEY, C.E., Chief Engineer of Railways, Southern Division, was accordingly

called to the bar, summoned to the floor of the House, and examined as follows:—

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Has any survey been made, Mr. Stanley, from the present terminus through the old Grammar School below Wickham terrace and thence through the Valley? A survey has been made through Fortitude Valley.

By the route that I have stated? Yes.

Where does that join the survey of the Sandgate line as shown in the plan before the House? In Bowen Park, near the Exhibition building.

Is that the line indicated in blue-dotted lines on this plan? Yes; that is approximately the route followed by the survey.

Has any estimate been made as to the extra cost that would be incurred by that route as compared with the one proposed? Yes; comparative estimates were prepared by me.

Can you say what the difference would be upon that part of the line? The difference in cost is estimated at £10,132 in favour of the route traversing Victoria Park.

Does that include land resumed as well as cost of construction? No; that is only the difference between the estimates for construction.

Has any estimate been made as to the cost of land resumed? I believe so, but I have no information of it.

In what state are those surveys? Plans and sections have been prepared.

Are those plans in such a state that they can be laid before Parliament? No.

Is the material available for compiling parliamentary plans? Yes; all the materials are in my office.

How long would it take you to prepare them? I think parliamentary plans could be got ready in the course of two or three days. I may state that I have had them pushed forward in anticipation of the Government deciding on adopting that line.

From Bowen Park the line proceeds across Breakfast Creek through a flat pocket some distance above the bridge;—did you make an alternative survey crossing Breakfast Creek close above the present road-bridge? Yes; an alternative survey was made by what is called the "Albion" route, joining the present route about the Albion Hotel.

Do you know what the difference of cost between those two lines would be—the one crossing Breakfast Creek near the bridge, and the one crossing it in this pocket? I have not the figures by me, but from recollection I think it would be some £4,000 or £5,000.

Do you remember what the difference in length was? About 15 chains.

Were there any engineering difficulties in that route? No; we should only have to cut through the ridge upon which the Albion Hotel stands.

There would be one cutting, would there not? Yes; rather a considerable cutting.

Are the plans for that alternative line ready? The original plans are in my office, but no steps have been taken to prepare parliamentary plans.

What is the extra length of the alternative line? About $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile.

Which in your opinion is the better of these two routes on that particular section? From an engineering point of view, I prefer the line *via* the Sports Ground.

Would not the other one join the Sports Ground? No; it would join some little distance beyond it.

Have you prepared an alternative route by the river down to the Hamilton? Yes.

What condition are the plans in for that route? The original draft plans have been prepared, but no steps have been taken to forward parliamentary plans.

Would there be any difficulty, if you went to the Racecourse that way, in continuing the line to German Station? No engineering difficulty.

By the PREMIER: Beside the matter of expense, is there any engineering difficulty on any of the routes you have surveyed? None whatever.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: On this plan I observe what is apparently a surveyed line keeping a little to the left of the Sandgate road nearly in a straight line, crossing Cabbage-tree Creek above the present road-bridge—has that line been surveyed? Yes; that was the first survey that was made.

Are the parliamentary plans for that ready? Parliamentary plans for that were prepared last year or the previous year.

If it was desired to continue the line through Bald Hills or to Caboolture, would not that be the best route to adopt? I do not think it would make much difference in that respect, because we should turn off from very nearly the same point.

When was this line *via* Nudgee first surveyed? I think instructions were given for the survey of that line in April last.

Were there any heavy works on the original line? No.

Do you know what the difference in cost of construction would be between what you call the original line and the line *via* Nudgee? The difference is hardly perceptible; it is only a matter of £50 or £60.

The line now proposed is nearly a mile longer than the other one? 53 chains longer.

Have you made any estimate of the probable cost of resumption of land on these two routes? That does not come within my province.

From an engineering point of view, which has the sounder land of these two routes? There is very little difference. By the Nudgee route we secure sound ground.

With respect to the Racecourse, would it not be practicable to bring the Racecourse on to the direct line without a loop-line? Not by the route shown on the parliamentary plan.

Would it not be practicable to get to the Racecourse *via* the Albion, on the road to Sandgate? You could only follow the route on which the branch line is surveyed.

Is that the only practicable mode of access? Yes, from the Albion route.

If you wanted to get to the river below the Hamilton, would the route down on the parliamentary plans be a desirable one? Yes; a trial survey has been made as an extension of the branch line to the Racecourse, which would terminate in the vicinity of the Powder Magazine, and a very favourable line has been obtained.

What is the ruling gradient on that line? One in fifty.

Is that the same on the alternative line surveyed? Yes; that was adopted as the ruling gradient on all the lines. There is very little necessity for introducing it except on occasional places.

Have you made any surveys to see whether the Sandgate road could be made available for the railway? No survey has been actually made by the road.

There is a long straight line several miles in length between German Station and Cabbage-tree Creek;—do you know whether that could be utilised for the purpose? I do not think there would be any difficulty in utilising portions of that road; but there are other parts where you will have to deviate.

Do you not think that several miles of the road between German Station and Sandgate could be utilised? Out of the $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles between German Station and Cabbage-tree Creek, I think, perhaps 3 miles could be utilised.

On the other side of Cabbage-tree Creek could not the road be also utilised? Yes; but it would necessitate a considerable detour.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: I hold in my hand a paper showing the different routes to Sandgate, numbered respectively 1, 2, 3, and 4—do you know this document, may I ask? No; I have not seen it.

Route No. 1 proposes to go *via* the Valley, Bowen Park, and Sports Ground. You know that? Yes.

Would that line go round by Petrie's Bight? No.

Does it start from the Roma-street station and go up past the new Grammar School? Yes; skirting the hill on which the Observatory stands and passing through the ridge under Wickham terrace near to the Presbyterian church.

Route No. 2 goes *via* the Valley, Bowen Park, river bank, and the Hamilton—where would that start from? It would start from the same point as No. 1, from the east or town end of the station.

Not from the Railway sheds? No; from the east end of the passenger station.

No. 3 route is *via* Victoria Park, Bowen Park, and Sports Ground—where does that start from? From the end of the steamshed siding, in what used to be the old cricket ground.

That is the route for which parliamentary plans have been prepared? Yes.

Is that the only route which starts from that place? No.

No 4 route goes *via* Victoria Park, Bowen Park, river bank, and Hamilton—where does that start from? From the same starting-point.

By Mr. GROOM: You say that route No. 1 will start from the east end of the passenger station: how will you proceed through the city? The line, as surveyed, passes through the old Grammar School ground, skirts the ridge upon which the Observatory stands, crosses into Wickham terrace near the Presbyterian church, and follows down in a line nearly parallel with Wickham street.

How would you reach the Valley? Wickham street is the principal street through the Valley.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: How far would the nearest point of that route be from Petrie's Bight? I should say about a quarter of a mile, or perhaps hardly that.

By Mr. GROOM: How would that affect your alternative route to the Racecourse as laid on the table? It would not affect it at all. The two lines unite at a point in Bowen Park.

How long would it take you to prepare the plans from the eastern end of the Roma-street terminus to the projected point at the Sports' Ground? I think the plans might be ready in two or three days.

You have already surveyed it and made an estimate of its cost? Yes, and the plans are well advanced.

By Mr. BEATTIE: Route No. 1, after leaving the terminus and going through the Grammar School grounds and skirting Wickham terrace—at what particular point does it drop down into the Valley? It crosses Wickham terrace near the Presbyterian church, passes through the block of land that used to be called Duerdin's paddock, and from thence runs parallel with Wickham street.

Between Leichhardt street and Wickham street? Yes, and after crossing Brunswick street it turns round to the left through the Government reserve.

Then the whole of the Valley is left to the eastward of what would be the station in Fortitude Valley? Wickham street would be a few chains to the eastward of the line of survey.

By Mr. GARRICK: Did you make a survey on towards the Bald Hills and the Pines? Yes.

Did that touch the line to Sandgate on the plans before the House? Not absolutely. It left

the original survey very nearly at the same point where the present line crosses Cabbage-tree Creek.

Then your survey to the Bald Hills and the Pines came in just above the bridge over Cabbage-tree Creek? Yes, leaving Sandgate on a short branch.

How far is the Sandgate station, where you have made the terminus of your present line, from, say, McConnell's? I could hardly tell the distance. The terminus is almost immediately at the back of the Osborne Hotel.

Could you not have gone under the hill, crossed the high ground above the swamps, and come out near McConnell's? It would be quite practicable to get a direct line from the turn off at Nudgee.

After crossing Cabbage-tree Creek, as on the plans before the House, could you not have gone under the esplanade in front of Sandgate and come out near McConnell's house, without going right round? I do not quite follow you: we do very little more now than head those swamps.

Was there room for you under that hill, heading the swamps, to bring the line out on the esplanade instead of stopping at the base of the hill? That could be done now as an extension of the line as surveyed.

Yes; but coming over the bridge, could you not have headed the swamps and come out on the esplanade? That is exactly what we do: we only skirt the swamps. Had the line been direct we should have had to cross the swamps to reach the esplanade.

In No. 1 survey, what stations have you provided between the terminus in Roma street and the station in Bowen Park? A station is provided at Bowen Park.

I am speaking of the route which goes through the old Grammar School grounds and at the back of Wickham street by the Valley;—what stations have you provided, if any, between the terminus and Bowen Park? I have provided for a passenger station near the crossing of Edward street before the line crosses Wickham street, and another station is provided for at Brunswick street, to accommodate the Valley traffic.

By Mr. MOREHEAD: It has been mentioned by the Colonial Secretary during the debate, that if the line to Sandgate made a detour by the Racecourse there were difficulties in the way of getting back again on the way to Sandgate—in other words, that if the railway went to the Racecourse you would not be able to get back again? The only practical route would be by the branch line as now surveyed. To get back to German Station you would have to retrace your steps to a certain extent.

Still you would be able to get back? Yes, by doubling back.

After getting down to Nudgee do you not get into very low-lying ground? Not by the route that has been selected by this survey. We cross some, but not to any great extent.

Then you get into no swampy ground at all? Yes; but very little.

Is there any settlement along that route? Yes, in the vicinity of Nudgee.

Is there enough settlement likely to make traffic for the line? It is a farming settlement chiefly.

I understand you have selected this as the best route to be adopted? I think it is the best.

Are you positive on that point? Yes, I am positive that it is the best, as it will accommodate a larger settlement, and although the line is 53 chains longer the cost will not be greater.

You have considered, of course, the line *via* the Hamilton? Yes.

Do you think the line before the House taps more settlement than the line *viz* the Hamilton would do? Yes; it goes through a more thickly-

populated district, and where there is more probability of extended settlement in the future.

Did you say that you did not go near any swamp land on the Nudgee line? We cross some in the vicinity of Nudgee Creek.

Will the crossing of that swamp be a costly undertaking? I think not; it will necessitate the line being raised a foot or two.

Can you tell us through whose land the line passes near Nudgee? I cannot.

I suppose it is not your province to ascertain? The book of reference is prepared in my office, but I do not study it; I do not look upon that as part of my professional duty.

You simply look at the cost of the undertaking? I select the best line from an engineering point of view, and estimate the cost.

Then that estimate is irrespective of the cost of land? Certainly.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: What advantage do you think the line *via* Nudgee has over the original line? I think it will accommodate more settlement than upon the line as originally surveyed *via* Zillman's Waterholes.

Has it any engineering difficulties? One line is in that respect about the same as the other: it is a little cheaper considering that it is longer.

If you say that the No. 1 survey crossed under the Wickham terrace, how far from Ann street would it cross Boundary street? About 4 chains.

It would cross that street on the left, would it not? Yes.

Would not that be a convenient place for a station? Yes.

Would there be any difficulty in getting from there to Petrie's Bight, if it were desired? I am inclined to think that the fall would be rather too rapid. It would necessitate a very steep gradient.

By Mr. GROOM: Taking the different routes submitted to the Minister for Works, which do you think will contribute most to the revenue as a paying line? I am disposed to think that the No. 1 route, through Fortitude Valley, would probably secure the largest passenger traffic.

I presume, as engineer in charge of the line, that you do not anticipate any goods traffic on that line? I think the goods traffic is likely to be very light indeed.

Then it is purely a matter of passenger traffic to be considered in the construction of the line? I think we must look chiefly to the passenger traffic to make it pay.

Has the question of passenger traffic entered into your calculation in surveying the different routes, in order to obtain the best possible returns to the railway revenue? In surveying the lines I took into consideration the most suitable points for accommodating passenger traffic by providing platforms and stations.

On the four different routes that you have submitted to the Minister for Works, which in your opinion will contribute most in the shape of passenger traffic to the revenue? I believe No. 1, through Fortitude Valley.

By Mr. SCOTT: What is the nature of the country between the proposed terminus of the branch line by the Racecourse to the German Station?—are there any engineering difficulties in getting from one point to the other? No; it is very easy country.

Could the line be easily made in that way? There would be very little difficulty, but it would follow very nearly the same route as the line on the table.

Would the line from the Sports Ground to the German Station, or a line to go from the Sports Ground to the German Station *via* the Racecourse, be the longer? It would not be practicable to get a direct line from the Sports Ground

to the Racecourse; we have followed the only practicable route, skirting the ridge lying between the two.

