

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**WEDNESDAY, 3 DECEMBER 1884**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

*Wednesday, 3 December, 1884.*

Petition.—Formal Motion.—Additional Sitting Day.—Howard and Bundaberg Railway.—Supply—resumption of committee.—Adjournment.

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

## PETITION.

Mr. STEVENSON, in the absence of the hon. member for Balonne (Mr. Morehead), presented a petition from Henry W. Bell, representing certain residents of Surat and district, praying that the proposed branch railway to St. George shall join the main line at or near Yeulba, and moved that the petition be read.

Question put and passed, and petition read by the Clerk.

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

## FORMAL MOTION.

The following formal motion was agreed to :—  
By Mr. NORTON—

That there be laid on the table of the House, copies of all regulations and instructions which have lately been issued in connection with the complete adoption of the staff-and-ticket system on the Queensland railways.

## ADDITIONAL SITTING DAY.

The PREMIER (Hon. S. W. Griffith) said :  
I beg to move—

That during the remainder of the session, unless otherwise ordered, this House will meet for the despatch of business on Monday in each week at 3 p.m., in addition to the days already appointed for meeting; and that Government business do take precedence on that day.

This is not an unusual motion to make towards the close of a session, especially when it is a long one; in fact, at the end of every long session the House has found it necessary to sit on Monday as well as on Friday. Next week, as we know, we lose one day, Wednesday, which is the anniversary of the foundation of the colony; so that we shall only be able to sit on the ordinary number of days. In the following week, which I hope will be the last week Parliament will have to sit this session, it will most likely be necessary to sit on Monday, as there is a good deal of small business to be done; besides the more important business that still remains to be disposed of—matters that have to come back from the other House, and other very important business that has to be dealt with here. I should be very glad if the session can be closed before this day three weeks; and it is in the hope that by getting two extra sitting days, and possibly three, we may be able to bring about that result that I make this motion now. It will be ex-

tremely inconvenient to hon. members to adjourn over the Christmas and New Year holidays, and have two or three days' work to do afterwards; it will be far better to make an effort to get through the work before Christmas.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said :  
The Colonial Secretary has given us to understand that he expects to finish the business of this session the week after next.

The PREMIER : I hope so.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH : We have been in session now pretty well on to six months, and yet it was only the other day when we had placed before us the Loan Estimates—when we knew what were actually the most important propositions of the Government. We have not heard one word from the Colonial Secretary or the Treasurer about that ten-million loan estimate, and we have simply the bare figures of the items of which the loan is constituted; but yet the Colonial Secretary comes down now and asks us to meet here an additional day in the week for the next two weeks, and finish the session before the end of the year. Why, I cannot understand such a proposal! Does the hon. gentleman think for a moment that having sat here patiently during the last six months, and gone through work which was often not of a very important character, we are now going to swallow, without the slightest consideration, such important proposals as remain to be dealt with—namely, the Land Bill, the amendments in which will have to be considered, and the ten-million loan—during the next two weeks? I do not know of what the hon. gentleman can have been dreaming. If he fancies it frightens hon. members to have a session after Christmas he is making a great mistake. I for one will do my duty if the session lasts until the end of next year, and it is absurd to suppose that we are to shirk our duty because we are frightened to sit during the hot months of the year to deal with important matters. We cannot have the consideration of the Loan Estimates before us until the week after next, and that we should be asked to pass them in one week is the most preposterous proposal I ever heard submitted. We cannot even pass the Estimates-in-Chief until the end of next week, unless the Government supporters behave as they have been doing all through, and unless the members of the Opposition consent to let the items pass without discussion. I characterise this session as one in which there has not been the least obstruction to business. I claim, at all events—and I am sure the Colonial Secretary will acknowledge it—that I have been always forward in assisting the Government in getting on with their business. I have assisted them prominently in the passing of almost every measure, and certainly there has been nothing that could ever have been characterised as the obstruction of Government business. Yet we are asked now to grant an additional sitting day in order that the session may be brought to a close before Christmas—that we should pass a Loan Bill to the extent of ten millions of money, and let the Land Bill pass without giving reconsideration to the important amendments that have been made in it. I cannot suppose that the Colonial Secretary is serious, but if he is he should have told us what he intends to do with the Loan Bill and the amendments in the Land Bill. If he abandons both measures there may be some prospect of closing the session before Christmas, but the House ought to have some indication what the Government intend to do. I cannot congratulate the Colonial Secretary on the way in which he gets his business through the House. If his intention had been to weary us and disgust public men with the public

business, he has succeeded to a certain extent ; but with all the facilities that he has had for getting his business through, it is not creditable to the Government that the business stands as it does at the present time.

The COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. J. R. Dickson) said : I hope that nothing that has fallen from the hon. gentleman will lead the House to reject the motion of my hon. friend. As the Colonial Secretary has said, we have disposed of a large amount of business, and with what remains to be disposed of we require an additional sitting day. Although the necessity is much to be regretted—and I am sure Ministers will feel the additional tax quite as much as other hon. members—still, with the desire to push through public business, I think it is right that we should have another sitting day. My hon. friend has expressed his desire that the session should terminate before Christmas, but he has said nothing that would lead hon. members to infer that the Loan proposals of the Government or the Land Bill should not receive the fullest consideration, even although the debates may extend over Christmas. We know it is desirable that the business of the country should possibly terminate at an early date, but, if necessary, the Government are not at all unprepared to meet after Christmas, and dispose of the business that remains. However, the motion before us is simply dealing with an additional sitting day, and nothing has been said to lead hon. members to imagine that the desire to obtain an additional sitting day is accompanied with a desire to stifle discussion on the important Loan proposals which I hope will shortly be submitted by the Government. The fullest information will be given on the occasion, but I do not see why we should not be able to deal with the remaining important matters within a reasonable time. It must be obvious to hon. members that another sitting day is absolutely necessary at the present time in order to proceed with the Government business, and I do not see that my hon. friend in any way merits the criticism or censure of the hon. member for Mulgrave with regard to the conduct of public business. I am sure it has been conducted with the greatest despatch, while at the same time the hon. member has, I admit, attempted to expedite business. While we may say that a fair criticism has been extended by the Opposition, yet at the same time the Opposition have not on this occasion done anything more than in ordinary sessions to curtail debate. It may not be their business to curtail debate ; but I do not think the business of the country has been particularly expedited by them as a whole. Certainly it has not been delayed through any want of management on the part of the Premier.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said : I must take exception to what has fallen from the Treasurer in saying that the present Opposition during the session had done no more to curtail debate than had been done by the Opposition during previous sessions. Such a statement is not warranted, and, in fact, is not warranted by the records of the House for the last five years. The conduct of the Opposition a few years ago was very different. We have done nothing whatever to interfere with the Government business, and as the leader of the Opposition says, we have often assisted the Government to further their business, even although at the same time we were cognisant of the fact that the Government had muzzled their own side in a way detrimental to the interests of the colony. In spite of that fact staring us in the face, we did no more than the ordinary course of debate warranted on any of the questions that came before us. What does this extra

day mean? According to the Colonial Secretary's showing, it means only one extra day ; yet we are to be put to the trouble of meeting on Monday ; and although we have already given the Government three days for their business, they now want four, in order that this session may close before Christmas. I would ask the Colonial Secretary what business he intends to finish. He might have told us what he is going to do. He certainly said we were to deal with a few trivial matters, and I would like to know if he considers the Triennial Parliaments Bill a trivial matter, or the Officials in Parliament Bill. He might have told us what his intentions are in regard to those two Bills, and the Colonial Treasurer might also have told us what he intends to do with the Duty on Spirits Bill. Not a word has fallen from either hon. gentlemen of their intentions with regard to these matters. Then there is another matter which I should like to remind the Colonial Secretary about. He has been asked by me twice—if not three times—this session whether he intended to give some additional members. In answer to a proposal made by the hon. member who now leads the Opposition in regard to certain constituencies which he acknowledged were unrepresented, the Premier stated that that would be the first duty of the new Government. Well, the new Government have been in office twelve months, and there is no appearance of their doing what the hon. gentleman said would be their first duty. Does he not acknowledge now, at the end of the session, the necessity of increasing the representatives in those places north and west which are so utterly unrepresented? Here am I, in this House, representing, I may say, five times the number of electors of five members I could pick on the other side—yes, six times the number of electors represented by six members on that side. There is scarcely any two members on that side that could be picked out who represent the same number of electors that I do. There are 4,000 electors in the electorate of Townsville ; and I should like hon. members to point out two electorates outside the city of Brisbane that, together, have the same number. Of course there is one—Mitchell ; that is unrepresented also, there being only one member for 2,000 electors. There are one or two others in the same position—the electorate of Mulgrave, for instance. But they are represented by Opposition members, and therefore the Colonial Secretary does not trouble about them, so long as he has a good majority at his back. I should like the hon. gentleman to answer my questions—whether he intends to increase the representation of those electorates north and west before the end of another year at least ; and what Bills he intends to pass through Parliament before the end of the session?

The PREMIER said : If no other hon. member desires to speak, I will reply ; but, of course, I do not wish to reply till the debate is concluded. The leader of the Opposition says that the Government have not conducted the business of the session properly. That, of course, is a matter of opinion. I should like him to point to any preceding session when anything like the same amount of work has been done in the time. He also thinks the Opposition have rendered great assistance to the Government. So they have, in many cases ; but I cannot congratulate them upon the assistance they rendered the Government on the Land Bill. The time occupied with that Bill was twice as long as it need have been. I do not want to blame them—my desire is that all questions should receive full consideration—but I do not think they can plume themselves upon the assistance given to the Government on that Bill. I am quite content to allow my conduct of business in this House to be

judged by results. The hon. gentleman suggested that this motion indicated a desire to hurry through some most important matters. I have no desire to do anything of the kind; and I think we shall have ample time to get over all important matters between now and the end of the week after next. Just let us see how many days we shall have. There is to-day and to-morrow; that is two days. Then there will be three days next week, and four days the week after, making nine sitting days for Government business, which represents more than a month's sitting at the commencement of a session. I do not know why, in that time, if we transact business at the ordinary rate of progress, we cannot dispose of all the business which is likely to come before the House. That, of course, is reckoning the time up to the end of the week after next. At the end of the session it is usual to take matters into consideration in that way, and arrange the sittings accordingly. It has been usual in Queensland, and it is usual in other colonies. It must be remembered that many hon. members live long distances away, and it is with a desire not to detain them longer than is absolutely necessary that the Government have taken the matter into consideration. For my own part no one will suffer more through this extra day's sitting than I shall; but I should be prepared to sit even on Saturday if it suited the convenience of other hon. members. I should be sorry to see the business hurried through, and I believe, with this extra sitting, there will be no need to hurry it through. If we cannot dispose of it by Christmas, then we must sit in January, February, or even March; at all events, I have, as I say, no desire to see the business hurried through. The hon. member for Townsville asked what the Government proposed to do with regard to additional members—whether we were going to bring in a Bill for that purpose. We had intended to bring in a Bill of that kind, and we had every reason to suppose that it would pass with very little trouble. But it was no use introducing it while the Land Bill was on; and when week after week rolled by, and the House was still occupied with that Bill, and when it was publicly stated here that a Bill to give additional members would occupy many days in debate, and would not pass with anything like common consent, the Government had to take the matter into serious consideration. I was surprised to hear that statement, because I had at one time understood that the Bill would go through by common consent; but when it was stated that unless some particular constituency got an additional member, the Bill would take—

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: Who led you to think the members of the Opposition would stop the Redistribution Bill by common consent going through?

The PREMIER: I said I found an Additional Members Bill would not go by common consent.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: You said it was from speeches of members of the Opposition.

The PREMIER: Yes; those speeches led me to the conclusion that there would be no chance of passing a measure of that kind very easily. Having arrived at this period of the session, I do not think we are justified in introducing such a measure now, when it would be likely to occupy a good many days. I am sorry for it; but, under the circumstances, I think the time for introducing the Bill has passed. Before I refer to the measures now on the paper, I should say that what I said before about smaller matters referred to some measures that have left this House and are now in the Legislative

Council, not including the Land Bill, and which will require further consideration in this House. With respect to the Bills now on the paper, we do not propose to proceed with the Triennial Parliaments Bill; we certainly have not time for that. The other two Bills on the paper I think we can proceed with.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: The Officials in Parliament Bill and the Queensland Spirits Duty Bill?

The PREMIER: The Officials in Parliament Bill passed its second reading without opposition, and it is, I believe, a matter of common consent which was expressed long ago. But if it is to take a long time I do not desire to touch that either, and the same observation will apply to the Queensland Spirits Duty Bill. Certainly we must sit next Monday unless we are to lose a day next week. I do not think there can be any objection to the motion being passed—a usual motion at this period of the session, and one which in no way involves hurrying through the business.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: In no previous Parliaments have the Government had four days.

The PREMIER: During the first session the hon. gentleman led the House he had Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Friday.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: Not Friday. I never had four days.

The PREMIER: The hon. gentleman thinks he had not, but if the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to refer to the records of the House he will find he had. It is simply a question of fact, and it is never worth while arguing about facts. It can be ascertained by reading the records; I read them the other day, and found it was as I said. The Government of which I was a member previously had four days in the week more than once. It has been a matter of course when the session has been very protracted.

Mr. BLACK said: Mr. Speaker,—I am not going to object to the additional sitting day proposed by the Colonial Secretary. I must say that I regret very much that he has waited until the extreme end of the year before he proposed it. He must have been able to foresee for some weeks past the almost impossibility of closing the session within a reasonable time; and he comes down now asking hon. members, at very great inconvenience to themselves, to give him an extra day for the purpose of getting through the more important business before Christmas. The hon. gentleman must know perfectly well that, even with an additional sitting day, it will be impossible to get all the business through. We have the Land Bill—which, I expect, will shortly be back from the Upper House—which will certainly take a considerable time in this House to consider the amendments that have already been made in it, and those which are likely to be made in future. With that Bill alone, it seems to me that the time between this and Christmas will be all occupied, even if the Bill were returned now. Then we have the Loan Estimates. They are a matter that will open a field for discussion to most members of the House; almost every item in that huge list will have to be debated, and very likely very seriously debated. I object on my own behalf, and on that of some other Northern members who have already been down here for five months, and who have been most regular in their attendance in this House, and who have always assisted the Government according to their views of what an Opposition should do—that is, to fairly criticise the principles of the Government; I object to this motion.

We have been here for over five months, and are likely to be here until the end of this month; even with the day that the Premier has referred to, it will be the 22nd. That will be nine days, and I consider that is manifestly unfair to Northern members, who have every right to be home by that time. I consider that the House should adjourn at the end of next week—at the latest about the 13th. I think that that is only what this House, and especially Northern members, have a right to expect, and not to be kept sitting here until the 20th, when many members will not be able to get home before Christmas. The Land Bill has been referred to by the Premier as not having received fair consideration from this side of the House. That is quite a matter of opinion. I do not wish to set my opinion against that of an experienced politician like the Premier; but I believe that the country is quite in accord with what the Opposition have endeavoured to do—to make it a practicable Land Bill. That Bill is nothing like what it was when introduced. The Bill that was introduced contained most experimental, most visionary, and most revolutionary principles. Where are those principles now? They are all melted away, and I am satisfied that the amendments that were forced upon the Government, chiefly by this side of the House, were such as to give universal satisfaction to the country. The hon. Premier has spoken about his anxiety and his wish, from the beginning of the session, to introduce an Additional Members Bill into the House. I beg to differ entirely from him. He may come and tell us so now—he may wish to tell the country that that was his desire—but he has not shown any inclination to do so, or he could have done it with the greatest pleasure. On the contrary, we find one Minister—and in such matters I think the utterances of one Minister may be taken to represent those of the whole Cabinet—the Minister for Works—who, when he was up at Townsville, and the question was put to him whether the Government intended to introduce an Additional Members Bill, replied that the Government were not going to commit political suicide. I believe the Minister for Works did give utterance to that sentiment, and I know it is so reported, and that the feeling all through the North is that the Government are not sincere in their desire to give additional representation to the northern portion of the colony where it is so very much needed. I shall vote in favour of the Monday sitting. I am ready to do my duty any day the Government wish to have it done; but I think that if the Ministry had shown any sincerity or anxiety to get the business through they should have put on the Monday sitting much before they have.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. Miles) said: Mr. Speaker,—I wish to correct the hon. member for Mackay. He said that when asked at Townsville if the Government were going in for an Additional Members Bill, I replied that the Government were not going to commit political suicide. What I was asked at Townsville was, "Did the Government intend to introduce a Redistribution Bill?" The hon. gentleman must know that there is a great deal of difference between a Redistribution Bill and an Additional Members Bill. They never asked me if the Government would introduce an Additional Members Bill. I did make the remark that the Government would not commit political suicide by introducing a Redistribution Bill.