From the proposed terminus of that line to the German Station are there any difficulties in the way? No.

Then why could not the line have been made in that way? You would simply be retracing your steps to a great extent.

Are there any engineering difficulties between the terminus there and the station, in a straight line going direct? I believe not; the country is comparatively level.

Why could not the line be taken in that way? There was no difficulty from an engineering point of view, but it would make it considerably longer—it would be taking two sides of a triangle instead of the base.

How much longer would it be? About a mile longer.

By Mr. DICKSON: I understood you to say, Mr. Stanley, in the course of your answers in the early part of the evening, that you considered about 3 miles of the road between the German Station and Cabbage-tree Creek might be utilised for the purpose of the railway? Yes; I think about that distance.

If the railway were carried along the road instead of by the line at present under consideration, would it not very much shorten the distance between the German Station and Sandgate? I think the distance if taken along the road would be much the same as the original survey.

That was some 53 chains shorter than the present survey? Yes.

I understood you to say that the cost of construction per mile would be no greater by the road than by the Nudgee diversion? I think the cost would be very similar to the original survey which formed a line parallel to the road; it crosses over small watercourses and some creeks, and very much the same character of country.

What do you think would be the difference of cost between the two lines, if carried along the road and if carried by the Nudgee route? For construction I do not think there would be very much difference.

Would not the 53 additional chains entail considerable extra cost? No; the line by Nudgee is of so favourable a character that, although 53 chains longer, it could be constructed at the same cost as the original survey by the road.

Do you consider the line by Nudgee, the parliamentary plans of which are before the House, to be a more favourable line, from an engineering aspect, than by the road? The works are of a slightly more favourable character.

Have you ever considered the desirability of bringing a passenger platform nearer the city than the Roma-street station? In connection with the alternative line that was surveyed *via* Fortitude Valley—

Apart from that survey have you ever considered the desirability of bringing a passenger platform, say, into Adelaide street? A survey was made for that some years ago.

Do you remember to what point in Adelaide street it was intended to bring it? To that triangular piece of ground between Roma, Adelaide, and George streets; it was proposed to place the terminus there.

Do you remember what the estimated cost of construction was? I do not, just now, but I have the information in my office if required.

I understood you to say that you consider it would be impracticable, or attended with very heavy expense, to make the present line under consideration, from the Albion pass by the Racecourse and thence to the German Station? By

a direct line, with a ruling gradient of 1 in 50, it would be impracticable.

Do you consider the present loop-line to the Racecourse may hereafter serve as part of a line for further extension towards Eagle Farm and the river? The branch line has been surveyed with that object in view—in fact, a trial survey has been made from the Racecourse to a point near the powder magazine.

Is the loop-line proposed to be constructed to be worked as frequently as the line to Sandgate, or only occasionally?—I mean, will it be of such a character as to sustain traffic as frequently if required? I have estimated it as of the same character as the line to Sandgate.

By Mr. BEATTIE: There have been three or four surveys made of the Sandgate railway, one of which has been alluded to as the line *via* Fortitude Valley;—can you inform me if there has ever been a line surveyed direct through the Valley going eastward of O'Reilly's Hill and crossing Breakfast Creek? No survey has been made.

Has it ever struck you that you could arrive at the same point at the Albion by such a route—do you not think it would be as cheap to go that way as it would to go round by the westward through Bowen Park? I think it would be more expensive.

You touch very little of the Valley going *via* Bowen Park? My opinion is that you touch the greater part of it.

I understand you to say that this line would turn off by Brunswick street? At a point beyond Brunswick street: the curve to which I refer does not actually start till you pass Constance street; it runs parallel with Wickham street to the crossing at Constance street.

Has there been any survey made eastward of O'Reilly's Hill? No; an examination has been made.

Do you think a line that way would be more expensive than crossing the swamp at Edmondstone's paddock? It would be; for one thing it would be longer, and you pass through a great deal of valuable property.

By Mr. GROOM: Do I understand you to say that No. 1 survey traverses the most populous part of the Valley? I do.

And you think that that line would best serve the people of the Valley? I should think it is as central as a line through the Valley.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: What is the distance from the Roma street passenger platform to the Racecourse by this plan before Parliament? The total length of the line from the terminal station at Roma street to the Racecourse is 5 miles 72 chains.

Is that from the platform or from the place you say the line begins? I believe the mileage is taken from the station itself; I have not the information here, but I believe so.

Do you know what is about the distance by road from the top corner of Queen and George streets to the Racecourse? I cannot say.

Is it not about 3½ miles? No, a great deal more than that; I should say about 5 miles.

Do you know what the distance would be to the Racecourse by the Hamilton route? 6 miles. That is going by Victoria Park? Yes, and the Hamilton.

Do you know what the distance would be by No. 1 route, by the town and Valley to the Racecourse? Precisely the same from the same starting-point: the difference in distance between the road *via* Victoria Park and *via* the Valley is only 1½ chains.

What would be the distance, say, from Edward street to the Course? About half a-mile less; the crossing of Edward street is nearly half-a-mile from the present terminal station.

By Mr. DICKSON: It is intended to have a station at the Racecourse near the grand-stand? Yes.

What will be about the distance from the grand-stand to the station? About 16 chains.

By Mr. GROOM: Are you quite clear upon the point that the plans of No. 1 route can be laid on the table within the next two or three days? Yes.

Are the plans ready of the original route from the German Station to Sandgate? That route formed part of the first parliamentary plans that were laid before Parliament.

Could that be ready also within the next two or three days? I do not think that we could very well regulate that portion of the original plans, as the mileage would not be correct; we should have to prepare fresh plans of that portion.

Could not the mileage be altered? Yes, it could be; but it would necessitate a great deal of labour.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: By whose authority did you survey the route by Nudgee—was it at your own suggestion or by direction of the Minister? I believe the Minister for Works asked me if I had ever considered the question of taking the line in that direction, and I replied that I had not, and that I had taken the most direct line; he then said he thought it would be worth while making an examination of the country to test whether it would be feasible to carry a line in that direction, and I believe I suggested that a trial survey should be made.

By Mr. DICKSON: If the present plans should be adopted, would there be any difficulty in extending the line to the Pine River and the Bald Hills;—if not, from what point would you start? It would be almost identical with the point on the original survey, near the crossing of Cabbage-tree Creek.

By the PREMIER: You have seen the routes on this paper marked Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4? I have not examined the paper.

Just examine it and see if you recognise the lines there (handing a paper to the witness)? Yes.

You know all the routes? Yes; and understand them.

You have already, in reply to the hon. member for Toowoomba, said that the plans and sections of route No. 1 could be laid on the table within two or three days? Yes.

Can the plans and sections of No. 2 be laid on this table in that time? No. 2, I understand, is the line *via* the Valley and Hamilton.

No. 2 is the line *via* the Valley, Bowen Park, river bank, and Hamilton? I could not say exactly when those plans could be laid on the table. It would take considerably longer to get them ready.

Can you give an approximate estimate of the time when they could be ready? I hardly know in what position the plans and books of reference is with regard to that line.

Putting on all the available force you have in the department—can you give us some estimate of what time it would require before you could put on the table plans of the line *via* the Valley, Bowen Park, river side, and Hamilton? I do not think it could be done within less than a week or ten days. It would involve the preparation of entirely new plans; whereas the other one would only involve the completion of one sheet.

That is route No. 1? Yes; the tracings for which are ready, and only require to be photographed by the blue process.

Route No. 4—Victoria Park, Bowen Park, river bank, and Hamilton—when can those plans be laid on the table? I think they would take about the same time as No. 2.

Can the whole of the plans be laid on the table within a week or ten days? I hardly think so with the means at my disposal; I could tell you better after consulting my chief draughtsman.

By Mr. MACROSSAN: Would the putting of the plans on the table within any given time interfere with your getting ready working plans for the Fassifern railway? I think it would, seriously.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: To the extent of the time occupied in preparing these plans? Yes.
That is for a week or ten days? Yes.

By Mr. MACROSSAN: Would the working of the line through the Valley be more expensive than the working of the line through Victoria Park? To some slight extent, as you would require gate-keepers at the level-crossings.

By Mr. BEATTIE: Would you not require them on the Bowen Bridge road, at Bowen Park, and at Brook street? Yes; but there would be a greater number of level-crossings on the line through Fortitude Valley.

By Mr. MACROSSAN: You said, in answer to a question of Mr. Beattie's, I think, that the traffic on the Valley line would pay better than the Victoria Park line? I gave that as my private opinion.

Would it pay in proportion to the increased cost of its construction? That is a very difficult question to answer without some data to go upon: my own impression is that it would.

By Mr. McILWRAITH: Did your answer to Mr. Beattie's question mean that there would be more traffic on that line? More passenger traffic.

You were not expressing an opinion that it would pay better? No; my answer was simply that it would secure a larger passenger traffic.

By Mr. MACROSSAN: Mr. Griffith asked you a question about what is called the Albion line—that is, the line which crosses in front of Mr. Edmonstone's house, cutting it off from the road and crossing Breakfast Creek above the bridge; are the gradients of that line favourable going across to the Albion? Not so favourable as the line by Sports Ground, as it necessitates a long 1 in 50 gradient in rising the ridge on which the Albion Hotel stands.

For quick passenger traffic do you think that advisable? No; I do not think long gradients of 1 in 50 are at all suitable for fast traffic.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: How long will that gradient be? I don't recollect the exact distance, but I should think about 40 or 50 chains.

By Mr. STEVENS: What do you call fast traffic? Thirty miles an hour—or the speed at which we run trains between here and Ipswich.

By Mr. MACROSSAN: You have not considered the prospective traffic which will arise on the Racecourse route as far as the Racecourse?—do you think it will be considerable? On certain occasions there will be considerable traffic; but I don't think the traffic will continue throughout the year.

Do you think that the Racecourse line traverses country which is likely to be taken up for residences? A certain part of it will be—around the slopes of the ridge which the branch follows.

An impression seems to prevail that the deviation to Nudgee is through swampy ground;—is that the case, or does not the line skirt a ridge all the way? We go along a ridge almost the whole way to Nudgee, cross a flat in the vicinity of Nudgee Creek, and then go across flat but dry country to Cabbage-tree Creek. I should think that the ground there is as good and as sound for railway construction as it is on any of the other lines.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Is there any settlement on that land between Nudgee Creek and Cabbage-tree Creek? Not after you cross Nudgee Creek.

About a mile and a-half, is it not? About that.

By Mr. FRASER: Do you consider the line by Nudgee will be favourable to the creation of passenger traffic through the erection of residences there? I think we are likely to secure more passenger traffic that way than we would have if the line had followed the original survey.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Where? Round by Nudgee—we shall secure the traffic from the settlement at Nudgee.

By Mr. FRASER: From the present settlement? Yes, and from prospective settlement.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Where do you think that prospective settlement will be? In the vicinity of Nudgee.

Where about? On the red-soil ridges between Nudgee and German Station.

Would not the original line traverse ridges nearly the whole way? Only one—that is what is called Red Hill, and that will be accommodated by the other line.

Does not the original line traverse that long stretch of ridge from Red Hill to Cabbage-tree Creek? It keeps to the left of the road and crosses the ridge.

At a short distance? About 20 or 30 chains.

Don't you think the whole of that is likely to be occupied by residences in the course of time? Yes, it might be; but it will be almost as well accommodated by the Nudgee line. The divergence between the two lines at that point is not considerable.

Is not Red Hill on the chord of the arc made by the Nudgee route? We are more likely to secure traffic on the chord line than on the other.

There are two Red Hills—which are you referring to? The one immediately beyond German Station.

Don't you know that from the second Red Hill to Cabbage-tree Creek there is a long extent of high and dry chocolate-coloured soil?—don't you think that is likely to attract settlement? You cross the ridge about a mile from Cabbage-tree Creek and descend to a flat, the same flat as you cross going from Nudgee Creek to Cabbage-tree Creek.

By Mr. MACDONALD-PATERSON: What is the difference between the survey *via* Nudgee to Sandgate and the other shortest route? 53 chains in length.

Then it is not true that there is a difference of two miles between the shortest route and the route by Nudgee? No; 53 chains is the difference.

When you speak of the inconvenience to traffic on a 1 in 50 grade do you mean the danger of the speed? Yes.

What would be the difference in the time of the journey, suppose you travelled slowly over the 50 chains of 1 in 50 gradient you have referred to? I can hardly say: it would not amount to a great deal. I speak more in the abstract; a grade of 1 in 50 is not suitable for fast traffic.

I understand that that is the principal obstacle in the way of the adoption of that survey? I stated that in my opinion that was not so favourable a line as the one by Sports Ground, on account of the necessity of having that grade for a certain distance.

Would you give an approximate estimate of the extra time which would be required on a journey in consequence of that grade? That would depend on the weight of the train.

Taking an average passenger train, what would be the difference? I could not say. It might be considerable in certain states of the weather. If the rails were greasy the engines might have some difficulty in taking trains up that gradient.

Suppose it is dry weather, which is predominant here for about nine months in the year, what would be the difference of time? It might be two or three minutes; I could not say exactly.

By Mr. FRASER: Where is the next station past German Station to be? At Nudgee.

How far would that be from the ridge of hills on the Sandgate road mentioned just now? I could hardly tell you, as the position of the ridge is not shown on the plan I have before me.