Mr. STEVENSON: I do not think the opinion of the hon. gentleman will alter the fact very much. I do not suppose the people of Townsville know the difference between a Re-

distribution Bill and an Additional Members Bill. The hon. gentleman would have given the same reply if he had been asked the other question. I am not going to object to the additional sitting day, because, in the interests of the country members, I will support anything which will get through the business more rapidly. When I was a country member I used to be inclined to sit as long as possible, and get the work done, and I am always in sympathy with members from the country. I wish to say one word in regard to what fell from the hon. Premier in connection with the part the Opposition took in passing the Land Bill—or rather, in preventing it from being passed more rapidly than it was. Anyone who knows anything about the passage of that Bill through the House will know, if there was more discussion from this side than from the other side, how it happened. The reason was that we could not get information from the Government side. The hon. member in charge of the Bill did not understand it in the shape in which it was brought in, and if it had not been for the Premier we could not have got any information. When we did get it, it had always to be forced out by hon. members on this side of the House. Everyone could see that the Government supporters had been instructed not to speak at all; they were evidently prepared to swallow the Bill in any shape the Premier liked to give it to them. It was only by long discussion that members on this side were enabled to get any information, and have the Bill licked into shape. If hon. members on that side had shown any inclination to discuss the Bill fairly, and there had been more courtesy shown by the hon. Minister for Lands, he would not have had to blame hon. members on this side of the House for hindering the passage of the Bill. I think there was not a word too much said on this side of the House. I do not know that we gave the matter even enough consideration. I think the time occupied in putting that Bill through the House, considering the importance of the measure and its length, was very short indeed. The Land Bill of 1874 took the whole of the session to pass through the House, and I do not think the Premier ought to cast any reflections on members on this side for hindering the passage of the Bill. At the same time I do not see the slightest chance, with that Bill and the other matters that we have to consider before us, of getting through the session by Christmas, and the idea of one additional Monday going to help materially is absurd. However, I shall willingly come here on the day asked for, though I am perfectly satisfied that the business asked for by the Premier will not be got through in the time.

Mr. ALAND said: Mr. Speaker,—I am rather sorry that the Bill giving increased representation is not to be introduced this session. I certainly think it was an error on the part of the Premier that he did not expedite the business, so that there would have been a chance of passing the Bill this session. I am not afraid of the additional seats; I believe if all the additional members were to take their seats on the opposite side of the House the Ministerial side would be able to hold its own. Now, sir, the hon. member for Normanby and several members on that side of the House have more than once spoken of the want of criticism given to the Land Bill by members on this side, and it has been insinuated more than once that we received instructions from our leader to hold our tongues. Now, sir, I resent that. I say the Premier—the leader of this side of the House—gave no instructions, and in no way gave hon. members on this side of the House to understand that he wished them to

hold their peace on the Land Bill. I think no Bill introduced into this House has received more consideration from both sides than that Bill on its second reading; almost every member of the House expressed his opinion according to his lights and his ability on the subject. The Opposition claim to have revolutionised the Bill—turned it inside out—but I do not think that the Bill is very materially altered, and where it has been altered, it was in accordance with the expressed wishes of many of the members on this side as well as on the other side of the House. The improvements, if we may call them so, that have been put into that Bill, emanated more from this side of the House than the other. We led off, and they took up the cue; they knew what was popular outside, and acted accordingly. In reference to the Monday sitting, I for one shall be very glad if the motion is carried; and I would be well pleased if at an earlier portion of the session generally we could meet earlier or sit later in the week. Ever since I have been in the House, I have regarded it as a sort of farce to come down here for the first few weeks in the session, and only sit a couple of days. If we went to work in earnest in the early part of the session, and stuck to it, there would not be this rush towards the end.

Mr. PALMER said: Mr. Speaker,—I was quite surprised to hear the remarks of the Premier when he complained of the manner in which the Opposition had acted towards the Land Bill. Of course I am only new in this House, but I am able to bear in mind how things are conducted in other colonies. I know very well that they have been twelve months passing the Land Bill through the Parliament of New South Wales, and they addressed themselves to it for the whole of that twelve months.

The PREMIER: Oh, no!

Mr. PALMER: If the Premier had only one member in this House with the turn for obstruction that Mr. A. G. Taylor has in New South Wales, he would not have had his Land Bill half through now. For my part I must say I was sincere in any—I suppose the Premier would call it obstruction—

The PREMIER: No, not at all.

Mr. PALMER: I addressed myself in all sincerity to the Bill with what experience I have had. With the business we have coming on—what is on the paper now and the Loan Estimates, to say nothing of the reappearance of the Land Bill in this House—I have come to the conclusion that we have more than we shall finish this year. I have cause to complain on behalf of residents in the north and west of the colony, that no Additional Members' Bill has been brought in. The voice of the people in the North is very strong for additional representation, and it seems to be a cry that embodies separation. The great cry in connection with separation is that the great and growing constituencies in the North are not in any way properly represented in the South. I think that I and hon. members representing the western districts have more reason to complain on that score than the hon. member has in regard to the conduct of the Opposition towards the Land Bill. I am quite willing to come here on Monday and Friday as well, so long as there is business to be carried on.

Question put and passed.

#### HOWARD AND BUNDABERG RAILWAY.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS, in moving—

1. That the House approves of the plan, section, and book of reference of the proposed extension of the Burrum Railway from Howard to Bundaberg, from 18 in. 8 chs. 79½ lks. to 54 m. 42 chs. 10½ lks., at

0 m. 6 chs. 70 lks., on the Wharf Branch, North Bundaberg, as laid upon the table of the House on Tuesday, 25th November last.

2. That the plan, section, and book of reference be forwarded to the Legislative Council, for their approval, by message in the usual form.

—said: I do not know that I can state, for the information of the members of the House, that there is an area of rich agricultural land in the country to be traversed by this particular line. On several occasions I have gone from Bundaberg to Maryborough, and I think it is, generally speaking, about the poorest and most worthless country I have ever travelled through. With the exception of some good timber land, there is little to be said for it in the way of opening up the country for settlement. But the main object in the construction of the line is to connect Maryborough with Bundaberg, and thus form, at some future time, a portion of the main coast line which I hope some day or other will connect the whole of the coast towns of the colony. I have received some information from the Chief Engineer in reference to the nature of the country through which the line will pass, and the cost of its construction. The survey of the line has been made by what is known as the direct route, commencing at Howard, the present terminus of the Burrum Railway—18 miles 8 chains 79½ lks. It traverses exceedingly easy country for railway construction, and joins the Bundaberg wharf branch, 6 chains 70 links from the North Bundaberg railway station—a distance of 54 miles 42 chains 10½ links from Croydon Junction—the southern branch of the Maryborough and Gympie line. The direction taken will be north-westerly, and the length of the line from Howard station will be 36 miles 33 chains 31 links. It is estimated that about twenty-three miles of this will be surface formation, therefore the earthworks will be light. The ruling gradient is 1 in 50, generally in short lengths, there being only one case where the gradient is used for a continuous length of 40 chains. The approaches to several of the rivers crossed by the proposed line are on a grade of 1 in 50. There are no curves sharper than 10 chains radius. As several important rivers are to be crossed, there will be a considerable amount of bridging required. The principal bridges will be at Cherwell River, length 146 feet, height 19 feet; Isis River, 330 feet in length, and 38 feet in height; Stockyard Creek, 352 feet in length, and 28 feet in height; Gregory River, 326 feet in length, and 32 feet in height; while the bridge over the Burnett River will be 1,773 feet. It is not yet decided whether this bridge will also provide accommodation for road traffic or not. The total bridge works, including culverts, will be 5,356 feet, or over a mile. I have already stated that the country through which the line passes is of a very poor description. A great portion is worthless for settlement, with the exception of two patches. From Howard to the Cherwell, a distance of 23 miles, there is some fair land, and there are patches of a few chains on each side of the Isis River, Stockyard Creek, and Gregory River. As the line approaches to Bundaberg the country improves, and may be classed as poor second-class pastoral. The principal sources of revenue will be the carriage of coal from Howard to Bundaberg, combined with through traffic between Bundaberg and Maryborough. The line is estimated to cost £202,854, which is £5,570 per mile, including double line bridge over the Burnett River, with footway.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: What is the estimate for the bridge?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The estimate for the bridge over the Burnett River, 1,773 feet in length, is £76,689. The cost of the

line, exclusive of the bridge, will be £124,165, or £3,400 per mile. The land required to be resumed is estimated at about 726 acres, of which 102 acres are private property, 619 acres Crown lands, and 4 acres roads and streets in Bundaberg. There is a slight variation on the original survey. It was found that the site originally selected for the terminus at Bundaberg ran through the school lands, and would have rendered it necessary to acquire the school at considerable cost. Not only that, but the Court-house erected within the past eighteen months would have also had to be removed. A slight deviation had to be made so as not to interfere with the site of the bridge crossing the river. As I said before, the object in view is to make this line eventually a portion of the main coast line. There is a proposition now to build a railway from Brisbane to Gympie. That will connect Brisbane with Maryborough; and this line will connect Maryborough with Bundaberg. It is also proposed to make provision to extend the line to Gladstone; and I hope that when the next loan is proposed provision will be made to extend it as far as Rockhampton. I need say no more on the subject, but will move the motion standing in my name. I omitted to state that the amount available now is £83,000.

Mr. NORTON said: I am glad the hon. member has seen his way to bring this motion forward during the present session. It is a pity it was not brought forward earlier. I expected it would have been, and so did those who are most interested in the construction of this line. However, as the plans have now been put before us for approval, I need say nothing further about that. There is one thing I must refer to briefly, and that is the character of the country through which the line will pass. I quite agree with the hon. member in his description of it as very poor and almost worthless country—that is, if it is to be judged from its outside appearance. But exactly the same might be said of the country about the Burrum Coal-mine, and the whole of the country in the Burrum Reserve, which is supposed to consist of rich coal land. There is nothing in the appearance of the country through which this line passes to indicate that it is different in that respect from the country which is so valuable about the Burrum mine. Indeed, from what we have heard in connection with that subject from geologists, we have every reason to infer that there is a rich stratum of coal lying under this very country. We must look upon it, therefore, as being worth far more than the mere surface value. As far as its grazing and agricultural capabilities are concerned, the country is no doubt very poor, except in certain spots, where it is very rich. On the whole, I think this line may be considered a fairly cheap one. The great cost, of which the hon. member has spoken, is incurred in carrying the railway bridge over the Burnett River. Apart from that, the bridging is not very great. There are only five water-courses to be crossed, and although they are larger than the ordinary water-courses which our railways traverse, we ought to remember that, with the exception of these, there is hardly any waterway at all. On the whole, I think the line is one which ought to be carried out, and which, taking everything into consideration, will be a cheap one. I need not say much as to the bridge over the Burnett, because it must be built at some time or other if the line is to run along the coast. The hon. member spoke of the line being continued from Bundaberg to Gladstone, and but for his mentioning it I should not now have referred to it. The hon. member has made a mistake, I think, in putting that item on the Loan Estimates in

the form in which it appears. The people of Gladstone were led to suppose that when tenders were called for the construction of that line it would be commenced from both ends—Gladstone and Bundaberg. I do not see how, as it is put down on the Estimates—

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The money is not voted yet.

Mr. NORTON: I am aware of that. The item appears on the Loan Estimates as for a line from "Bundaberg towards Gladstone," the inference being that the line is to be commenced from the Bundaberg end only, and it can only be continued from that end as far as the money will carry it, which is not in accordance with the understanding arrived at by the people at Gladstone from the hon. member's own words. I say again I am glad the hon. member has brought the motion forward. The line is one which ought to be constructed, and I do not suppose there will be any opposition to it.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said: I am not certain that I heard the Minister for Works correctly, but I understood him to say that the total cost of this line from its junction with the line at Howard would be £202,000, and that the cost of the bridge over the Burnett would be £78,000. If so, that would leave £124,000 as the cost of constructing a line thirty-five miles long across a country which is about the most favourable for railway construction in Queensland. If we divide that sum by thirty-five, we shall find that the cost of the line will be at the rate of £3,500 a mile. I certainly do not agree with the hon. member for Port Curtis that that would be a cheap line, especially when we consider that it is carried over the most level country in Queensland. The hon. member says he has been over the country. So have I, several times, and I say it is a perfectly level country, without any engineering difficulties, and with only a few paltry creeks to be bridged. If such a line is to cost £3,500 a mile I cannot understand it. It is high time the Chief Engineer was pulled up and brought to account—

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: You pulled him up pretty well.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: The Chief Engineer ought to be compelled to make lines as cheaply here as they are made elsewhere. There is more money thrown away in what I may call luxuries on such lines than would build an additional six or ten miles of permanent way. The thing is absurd. If the hon. gentleman will just look at the cost of lines in Victoria—a country which cannot compare with this for level ground—he will find that many of them are built for £3,000 a mile, and a very large number for between £3,000 and £4,000 a mile. In such a country as this is, it would certainly not have cost more than £3,000 a mile there.

Mr. MELLOR said: I am very glad to see this proposition before the House, and I have no doubt it will be carried. I am rather astonished to hear that the line will cost so much; but still the creeks that have been mentioned by the hon. member for Townsville are a good deal larger than he thinks. Going over to Bundaberg the creeks are small, but when the line comes near the sea they are a good deal larger. I do not think the hon. member has seen the places where the line will cross, or he would alter his opinion. At all events, the amount expended on the line is small in comparison with the cost of bridges. The country is also entirely level, and if it were not for the crossing of the creeks the line would not cost half as much as is anticipated. Where it is being carried to I know there is not very much timber and ballast, and for that reason I should have liked to see the construction of the branch to Isis carried on at the same time, because that is the

place where we shall have to go for the timber and ballast. There is on the Loan Estimates a sum for the construction of that branch; but it would have been better to carry it on simultaneously with the main line, because I believe it would pay the country well. In reference to the nature of the country I may say that no doubt it is poor, but I believe it is mineral land, and the coal deposits are invaluable. There is, however, good land in the district—not near the railway, but away in the Isis Scrub, and a little further west the land is excellent. I believe the line will be a benefit to the country, and I hope the motion will be carried.

Mr. MACFARLANE said: There seems to be a misunderstanding as to the cost of the bridge. I heard the Minister for Works say £17,000.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: £78,000.

Mr. MACFARLANE said: I hope the Government will not make any more cheap railways. We have had experience of both kinds, and it has been found that the substantial lines are the best, even though they cost a little more. I trust we shall never go back to the construction of cheap lines such as the Fassifern and Esk Railways.

Question put and passed.

#### SUPPLY—RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

On the motion of the COLONIAL TREASURER, the Speaker left the chair, and the House went into Committee further to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS moved that the sum of £3,632 be granted for the Botanic Gardens. There was an increase of £632 altogether—£292 for salaries and £300 for printing a catalogue of plants—which was supposed to be of some use in making exchanges with foreign countries. There was also a sum of £1,000 down for extra labour. It was proposed to try and get the gardens in thorough order, and when that was done it would not be difficult or expensive to keep them in that state. The last vote of the kind had only served to put the gardens in partial repair, and as the work had only been half done it was soon destroyed. The asphalt-ing was being carried on, and another £300 would be required in all probability. At the time the former estimate was passed the amount had been wrongly calculated; but he did not think the cost was excessive, and the work was very good indeed, better in fact than any asphalt-ing he had ever seen.

Mr. BLACK said he thought the Committee was entitled to some more elaborate explanation in connection with the vote, which showed a considerable increase. There was one of the Ministers under whose charge the gardens were partially placed—the hon. senior member for Maryborough—and it might be a suitable opportunity for him to give the Committee some information as to the work going on in the gardens and how things were progressing. The hon. member had now an opportunity which might not occur again during the present session. He noticed that in one place there was £180 down for extra labour, and in another place a little lower down, there was £1,000 for the same thing, making £1,180 for extra labour, without any specification, or any information, how it was to be expended. That was a large sum to place at the disposal of the trustees without any information being afforded. Why were not the two sums put together as one item? Then he found that there was £100 for a park ranger, which appeared to be a new vote. No information had been given as to the necessity for such an officer; and

the gardens seemed to have got on very well without one hitherto. Everyone of course wished to see the gardens made an ornament; but in carrying that out economy ought to be studied, and it had not been studied in framing the estimate. They were also told that £300 would be required for asphalt-ing; so that the total vote would come to about £4,000, against £2,950 last year. He thought the £300 for a catalogue might very well be dispensed with. It would not increase the attractiveness of the gardens in any way, and he thought it was unnecessary. He should wait to see whether any hon. member desired to move the omission of any of the items before that; and if not, he intended to move that the item for the catalogue be struck out.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said that the £180 was the usual amount put down for extra labour; but the work had never been thoroughly carried out; in fact, the side of the gardens nearest the Parliament Houses had been merely a wattle scrub—a perfect wilderness—and the road would never have been a good one. The only portion of road that was good was that near the river bank. It had been found that, to make the gardens anything like creditable, £1,000 would have to be expended in repairs, and asphalt-ing the footpaths. The asphalt-ing would do away with the necessity for the constant labour on the roads which was required before. As to the park ranger, the trustees thought he was necessary for picking up paper and other rubbish left by people who visited the gardens, and also for seeing that no damage was done to the trees and flowers. With regard to the £300 for a catalogue, he did not know whether it was required; but those who were connected with the gardens seemed to think it was. The sum, however, seemed to be a large one.