By Mr. MACROSSAN: What is the distance between the Nudgee station and Cabbage-tree Creek Bridge? About two miles, or a little over that.

Have you given instructions for any deviation to be made there lately? Mr. Phillips, the inspecting surveyor, suggested a deviation with a view to improve the line and obtain higher ground for the approaches to the bridge. Mr. Phillips also suggested a slight alteration with a view to avoid severance of private property, which is to be done by running the line along the boundary of certain lands.

Have you been informed that land had been offered for nothing since the line was surveyed? I understood from Mr. Phillips that such a proposal had been made.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Who made it? I think Mr. Phillips told me that he had heard from the Minister for Works that some proposal of the kind had been made.

By Mr. MACROSSAN: In connection with the question asked by Mr. Dickson about bringing the line into Adelaide street, I should like to know whether there is a workable grade between the present terminus and that point? I think you could not get from the present terminus to Adelaide street with a favourable gradient. Anyway, a deviation would have to be made from the existing line somewhere about the gaol cutting.

By Mr. STEVENS: Is the land in the vicinity of Nudgee more suitable for building than farming purposes? There is some very excellent agricultural land there.

Is it chiefly suited for farming or for building sites? I think chiefly for farming settlement.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: One answer of yours I did not catch. You were asked whether, in your opinion, a line through the Valley would be more profitable or would bring in a better return in proportion to its cost than a line by Victoria Park? I stated that without some data to go upon as to the actual amount of the traffic it was difficult to give an opinion, but that my impression was that it would be more profitable.

By Mr. GROOM: Have any other parties besides the one spoken of by Mr. Phillips volunteered to give up their land for nothing? Not that I have heard of.

Then there is only one case? That is all that I have heard of.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Does the line *via* Nudgee cut up private farms to any great extent? We avoid passing through farms except to a slight extent.

Is there much severance? No; I don't think it will be serious.

How does it compare with the original line in that respect? I don't think there will be a great deal of difference.

By Mr. MACDONALD-PATERSON: What would be the gradient from the present station to Adelaide street? I can hardly tell without referring to the sections.

By Mr. DOUGLAS: Would it be practicable? I think not.

You said just now that the distance from the present terminus to the contemplated station at the crossing of Edward street was about half-a-mile? Yes.

I presume you have carefully estimated the cost of the whole of that line—No. 1? Yes. Careful estimates of all the lines have been prepared.

Can you give an estimate of the cost of that half-a-mile between the terminus and Edward street? I cannot give you that at the present moment, but I can supply it.

Would such an extension of the present line, altogether apart from the contemplated line, No. 1, be useful in connection with the passenger traffic? Yes; I think it would be a very great convenience to the business portion of the community who travel by rail.

Would you be good enough to furnish your estimate of that half-mile? Yes, I will do so.

[Mr. Stanley then withdrew.]

Mr. BEATTIE said he was anxious that a line should be constructed to Sandgate, believing that it would meet the wishes of a great many people in Brisbane and along the route. He was in hopes when the Minister was giving them information with respect to the various surveys he would have given them further information about the route *via* the Breakfast Creek round to Hamilton. He might state at once that he was not anxious to see the line run through the centre of Fortitude Valley, because he thought that would be a most expensive route, and that it would not be so advantageous as some people imagined it would. He was under the impression until that night that a survey had been made of a line going round Victoria Park through Bowen Park along the Government water reserve until the English church was reached. There he expected there would be a station, and that the line would proceed to the eastward of O'Reilly street, crossing the Breakfast Creek road. The Engineer said that would be a long and expensive route. He did not wish to doubt that statement, but he believed that the line would pass over less swampy land. After it crossed Breakfast Creek above the present bridge the line could be taken to the Albion or the Hamilton. That line would keep clear of what he believed to be the most expensive part of a line to the Albion—that was the swamp on the south side of Breakfast Creek known as Mr. Edmondstone's paddock. A line taken across that piece of swamp would be a most expensive work. With the exception of a tunnel under Petrie terrace there were no great engineering difficulties in the first part of the line, and he could not understand how it was that the line from the present terminus to Bowen Park should be so expensive. If the proposed route were carried out it would be preposterous to expect any amount of passenger traffic from the south side of Breakfast Creek; and as to the station near the Hospital, it was not likely that residents of Fortitude Valley would walk there in order to ride into town when they could go from the outer limits of the municipality to town for 3d. by omnibus. He was rather astonished to hear the Minister for Works, and also, he thought, the Colonial Secretary, say that it was only a quarter of a mile from that station to Ann street. It would be about the longest quarter of a mile he had ever walked, and he should be disposed to add two more quarters to it. On the other hand, if the line were taken down to the bottom of Fortitude Valley, the same point on the other side of Breakfast Creek could be arrived at, and nearly the whole of the traffic from the Hamilton, Breakfast Creek, and the Albion would be accommodated. He had no wish to see those populous places deprived of the convenience of railway communication, but he thought the wants of the greatest number should be considered. No doubt the engineer and the surveyors had considered the route carefully, but

he believed that it would have been better and cheaper to have carried the line over Breakfast Creek and round by the road, more especially as the Bill just passed gave the Government power to use the road without paying compensation. He saw no difficulty in taking the road to the Hamilton and then striking off to Sandgate. Although he was opposed to the present proposed route and did not believe it would be so advantageous or satisfactory to the country as other possible routes, yet he felt bound to support the motion believing that it would be of advantage to some parts of the route, and that the fact that it was opposed to the interests of some portion of the people of Fortitude Valley was not sufficient reason for opposing it. He believed it would have been just as inexpensive to construct the other route, and if the line were carried on the east side of O'Reilly's Hill instead of the west, it would receive a large amount of traffic from Fortitude Valley, which would increase the revenue considerably and assist in making the line payable. He was perfectly satisfied that if the proposed route was adopted it would be a very long time, even with a large accession of population, before the line would pay.

Mr. DOUGLAS said he felt inclined to support the motion, chiefly on the grounds stated by the Colonial Secretary. All railways involved more or less questions of expense. The line *via* the Hamilton would very probably be the best line—it would undoubtedly be the most expensive, and before the completion of it was seen probably double the amount now voted would have had to be spent. It was important that the line should be made as soon as possible, and that the cost should be as nearly as possible within the estimate; and for those reasons he should vote for the motion. Any delay now might lead to still further delay, which would be very unadvisable. After hearing the statements of Mr. Stanley it was evident to him that the line was likely to be a useful one; perhaps not the most suitable, but still a suitable one. He hoped that ere long the Government would see their way to extend the present line from Roma street to a more convenient site in town. In that way the convenience of passengers would be consulted, and the revenue of the department would be proportionately increased; and it could be done by carrying out a portion—and not a very expensive portion—of the suggested No. 1 route. The extension would only be half-a-mile in length, and would involve very few engineering difficulties, except an excavation on the side of the Observatory hill, and it would prove an immense convenience to the travelling public.

Mr. GARRICK said he was very anxious that the line, if carried out, should be carried out as speedily as possible. He regarded the line not as some hon. members did—as simply a line for suburban traffic and to Sandgate—but as the commencement of a line which must shortly be extended to the agricultural district of Bald Hills and the Pines, and to Caboolture, possibly to be carried beyond that afterwards. It had been stated by the Premier that it was not usual to prepare alternative plans and sections, and to invite the House to consider alternative schemes, but that was probably because the desirability of considering alternative routes had not before arisen. In this case, more than any other he remembered, it was desirable that at least two or three alternative schemes should be submitted to the House; and in addition to such alternative plans and sections some further information should be furnished to the House with regard to the anticipated traffic upon this line. It might be very difficult to ascertain with exactness what traffic there would be,

but there were data from which a very fair estimate might be formed. The Engineer-in-Chief had stated his opinion—and he (Mr. Garrick) believed it was a correct one—that the line *via* the Valley and Bowen Park, notwithstanding the additional cost, would yield a better return than that *via* the Victoria Park. There must be a reason apparent to all hon. members for that. If the line were taken *via* Victoria Park and Bowen Bridge he could not see how any passenger traffic from the south side of Breakfast Creek could be attracted, and it must be evident that the inhabitants about the Valley and Bowen Hills would not walk to the Bowen Park station to be carried to Roma street to have to walk from there to their destinations in town. The line *via* the Valley, on the other hand, was furnished with a station at the intersection of Edward street, and another in the Valley, and would therefore secure a very much larger amount of traffic even from the existing population. The Colonial Secretary had started a difficulty by saying that the Government could not—or would not, he thought the hon. gentleman said—submit any other plans and sections to the House; but the hon. gentleman could hardly maintain that position, seeing that the Chief Engineer had stated that so far as the Valley line was concerned plans and sections would be ready in two or three days and might be presented for the consideration of the House. He would say nothing about the route as far as the German Station; but he could not see why the diversion should have been made to Nudgee. The line appeared to leave the road at five and a-half miles from Brisbane and return to the road at about eleven and a-half miles. It was quite clear to him (Mr. Garrick) that the Engineer himself was not thoroughly familiar with that road, for when asked about Red Hill he seemed to be unaware that there were two prominent red hills on the Sandgate road. The second of them was a ridge nearly a couple of miles in length with a chocolate soil, and there was a good deal of settlement on the western side of it, between German Station and Cabbage-tree Creek. For the greater part of the distance the proposed line would be perfectly worthless. It avoided the settlement about Zillman's waterholes, and by taking a circuitous route increased the haulage upon the line half-a-mile for all time. As far as cost of construction was concerned, there were very few points of difference between the diversion and the main line. It had been hinted that there were some stiff gradients on the Sandgate line, but on examination it had been shown that the difficulty was only at a few points. It had also been shown that there was at this moment a greater settlement on the western than on the eastern side of the road, and he believed that the land about Nudgee and the Serpentine was not so well suited for future settlement as the ridges on the western side of the road. He therefore could not see why the diversion had been made;—the cost would be as much, the distance increased, and the advantages of settlement not improved in any way. It was one of those things that no one could understand. It might have been that persons about Nudgee were willing to give their land for nothing, but the Chief Engineer had stated that so far as that was concerned there was nothing to choose between the routes. He only knew of one proprietor who was willing to give his land, while several had told the Minister for Works at a deputation which waited upon the hon. gentleman, that they were willing to give portions of their land required for the construction of a line passing along the Sandgate road.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Who were they?

Mr. GARRICK said he was one and Mr. Gillen was another. The hon. gentleman put the question himself. Why should it be said—if you don't accept this you will get nothing? The Government had information that other plans and sections could be laid on the table of the House, and therefore they should not seek to put the House into that position. He hoped the Government would not do so, but if compelled to accept this railway or have a further delay he should have to accept the line. He should do so, however, with regret, because he believed that the best line had not been placed before the House.

Mr. STEVENS said as hon. members had received a large amount of information which they could not thoroughly digest to-night, he would suggest that the debate be adjourned for a week. During the interval the plans and sections of the alternative routes might be prepared, and hon. members could then decide which was the preferable one. He moved that the debate be adjourned.

The PREMIER said he did not think the hon. member fully understood the position in which he would place Ministers if he carried his amendment. Had the Ministry brought down alternative proposals for the House to choose from every hon. member would have cried shame on them. The Government had received instructions from the House to make a line, and they had exercised their judgment, the present proposal being the result. They had submitted to the House plans and specifications of a certain line, and if the House came to a decision involving the expenditure of a much larger sum of money the whole question would be shelved, because Government would not accept the responsibility of spending the money. The adoption of the route *vid* the Hamilton would probably involve an expenditure of three times the amount of money voted, and the Government would decline to be in the slightest way responsible for the expenditure of £10,000 to £12,000 per mile on that line. The Government had done the best they could according to the amount of money at their disposal, and they had submitted a good line. They had been very strongly urged to make this a suburban line, but the instruction was for a line from Brisbane to Sandgate, and the Government proposed such a line and were prepared to start it as soon as they had leave from Parliament. There was no reason why contracts should not be made and the works let by six weeks from this time. Another condition, however, was now sought to be enforced, and hon. members were trying, on their own *dicta*, to persuade the Government that a line through the Valley would be a paying line. He had said before, and he repeated it again now, that that line would not be a profitable one. A Government railway going to Sandgate could not possibly have a suburban traffic. Everybody knew that, in spite of a railway going to Sandgate, which could not run at the outside more than six or seven trains a-day, the suburban traffic would chiefly be carried on by the omnibuses, and to ask the Government to expend £30,000 or £40,000 to compete with the three-penny omnibuses was a thing they would not for a moment entertain. They were asked by Parliament indirectly to do what they said they would not do. They had submitted their plans for a certain scheme which they had introduced, and yet they were asked to make a Fortitude Valley line. He would ask the House to review the whole position, and then, if they still insisted upon their Fortitude Valley line, let them find the money. He could not.