Mr. SCOTT said he noticed that, in addition to the £1,000 for extra labour, there were two additional labourers at £96 each. There were six before; but now there were to be eight. He had no intention of opposing the item of £1,000. The gardens had been in bad order for a long time; and if that sum was necessary to put them in good order he had nothing more to say about it. With regard to the catalogue, he thought it was necessary, if for no other reason than that the catalogue printed some years ago, when Mr. Hill was in the gardens, was full of errors. It was the only official catalogue that he was aware of in Queensland; and there were a great many plants named there that never were in the gardens at any time. The catalogue was got up in a haphazard way, and the sooner there was a new one the better.

Mr. FERGUSON said that the Minister for Lands had told them that the gardens were a perfect wilderness, though there had been a large sum voted year by year. How then, did he expect other gardens in the colony to be anything but wilderness when a much smaller sum was put down for them? The hon. gentleman said that if other gardens got £500 or £600, that was enough. He (Mr. Ferguson) did not find fault with the vote before the Committee at all; he believed it was money well spent. He knew that the gardens had been wonderfully improved this year. The asphalt-ing of the footpaths was a splendid improvement, and it was one of the best jobs of the kind that had been done in the colony. But he would point out that the Estimates were misleading. If hon. members turned to page 64, they would see that £1,650 was put down for a dwarf wall in Alice street; that was in connection with the Botanic Gardens. He did not know how the money was to be expended; but he did not see any necessity for it. At all events, the item ought not to be where it was; it was just as



much part of the Gardens vote as any other item. He hoped the Minister for Lands in his next Estimates would see that justice was done to other parts of the colony as well as the southern part, which was now getting at least £3 to £1 more than any other portion of the colony received in proportion to the population.

Mr. STEVENSON said the Minister for Lands afforded an instance of how soon a Northern man became extravagant in voting money for the South after he was associated with a Southern Ministry. It seemed that anything in the way of a vote for Brisbane was always looked upon as the right thing, while anything for the North was given with the very greatest disinclination. The hon. Minister for Lands not only went in for a special vote of £1,000 for labour for the gardens, but he even put on £300 for a catalogue, which he said he knew nothing about, simply because it was for Brisbane. Last night he would not hear of granting the most paltry sum of £200 or £300 for any reserve asked for in the North; but he would now give £300 for what he admitted he knew nothing about at all. It was really absurd; if the reserves were not wanted they should be struck off. He believed gardens were wanted, but the item of £300 for a catalogue was a most extraordinary thing. The hon. member for Rockhampton had also pointed out, on page 64, that there was an item of £1,650 for a dwarf wall. He fancied that there ought to be a reduction somewhere.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH said that last night they passed a vote for reserves, which were parks in the various towns of the colony, and the Minister for Lands expressed a very decided opinion that he believed the vote ought not to be upon the Estimates at all, and that it was high time it was abolished. The item under discussion differed in no respect from the reserves they voted money for last night. He was astonished at the way in which the hon. gentleman was carrying out his principles. He would ask them to consider what a small body of men, working independently, with the public with them, had done with the Acclimatisation Grounds for £500? It was a perfect anomaly, when they compared the proposed departmental expenditure with what the citizens could do for themselves when they made up their minds. What did the Minister for Lands propose to do? They had cavilled at the vote for a long time; it was ridiculously large, considering the amount spent in reserves throughout the colony. They had voted £7,550 for reserves in the colony, and out of that one-quarter was spent in Brisbane alone. Then, to-night, they were asked to vote an item which was one-half of what was spent for the whole of the reserves including that quarter for Brisbane only. The fact of the matter was, Brisbane was to receive two-fifths of the vote for reserves all over the colony. What they were asked to vote now was entirely for Brisbane, and was half of what they voted last night for the whole of the reserves in the colony. The Minister for Lands asked for an additional three labourers, and, considering there had been only six all through and they had done all the work, it was rather a large amount to ask for Brisbane. In addition to that he brought down an item that he said he thought would never occur again; he was going to put the gardens in such a position that there would be no necessity for it again. Was the hon. member so green as not to know that that item of £1,000 would never be taken off? He did not even know how it was to be expended. He said in his bush language that there were a lot of wattles growing at one end; but he (Sir T.

McIlwraith) never saw them. The hon. gentleman could not explain what he was going to do with the money, except that the Lands Office wanted to manipulate it as they liked. Why should they be so liberal when the Minister believed that all those works should be local works; and whilst at the same time he took off all he could from the country he added on 50 per cent. to Brisbane?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said he did not think the country reserves had been docked in any case. The country reserves had received larger sums from year to year on the Estimates; and what he said last night he believed to be the correct thing. It was bad in principle to grant sums without any system at all. Hon. gentlemen opposite professed great affection for the Botanic Gardens, and desired that they should remain intact, and when a proposition was made to carry wharves along there, which would not have interfered in any way with their value, they raised such a breeze as would have astonished anyone, as it astonished him. Then the hon. gentleman said that when he asked what was to be done with the money asked for putting the gardens in repair, he (the Minister for Lands) replied in his bush language that the ground was covered with scrub. There was a lot of scrub there that had not been altogether removed, and why, he would ask, did not the hon. gentleman, during the whole time he was in office, whilst the Government were wasting money year after year, frittering it away and tinkering at the work, carry out the work instead of leaving it until the gardens were a disgrace to Brisbane? If they were not to be made fit for public gardens it would be well to build wharves there at once. The proposition was to put them in good order, and every practical man would know that when gardens were once put in good order they might be maintained in that condition at a very small outlay. That was the object of the vote in question. It would take a very small vote to keep them in order afterwards. That action would not at all affect his consistency with the principle he had enunciated that the people should contribute a certain amount and the Government should supplement it. All persons in the colony were more or less interested in the gardens at Brisbane; they were not specially for the people of Brisbane, but for everyone who visited the colony. Every farmer must be interested in the gardens when they had reached a certain condition.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he did not feel inclined to discuss the question with the hon. gentleman who had just sat down as to whether the gardens should be kept up or not, or whether there should be a wall or a road placed round them; that was not the question at the present time. What he wished to point out was this: that the hon. gentleman had stated that he had not taken any vote off the Estimates this year which appeared upon them last year for gardens outside of Brisbane. But he had done what was equally disadvantageous: he had increased the vote for Brisbane, without increasing that for any other country reserve at all. Admitting that everyone had an interest in the Brisbane Gardens, everyone had much more interest in the gardens of his own township; but the hon. gentleman had not taken that into consideration. The hon. member for Mulgrave had not quite shown them how great was the increase this year for the Brisbane Gardens. Last night they voted £7,550 for reserves all over the colony, including those about Brisbane, £1,600 of that was for Brisbane alone. In addition to that £1,600 they were now asked by the present vote to give £3,632, and they were also to be asked by the Minister for Works to give £1,650

for a dwarf wall. Those three sums amounted to £6,882, while the whole of the reserves outside Brisbane were to receive £5,150; that was to say the Brisbane reserves were to receive £1,732 more than all the rest of the colony. The Minister for Lands came down to the Committee preaching economy and practising extravagance. He came down preaching that each town ought to pay for its own gardens, and he ended by bringing in an estimate to increase the amount for the Brisbane Gardens in a way that no Minister for Lands had ever attempted.

Mr. BEATTIE said he would not wish to deprive any of the northern or inland towns of their reserves, but the hon. member had not taken into account that the whole of the money was not for Brisbane. He was informed that the majority of the plants were sent all over the colony.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: £200 would cover the whole value of them.

Mr. BEATTIE said £200 would not cover the expenses of rearing them and getting them into condition to send away. He wanted to make a remark with reference to the two extra men that were employed at £96 a year; that was about 5s. a day. The Minister for Lands had told them what the park ranger's duties were; but those labourers had to work as park rangers on Sunday. They took it turn about, and gave up a portion of every Sunday and every holiday, which men in other employments had to themselves or were paid for. The extra £1,000 seemed very large, and unless they had the assurance of the trustees that it was not going to be asked for next year, he should vote against it.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH: How can you get an assurance from the trustees?

Mr. BEATTIE said he was sure the hon. member, if he were in power, would say that next year the money should not be voted; and he did not suppose the Minister for Lands, who had put the money on the Estimates with the understanding that it was for the purpose of having the gardens put in first-class order, would so far forget his duty to the House and the country as to put it on next year again.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said he was glad the hon. member had called attention to the fact that some of the labourers were required to go into the gardens on Sunday, and he should put a stop to the practice. The park ranger was the man who should be there, and the labourers should not be required to work on Sunday. With regard to what the hon. member for Mulgrave had said about the vote being a permanent one, all he could say was that if he ever brought in the Estimates again he should certainly not repeat that sum. It was only asked for in order that the requirements of the gardens in future years might be lessened. It was to save future cost, and make the gardens what they ought to be, without wasting money in small sums.

Mr. ARCHER said the hon. the Minister for Lands might say, as a figure of speech, that every man in Queensland was more or less interested in the Botanic Gardens, but he must know that there were thousands of people in Queensland who never had a chance, and never would, of entering the gardens. He was never one to cut down any necessary expenditure on the gardens, but if those enormous sums were to be spent on them it was undoubtedly necessary that the citizens of Brisbane should put their hands in their pockets. Another thing the hon. gentleman said was, that two or three years ago the gardens were a disgrace to the colony. Well, he (Mr. Archer), whenever he was living in the

town, had been in the habit of going into the gardens more or less every day; and certainly he walked round them two or three times every Sunday; and he could assure the hon. gentleman that instead of being a wilderness they were a delight. No doubt the expenditure of that £1,000 would make the gardens much prettier than they were, but he denied that such an enormous expenditure in one year was at all necessary. The gardens at present were beautiful, and a pleasure to anyone who went into them; but he did not wish to see so much money spent in extra labour, nor did he wish to see that dwarf wall built. Considering the small sum spent for gardens in other towns, the amount asked for was excessive. With regard to the talk about cutting up the gardens, he would do all in his power to prevent what he would consider such sacrilege for any commercial purpose. There was something in the world that ought not to be sacrificed merely for money. He was prepared to do every justice to the gardens, and to preserve and improve them, but he was not prepared to agree to granting more money to Brisbane than to the rest of the colony. He could defend the action he had lately taken in bringing the matter of the gardens before the Committee. He was prepared to do it again; and he was certain that, though some gentlemen in the Committee would cut up the gardens and sell them in patches for commercial purposes, he would be supported by the voice of the community in opposing such a sacrilegious act. He was quite satisfied that if a great deal of the expenditure proposed were made immediately it would undoubtedly improve the appearance of the gardens very much; but they were very good as they were. They could go on slowly, as they had been doing in the past. There was another matter in which he joined issue with the hon. member. It was a mistake to suppose that when a garden was once put into a high state of cultivation, and very nicely kept, it cost less annually. It was more pleasant, but he knew that it cost more to maintain it. The more plants that were put into a private garden, the more it cost to keep; and though the extra cost in a private garden might be repaid by the additional pleasure, he objected to large sums being spent on the Brisbane Gardens, when other parts of the colony had to pay them. It was time to take a stand and say that they should only carry on the Brisbane Gardens as now arranged, and make improvements slowly, for even then they would always be a pleasure and a credit to the city.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said that the wall down the north side had originally been built of wood, and was now so eaten up by white ants that the iron railing had to be propped up to keep it from tumbling over.

Mr. ARCHER said he would go down and have a look at it.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said it was propped up now. The hon. gentleman had referred to a proposition that had been made for a dwarf wall round the gardens, and mentioned that he (the Minister for Lands) had spoken in favour of it. Certainly he had. It would add to the beauty of the gardens, and would protect them rather than injure them.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said it was astonishing to hear the Minister for Lands declaring that if they were to make a wall round the gardens it would leave the gardens inside intact, and that that would be an improvement! Fancy a man of that sort in charge of the gardens! The thing was absurd. He would like to know if the park ranger, put down for £100 a year, had been appointed.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said there had been more paper knocking about the gardens during the past six months than he had ever seen before. He did not believe that the hon. gentleman had been in the gardens lately, for he could direct him to one corner that was a disgrace to the place. If once they stepped off the path they had to walk with the utmost caution.

Mr. BEATTIE said the hon. gentleman was perfectly right as to the innovations that had been made in the gardens. There was one innovation—he did not know who gave permission for it—he meant the ferry—which was the greatest curse ever established in the gardens. It was a perfect nuisance, as hon. members would see if they went down to the end of the walk towards the river. He hoped the hon. member for Mackay would not press his amendment to a division. It was, he thought, very necessary to have a catalogue for the gardens; but in making that catalogue he trusted they would not fill it with jaw-breaking names, but let them have some of the common names of the plants and flowers.

Mr. ARCHER said he had intended to say that he would not support the hon. member for Mackay in moving his amendment for omitting the vote of £300 for a catalogue. He wanted to see what plants they had in Queensland. But he should go dead against the £1,000 for cost of extra labour, and he hoped the Committee would support him.

Mr. NORTON said it appeared to him that a good deal of the money had been spent already; at any rate, he had a grave suspicion that it had. He could not help agreeing with the hon. member for Blackall that it was a very large sum to spend on the Brisbane Gardens. At the same time they could account for it to a certain extent. Under the old system for some years the gardens did not look so well as they ought to have done. But the seasons were not good, with dry weather, and it was impossible for the plants to recover quickly after rain had fallen when they had suffered so severely from the drought. They also suffered to some extent from bad management. The gardens were badly laid out at first, without any system. An attempt had been made during the last two or three years to make them a little less formal and more garden-like than before. Since the present Government had come into power an entirely new plan had been adopted—they had been placed under the care of trustees. Now, one of those trustees had taken a great deal of interest in the gardens at Maryborough, and deserved credit for bringing them into the beautiful condition they were in. But that gentleman, since he came to Brisbane, had got more luxurious in his ideas, and did not go about the management of the Brisbane Gardens in the same modest way as at Maryborough; a way by which he had rendered the gardens at the latter place beautiful, and such as the people were proud of. He had fallen in Brisbane into all sorts of extravagances. The asphaltting of the paths was, to a certain extent, a necessary improvement, as many of them were in so bad a state that it was absolutely necessary to do something for them. He therefore did not blame the trustees for spending the money in asphaltting the walks, for the walks would now be pleasant to walk on, and require no expense for some years. Had he been a trustee he would have done the same. Two years ago he pointed out to the Minister in charge of the vote that the foreman of the grounds received only the small salary of £120, and although he had to see to the opening and closing of the gates, which necessitated his residing near the gardens, he was not provided

with a cottage. Amongst all the increases in the vote there was nothing down for that purpose, and he hoped it would be taken into consideration. He could not see that much benefit would be gained by the appointment of a park ranger. The work could be a great deal better done by the gardeners. If the duty was left in the hands of one man he would always be in the wrong place when he was wanted. The chief depredators were boys, and he had seen them on Sunday afternoons carefully watching the caretaker or constable; and they took care only to pluck flowers and destroy plants when there was nobody about. It would be perfectly useless to make one man responsible for the care of those large grounds. If the gardeners were given to understand that it was their duty to interfere when they saw anyone breaking plants, or doing what they ought not to do, it would be better than entrusting all the work to one man. He did not see why, on Sunday afternoons, when there were a large number of people in the gardens, two or three constables should not be told off for duty there, as at other public places where a large crowd collected. The sight of constables would have a great effect in keeping order, and they would be both cheaper and more effective than a park ranger. The sum voted last night for the Maryborough Gardens was £500 and if that sum could be made to go so far there, surely £1,000 ought to be made to do for Brisbane. Complaints were always to the effect that the money voted was not nearly enough. If the trustees wanted to bring the large piece of wattle-overgrown land into order all at once, it would involve a great deal of expense; and then a still larger vote would be required to keep it in good order. In connection with the catalogue, he did not know what it was proposed to carry out, but he supposed it would be something more than a mere register of plants. Mr. Bailey had entered into the matter with him once or twice, and, judging from another catalogue of the plants of the colony compiled by that gentleman, it was likely to be valuable, not merely as a list of the plants in the gardens, but as an account of the uses to which they could be put. The hon. member for Fortitude Valley had expressed a hope that the catalogue would not contain any "jaw-breaking" names; but the hon. member must remember that it was not every plant that had a common name, while the scientific names of plants were known to everyone who had studied the subject. Of course the catalogue would contain both the scientific and local names of plants. On the whole he thought the vote was a great deal too high.

Mr. PALMER said he had heard that drunken men were allowed to go into the gardens to sleep off their debauch, thus making themselves a nuisance to ladies. Complaints of that kind had often been made. He once spoke to a constable about it, and the constable replied that his duty did not take him inside the gardens. Smoking in the gardens was also very objectionable, although he did not know whether it was contrary to the rules or not. With regard to the catalogue, he could not support the hon. member for Mackay in his opposition to it. The authorities went to a great deal of trouble in obtaining plants from all parts of the world, and to describe them and make the use of them known, a catalogue was necessary; and he knew no one more capable of compiling it than Mr. Bailey. Any work that that gentleman undertook would be a credit to himself, to the gardens, and to the colony. Last night, when hon. members were advocating the claims of some of the Northern towns, the Premier ejaculated that it was a general scramble; but who got the largest share in

the general scramble? No one objected to the Brisbane Gardens being kept as well as they were, or even better; at the same time the Premier had no right to say they were only scrambling for money for the North, when he took care that Brisbane—of which he was one of the representatives—was so well looked after. As to the “jaw-breaking” names, a catalogue of plants so extensive as that would be quite useless unless it mentioned them by their scientific names. No doubt the local names would also be given.

Mr. ARCHER said his hon. friend the member for Mackay informed him that he did not intend to press for the reduction of the vote, but he (Mr. Archer) begged to move the reduction of the vote by £1,000—extra labour, special grant.

Mr. STEVENSON said he wanted to refer to the reply given by the Minister for Lands about the park ranger. He had said the gardeners were not supposed to look after the gardens, and that the park ranger was supposed to take charge of the gardens all the week, Sundays included. He would not have a very lively time of it. He (Mr. Stevenson) was surprised that the hon. member for Mulgrave, who took such an interest in men not working on Sundays, did not object to that. He hoped that that man was not going to be bound down hand-and-foot every day of the week. All the gardeners ought to take their Sundays on duty turn about. He had another question to ask: What had become of the animals which used to be in the gardens, such as the monkeys; had they died?

The Hon. R. B. SHERIDAN said it was necessary that he should explain a little about the items that had been discussed, and he would first come to the park ranger. He could assure the Committee that no person in the gardens did better service. He was continually walking about the gardens, and came unexpectedly upon those who would be committing depredations or would be behaving themselves in an improper manner. Besides that he picked up any of the rubbish, such as paper or leaves, and kept the gardens in good trim. With regard to his being there on Sundays, that was not the case. He was relieved by the other men, and no one was there for the whole of the day. One or two men came there at 9 or 10 in the morning and stayed until dinner time, while others came in the afternoon as substitutes. On Sundays a great number of persons frequented the gardens, and it was necessary that someone should be there to see that the rules were not infringed. Respecting the stone wall, he might say that the wooden portion of the fence was entirely rotten, and it took a good deal of labour and trouble to keep it up. It had to be continually patched, and unless a proper fence was put up it was hardly any use having gates. Now, with regard to the expenditure on the gardens, he could tell hon. members that in New South Wales, last year, £10,000 was spent in their Botanic Gardens, but then they had a great deal of new ground to bring under cultivation, and they had to asphalt the paths. This year the vote was reduced to £6,000, so that it would be seen that by expending a fair and proper sum in one year the vote was reduced by one-third the next year. A great deal of the Brisbane Gardens was now as it was in the beginning—in a state of nature; and in order that that might be brought under cultivation and made attractive and useful to the people, additional expense must be incurred. He unhesitatingly said that, if the amount was voted for the present year, not much more than half as much would be required next year to keep the gardens in order. He took an interest in the gardens, as he had done in Maryborough.

He looked upon them not so much as a recreation ground for the rich people, but for those who were poor and could not keep up gardens of their own, and he was very glad to see the number of persons who frequented the Brisbane Gardens on Sundays. Rich people could have their own gardens, but the poor people could not, and it was necessary that there should be a place of recreation for them, so that they might see the flowers and enjoy the beauties of nature. He hoped the vote would be passed; and he could assure hon. gentlemen that his co-trustees and himself were doing their very best to manage the gardens economically and usefully. If they were assisted in their efforts that would be done, but if not, the gardens would never be either a credit to the town or the people.

The PREMIER said that year after year, ever since he had been in the House, it had been the complaint that the Brisbane Botanic Gardens were not properly kept up, and that a great part of the grounds were uncultivated; yet now, the very first time the Government recognised that fact and asked for money to keep the gardens in proper condition, they immediately heard that old cry “All for the capital—why spend any more money in the capital!” One would think some hon. members were of opinion that there should be no capital, or that it ought to be treated as a kind of necessary evil. He thought the Botanic Gardens were a great advertisement to the colony; and the better order in which they were kept the better for the colony. It was a place that all strangers went to see the first thing on their arrival here, and it had a great deal to do with the impressions they formed of the city itself, and of the people living in it. If anyone thought that the gardens could be kept up by the employment of eight labourers he made a very great mistake indeed.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH said the Minister for Lands had told them that the £1,000 would not be spent, and that eight men would be sufficient. The Minister for Lands had told them the real story. There were five Ministers on the bench, one of whom had nothing to do, and the Government had arranged with him to work the gardens. They could not be kept up without money, and therefore £1,000 extra was asked for. He had the highest appreciation of the capabilities of the hon. member for Maryborough in the matter of gardening. He had won his spurs at Maryborough; but the Government, because they had not yet passed the Officials in Parliament Bill and provided for the hon. member, were now asking that £1,000 be voted to keep him in employment. There was no doubt of that. That £1,000 was to keep the Hon. Mr. Sheridan employed, but if the Minister for Lands wanted to get his Estimates through he ought not to try and slip little jobs of that sort through the House.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Shame!

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH: Who says “Shame”?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I do.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH said if Ministers wanted to get their Estimates through the House they should not try and slip them through in that quiet and, he might say, rather shabby way. If that did not meet with the approval of the Minister for Lands, he was sorry for it. The hon. gentleman asked them for £1,000 for extra labour, and it had been clearly shown what the money was for. It had been clearly shown that if they spent that money on the Brisbane Botanic Gardens they thereby spent more than half the amount that had been granted for the gardens all over the colony. He thought

that was too much, especially as no reason had been given for it. The Premier said that of course the capital ought to have a great deal of consideration, and he (Sir T. McIlwraith) agreed that it should, but they had given it greater and greater consideration every year, while very little had been spent on other towns. He was not very particular about the amount put down for the recreation reserves of Brisbane, but he was strongly in favour of increasing the reserves in every other part of the colony. If the Premier wanted to get his Estimates through, he should keep out of those little "jobs" for which the Minister for Lands seemed to show such special affection. The hon. member liked to stick to his "old pal," and he had fastened on the hon. member for Maryborough, and would find him employment. If the hon. member for Maryborough would be well employed it would be a good thing, and then he might become really "a fifth wheel," and would take care that the expenditure of that £1,000 did not drop into other hands. The only sort of safeguard that the Committee had that that money would be expended, was that it was to be spent by the hon. member for Maryborough. It was simply a vote to give a good thing to the hon. member.

The PREMIER said he rose to congratulate the hon. member on the elegant speech he had just made in referring to a proposal to improve the gardens in Brisbane, as a "job," and also in the elegant manner in which he had characterised the hon. member for Maryborough as a "pal" of the Minister for Lands. If the hon. gentleman thought that he added anything to his reputation by speeches of that kind he (the Premier) did not think so. He thought any further argument was unnecessary.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said he had heard that speech twenty times, and it made just as much impression on him as a drop of rain on a felt hat.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said he did not think any remarks would have any impression on the hon. member. The hon. member was not acting consistently with the dignity of his position in characterising that vote as "a job," and in saying that the estimate was framed to suit the wishes of his (the Minister for Lands') colleague (Mr. Sheridan). He did not think the hon. member for Mulgrave had at any time been able to get the gratuitous services of such a man as Mr. Sheridan in doing work for the country. There was generally something more substantial behind than there was in the present case. Mr. Sheridan had devoted a great deal of his time and knowledge in carrying out the improvements in these gardens; and to say that that £1,000 was for the purpose of giving him a job, when he made nothing out of it—sacrificing indeed the whole of his spare time to the duties—was utterly inconsistent with the decency of any member of the Committee, and especially of the position occupied by the hon. member for Mulgrave. It was a most indecent charge to make. If there had been any pay attached to it there might have been something to go on—there might have been some semblance of a foundation for the statement; but as it was, there was not even the semblance—it was only throwing up mud, and nothing else.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said that if the hon. member thought he had defended his friend, Mr. Sheridan, from an attack made upon him by him (Sir T. McIlwraith) he was greatly mistaken. He was not aware that he attacked Mr. Sheridan; he never attributed to

him any improper motives; on the contrary, he complimented the hon. member on being a good gardener, and having won his spurs as a gardener. He also said that it was a very good thing that the Minister for Lands should have found employment for him. That was what the Minister for Lands had done by putting that £1,000 on the Estimates, and Mr. Sheridan would no doubt spend it as well as any man in the colony could do. He (Sir T. McIlwraith) said that from his experience of the hon. member in Maryborough. But why they should be required to spend £1,000 in order to keep the hon. member employed he could not understand. They might possibly lose the services of Mr. Sheridan as "fifth wheel."

The HON. R. B. SHERIDAN: I rise to order, sir. I think those words ought to be taken down. I appeal to you, Mr. Fraser.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH: Mr. Fraser, who is in possession of the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN: Sir Thomas McIlwraith.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said he had no objection to the words being taken down. The hon. member did not seem to know when he was being complimented.

The HON. R. B. SHERIDAN: I do not want your compliments. I want to be complimented by a respectable man.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said he thought he ought to move that those words be taken down. The hon. member happened to be a good gardener in Maryborough; but when they were asked to spend money in order to carry out the hon. member's "fad" in Brisbane, that was a different matter altogether. Why he said that was that the Minister for Lands did not give the slightest reason for increasing the expenditure. That expenditure had increased to more than double, and no reason was given for it by the Minister for Lands. Then the hon. member for Maryborough got up and did his duty for the first time that year, acting as trustee for the Botanic Gardens. It was next explained that the sum was put down to keep the hon. member employed. If that was the only object, then it was not worth the money. If the hon. member wanted to look after a garden, let him buy a piece of land and have one of his own; then he could brag about the results as much as he liked; but he did not see why they should have votes put on the Estimates to carry out any expensive "hobby" that the Minister for Lands and Mr. Sheridan might have.

The HON. R. B. SHERIDAN said it should be remembered that there were two other trustees besides himself; and therefore any improvements that had been made in the gardens reflected as much credit upon them as upon himself. Those gentlemen were fully employed every day; but yet they could find time to devote to the management of the gardens. Both gentlemen were in the Chamber listening to what he was saying. The hon. member for Mulgrave had spoken of him as a good gardener—he did not know why. But he (Mr. Sheridan) might just as well speak of the hon. member as a good water-closet maker. If the hon. member applied the epithet "gardener," which he knew he did, in terms of derision and contempt, he (Mr. Sheridan) had just as good a right to return the compliment. The hon. member further stated that he (Mr. Sheridan) at Maryborough won his spurs as a gardener. He (Mr. Sheridan) might just as well say the hon. member won his spurs at New Guinea; but the difference was that the hon. member got his spurs and he (Mr. Sheridan) did not. He was really sorry that the hon. member had forced him to speak in that way. He was

not indebted for any good or bad opinion to the hon. member. He (Mr. Sheridan) was not a disturber of the peace of any family in any way; he was not a person who came before the world in a suspected manner; he could bear to have the whole of his life opened and discussed in that Committee, or anywhere else, and he hoped the hon. member was in the same happy position.

Question—That the sum of £2,632 only be granted for the Botanic Gardens—put.

Mr. STEVENSON said they had received a lot of varied information from the hon. member for Maryborough, who had told them how well the gardens were kept; and a great deal of information about himself and about what he was capable of doing and what he was incapable of doing, and that he was incapable of disturbing the peace of any family. All that was superfluous; but the question he (Mr. Stevenson) asked had not been answered as to what had become of the animals that used to be in the gardens? Could the hon. gentleman answer that?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said he did not know what had become of the animals. He could not say that he was aware of any reduction in the number; he never saw any there except a monkey or two. So far as he knew they were there yet.

Mr. FERGUSON said that another reason given by the Government for the increase to the vote this year was that hon. members complained from year to year of the state of the gardens. On the same ground the other gardens in the colony had a right to an increased vote; because members had complained year after year of no increase being given. The hon. Minister for Lands told them that he had not increased any other vote, because it was against his principle to vote any money for gardens. But he sacrificed his principle where the Brisbane Gardens were concerned. The hon. member for Fortitude Valley had said the increase was fair, because the Brisbane Gardens were for the whole of the colony, and sent plants all over the colony. He could tell hon. members it would have been better if no plants had ever been sent from the Brisbane Gardens, because they had spread the most noxious weeds. He had a fine garden, and got some valuable plants from the Brisbane Gardens, with the result that his garden became overgrown with nut-grass and had to be abandoned.

Mr. STEVENSON said he had not yet had an answer to his question. He knew there used to be animals in the gardens. He also wanted to know who were the trustees of the gardens?

The Hon. R. B. SHERIDAN said he might state that the monkeys were sent to the Zoological Society in Sydney, and that the trustees had received in their place some very beautiful swans.

Mr. STEVENSON: Do I understand they were exchanged for swans?

The Hon. R. B. SHERIDAN said they were given to the Zoological Society in Sydney on the promise that swans and other ornamental birds would be sent here. The swans had arrived; and he might add that they were infinitely more valuable in point of price than the monkeys.

Mr. STEVENSON said he did not quite understand whether they were exchanged for the swans, or first made a present to the Zoological Society in Sydney.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said he thought there could be no doubt about that, after what the hon. member for Maryborough had just said.

Mr. STEVENSON: He said they were given.  
Question put.

Mr. STEVENSON asked whether the Minister for Lands knew who were the trustees? Was he going to delay his own Estimates by refusing information? He (Mr. Stevenson) would stop there till doomsday rather than let the vote go without getting the information he asked for.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said that if the hon. member had only asked who were the trustees he would have told him. The hon. member had mumbled something which he could not hear. The Hon. R. B. Sheridan was one of the trustees; Mr. Tully, the Surveyor-General, another; and Mr. Bernays, Clerk of the Assembly, the third.

Mr. STEVENSON said the hon. member need not get angry because he was asked a question. He had asked the question quite plainly, and in a perfectly civil way. He was informed on good authority that the monkeys were sent as a present to the New South Wales Zoological Society at the whim of one of the trustees. Another trustee might take a fancy to get other monkeys that would cost the country a good deal. He did not see that the monkeys were doing any harm, and they were a source of amusement to many people, especially children. It did not come within the duty of the trustees to get rid of animals that had been brought there by other trustees. There was no exchange made at the time, and no understanding that swans were to be got in place of the monkeys. There was another thing he wanted to refer to. The hon. member for Maryborough had told them that the park ranger was doing his work in a very satisfactory manner. He would like the hon. member to take the park ranger along the river bank from one end of the gardens to the other, make him look down the face of the bank—if he could stand the stench—and then say whether he was doing his work in a satisfactory manner.

Question—That the sum of £2,632 only be granted—put. The Committee divided:—

AYES, 12.

Sir T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Archer, Macrossan, Norton, Black, Aland, Stevenson, Lalor, Nelson, Lissner, Jessop, and Ferguson.

NOES, 23.

Messrs. Miles, Griffith, Dickson, Dutton, Sheridan, Smyth, Macdonald-Paterson, Buckland, Jordan, Foote, Isambert, White, Kellett, Mellor, Bailey, Beattie, Palmer, Salkeld, Foxton, Higson, Grimes, Macfarlane, and Groom.

Question resolved in the negative.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH said he did not know whether hon. members had considered the result of the vote they had just given. Last night they had considered the votes for reserves to the different parts of the colony. Reserve votes had been passed to different towns, showing a reduction made of one-fourth; while the Minister for Lands had disagreed with the principle of supporting the reserves at all. They, on his side of the Committee, had consented for the sake of economy to the reduction proposed. But there came on next the vote which applied to Brisbane alone—for the same purpose as the reserves in other parts of the colony. And what had they done? They had voted to Brisbane a sum of £6,883, and for the whole of the rest of the colony £5,950. They had reduced the votes for all the rest of the colony by 25 per cent., and increased those for Brisbane by 30 per cent. Country members would see the unfairness of a vote of that kind, and how unfair it was that a Government which represented exclusively that part of the colony should try and force extravagance in those votes which applied to Brisbane, and circumscribe their operations in all other parts of the colony. He did not himself cringe the amount that was spent on the Botanic Gardens in Brisbane, but it was unfair

that while such a large amount was spent there such stingy economy should have been exercised towards the other parts of the colony.

Mr. BLACK said he was very much dissatisfied in regard to the vote, more especially as the hon. member for Maryborough had given them to understand that though £1,000 was put down for extra labour this year, next year half that amount would be sufficient. That meant that the £1,000 vote was going to be perpetuated to some extent in the future. He moved that the sum of £3,632 be reduced by the sum of £999.