Mr. GRIFFITH said the hon. gentleman was very inconsistent, and must have a very bad

memory. He even could not remember what he had upon the notice paper. He told the House that Parliament had restricted the Government to making this line for £52,000; but could not Parliament change its mind? How many miles of railway, he should like to know, had been made in this colony as to which the Government had gone beyond what Parliament authorised in the first instance? Only this session the Government asked the House to sanction a line of railway that was to cost £200,000, although only £50,000 of it was voted. The Government did not see any harm in that. The fact, however, remained that many members of the House thought that a better line could be made to Sandgate than that proposed by the Government; and because they so thought they were told their conduct was inconsistent and impracticable. An hon. member had said to him that he would be willing to give £100,000 for a thing worth £100,000, but that he objected to give £50,000 for a thing not worth £20,000. That was his (Mr. Griffith's) view, too. He would not mind spending £100,000 on a line to Sandgate if it was worth it and would bring in 5 per cent on the outlay; but they were not justified in making a line to Sandgate unless they were perfectly sure it would pay. The Premier said it was simply a question of not how much it would pay but how much they would lose, and the hon. gentleman also said that the matter had been complicated by its being treated as a suburban line. He (Mr. Griffith) never thought that it was anything else. How else could the line be expected to pay? How could a line to Sandgate be otherwise than suburban? He never thought, and did not think now, it would be justifiable to have a line simply to take people to and from Sandgate. The line they were discussing carefully avoided passenger traffic, which was the only traffic that could pay. As to the Racecourse, it seemed ridiculous that people must travel first half-a-mile to the Railway Station and then make a journey of six miles to get to the Racecourse, while they could go a shorter and more convenient route by omnibus. This was not a justifiable way of spending the public money, because it was quite certain that the project would not pay. When he spoke this afternoon he pointed out two or three objections and the Colonial Secretary contradicted him, but he was glad to find that what he said had been borne out by the Engineer-in-Chief. First as to the deviations. The Colonial Secretary said that a line to which he referred would not go near Petrie's Bight. He (Mr. Griffith) called the junction of Ann street and Queen street Petrie's Bight. He could almost throw a stone from there to where the line would pass, and was quite sure there were men who could throw a cricket-ball: the line, in fact, passed not two minutes' walk from the Government wharves. It was close alongside Ann street, near the Union and Excelsior Hotels.

The PREMIER: It is 60 feet above the water.

Mr. GRIFFITH said it was there, at any rate. He had argued with respect to this deviation, on the one hand, that they could get to the wharves from it, and on the other that it would be convenient for passenger traffic. The next thing he had dissented from was that the line as proposed by the Government went through a long swampy flat, so as to avoid the traffic from the Hamilton. The Minister for Works said he could not adopt that line for engineering reasons, but it now appeared that it would make the journey to Sandgate longer by only four minutes, and would cost only £4,000 more. But by going that way they

would get the whole of the Hamilton traffic along the line, if they took the train to a reasonably central part of the town. Roma street could never be the terminus for any suburban traffic except that up the line, as at present. Coming to the next point, upon which there was a difference of opinion—namely, the line to Nudgee—they were told that it would be the cheaper route, but it now turned out that it would cost the same money, and would not pass through country favourable for settlement. It would go over swamps and places which were separated from the sea by swamps, and to which the sea-breeze could not come without passing malarious swamps. Every possible argument that could be brought against a railway line existed against this one. It appeared that so far from its being necessary to postpone the Sandgate line indefinitely, it might be approved of this session if the Government liked to lay the plans upon the table. If this £52,000 was a hard-and-fast limit let them consider whether they could not relax it. Suburban traffic down the river would pay much better than up the river, for people liked getting near the sea and sea breezes. The Premier had said that suburban traffic did not pay. Did it not pay in Sydney? Did it not pay in Melbourne?

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. GRIFFITH: Does not the Hobson's Bay line pay?

The PREMIER: Yes; but the suburban lines they purchased had ruined the men that made them.

Mr. GRIFFITH said it paid handsomely long before the Government bought it. It was sheer nonsense at this day to say that suburban traffic did not pay. That was the kind of argument that might have been used when railways were first talked about, and when it was said that railways could not go more than fifteen miles an hour with safety. Why was it that suburban traffic paid so well in Sydney? For six or seven miles from town there were trains every hour of the day, and they were crowded. He believed the Toowong traffic paid when the hon. the Speaker regulated it, but it did not now. He was in favour of an adjournment of the debate, and if the Government were really in earnest in making a line that would be of use to the country they could do it very well this session.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it was impossible to follow the arguments of the hon. member who had just sat down. He commenced by disputing his statements that no line would go to Petrie's Bight. Then he said it would go there, and then he said he did not know where Petrie's Bight was; finally, he said it would go by what he called Petrie's Bight. He might call Wickham terrace Petrie's Bight if he liked, but the description would nevertheless be incorrect. There was no parallel whatever between the line and that approved of the other night, for which only £50,000 was voted, though it would ultimately cost £200,000. The fact was that when that £50,000 was spent the line would stop until more money was obtained, but as for any line stopping short of Sandgate the thing was absurd, if the line was to be made at all. The result of adjourning this debate for a week would simply be that there would not be a line to Sandgate this session. The Government were not going to put alternate lines upon the table for members to pick and choose from. Someone insinuated that it was the custom and the duty of the Government to put alternate lines upon the table. It might just as well be understood at once that the Government were not going to do that: this was a line that, after mature consideration by them, though it was not the line that several members of the Government would approve of, if they

could get a better at anything like the price—this was the line that they had decided upon. He, himself, would far rather have a line by the river to the Hamilton, but that would cost double the price, and the Government were not prepared to undertake the expense. They had a dispute as to alternative lines once before in the House, and it lasted for a long while; he referred to the Ipswich railway, and the question whether it should go to the north or the south side of the river. Did the Government put an alternative line on the table? Nothing of the sort; they brought forward the plans of the line they approved of and said "take that." If hon. members wished to have a line to Sandgate they had better approve of the plans and specifications on the table. If they were determined that Brisbane should not have a line to Sandgate, let them vote for the adjournment of the debate, or for the member for Toowoomba's amendment. There would then be no time this session. He, himself, thought it was of importance that there should be a line to Sandgate, and there was nothing to prevent the contract, as his hon. friend had pointed out, being taken in hand in six weeks, and the line commenced and carried out at once. If hon. members chose to block the scheme for any reason of their own they must take the whole responsibility. The Government would take none. They were prepared to make the line for as near £52,000 as they possibly could, and hon. members must understand at once that the Government were not prepared to put alternate lines upon the table and allow them to be picked and chosen from just as they liked. Hon. members, therefore, had better make up their minds at once.

Mr. MACDONALD-PATERSON said he had made up his mind some time ago. He had given a great deal of attention to the matter, and had studied the merits of the different surveys, and he believed almost every member would agree with him that the Sandgate line could not be dissociated from the desirability of having a central railway station in the city of Brisbane. However much he would like to see the line to Sandgate, he should give his vote for delay rather than vote for the route *via* York's Hollow. It was unfair to discard the subject of the central station. The Roma-street station originally was a mistake, and it was notorious that public opinion was that it should be placed in a more central position. If they were to adopt the route suggested to-night, at no very great distance of time, if not next year, they were certain to have an agitation for a more central passenger station for the Southern and Western Railway system, and they ought therefore to regard this question of the Sandgate line as one to be associated with this subject. When the Engineer-in-Chief was under examination, he asked him as to the advisability of having a central station in Adelaide street, and Mr. Stanley's reply was that it was impracticable. Since then he had seen Mr. Stanley outside the House, and that gentleman said that his question was misunderstood; he thought the reference was to the old project of a station in Adelaide street, at a point of land near the junction of George street and Ann street. When he asked the question he had, in his mind, the square on which the Normal School stood. He (Mr. Paterson) thought the line by way of the reserve on Wickham terrace was the proper route; there was no difficulty whatever in going from the present railway station to some point between the slopes of the reserve of Wickham terrace and the frontage to Adelaide street. It would be wise to use the present Normal School Reserve as a station site. It was a very central spot, and the old Grammar School could be utilised for the

Normal School, which could come down, and there was a small Presbyterian Reserve that could no doubt be resumed at no very great expense. Then the Government would have the whole of the square, and the railway could move from that through a tunnel into the watershed of the Valley, and so on to Breakfast Creek. The question of expense in making a railway of this kind successfully for passenger traffic should not deter them from making the railway which was most convenient to the public. Traffic on the Sandgate line would not be one-half of what it would be if there was a proper central railway station in Brisbane. The convenience of being able to reach the centres of business from the railway station always induced traffic; and coupling as he did the desirableness of having a station more central than the one they had in Brisbane with the necessity of a line to Sandgate, he held it was better to defer the consideration of the matter, even at the risk of losing another year, than to adopt the route suggested by the Government. He would rather see £100,000 spent in bringing the railway into the city, and *via* the Valley.

Mr. RUTLEDGE said he had not intended till within the last few minutes to say anything; and, had it not been for the disposition of some hon. members to take action which would result in the throwing overboard of the railway for another year, he should have held his peace. They were all agreed that a railway to Sandgate was necessary. The House had decided by a large majority that there should be a railway to Sandgate. He had hoped that a route might be selected that would have given general satisfaction; but in matters of this kind it seemed impossible to give general satisfaction. As a great part of the line would go through a portion of the electorate he had the honour to represent, he was naturally interested in the railway, but was not tied down by preference to any particular direction. If it went by the Albion, according to the plan, it would accommodate a large number of his constituents, and it would also accommodate a large number at German Station and some at Nudgee. Perhaps the line would have accommodated more if it had not gone to Nudgee but *via* Zillman's Waterholes. He had no personal interest in the undertaking, and it was a matter of indifference to him individually by what route the line went. He was only anxious that economy should be studied in the direction it took, and that the line when carried out should serve the greatest number of persons resident in the district. There was a good deal in the remark that the Sandgate line was not on a par with suburban lines generally. If they could combine suburban traffic with the traffic on the Sandgate line it would be very desirable to do so; but if that could not be done efficiently, the suburban must be sacrificed to the Sandgate traffic. The original idea of the House when it sanctioned the line was that there might be a quick and easy mode of reaching the salt-water of the Bay. He could not say that he altogether approved of the particular route adopted, but would ask hon. members, now they had been told that if the plans were adopted the line would be commenced during the course of the next six weeks, whether it was wise to wait for twelve months until further plans were submitted? When it was a question the other night of the salaries of two high officials in the Government service, was it not a question much discussed as to whether the Government should not take the responsibility of voting the salaries and retaining or dismissing one of the officers? The conclusion generally arrived at was that the Government were responsible; and the same argument applied to this line. They as a House

were to a great extent in the hands of the Government; they could not compel the Government to come down with a more satisfactory line next year, and it was a question whether they would accept what the Government—which was all-powerful—gave them. They had better take what the Government chose to give them, and be thankful for it. The Government said they were willing to take the responsibility, and it ought to be thrown on them. But he asked hon. members to pause before they gave votes which would result in the line being thrown overboard. A large number of his constituents were deeply interested in the construction of the line. While the line would accommodate very many at the end towards Caboolture and Gympie, it would also accommodate a large number about Lutwyche, the Albion, German Station, Nudgee, and other places. A large number of these persons were looking forward with a very great deal of anxiety to the adoption of some route or other by which their district would be tapped and put into communication with the metropolis. While prepared to waive any objections he might have to the route proposed, he would urge the necessity of taking care that the line, when constructed, should be of some practical use to the people who were compelled to come to the city every day. He had spoken to the Minister for Works privately, some time ago, with respect to the extension of the present terminus to some point where it would be more accessible. The hon. gentleman told him that he had it in contemplation to consider the expediency and practicability of extending the terminus without delay. He (Mr. Rutledge) asked the hon. gentleman the same question yesterday, and was told that the thing was deferred for the present. There was a great outcry as to the inconvenience experienced by persons who wanted to come from the various suburbs into town. After getting to the Railway Station people had to walk to Queenstreet or else pay for the services of a cab, which would cost more than the fare for the whole journey. If they were going to spend money at all it should be in the way of extending that line. The Engineer-in-Chief stated in the early part of the evening that the extension was impracticable; but why should any engineering difficulty present insuperable objections to the accomplishment of any object they had set their minds on? If they could climb over mountains and find their way to the table-land by means of engineering skill, it should not be considered impracticable or impossible to extend the present terminus to the neighbourhood of Adelaide street corner, if no further. There might be great difficulty in the route as suggested by plan No. 1—a difficulty that was increased by the consideration of the magnitude of the expense incurred in carrying out the suggestion; but the difficulty in the way of taking it skirting round Wickham terrace into the Valley was not to his mind the principal objection to that scheme. He agreed with the hon. member for Fortitude Valley that if the line were carried that way it would not be of much service to the residents there, and would be a most roundabout way. If the Government were disposed to promote the settlement of the suburbs, they should do something without delay towards bringing the terminus of the Southern and Western Railway to the neighbourhood of the corner of Adelaide street. That was a boon they were all crying out for, and he thought there should be no hesitation in at once accepting a suggestion of this kind. Surely they wanted their railways to pay; and if it could be shown that offering facilities to people who had to come into town every day they would at the same time promote settlement in

the suburbs, then there ought to be no excuse for delaying for a single day the consideration of the question of extension to which he had referred. He would ask hon. members not to adopt a course of action that would result in throwing over the construction of the Sandgate line indefinitely. If they could not have the thing in a perfect state, let them have it in an imperfect state rather than not have it at all. Supposing the present Government to be in office next year, as no doubt they would be, there was no reason to suppose that any better proposition than the present would be submitted to the House; and he trusted, therefore, that hon. members would take that into consideration, and that after the intimation which had been given by the Colonial Secretary—that if the line submitted by the Government was adopted now it would be commenced within six weeks—they would not adopt a course that would result, so far as the Sandgate railway was concerned, in an indefinite postponement.