Mr. ALAND said he trusted the hon. member for Mackay would not press the amendment for such a reduction of the vote, or pursue the tactics of moving its reduction £1 by £1. He (Mr. Aland) thought that the Government had been rather too lavish and liberal in the way they spent money on the Botanic Gardens in Brisbane, somewhat at the expense of the reserves and parks in other parts of the colony. But having been beaten on the vote, the other side should be content, unless their object was to take up the time of the Committee by going on dividing and dividing on the matter.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said that as a general rule it was right, when a party had been defeated on a division in trying to reduce a vote, that they should submit to the opinion of the majority of Committee. But in that particular case he had no intention of submitting, and he hoped the hon. member for Mackay would continue in the direction he had now taken. If he did he would have his support right to the end of the £1,000 taking it £1 by £1. His reason for doing so was that he meant to call the attention of the whole colony to the fact of the want of fair play exhibited by the Lands Department to every place outside Brisbane. There was no other way of doing it but that adopted by the hon. member for Mackay. If they sat there that night voting on that particular sum, the people of the colony would ask what the members of the Assembly had been doing. And when they found out what they had been doing he was quite certain that they would endorse their action. But whether they did so or not, he thought it was only right that attention should be called to the fact that £1,700 was about to be given to Brisbane more than to the whole of the colony for reserves and parks. He had no desire to protract the discussion on the Estimates or to take up the time of the Committee, but he looked upon the matter as one involving principle.

Question put.

The Committee divided :—

AYES, 11.

Sir T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Archer, Macrossan, Nelson, Black, Stevenson, Lissner, Norton, Lalor, Jessop, and Ferguson.

NOES, 21.

Messrs. Griffith, Sheridan, Dutton, Dickson, Miles, Macdonald-Paterson, Smyth, Buckland, Isambert, Jordan, Grimes, White, Foote, Kellett, Mellor, Beattie, Foxton, Macfarlane, Salkeld, Bailey, and Groom.

Question resolved in the negative.

Mr. STEVENSON said he intended to support the hon. members for Mackay and Townsville in trying to get the vote reduced. The Minister for Lands himself did not believe in that expenditure, and yet he came down with a largely increased vote for the Botanic Gardens of Brisbane. Last night when several hon. members on that side asked that other towns of the colony—which were as much entitled to participate in the vote in proportion—should be considered they were actually laughed at, and were told by the Premier that they were making a scramble. Other places had a right to be treated

on exactly the same lines as Brisbane, and when they found that Brisbane was to get over £1,700 more than all the rest of the colony put together it was time something was done to draw attention to the fact. He should move as an amendment that the vote be reduced by £998.

Mr. FERGUSON said he hoped the hon. member for Mackay would not go any further in his opposition to the vote. He could see plainly that there was not the slightest use in trying to reduce it. It was evident from the last division that the North would get no justice done to it. Of the large majority who voted on the last division, only two members—those for Wide Bay—represented constituencies north of Brisbane. All the rest represented the southern part of the colony. Such being the case, what could hon. members expect? They might go on like that for a month, and the result would be the same; and it would be a waste of time to go on dividing any longer.

Mr. BLACK said he was sorry he could not entirely agree with the hon. member for Rockhampton. He knew they were quite in accord on the matter. He was quite prepared to sit there for a month. He had already been there for five months, and had got little or no consideration. In fact, the Northern members were getting no consideration whatever from what he could only stigmatise as a Queen-street Ministry. He was going to call the attention of the country to that state of affairs. The hon. member for Townsville had pointed out the monstrous nature of the vote, and unless they made a determined stand now, the vote would be passed without notice, and very likely next year they would be asked to grant a still larger amount. He was sorry he could not withdraw his opposition to the vote.

Mr. GRIMES said the hon. member for Rockhampton had called attention to the fact that only two members north of Brisbane voted with the majority in the last instance. He (Mr. Grimes) wished to point out that the most northern member voted for the full amount during the first division. He referred to the hon. member for Burke.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said the question was not one as to who voted for and who voted against the motion, as far as he was concerned. The hon. member for Burke might vote for or against it, just as he pleased, but if he did not feel as warmly on the point as the other Northern members did, he was at liberty to please himself. He (Hon. J. M. Macrossan) would call the attention of the hon. member for Oxley to the fact that the member for Burke did not vote in the second division. He voted with the Government in the first division, no doubt. He would call attention to another fact, in addition to the fact that £1,732 more was being given to Brisbane than to the whole of the other parts of the colony. There was the town of Dalby which had no reserve on that list; a town which was supposed worthy by the House of having a representative to itself. That gentleman voted against the £1,000. There was the town of Clermont in the same position. Clermont was also a place supposed worthy by the House to have a member allotted to itself. The gentleman who represented Clermont sat on the Government side of the House, and if he was not public-spirited enough to vote against the town being left out he could do as he pleased.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: He is not here!

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he referred to Mr. Higson, thinking he represented Clermont. He was connecting Clermont with the hon. member on account of the land

transaction that took place there six or eight months ago, and he intended to allude to that matter when they came to another vote. Then there was the town of Gladstone, which he was certain was just as much entitled to a reserve as Tiaro. What was Tiaro? Had any member ever seen it? Why, there were a dozen little hamlets between Brisbane and Sandgate larger and of more importance than Tiaro. Then there was the town of Cairns. There was no reserve for it, and no attempt by the Minister at making a reserve; but there was a reserve for Southport, whilst the men who visited that place were chiefly inhabitants of Brisbane, who went down there to enjoy themselves and get a mouthful of fresh air and a dip in the sea; so that those people had not only a splendid and a costly reserve in Brisbane, but one at Southport, where they went down to recreate themselves. Then there was the town of Port Douglas—no reserve; but Cleveland had one, and Cleveland was about as important as Southport, with the exception that it was not so large, and certainly not as large and important as Port Douglas, from a revenue point of view, notwithstanding it was to have a railway as well as a reserve. Then there was Herberton—a very important inland centre—no reserve. Ravenswood was mentioned last night in the Committee, but he could not get the Minister for Lands to make a promise to put a sum on the Supplementary Estimates for a reserve for that place. He did make a promise for Charters Towers, and that was one of the most important places out of Brisbane; it and Gympie were the two most important. Then there was Normanton—another place with no reserve. He said nothing of Burketown, because it was too small.

The PREMIER: Then there is Boulia.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: There was Blackall, another place beginning with a B.

The PREMIER: And there is Birdsville.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said Blackall was a place he had never seen. He believed it was larger than Southport, larger than Cleveland, and very much larger than that other watering-place—but he forgot Tiaro was not a watering-place. It was a place to which water was brought.

The PREMIER: There is Bogantungan.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said then there was that neighbour of Blackall—Aramac—another town without a reserve. Emerald, a town which was becoming of great importance; the junction of two important railway lines; the junction of the Clermont and Springsure lines; a place which he believed would be the Ipswich of Central Queensland. Then there were Goondiwindi and Tambo.

The PREMIER: Is that all?

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said every one of those places he had mentioned was more important and more deserving of a reserve than Tiaro, and yet there was £50 down on the Estimates for Tiaro. Well, he supposed Tiaro must have been put down to soothe and pacify the member for Wide Bay. He did not know of any other reasons. Now, he wanted every hon. member to know the way in which the towns outside of Brisbane were treated, and then they could vote for the vote or against it. Then every individual member must, to satisfy his own conscience, determine how he should treat the action of the Government in that matter.

The PREMIER said he wondered whether the same spirit of localism had ever been displayed in any other country in the world as in

Queensland. Year after year there were some members who made it their business and traded upon trying to get up animosity between one part of the colony and another. For many years members on both sides had been doing all they could to dispel that feeling—a purely factious feeling worked up by interested persons. He thought the time had passed for that sort of thing; but they were told now that they should have a night or two of it. It seemed to him just then that the hon. member for Mulgrave had attained two objects by the tactics he had been pursuing. He had said that afternoon that the Estimates would take until the end of next week to pass. It was very easy to make a prophecy come true; and the hon. member evidently intended that his prophecy should come true. The hon. member had also illustrated in a peculiar manner his desire to assist the Government in the conduct of their business. He (the Premier) was at a loss to understand why the proposition simply to utilise and reclaim a waste part of the gardens in Brisbane should be received in the manner it had been. The matter was not one of very great importance. There was simply a proposal that a part of the gardens that had lain waste for many years, should be made to look respectable; and yet all the evening had been wasted on such a useless discussion. It was rather a singular circumstance that the members who took up the time of the Committee, objecting to items of expenditure, were the very men who put the items on the Estimates in the first instance. That was a singular thing. If they were going to discuss the items in that way, then they would have to find out who was first responsible for putting them on the Estimates. But was that worthy of any men who legislated for the affairs of the country? Of course, if hon. members liked, they could have 1,000, or 10,000, or 240,000 divisions; but then the business would be stopped. The Government desired to get through the business in the ordinary manner, and, desiring also that the prophecy of the hon. member should not be fulfilled, hoped that the general good sense of the Committee would allow the business to be proceeded with.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he quite agreed with the hon. member when he said he did not suppose there was another colony where there was such a spirit of localism as in Queensland. Take, for instance, New South Wales and Victoria. Justice in the matter of parks and reserves was done to the different districts in those colonies; and neither Melbourne nor Sydney got everything. When the hon. member deprecated that spirit of localism he should look to what was being done for Brisbane, and to the way in which other parts of the colony were being neglected. The Minister for Lands had previously deprecated an increased expenditure on the reserves of the colony, and said he wished them wiped out altogether; and yet he came down with that senseless item of £1,000 for a system of high gardening in a particular part of the Brisbane Gardens. No wonder hon. members had had their attention directed to that sort of thing. The Premier said that he (Sir T. McIlwraith) had tried to make a prediction, that the Estimates would not pass that year, come true; but that was absurd. If he had wished to stop the business, he could have done so on much more important questions than that now before them; but he had done his duty as leader of the Opposition in criticising Bills; and when he had let the country thoroughly understand the question, he had done what he could to assist in passing those Bills. He defied the Premier to say that anything he had done that evening was a departure from that course.



The hon. member might fancy that because he would not allow his own side to run riot on small questions, that he (Sir T. McIlwraith) was to be responsible for his own side in the same way. He did not believe in taking up the time of the Committee on a small item of £1,000, although it affected the vital interests of the colony and illustrated the way in which the northern districts were treated by the Southern members. He had looked for some assistance from members on the other side, but he had not got it. When the votes for reserves were before the Committee, the Premier contemptuously referred to the claims for other districts as "a scramble for money." The fact was the Government had put down nearly everything for Brisbane and nothing for many other parts of the colony. There was no reason to waste time over the vote, if the Premier had the good sense to advise his colleague to withdraw the vote. Either the Minister for Lands or the hon. member for Maryborough must be wrong on the matter; because the one said that when that £1,000 was spent no more would be required for that purpose; while the other said it would take £500 a year to keep that part of the gardens in order. One of them must be wrong. He did not see why they should spend money to suit a hobby of any Minister. He was sure the people in Brisbane, when they considered the small amount of money voted for parks and gardens in other parts of the colony, would cry shame on the Ministry.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said that one would think the present Government was the only Government that had spent large sums of money on public parks and reserves; but he would just draw attention to the fact that there was a vote of £1,550 put down last year by the late Government for Mount Coottha—a vote for fencing a scrubby mountain three miles out of Brisbane, which nobody could reach. Even he, who lived much nearer to it, had tried to reach it by walking and could not do it; he would have to use a horse to get there. Now there was £250 more required to complete the work. He had never put down an item more grudgingly than that. It was an utterly worthless expenditure so far as the people of Brisbane were concerned. If the money had been spent in embellishing the gardens there would have been some justification for it; but as it was it was the most unwarrantable expenditure he ever heard of. The hon. member for Townsville seemed to have forgotten that the towns he referred to, Clermont and Dalby, had returned members for a long time. The hon. member was a member of a Government for four or five years. Why did he not see that a sum of money was put on for those places? As to the vote for Tiara, that was put on by the late Government. There was no difference whatever in the Estimates for reserves; they were just in the same state, so far as the amount was concerned, as under the late Government. The only difference was the £300 for Bundaberg, which he promised last year.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that the hon. member stated that the expenditure at Mount Coottha was most unwarrantable; but he held a different opinion. There was nothing he was prouder of than in having made that reserve; and if that £1,000 had been put down to make it a better reserve for the people of Brisbane, then he thought it would have been received a great deal more favourably. He admitted that the late Government put on the vote for Tiara, and they would have done a great deal more for other parts of the colony. What he objected to was that they should vote so much for one part of the Brisbane Gardens, and not give anything to other places in the

colony. That was what had raised the opposition of members who were not directly connected with Brisbane.

Mr. STEVENSON said he did not believe in the expenditure for Mount Coottha; it was a very good thing to proclaim a reserve there, but the expenses were not justifiable. At the same time if the Minister for Lands felt so strongly on the point he should remember that two wrongs did not make a right, and what right had he to propose another £250 for that reserve? It was only making things worse, when he said that nobody could get up there. The leader of the Opposition had pointed out that they did not find fault with the late Ministry, or the present Ministry, for putting on sums of money for reserves in different parts of the colony. They complained that they were not putting on enough. They wanted other places to get the same proportion as Brisbane, and objected to such places being unrecognised altogether. When Northern members asked that the same treatment should be meted out to their districts, they were treated with contempt, and left out as they were last night.

Mr. ARCHER said he had an opinion of his own in some matters. He did not say that he quite agreed with what had fallen from the hon. leader of the Opposition as to the expenditure upon Mount Coottha; but now it was fenced he had no doubt it would become a favourite resort of the people of Brisbane, and in times to come they would be very grateful to the person who first suggested that being reserved. It was a magnificent place in spite of what the hon. Minister for Lands said. That gentleman said it was a poor place, which showed there was a difference of opinion, and only proved that some persons could enjoy the place and others could not. He heard the Premier preach a very good doctrine about obstruction, and he was perfectly well aware that during the first and second years of the last Parliament that that gentleman carried obstruction to a point which he considered unjustifiable; that was with regard to the mail service. He would have obstructed to the last, but the then leader of the Government had the firmness to make a wall of stone which the hon. gentleman could not break down. He (Mr. Archer) had come to the conclusion that obstruction was not justifiable unless there was some principle involved. Therefore the Premier's obstruction to the mail service for nine weeks was not justifiable, and he (Mr. Archer) did not consider it justifiable to continue voting on the point to-night. They had divided twice, to show the country the injustice that was being done. He had come to the conclusion that members of Parliament were only justified in obstructing when there was a matter of principle involved that injuriously affected the country as a whole. Therefore he could not support his hon. friends any longer. He had proposed himself that £1,000 should be knocked off, and he voted also for the second amendment; but he did not think the principle involved justified him in carrying on his obstruction further.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he was not going to say that the hon. member for Blackall had shown the white feather; but their opinions differed. He (Hon. J. M. Macrossan) looked upon obstruction as having its use in parliamentary government the same as every other privilege. It enabled a member of Parliament to call attention to what otherwise would have escaped the notice of people. Obstruction now would have the result of attaining the object that those who were opposing the vote had in view. The hon. member for Blackall had

twitted the hon. Premier for having obstructed for nine weeks. The hon. gentleman tried to look virtuous and turned up his eyes, but he thought he was doing right; whether he was or not was a matter of opinion. One effect that obstruction had was that there was never an Act passed by the late Government that was so closely scrutinised, or improved upon afterwards, by the people of the colony, and the reason was that it was so much obstructed. It would never have been so well understood in the northern and western parts of the colony; so the hon. gentleman lost by obstruction. But the Opposition did not intend to obstruct till Christmas on the present occasion. They only intended to obstruct that night, and he hoped there were a few members on that side of the Committee who had public spirit enough to be called obstructionists. He wished the Minister for Lands to answer a question; of course he might refuse to do so, as he had refused to answer others. Had any applications been made to him by any place outside of Brisbane, during the current year, either for new reserves or for additional grants to reserves already in existence?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said there had been one or two applications for new reserves—one at Goondiwindi, and the other at Clermont. There had also been an application for money for a reserve at Herberton.

Mr. MELLOR said he was sorry that hon. members opposite were going to obstruct. The hon. member for Townsville had made reference to one portion of the constituency he (Mr. Mellor) represented, and had said that Tiaro was a deserted village.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: I said no such thing.

Mr. MELLOR said that the hon. gentleman had said that there were not many people there at all events. He said Gladstone was entitled to a reserve; but Tiaro had twice as many inhabitants as Gladstone. It was a very small sum to put down for Tiaro. He did not think the sum put down for the Brisbane Gardens was at all out of the way, as the gardens were a public institution belonging to the whole colony. He thought the references which had been made to the hon. member for Maryborough were very unjust. He was performing his duties gratuitously, and deserved the thanks of the House and of the whole colony.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he had not called Tiaro a deserted village; it was not large enough to be called a deserted village. It was a pretty place, but there were several hamlets between Brisbane and Sandgate as large as Tiaro. What he was going to ask the Minister for Lands was whether he had acceded to the request of the people of Herberton?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said the application was made about a fortnight ago, and he had agreed to supplement any amount they raised with an equal sum. If they raised £50 the Government would give them £50 more.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN asked whether a similar condition had been imposed upon the people of Brisbane with regard to that £1,000.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: Then why should it be imposed upon the people of Herberton? Were they not step-children of the Government—did they not belong to the same family as the people of Brisbane, and did they not find a fair share of the money which was to be expended on that vote for Brisbane? He was inclined to think that per head of population they subscribed a

large share; in fact he was certain of it. He would not object to the principle of the Government giving £1 for £1 if it applied to the whole colony; he thought it would be a very good principle; but when it was applied to one part of the colony and not to another, especially as that part was his electorate, it only strengthened his determination to obstruct the vote.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said the hon. member had enumerated a number of towns in different parts of the colony. He could add to the list fourfold, or fivefold, or even tenfold—all towns quite as much entitled to grants as those the hon. member had named; but where would the money come from? He was inclined to deal with all new applications in the way he had indicated, and hoped that eventually the same principle would be applied to all cases alike.

Mr. BLACK said he did not know there was any power that the Government possessed to treat the votes in that way, and it would make him more determined in his opposition than ever. A place like Herberton was picked out for the trial of a new experiment, and the people were told that they would have to subscribe £50, and then they would be subsidised £50; while at the same time £1,000 was put down for Brisbane to pay for extra work which was not even specified. If the Government had been able to schedule the work to which the money was to be applied, hon. members would have had some reason for discussing the vote on its merits; but while a very small sum was put down for the proper working of the gardens, there was £1,000 put down as a special grant. The Minister for Lands had referred to the Mount Coottha vote. He (Mr. Black) opposed that vote; and had he received a promise of support, would have opposed it pound by pound till it was struck off. He considered it an unnecessary vote, notwithstanding the remarks of the hon. leader of the Opposition, and the hon. member for Blackall. The Government had struck £1,300 off that vote, but they had stuck it on the Brisbane vote, so he did not think the Minister for Lands deserved much credit. In addition to the very large vote for Brisbane amounting to £1,732—more than the vote for all the rest of the colony put together—he found on the next page items of Colonial Botanist, £300; Botanical Library, £50; and collection of indigenous timbers, £200. Those were similar votes; they were not distributed all over the colony in any fair ratio.

Mr. MACDONALD-PATERSON said he should like to know whether the Minister for Lands' statement that he should like to see all the votes for reserves swept off and replaced by modified sums equivalent to sums subscribed by local bodies, was an expression of his opinion as a member of the Assembly or as a member of the Cabinet. He should be glad to know that, because the Minister for Lands had a very limited experience in public matters, and that question had formed the subject of many discussions in the House. If the hon. member had expressed the opinion of the Government in his remarks the discussion would take a different turn altogether.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said it was simply his individual opinion, otherwise he should not have brought the Estimates forward, and asked the Committee to pass them as they were.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said it was extraordinary that the hon. gentleman got up and answered the member for Moreton as a member of the Assembly; and that when he had answered him (Hon. J. M. Macrossan), and had refused the grant to Herberton unless they subscribed an equal amount, it was as a member of the Ministry, or as the Minister for Lands,

representing the Government. Surely the Minister for Lands would not take upon himself to introduce a new rule in the distribution of the vote without the consent of his colleagues; but if he did, he was not only inexperienced, but also extremely high-handed. He (Hon. J. M. Macrossan) could not understand the answers or reconcile them.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said that if the hon. gentleman wished to understand him he could. He had said that he would recommend the Government to deal with Herberton in the way mentioned. The Government might refuse to do so. He had simply told the representative of Herberton what his individual opinion was.

Mr. STEVENSON asked if he was to understand that the Minister for Lands would treat all new applications in that way, or whether his new condition would apply to the promise he had made the previous night in regard to Charters Towers?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said that all new applications made to him would receive the same answer.

Mr. STEVENSON said he thought the hon. gentleman had given the member for Kennedy a distinct promise that a sum would be placed on the Supplementary Estimates for Charters Towers. Was that sum to be given on the same conditions that he said all new votes were to be treated?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said that when Charters Towers had been brought under his notice, he had been obliged to admit that it ought to have been included in the number of places that should get a grant, and he had said that he was prepared to make a recommendation that a grant should be made. He had also said that any application made to him should be dealt with in the same manner.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he certainly could not understand the hon. gentleman, and he hoped the Premier would get up and interpret what the Minister for Lands meant. The people of Herberton asked the Minister for Lands for a grant of money for a reserve, and the answer was that they would receive a grant conditionally on their subscribing an equal amount. The Minister for Lands had told the member for Moreton that his opinion was given as a member of the Assembly, but that he acted as Minister for Lands and as a member of the Cabinet in answering the member for Kennedy as to placing a sum on the Supplementary Estimates for Charters Towers. Now, in answering the member for Normanby, he had said something which he (Hon. J. M. Macrossan) could not understand, and an interpretation of that answer was wanted from the Premier. Was the grant to Charters Towers to be given on the same conditions as that to Herberton, namely, that they must subscribe £500 if £500 was placed on the Supplementary Estimates? That was a plain question.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said that on the previous night he had declared that the Government would place a sum on the Supplementary Estimates for Charters Towers; and in regard to Herberton he had said he would recommend that they should receive a sum of money on certain conditions—namely, that they should subscribe a sum, and that the Government would supplement it by an equal sum. That would be his recommendation, although it was not particularly relevant to the matter under discussion. The question had been raised by some gentlemen on the other side of the Committee why certain sums should be granted for certain purposes, and, individually, he had given his opinion that they ought not to be granted.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN asked if he was to understand from the answer given, that the money to be placed on the Supplementary Estimates for Charters Towers was to be placed there unconditionally?

The PREMIER: Yes.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he would then ask why a similar sum should not be provided for Herberton unconditionally. Why should conditions be imposed on Herberton and not on other places? Could the Minister for Lands give any reason why the people of Herberton should be treated differently from the people of Charters Towers? He could not see any reason why they should. There were miners in the one place as there were in the other. Fortunately both places were in the far North, and therefore it could not be a question of North *versus* South; but why should they be treated differently?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said they must draw the line somewhere. It was quite impossible that money could be found for all the places. Charters Towers was certainly a considerable town, and ought not to have been omitted from the list of places to receive money for reserves. But if Herberton was to receive money on the same conditions then very small towns in the colony—scores in number—would have an equal claim, and it could not be done.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said that Herberton was not a small town. If the Minister for Lands did not know where Herberton was the Premier could tell him, and the Minister for Works could also tell him that it was not a small town. A town that had 700 or 800 electors on the electoral roll was not a very small town. Was the rule that had been applied to Herberton to be applied to other places with the consent of the Ministry? Was it to be a new rule established from henceforth that every place that had subscribed was to be entitled to an equal sum from the Estimates? They must understand that. The Minister for Works appeared to be amused. He should like him to answer that question; and if he approved of the principle? If so then they must begin at the fountain-head. In the grants for divisional boards no distinction was made between Brisbane and any other part of the country. All were made alike, and if the Ministry were going to establish a new principle in regard to reserves, all places must be placed on the same basis. There must be no distinction made; at any rate they on that side of the Committee would take care that no distinction was allowed to be made.

The PREMIER asked why all that sudden zeal for equality had begun on the Opposition side of the Committee. Many hon. members would probably come to the conclusion that those good intentions for equal distribution were mere words. Did the hon. member wish to apply the principle he mentioned to the whole of the financial operations of the colony? Did he wish to take the revenue and divide it between each town and district, apportioning it between the Colonial Secretary's Office, the Lands, the Works Department, reserves, poor-rates, hospitals, schools, etc.? On that principle, government would become impossible. The hon. member must see the fallacy of his argument as well as he (the Premier) did. There was only a limited amount available for the purpose, and to someone must be given the discretion of apportioning it. The hon. member might just as well complain that Brisbane got more for police magistrates or judges than Herberton, or Boulia, or Birdsville.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said the hon. gentleman was quite mistaken. Nobody on that side was arguing that the money should be

divided *pro rata* over the different districts. Their argument was that no distinction should be made between different parts of the colony. It was the fact of treating the people of Herberton different from the people of Brisbane, that would render the government of the North by the people of the South impossible. There was no fallacy in that argument. The hon. gentleman might depend upon it that any distinction of that kind would recoil upon himself, and upon the Government of which he was the head.

The PREMIER said the hon. member had for many years been trying to induce the people of the North to believe that the party now in power desired to do injustice to them; but they had declined to believe it up to the present. The intentions of the Government were shown by their acts. The hon. member wished them to believe that the people in the North were such arrant fools that because Herberton did not immediately get £150 for a park—of which very few members had ever heard until that afternoon—therefore the Government intended to do them an injustice. The people of the North were not such fools as to believe that. They did not believe anything of the kind, either at Herberton or anywhere else in the North. He himself had never heard of any application from Herberton before, but Herberton would be treated the same as Charters Towers or Brisbane. Some places were treated on one footing and some on another, and whether a town should be placed in one category or the other must be determined either by the Government or on the arithmetical principle to which he had alluded.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said the hon. gentleman had admitted the whole of his argument when he admitted that Herberton should not be treated differently from Charters Towers or Brisbane. But his colleague had treated them differently, and that was what they objected to. If Herberton was to be placed on the same footing as Brisbane, why should the condition be imposed that they should raise £1 for £1? If a reserve was to be placed at Herberton it should be unconditionally—the same as at Charters Towers or at Brisbane. By admitting that the hon. gentleman condemned his colleague—let them settle that matter between themselves.

Mr. JORDAN said that, with regard to the reserve at Charters Towers, he believed the hon. member for Kennedy considered that he had received a distinct promise from the Minister, and that it was acceded to on that account. If that were so, the circumstances of the two cases were not the same, for no promise had been made as to Herberton. He had come to the conclusion that after all there was not so much principle in the obstructive course taken by the Opposition, as he had at first thought. He had at first thought the Opposition were obstructing because of the inconsistency of the Minister for Lands in first expressing an opinion adverse to granting money for reserves, and then asking for £1,180 for additional labour for the gardens at Brisbane. He gathered now from the remarks of the hon. member for Mulgrave that it was no longer a question of principle, because if the amount had been put down for the improvement of the reserve at Mount Coottha he would have approved of it. The question was simply whether the money should be spent on the gardens, or on Mount Coottha. At the beginning of last session the hon. member for Mulgrave stated distinctly that he did not intend to pursue an obstructive course, and his conduct since then had been thoroughly consistent. The

hon. member for Townsville, on the other hand, said he thought obstruction had its legitimate uses, and he had acted consistently to-night. Since it had been acknowledged by the leader of the Opposition that there was no principle in the obstruction, he hoped it would be carried on no longer. It was wasting the time of the Committee, and was unjust to the country, and to the members from the country. Enough had been said to show the public what the feeling of the Opposition was on the question. He regretted that the Minister for Lands held those opinions about reserves. His own opinion was that reserves should be granted to every large town in the colony. Brisbane had a population of 34,000—as much as the population of three or four of the other largest towns in the colony; and it was a question whether they should leave a portion of the Brisbane Gardens in a wilderness state or reclaim it. There was no doubt it ought to be reclaimed, and that £1,000 would be very properly expended for the purpose.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said the hon. gentleman who had just sat down seemed to think that the Minister for Lands made a promise to the hon. member for Kennedy, because the hon. member for Kennedy imagined that he had got some kind of a promise from the Government. He did not object to the Minister for Lands making such a promise. He thought he should go further, but notwithstanding that, it was not the question they were contending for at the present time. He could tell the hon. member for South Brisbane that the people of Herberton had a reserve granted to them of about six acres, and that surely implied that something should be done to improve it. The Minister for Lands was asked for a sum of money, but he gave the answer that the Government would only subscribe £1 for £1. The hon. gentleman had made that proposition, he said, as a private member, but if he was a private member he would not be in the position he was now in. He was a Minister, and every act of his, his colleagues as well as himself were responsible for. The hon. member for South Brisbane said that Brisbane contained 34,000 inhabitants, but it was not larger than all the rest of the colony put together, and, as he had pointed out before, Brisbane actually got £1,732 more than the rest of the colony.

Mr. KELLETT said it was very warm that night to continue such a discussion, and he thought the member for Townsville had pretty well attained his object in letting the people know that he had not forgotten them. No doubt there was a sort of touting for electors when the Estimates were on, and the member for Townsville, having spoken about forty times, ought to let the matter drop. The hon. member, who now lived in New South Wales, apparently thought it necessary to come in at the end of a session, after having been away down south, and let the people in the North know he had not forgotten them; but he had not done enough. The whole matter could be summed up in this way: The Ministry proposed to spend £1,000 on the Botanic Gardens, and the members of the late Government thought it should be spent at Mount Coottha. That was the whole story, and hence the obstruction which was going on.

Mr. STEVENSON said, instead of the hon. member addressing himself to members of the Opposition, he should advise the two members of the Ministry who were at present in opposition to come to terms. A question was asked the Minister for Lands why the distinction was made between Charters Towers and Herberton, and he said, "We must draw the line somewhere." The Premier, in answer to the same question, had

said no distinctions ought to be made. Those answers were diametrically opposed to one another. Was the Premier going to let the Minister for Lands override him, or was it to be the other way? He wondered if the Attorney-General could give any explanation why the money had been given to Charters Towers without any conditions being imposed. It seemed extraordinary that the members of the Ministry should be opposed to each other. They ought to settle their estimates before they came into the House.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said he was absent last night when the question of reserves was under discussion. On looking at *Hansard*, he noticed his hon. friend (Mr. Lissner) was reported to have said there, respecting the question of reserves—

"He would not leave the matter to his colleague, the Attorney-General, because he did not think he looked after the place."

He felt sure there must have been some mistake, and he mentioned the matter to the hon. gentleman, who told him that he was not correctly reported. His hon. friend would admit that he had not neglected the interests of his constituents at Charters Towers, and he hoped he would tell the Committee what he had told him (the Attorney-General) that morning.

Mr. LISSNER said he was sorry he had had to fight for the vote for Charters Towers, because he believed a certain amount of jealousy had been created. He believed a sort of pre-emptive right had been established in the case of the Towers. Certainly there was a distinction between tin-mining and gold-mining, but he would waive that. Herberton was probably quite as good a child as Charters Towers; but he could not help thinking Charters Towers had a prior claim, and the Attorney-General would bear him out in that. Last year he had had a promise from the Minister for Lands that Charters Towers would not be forgotten, but it had been omitted, he supposed by mistake, and he had felt it his duty to call attention to the matter again this year. As far as what the Attorney-General had mentioned was concerned, he (Mr. Lissner) did not think he had said exactly what was attributed to him. What he intended to say, at all events, was that as he was in the House he would not care to leave the matter to the Attorney-General to look after. He did not think that the Towers stood in the same category with other towns, but if in the future the pound for pound system was adopted he thought it would be an improvement. When people wanted a garden they would get £1 from the Government when they subscribed £1, and they would then see who were the gardeners for money and who were the gardeners for nothing.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said that the hon. member for Stanley was labouring under a wrong impression when he imagined that the leader of the Opposition had anything to do with that obstruction. The members of the Opposition did not place themselves body and soul in the hands of their leader; they had a right to think for themselves and they did so. They were quite disassociated from their leader in that matter. He (Hon. J. M. Macrossan) did not know what the leader of the Opposition might have said with regard to Mount Cootha. It was not so much a question whether that amount should be spent in Brisbane; the question was that Brisbane was receiving too much consideration on the Estimates—getting more than all the rest of the colony put together; and the object of the obstruction was to let people understand that. If they went by the advice of the leader of the Opposition, they

would submit at once; but they were quite capable of advising themselves and following their own opinions. He (Hon. J. M. Macrossan) believed they were doing the right thing.

Mr. JORDAN said he would put it to the hon. member whether the Opposition had not now attained their object of letting the country see the manner in which the Government treated other parts of the colony in comparison to Brisbane? If that was so, then no further object could be gained by continuing the obstruction. It would not be to the advantage of the country in any way to go on wasting valuable time at the end of the session.

Mr. KELLETT said he would point out that in that vote Brisbane was not treated better than it was under the late Government. If hon. members looked at the Estimates of the late Government, they would find that there was just as much down for Brisbane as there was now; so that hon. members need not talk about too much favour being shown to Brisbane.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said that was a matter of opinion. The hon. member must allow other people to judge as well as himself, and he must not suppose he could dictate as to what hon. members on the Opposition side should believe. As to what the hon. member for South Brisbane said about continuing the obstruction, that also was a matter of opinion. The Opposition members were the best judges of that. They could not prevent the vote passing, he knew. If valuable time was being wasted, and if the hon. member wished to save time, let him whisper into the ear of the Minister for Lands to withdraw the vote, or do anything else he could think of for that object.

Mr. JORDAN said he should not presume to advise the Minister for Lands at any time, and certainly not to cry "*peccari*" in that matter. He had too much common sense for that. If the hon. member for Townsville knew what he was about, so did the Minister for Lands.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said that in that case the hon. member should keep his advice to himself. If he thought it was presumption to advise the Minister for Lands, then he ought to think it presumption to advise him (Hon. J. M. Macrossan).

Mr. KELLETT said he did not wish to advise the hon. member for Townsville. He simply wanted to show him that in previous Estimates Brisbane was treated just as it was now. If the hon. member chose to tot up the figures he would see that he was talking against what was a fact. The hon. member wanted to make out that Brisbane was much better treated than the North. He wanted to let the people of the North see that he had not forgotten them. Because he had gone to live in New South Wales he now took up the cry of "the North! the North!" and had he not attained his object by making the matter public? If he repeated his opinion forty times, it would not make the matter any stronger.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said the hon. member did not dictate, but he slandered. That was not the first time he had slandered either. He said he (Hon. J. M. Macrossan) wished to impress the people of the North that he had not forgotten them because he had gone to live in New South Wales. That was not true; he had not gone to live in New South Wales. If the hon. gentleman did not know that, then he should not say so; if he did know it, then he was guilty of slandering. The people of the North knew he had not forgotten them. He was simply doing what he considered his duty in justice to the people of the colony. The question

of the North was raised incidentally through the way in which the Minister for Lands treated the matter. There was no question of North and South before that.