Mr. REA said that if there was nothing else that would determine him to vote for the amendment it would be the demeanour of the Colonial Secretary on the present occasion. He should like to see any Minister now-a-days in the House of Commons dare to make such a threat as that which had been made by the hon. gentleman. He ventured to say that even if Mr. Gladstone did such a thing his own men would turn upon him. What was it the House had been told?—why, that if they did not choose to adopt the plans submitted to them by the Government they would have nothing! Why, what was the use of putting plans and specifications on the table after such a threat as that? What was the use of calling the Chief Engineer to the bar of the House to examine him as to the best route if they were to be told afterwards—“You must take this or nothing.” The whole thing was absurd in the face of such a threat from a member of the Government. It was a repetition of the conduct of the Government in regard to the continental railway, as hon. members were then told that no information could be given as to what route would be taken by that line: the fact was that no information was to be obtained, but the Ministry were to do as they pleased. It should be the endeavour of every colony to give the greatest facilities for transit between the suburbs and the centres of population, and unless that was done how was the interest on the railway loans to be paid? He had been told that the proposed line would not pay working expenses, and the argument of the Premier was that suburban traffic would not pay: if that was the case, what was the use of having lines to the suburbs?—why not take them out to the wilderness at once, as far away as possible? The House had been told that there were plans of three or four alternative lines to Sandgate; and, if that was the case, it was only right that the House should have them before it so as to be in a position to decide which was the best to adopt.

Mr. KELLETT said he was sorry to have heard from the Colonial Secretary that, unless the House accepted the plan before it, the whole question would be shelved till next session. They had been told by the Chief Engineer that in a few days other plans could be prepared; and after the expression of opinion that the line proposed by the Government was the worst one that could be adopted, he thought that the other plans should be laid before hon. members. The only thing that could be said in favour of the present line was that it was cheap and nasty. They had been told by the Minister for Works that even if this line would be only a pleasure-seekers' railway; but he (Mr. Kellett) thought it could be made more than that. It had been

shown on one of the plans—that of the line to the Hamilton and the Racecourse—that a branch could be taken from it to the Powder Magazine and deep-water. There had been a cry for years past for a line to deep-water, and here was a line that showed the shortest route to it. It would take all the coal traffic, and would, at the same time, answer all the purposes of a line to deep-water; so that it would be something more than a mere pleasure line. He was perfectly certain that, with the traffic through the Valley and the coal traffic, and presuming there was a station nearer to the centre of the town, it would be a very payable line indeed. He was not present at the last deputation which waited upon the Minister for Works in reference to this very line; but, from what he had read in the newspapers, it appeared that the hon. gentleman told the deputation on that occasion that he believed in the line to the Hamilton, and that the only objection to it was that the money was short; but he would ask the House to grant the extra sum of money, as he believed it would be the best line. He (Mr. Kellett) had read that statement, and felt so satisfied that that would be the line the House would be asked to adopt that he felt perfectly astonished when he found that such was not the case. He had then thought that it was nothing but a matter of consultation with the Treasurer; but now the House were told that they must either take the line offered to them or get nothing. He was sorry the Colonial Secretary had put down his foot and told them that the other plans would not be submitted to them, as it was quite evident that even the hon. gentleman himself had not seen all the plans. Were those plans before him the hon. gentleman might possibly change his mind.

Mr. HORWITZ said the question before the House that evening was whether there would be a line between Brisbane and Sandgate. It was well known that the plan submitted to the House was not a suitable one, and he had seen parties residing between Brisbane and Sandgate in the course of the previous week who told him that it was not a good plan, as the line went away from where population was settled. It was useless to build a line where there was no population. As the Colonial Secretary had told them that unless they adopted the plan recommended by the Government they would have nothing, he would at once say that the plan before the House, if approved by the House, would only be a “white elephant,” as, unless they built a railway where population was, it would never pay, and they might as well do without it. No matter how good the intention of any Government might be when in power, unless they were checked they were liable to go astray. For instance, some years ago a line was made from Toowoomba to Warwick, which was a distance of fifty-two miles by the road, whilst by rail it was sixty-six miles, so that the money for making the extra fourteen miles of railway had been wasted. A straight line from Toowoomba to Warwick ought to have gone by Drayton, Spring Creek, and Allora, whereas it was made where there was no settlement. A similar case was now before the House, and if the question went to a division it was his intention to vote against the line submitted by the Government.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said the hon. member for Stanley (Mr. Kellett) had given a very correct version of what had taken place when the deputation waited upon him; but the hon. member must bear in mind that it was a very different matter to make a line that would cost £17,000 more than the present line. Even

this line, which was estimated to cost £4,000 a-mile, would, he believed, cost more than that. The hon. member had spoken of the line as being cheap and nasty, but he did not think that any line could be termed cheap that would cost £4,000 a-mile, if not more. Independently of that, it would be the best line that could be made, although it might not go through the centre of population. Hon. members were apt to go away with the idea that this line would pay; but if they only drew a comparison between the suburban line they already had, that carried a large number of passengers, with the prospects of the Sandgate line, they would see that even supposing the Sandgate line carried as many it would not then pay. He had just taken out a few figures to prove that. The total receipts for last year from the suburban line between Brisbane and Oxley amounted to £1,765 for passenger traffic—he did not take the goods traffic, which was very trifling—and the number of passengers carried was 31,800. He thought that if the Sandgate line carried that number of passengers for the first five years after it was opened it would do very well. But then how would they stand as regarded the expense? The interest on the money for the construction of the line would amount to £3,300 a-year, not one-half of which would be received in receipts. He thought that the people of Brisbane and the people along the line from there to Sandgate ought to be very well satisfied with the line which it was proposed to build. He believed there were many parts of the colony which would be glad to have such a line where there was far more necessity for it.

Mr. KATES said he was very glad to hear that the Colonial Secretary had intimated that if the plans were not adopted the question would be shelved till next session. He should be very glad indeed if that was the case, for to his mind the line would never be productive. First of all, there was a magnificent road from Brisbane to Sandgate—a road they would be very glad to have in his part of the country—and, secondly, there was no agricultural land near Sandgate—nothing to bring from it, and very little to take to it, with the exception of a few pleasure-seekers—and how, then, could it be expected to pay? Hon. members had seen that the Minister for Works had been obliged to reduce the number of trains running to Roma in consequence of there being so little traffic; and he thought, as regarded the Sandgate line, it would be found that there was very little traffic. As to £50,000 paying for the construction of the line, he did not think twice that sum would be sufficient. For the reasons he had given he should vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Toowoomba.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he should like to know whether the House would be justified in authorising the construction of a line which both the Treasurer and the Minister for Works had told them would not pay? He would support the construction of lines in any direction where it could be proved they would pay. He believed there was every reasonable prospect of the line to Sandgate paying if it were taken by the proper route. Not only would the line to Sandgate pay, but he believed indirectly the South-western line would be benefited by the line being connected with the Roma-street station. He thought it would be advisable for them to wait before arriving at a decision till they saw the plans of all the routes which had been surveyed.

Mr. STEVENS said he wished to withdraw his motion.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: No; I object.

Mr. GRIFFITH said if the facts were as stated by the Premier and the Minister for Works, they

would not be justified in authorising the construction of the line. If they knew that a line would not pay they had no business to make it. He believed that a line to Sandgate would pay if it were taken by a reasonable route. He did not think the through traffic from Brisbane and Sandgate alone would pay; the traffic of the intermediate centres of population must be secured. As the proposed line would only tap one centre of population—the Albion—he did not think it ought to be made.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said he believed he was warranted in saying that the idea of a railway to Sandgate was until recently a dream, but certain hon. members who were beginning to find that it was a reality, and that there were members of the Government in favour of it, were pushing their demands and desires in another direction. They not only wanted a line to Sandgate but they wanted a central station for the convenience of business men coming into town every day—it was so very inconvenient for them to land at the present station. He thought there ought to be two or three stations in Queen street. Every man who found his way into the House ought to have a railway made to his door, and every business man who came into town should be picked up and dropped at his own door when he wished. It was very evident that an attempt was being made to plunder the country at the expense of the Brisbane and Sandgate railway, and he for one should set his face against it. He never believed in the Sandgate line, and when £52,000 was put down for it he thought the Treasurer was altogether too liberal. Finding that the line by some of the surveyed routes would cost double that amount, they did the next best thing and selected a route which would cost less. They ought not to be particular to a minute or two in the time of the arrival or departure of trains from Sandgate so long as the railway went there. He did not think it would suit to make the line through the Valley. They knew what had happened at Ipswich, where a number of old shanties had to be pulled down, and great injury was done to the town in consequence of the railway passing through it. The Valley was a progressive place, and the same thing would happen there. The only people who would be benefited by the railway being made through the Valley would be those who received compensation from the Government for land which was required. He was satisfied that settlement would follow the railway. If a line went through good building country, and he was informed that this line would, there would soon be settlement. If the railway would not pay, he thought that the most impudent claim he had heard of had been set up by a few persons who desired to have a railway to Sandgate, and who would plunder the country and saddle it with the expense of the line.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN believed that if the thing was worth doing at all it was worth doing well; but if, as the Minister had said, the line would not pay, it ought not to be made. His idea was that the Minister for Works was adopting the exact plan to make it not pay, because the only chance of a line to Sandgate paying was by its being taken through the centre of population. He did not suppose many members cared where the line went to if it passed Breakfast Creek. He was of opinion that it ought to be taken through the Valley. If the Ministers really believed what they had said as to the line not being a paying one, they were by proposing it putting themselves in a position which would bring a great deal of trouble on their shoulders at some future time. It was not the fact that the line would be only used by the people of Brisbane, as people from all parts of the colony were only too

glad to be able to get to the seaside at certain periods of the year. If the line went through the Racecourse he believed that the income from it would be largely increased, because the Racecourse would be used in future for purposes to which it was not now applied. It was a beautiful spot; just such a place as people liked to visit for out-door sports and amusements. He thought there would be gatherings there at least once a-week. The Minister for Works seemed to think that there was some consolation in the fact that the line would not cost much. He did not see any consolation in that, because if in the course of a year or two the line was found to be useless there would be so much money thrown away. Under all the circumstances he thought it would be better for the House to allow the matter to stand over for a few days, when hon. members would be in possession of better information.

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

The House divided :—

AYES, 24.

Messrs Palmer, McIlwraith, Macrossan, Perkins, Fraser, Scott, Beor, Weld-Blundell, Garrick, Douglas, Amhurst, Hamilton, Price, Kingsford, H. W. Palmer, Thompson, Beattie, Stevens, Archer, Kellett, Swanwick, Dickson, Rutledge, and Norton.

NOES, 13.

Messrs. Griffith, Rea, Meston, Macfarlane, O'Sullivan, Paterson, Grimes, Kates, Sheaffe, Lalor, Persse, Hamilton, and Groom.

Question, consequently, resolved in the affirmative.

Original question put, and the House divided :—

AYES, 25.

Messrs. Palmer, McIlwraith, Macrossan, Perkins, Beor, Fraser, Scott, Weld-Blundell, Garrick, Rutledge, Dickson, Douglas, Amhurst, Hamilton, Kellett, Kingsford, Price, Thompson, H. W. Palmer, Beattie, Archer, Grimes, O'Sullivan, Stevens, and Swanwick.

NOES, 17.

Messrs. Meston, Paterson, Griffith, Rea, Norton, Kates, Lumley Hill, Morehead, Cooper, Davenport, Sheaffe, Macfarlane, Groom, Horwitz, Low, Persse, and Lalor.

Question, therefore, resolved in the affirmative.

Question put by the Speaker :—

That the plans, sections, and books of reference of the Railway from Oxley to South Brisbane, as laid on the table of the House on the 20th October, be approved.

Mr. FRASER presented a petition from residents in the districts of Oxley and South Brisbane with reference to the proposed line of railway, and moved that it be read.

The PREMIER : What is the question before the House?

The SPEAKER said that a petition relating to the subject of the debate could be received.

Question put and passed.

The petition, as follows, was then read by the Clerk :—

The Petition of the undersigned, inhabitants of Oxley Creek, Rocky Waterholes, Cooper's Plains, and Four-mile Swamp, the same being freeholders, leaseholders, or householders therein.

To the Honourable the Members of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland in Parliament assembled, humbly sheweth:—

That your petitioners learn with considerable disappointment and regret that, according to the plans, &c., now laid before your Honourable House for an extension of the railway from Oxley to South Brisbane, it is contemplated to adopt the route surveyed by Mr. Fitzgibbon.

That the line surveyed by that gentleman affords no convenience whatever for passenger traffic and very little for farm produce, as when once over Oxley Creek it runs almost completely to the bank of the Brisbane River, and follows that river bank until close to the settlement at Boggo.

That very few persons reside near that part of the line at present, nor is there any prospective chance of further settlement in that particular locality.

That your petitioners respectfully represent that the line should be brought along the route surveyed by Mr. Thorneloe Smith, or as near that route as possible. A railway running in that direction would pass through thickly-populated localities in its course, and would therefore be infinitely more useful to the public. It would also open up healthy and extensive suburbs for further settlement along the line.