Mr. KELLETT said he would be sorry to slander the hon. member or anybody else; and he denied emphatically that he had ever done so. The hon. member's statement was as untrue a statement as had ever been made in that Committee. He never slandered any hon. gentleman, and he never said anything in the House that he was not prepared to say outside. Still he must apologise for having made a mis-statement; he certainly thought the hon. gentleman had gone to live in New South Wales.

Mr. BLACK said he hoped that the amicable nature of the debate up to the present time was not to be interrupted by any gentleman opposite losing his temper.

Mr. KELLETT: The bad language came from the other side.

Mr. BLACK said he was not going to quarrel with the hon. member for Stanley; but he agreed with what had been said, that it was not a question of North or South; it arose from the extraordinary treatment meted out to the Herberton reserve, which was to be granted a sum of money on the condition that the people should subscribe £1 for £1—a condition which never had been proposed before, that he was aware of, in any part of Queensland. He saw no reason why Herberton should have been picked out for that exceptional treatment. It was not a question of North or South; but what he maintained was, that Brisbane was monopolising to herself a far greater share of that vote than she was entitled to. It was not only the Northern towns that were treated unjustly; but places in the South were subjected to equally unfair treatment. He did not know whether the hon. member for Stanley was in the Chamber when the statement was made that Brisbane was receiving £1,720 over what was voted for the rest of the colony put together. It was immaterial whether that had been going on for a number of years. He doubted very much whether it had, but it was a matter that could be ascertained by going through the previous Estimates. It seemed to him that that large sum was brought about chiefly by that one vote of £1,000 for extra labour for the gardens—a vote which was not material for their proper management. If that were taken away the sum remaining would be quite sufficient for keeping the gardens in order, and if the Minister for Lands would only make some reasonable compromise the debate could easily be brought to a close.

Question—That the sum of £2,634 only be voted—put, and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 9.

Sir T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Macrossan, Nelson, Black, Stevenson, Lissner, Norton, Lalor, and Jessop.

NOES, 21.

Messrs. Rutledge, Miles, Griffith, Dickson, Dutton, Sheridan, Stevens, Smyth, Foxton, Bailey, Beattie, Foote, Buckland, White, Kellett, Isambert, Jordan, Grimes, Mellor, Macdonald-Paterson, and Macfarlane.

Question resolved in the negative.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN moved that the vote be reduced by £997.

Mr. BLACK said that, in the early part of the evening, he understood from the Minister for Lands that he was not inclined to press the item of £300 for the catalogue of plants. He would like to have some intimation from the hon. member whether he was prepared to yield it.

The PREMIER said that as a matter of order that could not be discussed now, as a motion had been made to reduce a subsequent item.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he thought the hon. the Premier was wrong. His motion was to reduce the whole vote and not any particular item. He thought the hon. member for Mackay was quite entitled to ask a question upon any item in the list. The hon. the Premier evidently wished to prevent discussion upon the item of the catalogue. No particular item had been reduced, and he had moved a reduction upon the whole sum. He maintained that a discussion could arise upon any item in the list.

The PREMIER said the first question was to omit the item of £1,000; there was no doubt about that. Then the rule was clear:—

“After a question for omitting or reducing any item has been disposed of, no motion shall be made or debate allowed upon any preceding item.”

He did not care what motion the hon. member had made afterwards; his first motion was to omit the item of £1,000; therefore every subsequent motion must be taken to be with regard to that, otherwise it was out of order.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: My vote was to reduce the lump sum by £1,000.

The PREMIER: No, no!

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: I say it was. The first motion you put, Mr. Fraser, was that the sum of £3,632 be granted to Her Majesty for contingencies and salaries, Botanic Gardens. It was then moved to reduce that by £1,000.

The PREMIER: You proposed to omit the item.

Mr. BEATTIE said his opinion was that the hon. member for Blackall moved that the item of £1,000 be omitted.

The CHAIRMAN said that, according to the memorandum he took at the time, the first motion was to reduce the vote by the sum of £1,000, the last item in the vote; and then he put the question “that the item be omitted, and that there be granted to Her Majesty only £2,632.”

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said that the subsequent votes had not been put in the same way. What he had just moved was that the sum of £3,632 be reduced by £997; the motion previous to that was that it be reduced by £998; and the one previous to that, that it be reduced by £99.

The CHAIRMAN said the hon. member was perfectly right in the subsequent amendments he had made, and they were put as they had been moved; but the first motion was moved precisely as the hon. the Premier had stated, consequently no item previous to that could be discussed.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: Does the rule say “discussed” or “attempted to be reduced”?

The CHAIRMAN: It may not be discussed.

Mr. LISSNER said life was too short for any more divisions. As a Northern member he was satisfied to give it up, and he hoped other members would do the same. Life was not long enough for it, and he was not going to vote any more.

Question — That a sum of £2,635 only be granted—put, and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 5.

Messrs. Macrossan, Black, Stevenson, Jessop, and Norton.

NOES, 20.

Messrs. Miles, Rutledge, Sheridan, Dutton, Dickson, Griffith, Smyth, Macfarlane, Salkeld, Buckland, Beattie, Bailey, Foxton, Grimes, Foote, White, Mellor, Isambert, Jordan, and Macdonald-Paterson.

Question resolved in the negative.

Mr. BLACK said he regretted that the ruling had been such that they could not have any further discussion on those preliminary amounts, some of which he thought might very well be reduced. However, he begged now to move that the sum be reduced by £996.

Question put.

Mr. BLACK said that the vote in the Estimates for one solid sum of £1,000 for extra labour was a very big one. He intended to have asked the Minister for Lands how he was going to spend that £1,000; whether it was to be left to the trustees to spend it, or to the head gardener, or to the overseer, or to the propagator, and how the money was going to be spent? As it seemed impossible to get the vote excised altogether—which he should have liked—he thought they should have full information as to what was going to be done with the £1,000?

Mr. JESSOP said that something had been said about North and South, but he would suggest, that a very good way of deciding the matter would be for the Minister for Lands to withdraw the £1,000 in dispute altogether.

Mr. GRIMES asked whether it was the intention of the Minister for Lands to employ Germans at 3s. 9d. a week with that £1,000?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said he did not know what men were employed, but he was certain that their wages were very much in excess of 3s. 9d. per week. He thought the labourers got £96 a year.

Mr. STEVENSON said he hoped the Minister for Lands—he did not know whether there was a hint that he should do so—but he hoped the Minister for Lands would not support any such suggestion. At any rate he should give the men the wages which the hon. member for Oxley himself offered—namely, 7s. a week.

Mr. SMYTH said he begged to contradict the hon. member for Normanby. He had seen the hon. member for Oxley offer a new chum 15s. a week at the immigration yard, and the man indignantly refused it.

Mr. STEVENSON said that surely it was no answer to his statement that the hon. member for Oxley had offered a man 7s. a week to say that he had offered another man 15s. a week.

Mr. SMYTH: It might have been a black man.

Mr. STEVENSON: No, it was not; it was a white man.

Mr. BLACK said he did not know what course the debate was taking; but they seemed to be getting into quite a side issue. He could not understand what the question of German labour at 3s. 9d. a week referred to. Was there a scheme on foot for finding labour for the unemployed in Brisbane at that rate of pay? He should be glad if the Minister would give them some information on the subject. He wished to know how the £1,000 was going to be spent, and if the hon. gentleman would give them a dissertation on the labour market at the same time; the Committee would be glad to hear it.

Mr. BEATTIE said the answer to that question was given early in the evening. He understood the Minister for Lands to say that £300 would be spent on the formation of asphalt footpaths, and the remainder on putting the so-called waste land into something like form.

Mr. STEVENSON said he noticed that last year £400 was voted for a stone wall for the railing of Queen's Park. Was any of that money to be spent for the same purpose?

The CHAIRMAN said that, as there was nothing in the Estimates for the present year for that purpose, the question was out of order.

Mr. SMYTH: What stone wall does the hon. member refer to? Is it the "stone wall" he is raising at the present time?

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said the Chairman ought also to have objected to the question of the hon. member for Oxley when he displayed such a want of manliness in traducing the German race during the absence of the German members. That hon. member had the audacity to ask the Minister for Lands if he was going to employ Germans at 3s. 9d. a week—implying that they were only worth that amount, and suggesting that by that means the Minister for Lands might make the vote go further than he could by employing his own countrymen. If the hon. member for Kennedy (Mr. Lissner) had been present he would have been down upon the hon. member for Oxley like Bismarck upon France. Germans were worth as much as any other white men as labourers, and if they were employed in the gardens they should be employed, not at 3s. 9d. a week, but at £96 a year, the same as the other labourers there were receiving. He entered his protest against any such idea as Germans being employed at 3s. 9d. a week.

The PREMIER: That is too thin.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said the hon. member for Mackay had asked a question as to how the money was to be spent; but no answer, it seemed, was intended to be given.

The PREMIER: It has been answered a dozen times.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he had not heard it once. It might be only a coincidence—one of those "undesigned coincidences" of which a late member of that House, the Hon. John Douglas, used to speak so often—but it seemed strange that the sum wanted was exactly £1,000. Was it that the hon. member for Maryborough—the fifth wheel of the Ministerial coach—was jealous because his colleagues had the expenditure of £1,000 as salary, and that he had induced the Minister for Lands to put a similar sum on the Estimates so that he also might have the distinguished privilege of spending £1,000, even though he did not spend it upon himself, but only upon the public gardens? By doing so he would be bleeding the country to the extent of £1,000, which would put him on the same footing as his colleagues.

Mr. MACDONALD-PATERSON: That is where the harmony comes in.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: Exactly. Then the hon. member for Maryborough would make himself useful, and the gardens ornamental. It might be as well if they came to a division again; and as the Minister for Works had rheumatic gout, it would do him good to walk across the Chamber.

Question—That £2,636 only be granted—put, and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 7.

Sir T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Macrossan, Clubb, Black, Stevenson, Jessop, and Norton.

NOES, 18.

Messrs. Rutledge, Miles, Sheridan, Dutton, Dickson, Macdonald-Paterson, Griffith, Smyth, Bailey, Beattie, Grimes, Foxton, Jordan, Foote, Isambert, Buckland, Macfarlane, and Salkeld.

Question resolved in the negative.

Mr. STEVENSON said he was glad to see that his side was getting a little encouragement to go on. A great change had taken place, and the majority on the Government side was dwindling away while the other side had had accessions to their numbers. He would now move that the vote be reduced by £995.

Question—That £2,635 only be granted—put, and the Committee divided :—

AYES, 5.

Sir T. Mellwraith, Messrs. Macrossan, Black, Jessop, and Stevenson.

NOES, 21.

Messrs. Rutledge, Dickson, Dutton, Sheridan, Miles, Smyth, Buckland, Isambert, Foote, Grimes, Macfarlane, Foxton, Jordan, Mellor, Griffith, Kellett, Beattie, White, Macdonald-Paterson, Salkeld, and Bailey.

Question resolved in the negative.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN moved that the vote be reduced by £994.

Mr. BLACK said he would like to know from the Minister for Lands how the £1,000 was going to be spent. They had been told that £300 was to be devoted to asphaltting footpaths; but what about the other £700.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said that the hon. member knew that he had already given the information. If he again repeated it he hoped hon. members opposite would allow the vote to go on. He certainly would not repeat it if it was to keep that sort of thing going.

Mr. STEVENSON: Does the hon. gentleman refuse the information?

Mr. BLACK said he did not think the hon. gentleman had given a satisfactory reply, and he did not intend to go on until he got the information. The hon. gentleman said an explanation had been given, but he (Mr. Black) had not heard it. All he had heard was that £300 was to be spent in asphaltting the paths; but the bulk of the vote was to be left entirely in the hands of the trustees to expend. He had asked already whether it was the trustees or the head gardener who were to have control of the vote; but he had not been answered. Under the circumstances he should go on dividing the Committee until he got a reply.

The PREMIER said he had ejaculated two or three times that the information had been given a dozen times; it was given about 5 o'clock that evening at length. The present condition of part of the gardens was very unsatisfactory; and the men on the ordinary staff were entirely employed in keeping in order the part already cultivated. It was proposed to spend a large sum to put the whole place in proper condition. That had been explained over and over again. The expenditure of the money would be entrusted to the gentlemen who had undertaken to manage the gardens.

Question—That the sum of £2,638 be granted as salaries and contingencies for Botanic Gardens—put, and the Committee divided :—

AYES, 5.

Sir T. Mellwraith, Messrs. Black, Jessop, Macrossan, and Stevenson.

NOES, 20.

Messrs. Bailey, Rutledge, Jordan, Foote, Kellett, Dutton, Sheridan, Smyth, Miles, Dickson, Buckland, Macfarlane, Mellor, Grimes, Foxton, Griffith, Stevens, Macdonald-Paterson, Salkeld, and Rutledge.

Question resolved in the negative.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN moved that the amount be reduced by the sum of £993.

Question—That £2,639 only be granted—put, and the Committee divided :—

AYES, 5.

Sir T. Mellwraith, Messrs. Macrossan, Stevenson, Black, and Jessop.

NOES, 19.

Messrs. Bailey, Rutledge, Dutton, Miles, Sheridan, Smyth, Dickson, Grimes, Macfarlane, Griffith, Mellor, Jordan, Isambert, Foote, Buckland, Stevens, Salkeld, Foxton, and Macdonald-Paterson.

Question resolved in the negative.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said that hon. gentlemen had been called upon to divide four times, and he thought it was time now to come to serious work.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he was sorry that the "Hear, hear" of the hon. member sounded so angry. One bad temper generally beget another, and it was much better that the whole Committee should keep its temper. They had been opposing the votes since tea-time, and had devoted three hours of legislative labour to it. Some hon. gentlemen had tried to make it appear in the little interludes of debate between the divisions that it was a question between North and South. The Premier himself had tried to import that into it once or twice, but he thought it was evident to everyone that the hon. gentleman's attempt was too laboured, and so it failed. There was no intention shown by his side of the Committee to bring in the spirit of antagonism which had existed, and which still existed to a very large extent between the North and South; it had been a question of Brisbane against the whole colony, and he hoped hon. members for country districts would understand that thoroughly. The question he had raised was that the reserves and gardens in Brisbane were receiving £1,732 more than all the reserves and gardens outside Brisbane all over the colony were receiving. They did not compare Brisbane with Townsville or Rockhampton, or any other part of the colony; they simply objected to Brisbane receiving such a disproportionate share of the vote, as against the rest of the colony which contributed towards the revenue from which the money for the vote was derived. The only question of North and South had been raised by the Minister for Lands himself, and raised in a manner which certainly did not reflect much credit upon him. The previous night, while the vote for reserves was under discussion, the hon. member for Kennedy called attention to the fact that there was no money on the estimate for a reserve at Charters Towers. The Minister for Lands, under pressure from both sides of the Committee—especially knowing that his colleague, the Attorney-General, was also a member for Kennedy—consented to place a sum on the Supplementary Estimates for Charters Towers. The hon. member kept from the Committee what only came out in answer to a question by himself (Hon. J. M. Macrossan) the action he had previously taken with the people of Herberton. That was how the question of North and South arose. The previous night the hon. member had promised unconditionally a sum for Charters Towers, while two weeks before he had refused a sum to Herberton unless they subscribed £1 for £1. It was not the question of North and South they had raised, but of Brisbane against the whole colony. They were now satisfied. They had drawn the attention of the people of the colony to the anomalous vote which gave such a disproportionate share of the revenue to the city of Brisbane as against the whole colony. They had no intention of obstructing the item. They knew very well that the minority in a representative Assembly must always give way; but that minority had its rights as well as the majority, and it was entitled to assert those rights at the time it thought best and most opportune. In doing so, he believed they had done their duty to the whole country, and he was sure that no such vote as that would appear again on the Estimates. No Ministry, whether the present or a future one, would ever again bring forward a vote showing such a disproportionate amount as £1,700 more for Brisbane than for the whole of the rest of the colony.



The PREMIER said he agreed with the hon. gentleman that they had attained their object. They had obstructed the public business for the whole evening.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said the hon. gentleman would not attain his object by saying that they had obstructed public business for the whole evening. The obstruction was only an incident in calling the attention of the people of the colony to the vote. Public business had been obstructed by them in doing their duty to the country.

The PREMIER: That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. BLACK said he did not understand what the Premier meant by saying they had gained their object in wasting the whole evening. He did not believe any object was gained at all as far as waste of time was concerned.

The PREMIER: You succeeded in wasting it.

Mr. BLACK said he considered they had vindicated a principle. He went farther than the hon. member for Townsville, who had said he thought such a vote was not likely to appear on the Estimates again. He hoped that such a majority as the Government had had at their back the whole evening would never be found again supporting a Brisbane vote against the interests of the whole colony without being able to bring forward any sound arguments in favour of it.