That the survey last alluded to runs in close proximity to the present centres of population in the district through which it passes—viz., the head of Oxley Creek, the neighbourhood of Stable Swamp Creek, Rocky Waterholes, and Four-mile Swamp. It would also be useful to the inhabitants of the Old Logan Road and Cooper's Plains, thus ensuring a considerable traffic, both in passengers and goods and traffic for produce, thus rendering the line more remunerative to the Government.

That a large proportion of the hardwood timber at present used in Brisbane is brought from the heads of Blunder and Oxley Creeks, where there is almost an inexhaustible supply;—this timber is loaded into punts at Oxley Creek, near the place where Mr. Smith's survey proposed to cross it. It is probable that this timber traffic would also be secured by the railway if brought by Mr. Smith's route.

That a great portion of the land through which Mr. Fitzgibbon's survey runs is scrub, cleared and in a high state of cultivation, consequently the outlay for compensation must greatly enhance the cost of the line.

That the land traversed by Mr. Smith's survey is of a totally different description, being for the most part low-priced forest land.

That the only reason your petitioners are aware of alleged for adopting Mr. Fitzgibbon's survey is that given by Mr. Stanley, in his report to the Commissioner for Railways dated 23rd May, 1873—namely, that in the neighbourhood of Oxley it secured the highest ground over flooded country.

That the flooded country crossed by Mr. Smith's survey does not exceed a mile and a-half, and as the water through which it would pass in time of flood (say about once in ten years) is mere back-water from the river and altogether free from current, the cost of making provision against injury to the line from that cause for the short distance mentioned would not be very extensive—probably it would be more than counterbalanced by the reduced cost of the land.

That running in the direction of Mr. Smith's survey are many roads not now used for traffic, which under an Act just now passed by Parliament might be utilised for Railway purposes, thus further reducing the cost of the land required for the railway by the line now mentioned.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your Honourable House will take these premises into your favourable consideration, and afford your petitioners relief by withholding your approval of the present plans and books of reference of the line of railway from Oxley to South Brisbane until a line is adopted more suited as a means of traffic to your petitioners and the other inhabitants of the populous and important district through which it will pass, and one more likely to yield a remunerative return for the money to be expended in its construction.

And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray, &c., &c., &c.

[Here follow eighty four signatures.]

On the motion of Mr. FRASER, the petition was received.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS, in moving the adoption of the plans, sections, and books of reference of the railway from Oxley to South Brisbane, said that when the surveyor commenced the survey of the line some few months ago, he started from Oxley, but he subsequently found that he could make a shorter and cheaper line by starting at a point between Oxley and Sherwood. The line was surveyed from that point to the Oxley Creek, which it crossed at some little distance below the Oxley Creek bridge, and then struck the old line surveyed by Mr. Fitzgibbon many years ago at a point about ten chains below the bridge on the road from the Rocky Waterholes. The line was very favourable for construction until it got to the range on this side of Boggo where the South Brisbane cemetery was situated. It traversed a very large quantity of agricultural land in the parish

of Boggo, and ran at intervals for a considerable distance along the road. The Chief Engineer expected to be able to still further avail himself of the road, and he had used just outside Woollongabba 30 chains of the road more than the original survey showed. Hon. members, of course, were well aware that this line was chiefly intended to accommodate mineral traffic, and to develop the coal mines of East and West Moreton. It had been found necessary by the Government, in the face of the extensive development which must necessarily result from the fact of a line of steamers of large carrying capacity making Moreton Bay their terminus, that facilities should be given to the coal-owners for the shipment of coal with the greatest ease and at the cheapest rate. The line as originally surveyed was eight and a-quarter miles in length, but the distance had been reduced to five and a-half miles, and the line would be carried to the same point—namely, the Woollongabba Reserve, opposite the Woollongabba Hotel. The cost as estimated by the chief engineer was £26,000 or £4,000 per mile, including a couple of wayside stations. A terminal station was not included, because the line where the present survey ended was not intended to be the terminus of the line. The Chief Engineer found some difficulty in determining whether he should take the line to the bank opposite Government House and near the English Church and erect wharves there for the shipment of coal; or whether he should take the line to a point below Kangaroo Point called Shaftston. He therefore asked to be allowed to terminate the line until he should have satisfied himself by a survey of both lines. Since then he (Mr. Macrossan), from a personal survey, had come to the conclusion that a line as good as either could be brought further in to South Brisbane, where a better spot could be found for the shipment of coals, at a point opposite the Gardens, and for the accommodation of the South Brisbane traffic. The line at present terminated at Woollongabba. On the left-hand side of the river near Woollongabba was a large water reserve, and by constructing the line through that easy gradients could be obtained until the road was struck. The gradients would be very easy until the line reached the junction of Stanley street, Vulture street, and Dock street, where the line would be carried round on to a very large flat extending back from the river and sufficiently large for a coal terminus. A curve of not more than 4 chains radius with a good line would be sufficient here, as the train could not travel at more than 10 miles an hour, the line being on the main road. A passenger station, which would be a real convenience to the people of South Brisbane, could be erected at this point. The line would then have been brought further into South Brisbane than the Southern and Western line was brought into Brisbane. There would be, he thought, no objection to the passing of these plans.

Mr. GRIFFITH: Where is the money?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said the hon. member would hear that by-and-bye. The Treasurer must find the money, as it was an undoubted fact that he must enable the coal-owners to ship their coal. It would be very little use to try to establish commerce with England and the East unless suitable facilities were given for coaling vessels which came here. The shorter the line for mineral traffic were, the better it would answer the purpose. Many hon. members had an idea that it would be better if the line were carried further down the river, but that would entail further expenditure and increase the cost of carriage to the proprietors of the coal. The cause of the comparatively heavy cost was the heavy cuttings at the cemetery hill, causing the quantity of earthworks over the

whole line to average 6,300 yards per mile, although the other portions of the line were almost level. As he thought there could be no objection to the line, he need do no more than move the motion on the paper.

Mr. GRIFFITH said the Minister for Works had stated that this line was to be a coal line, but he found that it terminated two miles from the bank of the river. The railway on the north side would be as good for the purpose, or better, for it was not so far from the water. How was the line to be brought to the water? The Colonial Treasurer, it appeared, had some scheme in his head, but what was to be done or where the money was to come from had not transpired. He did not understand these things. It seemed that the Minister for Works was going, next year, to carry the line to some part or another of South Brisbane, so that there would be something to hold *in terrorem* over the head of constituencies. He was justified in saying that, because the Government from the commencement of last year had always taken care to have something to hold *in terrorem* over hon. members. He did not see how the construction of this line could substantially advance the interests of South Brisbane in the way of giving them the advantages of railway communication. He held that this line, also, should be a suburban line. It was quite certain that a line with a terminus at Woollongabba would not be a suburban line. The one important point to know was, where it was intended that the line would touch deep-water. In 1873, on a proposal to continue the line from Oxley to North Brisbane, strong objections were taken to the scheme. The Government during the previous session had declined to say how they meant to bring the railway to town, but left the line at Oxley, and by that very ingenious device they, in 1873, secured power for another year. The present Government seemed to be adopting a similar device, and he felt quite justified in reminding the country of the manner in which those things had been done. If a coal line was to be made, the first thing to be done should be to see where the wharves were to be and connect that point with the railway; but the Government were beginning at the wrong end, and the line as now proposed would be of little or no use to the coal traffic. As to passenger traffic, who would go down to Woollongabba to go up the line? It would be easier to go from the existing terminus. Until they knew where the terminus was to be they could not tell what the line was. The terminus might be at Shaftston, or Lytton, or South Brisbane, or where it was proposed to be now. He could not reconcile the statement of the Minister for Works, that the Treasurer would find the money, with the position they had hitherto taken up. The Sandgate line was passed because it came nearest to the amount voted. If the same principle was applied to the South Brisbane line they would not go further than the money that had been voted for it, which was nothing, and that meant that they would never begin it at all. The Minister for Works ought to have told them how the money was to be provided, and to have given information to show how the line would pay. He had heard it stated that to take the line from Woollongabba to deep-water would cost £16,000, irrespective of cranes, wharves, and everything else. Having always believed that the line should have been extended to South Brisbane, he did not begrudge any expense in that direction, but he doubted whether the route was the best one for the coal traffic and whether the Government were sincere in their proposal.

The PREMIER said he failed to see any connection between what passed in 1873, when

the Government managed to secure possession of power for another year by keeping back the line at a certain point, and the plans and sections now on the table for a railway to deep-water. It was ridiculous to think that the Government had brought in this line and were keeping people in suspense as to its terminus in order to retain office for another year. He failed to see that that line and the existence of the Ministry had the slightest connection whatever. This was a line in which he had always taken the warmest interest, and had the Bill passed a short time ago to facilitate the making of railways on main roads been in existence last year, it would no doubt have been included in those brought forward by the Government last year. He looked forward shortly to there being a large fund at the disposal of the Government for purposes of that kind, and the Government would not be going far out of their way if, with the approval of the House, they were authorised to spend £26,000 on the experiment of a coal line on the cheap principle described by his hon. colleague. They had the money in their possession, and he would give plain intimation that if the House authorised him to do so he would spend the money if he could find it. The ordinary plan was first for the Treasurer to ask for a loan, and a year afterwards to ask for the approval of plans. He did not see why that should be always so—why the process should not sometimes be reversed. All information available on the subject of the proposed railway had been given by the Minister for Works; and from an engineering point of view the route was the best, limited by the amount of money he proposed to spend upon it. It was still a matter of doubt where the terminus on the river would be. They were only asking the House to agree to a certain scheme, the details of which could only be put before them to a certain extent, but which up to that extent were correct. He saw no reason for delay simply because it was at present impossible to put a complete scheme before the House. The line had been estimated to cost £26,000, and he believed it was well worth constructing as an experiment. With regard to the Sandgate line, he would admit that he was only half-hearted, and was only carrying out a decision of the House; but he had a far stronger opinion of the utility to the colony of the line now proposed than of most others which had hitherto been brought before the House. But he should never advocate the line as a suburban line for passenger traffic. It was wanted especially to convey coal to deep-water, and to encourage the development of that industry within reasonable bounds. It was not beyond their means to try it as an experiment, at all events. When traffic became developed the gradient might be altered to 1 in 50, but at present the proposed grade was quite sufficient for the traffic. There was one advantage. The engineer had already managed that the grades should be compensating grades—when the train made a descent of 1 in 30 its impetus carried it up the next incline of the same gradient. The House might fairly be asked to give their sanction to the line as an experiment.

Mr. THOMPSON said he had always supported a line to deep-water with the idea of developing the coal traffic, and he supported the South Brisbane line on the ground of its general utility. There was no doubt coal in West Moreton equal for all purposes to the best Newcastle coal, and although the history of the coal trade had been the history of misfortune, they were at last beginning to recover a name they ought never to have lost. A great impetus had lately been given to the industry, which was attracting renewed attention. He should support the Government scheme, because if they got to

Woollongabba they got so far on the road to deep-water, and he was quite willing to believe that the Ministry, having got so far, would not stay their hand. It was admitted that as a suburban line it would be a failure, and the Government must look to the coal traffic to make it pay. A line could be made from Woollongabba to the old Powder Magazine, which would suit the purposes of the trade for many years. The weak point in their coal was its tenderness; it would not bear any knocking about, and their appliances gave it the greatest amount of knocking about possible. If the coal could be put from the trucks to the railway waggons and thence to the ship, the knocking about would be reduced to a minimum. He supported the Government scheme with great pleasure, and in full confidence that before very long it would bring about the means of shipping coal which had so long been desired. To give hon. members some idea of the cost of getting coal to market, he might tell them that to get coal from a mine at Bundamba, in which he was interested, to Ipswich, cost 3s. 6d. a-ton, and a similar amount was charged to punt it down to Brisbane. Coal must be easily got which could afford such a heavy price for carriage and still pay the miners and the coal-owners. He was willing to trust the Government in the matter; he was glad to see the line going even as far as Woollongabba, and he should give the scheme his hearty support.

Mr. DICKSON said he did not think any reasonable objection could be raised to the proposed line, although, judging from the plans, it did not seem to him to run in a direction best suited to the convenience of the people of South Brisbane and the residents along the line; but, after hearing from the Premier that the line would not be so much a passenger as it would be a coal line, that objection was to some extent removed. It was a misfortune that the Government had not shown on the plans the destination of the line; but still he intended to give his support to it. He would ask the Minister for Works if he would not be able to submit to Parliament some plan showing the completed line, as that would be far more satisfactory. The whole line was only five miles in length, and, he took it, it would be let in one section, and therefore he apprehended there was no reason why the information he had referred to should not be given. He was only surprised that gentlemen interested in coal had not asked that question before, because a line to Woollongabba could not benefit the coal interest until the last connecting link to water was made. He should support the line, as he believed it would be of benefit to the coal-mining industry, and he trusted that they would be able to show that they had mines that would turn out a good article. But while giving his support to this railway, he could not give it to the extraordinary proposal of the Treasurer—that he should consider the sanction of the House to this railway equivalent to authorising the use of the balance of the present loan votes for the construction of the line. He (Mr. Dickson) distinctly objected to such an incorrect principle of financing, as the loan moneys had all been obtained under distinct appropriations. He did not wish to see any delay in the construction of the work, but he would suggest that it should be proceeded with in this manner—that the Treasurer should bring down a loan estimate to cover the amount required for the work upon the understanding that such an estimate would be incorporated in the first Loan Bill to be authorised by Parliament. He could not allow his vote to be interpreted to mean that while approving of the line of railway, he authorised the Treasurer to use money for this work which

had been obtained for certain other appropriations. He trusted that hon. members who were interested in this line would not be satisfied with the plans which had been laid upon the table; but whilst supporting them should obtain from the Minister for Works a statement to show what the destination of the line would be. He sincerely trusted that the benefits arising from the line would be a tangible fact before many years were over.

Mr. FRASER was understood to say that the proposal before the House was not in every respect quite satisfactory, as the line terminated nowhere. Although the objection, or rather, dissatisfaction, connected with that part of the scheme had been partly removed by the statement of the Minister for Works, he considered that the hon. gentleman should at once give instructions to have complete plans laid upon the table, so that there would no longer be any doubt on the matter. He would not at that late hour of the evening refer to the importance of the coal interest, but he thought that both the Premier and the Minister for Works undervalued the suburban traffic which they were likely to have in connection with that line. It had been stated that evening that suburban lines would not pay. Whatever might be the case in this colony, it was well known that in the old country there were no lines which paid anything like the suburban lines which were connected with large centres of population. He would direct attention to what was going on in South Brisbane since the Bridge lands had been sold. The improvements there in the way of large buildings had been very great, and he believed they would find that great benefit would be derived from the suburban traffic that had recently sprung up. The route taken was not one that would commend itself to him if making the selection. A more serviceable, but perhaps not shorter, route could have been selected; and when he heard of the Minister for Works' intention of bringing this line forward, he expected the old Ipswich road would have been made use of to a larger extent. But on the principle laid down by the Colonial Secretary that they must accept what was offered or else have nothing, he supposed they must submit and be thankful for what they got. He might point out that it would have been, perhaps, more judicious if the line had been brought into South Brisbane in such a way as ultimately to be connected with the line from the Logan—which was only a question of time; and to run in the same direction for a short time in such a way as would lead to the settlement of a large population. They had been told that the suburban traffic of Toowong and Indooroopilly did not pay. That might be; but the Minister for Works was himself to blame to a considerable extent for that, as from the steps he had taken the omnibuses were enabled to compete successfully for the suburban traffic. That was one of the reasons why the suburban traffic of Toowong did not pay. However, he would express the hope that all that had been promised this evening would be effectually carried out; and as to the ways and means, the Treasurer must be left to devise them. If it should be considered desirable to take a branch line to Shafston or Lytton he should not have any great objection, as he was told that some industries would be benefited thereby, and they might accomplish two objects at the same time.

Mr. MACFARLANE said that many years before, and during the three years he had been a member, he had advocated the construction of this line from Oxley to deep-water; and he was glad now to see that there was some likelihood of its being carried out. When the plans were first

laid on the table, the terminus being at Woollongabba, he was disappointed, and thought something better might have been provided for the traffic. He was not in the House when the Minister for Works introduced these plans and specifications; but, as far as he could understand, the line would terminate somewhere about the Powder Magazine.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: At the Dry Dock.

Mr. MACFARLANE said perhaps that would suit the South Brisbane people quite as well, but it was not as he had anticipated. This line was what they had been working for for many years, and he did not anticipate there would be any opposition to the passing of the plans and specifications.

Mr. GRIMES had much pleasure in seeing these plans laid on the table, and also at hearing the Minister for Works had determined the point at which the line should terminate. The hon. gentleman had indicated that it was his intention to bring the line along the water reserve into South Brisbane, near the Docks. He (Mr. Grimes) thought the route and the terminus laid down on the plans very good, but there might have been an improvement in the route. It might have been made much shorter by bringing it down on the western side of the Clarence Hotel; and that route would have been quite as well for the Government, because it would have passed through a large portion of Government lands—the old Bridge lands—which would have been increased in value more than the increased expenses of cuttings. He did not express his satisfaction so much because the line was coming from Oxley through the electorate he represented, because it was a question whether it would benefit the Oxley people much; they had already a railway which suited them very well, and came direct to the north side.* But it would be a good thing for the country: it would develop the coal-mining industry in the West Moreton district, and might lead in the future to a large export of coal.

Mr. DOUGLAS said this line was one that should be constructed out of loan; they were now, by giving their authority to these plans and specifications, going to authorise a loan, and they were doing it in a very irregular way. They were not justified in authorising this line at all until provision was made by parliamentary sanction for the money, however desirable the railway might be. This line ranked infinitely before other undertakings they had already authorised, but they had not made provision for it in the ordinary way. He did not know what the sense of the House was, but felt that he at any rate should not be justified in voting for this line. As a precedent, it was one of the very worst they could make, because, however good the thing was in itself, it ought to be done in the right way. He really could not make up his mind, though he knew they had discussed this matter over and over again and believed the thing in itself was justifiable, to give his assent to a vote of this kind brought forward in this way. They were committing themselves without having any provision made, except the statement of the hon. gentleman, that he was going to take the money required from some other fund voted for some other purpose. The hon. gentleman had not asked them to authorise the borrowing of the money for this purpose at all.

Mr. GROOM said he quite endorsed the sentiments of the hon. member who had just resumed his seat. He should vote for the motion, although he wished it to be distinctly understood that he did not approve of the course which the Premier proposed to adopt. As far as the

Railway Companies Preliminary Bill was concerned he hoped that it would prove as great a failure as the Western Railway Reserves Bill, and that no railway would be made under it. He expressed that wish most heartily because he believed the Bill to be a mischievous one which would be the foundation of all sorts of gigantic swindles and be ruinous to the country in many respects. If they once admitted the principle that the Government could apply to another purpose money which had been voted for a specific purpose they would not know where it would end. A Government would have no difficulty in bribing constituencies by promising to construct branch lines. The line before the House ought to have been included in the scheme of railways enunciated by the Government. The late Government were very remiss in their duty in not undertaking the construction of a line from Oxley to South Brisbane. A great swindle was perpetrated on the country when the line was taken to North Brisbane instead of South Brisbane. Had it not been for personal rancour towards a Minister who sat where the Minister for Works was now sitting, he believed that the line would never have been taken on the north side of the river. No one knew that better than the Premier. He would repeat that the principle enunciated by the Premier to-night was vicious, and were the hon. member on the other side of the House he would be the first to rise and condemn it. He believed that the construction of the proposed line would be productive of good results. It would lead to the development of the coal industry and tend to increase the traffic on the Southern and Western Railway.

Mr. PERSSE said he did not believe that there was a member in the House who was more in favour of the construction of a line from Oxley to South Brisbane than he was. He could not help thinking that the Government were entirely wrong in supposing that they could appropriate money to other purposes than those for which they had been voted. Certain money was voted to extend the main line further westward, and he maintained that that money ought to be applied to that line only. If the Government did what they proposed to do, he would have a perfect right to ask them to take money out of that vote to construct a line from the Logan to Oxley. Although they should bury things of the past in oblivion, he could not help saying that the construction of the railway on the north side of the river was the rankest imposition ever perpetrated on the public. No one would deny that a line ought to be made from Oxley to deep water; but he contended that the line marked on the plans which they were now asked to adopt was not in the nature of such a line. The line was to be taken to Woollongabba, and he would like to know where it was to be taken to thence—to the Dry Dock or Bulimba. If the line was only to be made to Woollongabba it would be madness for the House to consent to it. Moneys which had been voted by Parliament seemed to be like a little purse in the hands of the Government, which they could use as a sop to any constituency. The position taken up by the Government was entirely wrong, for this reason—that they had refused to grant other lines because money had not been voted for them. He contended that until a vote was passed the Government had no right to move for the construction of a line of railway. He was not very well up in the ways of the House, but the proposal appeared to him to be one for the misappropriation of money. He firmly believed in the construction of a railway from Oxley to some point of deep water which money voted for the purpose, and he would give

1880—4 N

his hearty support to any Government that proposed such a measure; but he should not support the present proposal to misappropriate money voted for another purpose by using it for the construction of a line from Oxley to Woollongabba. He hoped the plans would be rejected.

Mr. HORWITZ said he was of opinion that a line should be carried to deep water, but he did not believe in extravagance. The House had already voted one white elephant to-night, and he did not believe in voting another. As a line had been approved of for the northern side of the river, a branch to deep water might be made from that. He did not think the Treasurer had any right to say he would find the money. If money had been voted it should be spent on the object for which it had been voted, and to appropriate it to other purposes was simply bribery and nothing else. The people of Brisbane had a very good river, and they did not want railways on both sides of it. He had been rather in favour of taking a line to deep water on the south side, but as the plans of a line on the north side had been approved, he thought it would be better to make a branch from that line.

Mr. REA said the Premier proposed to do what men were sent every year to penal servitude for doing—namely, to misappropriate a large sum of money for other purposes than those it was intended to be used for. It would be, no doubt, a dangerous precedent if he got the Opposition side of the House to countenance the beginning of a false system like that. The hon. gentleman had told hon. members that if they voted for these plans he should take that as an intimation that he was authorised to misappropriate this money. This was the second instance of the Premier breaking faith with the men who had lent money in London. He would again read that part of the letter in the *London Times* in which the hon. gentleman called the attention of those gentlemen to the way in which he was going to borrow money and spend it. The letter said—

"For the last four years Queensland has appeared before the British public as borrowers for amounts averaging per annum about £1,200,000. This constant annual borrowing, with no hint of finality, the present Government considered must ultimately weaken their credit. They carefully studied, therefore, the wants of the colony for the next three years, and have scheduled them in the Loan Act."

The proposal now made was to misappropriate money, and when that practice was once begun, hon. members might give up all power over the public purse.

Mr. DAVENPORT said of all the small goods put before the House this session in the commodity of branch railways, he thought this little railway presented the most cheerful prospect. He was sorry that he could not give the same meed of praise to other proposals of the Government. He was, however, exceedingly sorry that in the matter of these lines the Government had given way in a pernicious manner to the system of log-rolling. The sooner the House put its foot down and stopped that sort of thing the better it would be hereafter for the country. He had intended from the first to look favourably upon this line, but he could not recognise the principle upon which the Government intended to take funds voted for another purpose. He therefore moved, as an amendment, that the following words be added after "20th October"—

Provided always, that this House has provided the funds necessary for its construction.

Mr. MACDONALD-PATERSON said he should support the amendment of the hon. member, believing that the principle involved in the speech of the Premier was a most pernicious one.

He should not care to see such a precedent established, no matter what party or set of men might be in power. He was as much in favour of giving every convenience and facility for the development of the coal traffic as any member in the House, but there was something higher to be considered where such a pernicious principle was likely to be established, and he should vote for the amendment.

Mr. STEVENS said it would be time enough to meddle with the money voted for the extension of the Southern and Western Railway when the work was being done on the land-grant system.

Mr. THOMPSON said that money appropriated for one purpose could only be appropriated for another purpose by Act of Parliament. He understood the Premier to mean that the money would be some day available, not that he would appropriate the money in a way unauthorised.

The PREMIER said he had never any intention of taking money voted for one purpose and spending it on another; but it had always been the practice whenever money was voted for a special purpose, and funds were available, to commence spending it in anticipation of the money out from home, and make up the deficiency subsequently.

Mr. GRIFFITH said the Premier's explanation simply meant that he intended to spend money for one purpose which was voted for quite a different purpose. In other words, that £390,000, borrowed for the Southern and Western Railway, being available in the sense that he had possession of it, he intended to use it for another purpose. The Premier was in this position, that he must either break the law by spending money in a way unauthorised by Parliament, or he must accept the amendment—or the passing of the resolution was merely an idle form.

Mr. DICKSON said it was the custom where urgent works were required to be done to bring in a Loan Estimate to be included in the first Loan Bill, and that was the course that should have been adopted in the present case. In that case any sums available might, by the authority of the House, be employed for the purpose prior to the loan being negotiated. The Premier had no right to assume that the money for the Southern and Western Railway would never be required because a new system of railway construction had been authorised. The hon. gentleman's course was a clear one. If the hon. gentleman introduced a loan estimate covering the amount required for this railway, that would meet the objection.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it appeared to him that the last speaker had been setting up arguments for the purpose of knocking them down. As far as he had understood from the Premier, there was no objection to the amendment of the hon. member for Toowoomba (Mr. Davenport). There was no objection to put this money on the Loan Estimates, but there was plenty of money available—

Mr. GRIFFITH: Not for this work.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said they had the money; and if the question was carried the money would be put on the Loan Estimates, but that loan would not be coming forward for some time, and in the meantime he considered that the Treasurer would be perfectly justified in using the money he had—with the sanction of the House, of course.

Mr. GRIFFITH: Spend the money first and ask for authority afterwards?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said, not at all. They had no objection to the amendment.

The work would not be gone on with until the Government had the sanction of the House to spend the money, to be covered by the next loan.

The PREMIER, in explanation, said that when he spoke on the matter before he explained that, owing to the exigencies of this particular case, the matter was inverted—that the ordinary rule was first to bring down a loan for a work, and that being granted, then to bring down plans and sections; but if they obtained the approval of the House to the plans and sections before them they would then ask for a loan, and having obtained that sanction they would be at liberty to take the money from anywhere.

Mr. NORTON said that he did not intend to support the motion, for this reason—that when he moved some time ago for a sum of money for a railway from Gladstone to Rockampton he was met with the answer that there was already water-carriage. The argument used in that case applied with greater force to the proposition now before the House, as there was not only water-carriage from Oxley to Brisbane, but also a railway on one side of it. Having this means of communication, he did not see why there should be another railway on the other side of the river.

Mr. FRASER said that the present was not an analogous case to that mentioned by the hon. member for Port Curtis—for this reason, that the coal traffic that was intimately connected with this scheme had, in the first place, to be brought a considerable distance to the river, and then to be shifted into punts and brought down the river and re-shifted again. The necessity for a railway was this—that direct communication should be made with the coal-pit, which was miles away from the river, to deep water. That being the case, he thought the hon. member would see that there was no analogy whatever between the two cases.

Mr. DOUGLAS asked whether he was to understand that the Premier accepted the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Toowoomba (Mr. Davenport)?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Did I not tell you so?

Mr. DOUGLAS said it was important that the decision of the Government should be made known?

The PREMIER: I have no objection to the amendment at all.

Mr. DOUGLAS said that got rid of a great difficulty, as it simply conceded all that the Opposition contended for—that the money should not be spent until it was voted, as it not only involved a question of expenditure, but of extra taxation, which was a most important question. One of the strongest objections he had to the present Government was that sufficient provision had not been made for meeting the rightful demands of the Treasury.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: We will look after that.

Mr. DOUGLAS said he only hoped the hon. member would do so, but he did not see much probability of its being done. He felt much indebted to the hon. member for Toowoomba for having moved the amendment, as without it the head of the Government might have felt himself to be in a position to spend money without the sanction of Parliament.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said this was the old trick again. Whenever a thing was attempted to be done for the good of Brisbane those who were continually getting up and blowing off steam and noise—it cost them nothing

—and appealing to people outside, opposed it. Was the hon. member (Mr. Douglas) opposing this railway or not? What did it mean? If the money was in hand what better use could it be put to than this? What did they find? That every sort of difficulty and embarrassment was placed in the way of the Government by the leader of the Opposition and the members for Enoggera and Maryborough—it was a nice picture. They were also invited to see that men were walking about the colony looking for employment, and when the Government wanted to carry out an important work, and provide machinery for affording employment, where did the opposition and obstruction come from? He hoped the working men would take notice where it came from, and that those who held meetings in Brisbane would not forget the leader of the Opposition and the member for Maryborough.

Mr. KELLETT said he objected to the statement of the Minister for Lands—that a number of members of the House had tried to obstruct the railway and stop it going to South Brisbane. He had heard nothing of the kind. What they objected to was that moneys should be voted for certain purposes and afterwards used for different purposes altogether. He did not know whether the member for Maryborough had misunderstood the Premier, but he could hardly think that the hon. member had understood him when he said that he was satisfied as the Premier agreed with the amendment. At any rate, he was not satisfied with agreeing to the amendment, because it left them in the position they were before. The Premier said that he would take the money that would be required from the Western Railway vote, and at some future time would ask for a vote to refund it. During this session there had been nothing but taking from one vote and putting it to another. He was a young member, but it seemed to him that this was extraordinary usage. Night after night they were considering the last loan vote, and they passed it for certain purposes, yet now they were told that it could be handed about and applied to another purpose. That seemed to him extraordinary. On the very last item that had been discussed that evening it had been fairly argued that a better line could be found; but they were told that no money was available, and that the one proposed was the line Ministers had agreed to. Now, however, the House was informed that for another matter money could be found. That was what he objected to. He certainly believed that a railway to deep water was a necessity. He was not trying to obstruct that being done, but he said this proposal was not the right way to gain that end. If the proposed railway was so valuable to the country why was it not included in the last loan vote? The proposal now before the House was but an after-clap. Besides, he maintained that by constructing a branch line of some two miles they would get a better line to deep water than the proposed railway to South Brisbane, or rather to Woollongabba. Even if it were extended from Woollongabba to deep water, a branch line to deep water near the powder magazine would be better, and they would get to the other side of the Hamilton flats, which was the worst part of the river, and would always need dredging he was informed. If they could get a line to deep water at an expenditure of £14,000, in place of spending three times that amount on a line to South Brisbane, would it not be much better? The plans before the House were for a line to Woollongabba, and hon. members had not been told to what point the railway was intended to go from there. He was strongly inclined to think that a small

syndicate of a meat-carrying company had something to do with this proposal, and that the line was going to their dépôt. The only reason that he could account for the line terminating at Woollongabba was that it might be diverted to a point lower down the river. The House were not told to what part of the river the line was to be extended from Woollongabba. That was not a proper position to take up, and he hoped the House would not allow the matter to be carried in the way proposed. If that was the way business was to be done it would be better to save the time of hon. members—get rid of the House, in fact—and let Ministers settle everything themselves. He believed it was the opinion of the country that at the present time a good coal traffic was likely to be a great interest; but, for the present, owners of coal mines could get all that they required by a line to deep water at the powder magazine, which would be more advantageous than the one proposed. The branch proposed could only be justified on the ground that it was suited to the coal traffic; but he could see no argument in favour of it as against the other, and could not understand the plan of taking from one vote and giving to another.

The SPEAKER said that before putting the question he wished to point out that if the amendment was passed the House would agree to approve of the plans, sections, and books of reference of a railway from Oxley to South Brisbane, provided that the House found the necessary funds for the construction of the line. He did not think such an approval was the one that was required by the Act, and that it would not be proper to invite the Council to concur in a condition that had a proviso attached such as that of the amendment. It would be better probably for the member for Toowoomba to accept the assurance of the Premier, and that the approval of the plans should be transmitted by message in the usual form.

The PREMIER said he held the same view. He did not think the provision was at all necessary. He could only inform the House that until he had received the formal sanction of the House for the finding of the money nothing would be done.

Mr. GRIFFITH: The sanction of the House in committee?

The PREMIER: That is the only way in which a loan vote can be passed.

Mr. DAVENPORT said that after the assurance of the Premier he would withdraw his amendment.

Amendment accordingly withdrawn.

Original question put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS moved that the plans and sections of a branch line from Sandgate line to Racecourse, as laid on the table of the House on the 26th October, be approved. He thought, surely, hon. members knew sufficient about it. The engineer's estimate of the cost of the line was £5,000.

Mr. GRIFFITH: When is it proposed to run trains?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: When the line is constructed.

Mr. GRIFFITH: How often?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: As often as they are required.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he thought it rather late to go on with new business at twenty minutes past 11 o'clock. He recognised, however, that this line was part of the Sandgate railway scheme, and he thought it might have been better if the Minister had told them that it

was only a sort of an appendage to be used on special occasions. If that were so it would be the first instance in this colony where the Government had constructed a line to be used only at long intervals of time—probably six months apart.

The PREMIER said that in coming to a decision on the Sandgate line the House had virtually decided in favour of the line now proposed. The question as to how often the line should be used was one of administrative detail which might be well left to the Government in power to determine.

Mr. GROOM asked whether the promise made by the Premier with regard to the voting of money for the line just approved of would apply to this line?

The PREMIER: Yes.

Mr. DICKSON said he entirely dissented from opinions expressed by Ministers that the Sandgate line would not pay. The line to the Racecourse would command a very large traffic and help materially towards making the Sandgate line pay.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not see why the question should be debated, the line being part and parcel of the Sandgate line. The Racecourse branch was an essential feature of the Sandgate line, and one which was likely to bring in a great deal of money. He did not agree with some of his colleagues, as he believed that the Sandgate line would pay.

Question put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS, in moving that the plans of a line from Maryborough to Burrum, laid on the table on the 27th October, be approved, said he did not think there could be much discussion on the question. It did not matter whether the Bill before the House was passed or not.

Mr. DOUGLAS: I look on this as a purely formal matter.

Mr. GRIFFITH: I do not regard it as formal.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said that the money for the line had been passed, and the fact that there was a Bill before the House to give power to a private company to construct a line ought not to be considered in the matter.

Mr. DAVENPORT asked whether the approval of the plans would commit the House to the passing of the Bill?

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. GRIFFITH: But it commits us to the making of the line.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The money has been voted and the approval of the plans only commits us to making the line if the company do not do so.

Mr. KELLETT: Cannot the Government apply this money to some other railway which will be more useful?

The PREMIER: The hon. member has been very facetious to-night, and has asserted that the Government have done nothing this session but take money voted for one purpose and apply it to another. I challenge the hon. member to stand on his legs and state one instance in which that has been done. Only one instance.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he did not consider the motion a formal one. It was a very extraordinary thing that whilst a Bill was pending respecting the construction of the line by a private company the Government should ask the House to approve of the plans. This was part of the regular proceedings on a Government scheme. If the plans were sanctioned it would not be known whether the rail-

way was to be carried out by the Government or by a private company. A grave question might arise whether it was desirable that the Government should make the line if the company did not, or whether it should stand over until next session. That was a question which deserved more serious consideration than it was likely to meet with at half-past 11 o'clock at night. Hon. members had gone away under the impression that no new business would be dealt with.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: This is no new business.

Mr. GRIFFITH: The hon. gentleman said last night that he would take the proposals *seriatim*, and it was not expected that he would bring on any proposal after half-past 11.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the hon. gentleman had lost his temper.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he had not, but it seemed as though hon. members opposite had lost their tempers and their heads, and their understanding also. He did not intend to discuss the plans on their merits.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Go on.

Mr. GRIFFITH said the hon. gentleman might as well hold his tongue, as neither his interruptions nor his speeches assisted in the conduct of business. Before the plans were approved the House ought to consider whether it was desirable that the Government should undertake the construction of a railway to an unproved coal district. The terminus of the line was, he believed, a valuable coal district, but it was quite unworked. He was in favour of letting the company who were prepared to work the coalfield also make the line, but whether if the company was not there it was desirable for the Government to make the railway was another question which he was not prepared to discuss. He moved that the debate be adjourned.

The PREMIER said he was astonished to hear the hon. gentleman put the objection in the shape he did. The question of whether the line should be made or not had already been discussed, the decision arrived at had been acted upon, and money had been borrowed for the purpose. The question now was, had the hon. gentleman any argument to bring forward against the plans, for arguments against the line were not to the purpose. He knew the hon. gentleman could not have a single argument against the plans, because it was a straight surface line and one of the cheapest lines to construct in the colony. If the company did not make it the Government were committed to do so, and in either case the plans and sections would be wanted.

Mr. GROOM said he was sorry to differ from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Griffith), but this line did not appear to him to come in the same category with the others. The money had been voted by the House, and the matter had been very fairly considered last session. If the debate were now adjourned, many hon. members who were present might lose their opportunity of speaking. The passing of the plans and sections would not affect the question of constructing the line; and as the hon. members for Maryborough and Wide Bay had raised no objection, he hoped the hon. gentleman would withdraw his amendment and allow the plans to be approved.

Mr. DOUGLAS said under any circumstances—whether the line was carried out by Mr. Hurley or by the Government—it would be necessary that the plans and sections should be authorised. The fact of the plans being adopted would not prevent the hon. gentleman from making any alteration he might consider it

necessary to make in the Bill before the House. As the House had already sat so late he thought they might as well approve the plans of this line, especially as they had afterwards to be considered by the other Chamber; and sometimes a considerable amount of delay arose.

Mr. DAVENPORT said the Premier had stated that if Mr. Hurley did not construct the line the Government was committed to make it because the money had been voted last session. He should like to hear from the Premier the exact definition of the word "committed" in the case of these public works. Was not the Government also committed to the extension of the Southern and Western Railway, for which £390,000 had been voted, and did they not now ignore that and say that a syndicate would do the work on a system of land grants?

Question put and negatived.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he objected to the question being gone on with at that late hour of the night. The more he looked at the Burrum scheme the less he liked it, and he would not assist in furthering a scheme which, as it came before the House, seemed to be a perfect swindle. He believed he was justified in doing all he could to prevent the passing of the Burrum Railway Bill.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said this was not Mr. Hurley's scheme, but the Government scheme.

Mr. MOREHEAD said that if the Government were prepared to make the railway themselves, and showed him how it would pay, he should certainly support them; but he objected to the Government bringing in a private Bill with one hand, and with the other the proposal that the work was to be undertaken by themselves. He trusted the House would not consent to their occupying such a dual position. It seemed as if they were playing a game which no other Government ever dared to do. He trusted the Government would consent to the adjournment.

Original question put, and the House divided :—

AYES, 17.

Messrs. Palmer, McIlwraith, Macrossan, Perkins, Beor, Dickson, Scott, Low, Norton, Stevens, Kingsford, H. W. Palmer, Amhurst, Price, Douglas, Groom, and Swanwick.

NOES, 11.

Messrs. Macdonald-Paterson, Grimes, Rea, Cooper, Morehead, Hill, Davenport, Kellett, Persse, Kates, and Horwitz.

Question, therefore, resolved in the affirmative.

It was resolved that the resolutions arrived at be transmitted to the Legislative Council for their concurrence, with the usual message.

The House adjourned at ten minutes to 12 o'clock.