Question—That the sum of £3,632 be granted—put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS moved that the sum of £50,708 be granted for the Survey of Land. There was an increase of £7,900—two increases to two first-class draftsmen of £25 each; three new draftsmen at £250 each; an additional sum of £7,000 for fees to licensed surveyors; and an additional £100 for instruments, postage, and incidental expenses. The large increase of £7,000 for surveyors' fees was necessary to keep pace with the work. Arrears of survey had accumulated, and it was only by increasing the number of surveyors that those arrears could be cleared off. There was an increase in the vote for instruments, caused by the additional surveyors who had been employed.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that of course the legislation connected with the land, so far as that House was concerned, would make a very material difference on the vote for the future. Since the Land Bill had passed that House, had the Minister for Lands taken any steps to increase the staff of surveyors? They had passed a Land Bill by which the whole of the lands of the colony should be surveyed before selection. Of course, every day was a matter of consideration, and, therefore, he asked what arrangements the Minister for Lands had made, and what information had he to show them that the conclusions which he had come to were correct?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said it would be quite time enough to make arrangements to meet the case when the necessity arose. At present they had only to deal with the present Act. The increases were put on to meet the arrears of work under the present system.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he quite understood that the Estimates had been made for the present state of things. But there had been changes since then. Was he to understand that the Minister for Lands had made no arrangements, nor had anticipated making any arrangements to meet the requirements of the Bill that had passed that House at all events? Had he taken no step to find whether it was feasible to get the number of surveyors necessary to

survey the land that was to be opened for selection, and to meet the demands for selection during the next two or three years?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said he had little doubt that an adequate number of surveyors could be got when the necessity arose for the survey of the land opened for selection under the new Land Act. It was only a question of money. Even the present staff could do a very great deal of work if they were concentrated on certain points, instead of being employed on small pieces of land here and there all over the colony.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that the radical change that had been made by the Bill must have induced the Minister for Lands to make inquiry as to the feasibility of making survey before selection. Was he (Sir T. McIlwraith) to understand that he had made that inquiry, and that he was quite satisfied if the Land Bill passed, as it had passed that House, that he would be able to put the survey staff in such a condition as would readily meet the requirements of the colony?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said he hoped that they would be able to meet the requirements of the colony. He did not think there would be any serious difficulty, but he had made no special arrangements in anticipation.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that of course he did not refer to any permanent arrangements, because the Minister for Lands had no authority to make such arrangements. But was he to understand that the matter had been the subject of serious consideration, and that after consideration the Minister for Lands had found that the proposal of survey before selection—which he had accepted—was feasible, and that he would be able, without any pressure, easily to satisfy the requirements of the colony so far as surveys were concerned?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said he had naturally satisfied himself before he had accepted the amendment as to survey before selection. He believed they would be able to carry out the system of survey before selection. Had he not been satisfied on that point he would not have accepted the amendment in committee. Some pressure, there was not the slightest doubt, would be felt at first. That was inevitable; but the difficulties would be overcome after a time. It was only a question of appointing additional surveyors.

Question put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS moved that there be voted, for the service of the year 1884-5, a sum not exceeding £4,000 to defray expense of the Trigonometrical Survey.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that the vote was a very important one, and he was rather surprised that it was not increased. What was the work that had been done under the vote before, and what was the position of the trigonometrical survey now, and how did they mean to extend it? It was a vote which must go on increasing in a geometrical ratio.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said it was impossible for him to explain the character of the work done. He could only tell what the expenditure had been. He believed that the base line had been laid down, and the survey marked out as far as the head of the Burnett River. The expenditure had been, in 1882-3, £174 18s. 8d., last year £2,510 0s. 5d., and in the present year £936 8s. 10d., making £3,621 7s. 11d. altogether. The amount to the credit of the vote had been allowed to lapse to the extent of £5,315 0s. 11d. £4,000 would be sufficient to meet the requirements of the survey during the present year.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH asked if only £300 had been spent last year?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said that £900 had been spent from 20th July during the present year, to 20th of last month. The sum spent last year was £2,510.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said that there had formerly been a reason why the vote for the trigonometrical survey had been put down in the Estimates in round numbers. There was no reason now for that, because the Government had had sufficient time to mature their arrangements. But he could not discover from the papers what were their intended operations. What had the Minister for Lands to say on that important matter now? The sum of £4,000 was an indefinite amount put down in order that the House might affirm their belief that a trigonometrical survey should take place. It was strange to find the same indefinite amount again on the Estimates. The arrangement ought by this time to be matured, but all they knew was that a base line had been measured.

The PREMIER said he understood that a base-line, seven miles in length, had been measured on the Darling Downs with the greatest accuracy—within a possible error of something less than two inches at the outside. Two officers were specially employed, one of whom had had very large experience in work of that kind. Not much work would be done during the hottest months of the year. The reason why no further progress had been made was that the instruments did not arrive from England until quite recently.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said he knew from the report that the base-line had been laid down, but what he wanted to know was whether the survey had been actually commenced?

The PREMIER: It has.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said it seemed, from the indefinite sum asked for, that the Government had not made up their minds what they were going to do. The staff ought to have been organised by that time. There was a reason for putting down an indefinite sum like £4,000 when the late Government initiated the work. Now, he wanted to know what the present Government meant to do. The vote asked for was merely a vote for the Surveyor-General to do what he liked with. The work was one of the most important that had been brought before them, and yet they had not the slightest information as to how it was being proceeded with. The vote would require very close scrutiny when it was brought forward again, for in its present form it was as if they were asked to vote a lump sum of £100,000 for the Southern and Western Railway without the slightest details being given. What arrangement had been made between this Government and that of South Australia? Who was conducting the survey, and what progress had been made?

The PREMIER replied that the survey was being conducted by the officers of the South Australian Government, the work to be checked by Queensland as soon as they got telegraphic communication, which would not be very long now. All they had to do was to determine the north place and south line, in which there was not likely to be any error; and if too far to the east or to the west, that could be checked.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH asked what arrangements had been made with the South Australian Government as to the expense of the work?

The PREMIER replied that Queensland was to pay one-half the expense. The instruments

to be used from Boulia, the nearest telegraph station, had not yet arrived, but they would be here in two months, when an officer would be at once sent out to check the survey.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH asked what were the obligations between the two Governments? Was their decision as to the boundary line between the two colonies to be accepted as final? And was the cost of checking to be borne by Queensland, or to be shared with South Australia?

The PREMIER replied that they were not bound to accept the line laid down unless they found it accurate. One of the reasons why one of their own officers had not been sent to join the South Australian party was that they had not the proper instruments to send with him. The expense of checking from Boulia was estimated to cost between £300 and £400, which this Government—he did not know why—had stipulated to pay.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH asked how the compromise had been arrived at with regard to fixing the meridian? They had always contended that it should be fixed by Queensland on account of their further telegraphic communication. Had it been done by telegraph?

The PREMIER: No; by observation on the ground.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH asked if there was any arrangement about fixing permanent marks? Were the permanent boundaries to be fixed in the meantime?

The PREMIER said he was informed that the starting point—the southern extremity on the 138th meridian—was fixed in this way:—A point on the border of South Australia and Victoria had been ascertained by means of the electric telegraph. From there a line had been actually measured along the border between South Australia and New South Wales right up to the corner in the southern boundary of Queensland. From that it had been chained to the 138th parallel, and that was how the starting point was arrived at.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said the hon. member said the points were fixed by observation. Were they checked by any observations taken on the northern shores, or any intermediate point?

The PREMIER said there was no means of checking the points except by astronomical observation. There was no other possible means until they could measure from Boulia when the chronographs came to hand. The boundary was being marked at convenient intervals by iron bars.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH asked how far the surveyors had got from the south-west corner, and if the Government were advised periodically of the progress being made. Were the boundaries being fixed as they went along, and to what point had they got up to the present time? Had they got up to the boundaries that property holders in New South Wales and Queensland were disputing?

The PREMIER said the surveyors had not got further than sixty or seventy miles from the border. He understood that they were considerably obstructed by the weather. It was not so long ago that the arrangement was completed—not more than eight or nine months ago at the outside.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH asked if any amount had been specified for which the work was guaranteed to be done? Why had the correspondence on the subject not been laid on the table of the House? If it had been he would not have had to ask so many questions.

The PREMIER said no fixed amount had been mentioned, because it was difficult to ascertain the expense. He regretted that the papers had not been laid on the table of the House; they should have been.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: The latest information to hand was that sixty miles from the border was the furthest distance reached.

The PREMIER: Yes. That was not very recent information; but it was the latest.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: How far back is that information?

The PREMIER: About two or three months ago.

Question put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS moved that £9,626 be granted for Pastoral Occupation, salaries and contingencies. There was only one increase of £25 under that head to the draftsman.

Mr. NORTON said there was an increase in the item of Commissioners.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said the commissioner at Blackall had been transferred.

Mr. STEVENSON said he wanted to get some information from the Minister for Lands before the vote passed. Some time ago he called for a return showing "the names of the licensees or lessees in the unsettled districts who have been asked to show cause why their runs should not be forfeited on account of non or insufficient stocking, or who have got notice of forfeiture on account of non or insufficient stocking; also the names of such licensees or lessees whose runs have been reinstated, or who have got promises that such runs will be reinstated; also all correspondence in connection with the foregoing." Well, that return had taken a long time to make up, and, now that it was laid on the table he was sorry to say it was very imperfect, and did not really give the information in the way that it was asked for, and ought to have been given. He had the schedules, but the papers were at the Printing Office. He had asked the Minister for Lands to get the return before that estimate passed, because a discussion would arise on it. The schedules simply showed the runs that were insufficiently stocked or unstocked, and there were crosses here and there to show the runs that had been reinstated. What kind of information was that to give the House? The person who made up the return ought to have gone through it and made a list of the runs that had been reinstated, instead of making crosses. The information that was wanted was not there in a way that it could be acted upon. About one-half the runs appeared to have been reinstated, and yet they were put down as insufficiently stocked or unstocked. He would like to know on what principle the Minister for Lands had acted in reinstating runs of which he had given notice of forfeiture.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said that no runs had been reinstated except in cases where the lessees had given very good reasons and supplied ample evidence that it was impossible to get their stock out there in time, and who had really asked for an extension of time, which he had the power to grant if he thought there was sufficient reason.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that the papers had not yet been printed. Were they to understand that those papers would show the reasons on which the Minister for Lands acted in reinstating some of the runs and declining to reinstate others?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: All the correspondence on the matter is given.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said the hon. gentleman stated that he had sufficient reasons for reinstating certain runs. Was that information, or those reasons, given in the papers?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said he thought so, in nearly every instance. In some instances the lessees waited on him personally and described their cases; but in most instances it had been done by letter.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH asked if, where it had been done personally, any notice was taken of that in the papers? Did the papers show the reasons that induced the Minister for Lands to decide in favour of certain parties?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said that the papers would supply all the information under that head in almost every instance.

Mr. STEVENSON asked if the hon. gentleman would tell them what guided him, in the first instance, in giving notice of forfeiture?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said his information was derived from different sources; but there was one source upon which he relied to a great extent, and that was the returns under the Brands Act. Where the returns sent in were manifestly at variance with the area held by the lessees, they were given notice of forfeiture. In some instances it was shown that the returns were not correct; and in other cases evidence was given that the runs had been sufficiently stocked, but that it had been necessary to remove the stock owing to the drought or other causes.

Mr. STEVENSON said he noticed that in the Burke, Cook, and other districts a great many of the lessees got notice of forfeiture. Could the hon. gentleman say what proportion of those runs, after making inquiries, he found to be stocked?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said he did not think he had attempted to ascertain that. There were a good many of them certainly not stocked as required by the Act, even by the admission of the lessees themselves. In many cases there had been great losses through the blacks; that was in the newer country.

Mr. STEVENSON asked if the hon. gentleman could say how many runs he had reinstated?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said he could not.

Mr. STEVENSON said he knew a great many had been reinstated, and he knew also that the hon. gentleman found that a very large proportion of the runs in which notices were given had been fully stocked from the beginning. A great many of the lessees went to considerable expense, and had a great deal of trouble over the notices that were given. He would like to know whether the hon. gentleman was prepared to reimburse those lessees the expense they were put to?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said he did not know one single case in which the lessee did not deserve what he got, inasmuch as they did not make returns under the Brands Act. The brands inspector in those districts ought to have compelled them to do so, but there had been a good deal of laxity in the matter, and the Chief Inspector did not seem to have control over the brands inspectors. In some cases returns had not been made for years. As to the runs that were sufficiently stocked, the lessees need never have feared that they would be disturbed in any way. They knew the reason why notice of forfeiture was given.

Mr. STEVENSON said the Minister for Lands went by the returns that were sent to the Brands Inspector. The hon. gentleman gave them to understand some time ago, when speaking on the second reading of the Land Bill, that it would save a great deal of perjury in regard to those runs where the owners and managers had been in the habit of perjuring themselves to acquire a title. If the hon. gentleman thought that squatters were a class who indulged in that kind of thing so much, and went fussing about in the Brands Office to see the number of stock of each lessee—and that was what he had gone upon, and the lessees knew that that was what he had gone upon in putting them to a very large expense—he did not think there would be very much trouble, in future, in getting over that difficulty; because, if they were such a class he should fancy that they would take very good care that the Brands Inspector was kept well posted up by returns sent in, showing stock quite enough to hold the run so far as stock were concerned. The Minister for Lands showed very little discretion, indeed, especially in a season like the past, in putting lessees to so much trouble, and expense, and worry. He had not much information to go upon, and in a great many cases he found the country had been fully stocked; and after having had to move their sheep and cattle from their runs, the squatters would not even stretch their consciences, and hesitated to send in returns to the Brands Inspector, because the stock were not actually on the runs; and for that they received notice of forfeiture, and had to employ agents and sometimes lawyers, at a great expense, to look after their interests. It was very hard that those lessees should have been punished. In most cases the runs had been found fully stocked, unless in cases where they could not possibly be so, on account of the season. He was inclined to think that in some cases the Minister had reinstated runs without any attempt at re-stocking having been made. He wished to know whether, in any cases where the lessee of a run had gone to the Treasury and tendered his cheque for the rent of his run, he had been told that it would be accepted conditionally, and when he said he would either pay without conditions, or not at all, it had been accepted?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said that no case of that kind had come under his notice. Perhaps the Colonial Treasurer would know something about it.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said that no rent on account of runs which were held in suspension by the Minister had been received at the Treasury, except on a printed receipt bearing a special memorandum on the back, stating that it was received pending inquiry at the Lands Department. No instance had come under his knowledge of any lessee insisting upon either getting a clean receipt, or refusing to pay. In any cases of uncertainty the Lands Department was consulted, and any receipt issued free from that proviso would only be issued upon the Lands Department stating that the run had been reinstated.

Mr. STEVENSON said he could not go thoroughly into the matter with the information that was given in that printed form. He would have liked to have done so, because he believed that a great injury had been done to a great many lessees, and there was not much country left in Queensland to take up. If the action that had been taken by the Minister for Lands with regard to those runs had been taken ten or fifteen years ago, a check would have been given to settlement that would have kept it back for at least ten years. The Minister for Lands ought to have been the last one to carry out the letter of the

law. He knew that pioneers in new country had always been encouraged to open up the country and settle it, and had never been interfered with if they showed a desire to take up country in a legitimate way. The hon. gentleman knew that, in the old days, his partners used to take up land that they did not stock to the letter of the law any more than anyone else, and no land commissioner or Minister ever interfered with them on that account so long as they showed a desire to take up the country in a legitimate way. A great many of such men had been harassed without any rhyme or reason whatever; and, taking it all round, thousands of pounds had come out of the pockets of those struggling squatters in the very season when everything ought to have been done to encourage them.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said it was a pity that that return had not been put in such a form that hon. members could have understood it; because it was a comment upon very important Ministerial action. The matter of the return was of course, well understood by hon. members; the Minister for Lands had given wholesale notice of forfeiture to those runholders of the colony whom he found, on a study of the Brands Inspectors' returns, did not sufficiently stock their holdings. A return was asked for, showing the cases in which notice had been given, and also the cases in which they had been reinstated on a promise that they would be fully stocked. The return had been given in most elaborate form, and was very unwieldy to handle, showing all those to whom notice had been given of forfeiture, and there was simply a note to say that the runs marked with a red cross had been reinstated, and the rents of others had been received provisionally. He would like to know from the Minister for Lands what had been the practical result of the action taken by him? Had it been found out that some men actually had been holding their runs in contravention of the law, so that forfeiture had taken place; and what was the proportion of such cases? What proportion had been reinstated, and generally for what causes? The hon. gentleman having conducted the whole of the business himself would be in a position to tell them what had been the result of his own action.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said he could not state exactly the proportion of those who had been reinstated. Some were in abeyance as there was no proof of their having stocked in accordance with the requirements of the law; others had failed from causes which deserved consideration, but had not yet made application for the extension of time which the Minister was empowered to grant. Some of the cases in abeyance were difficult to deal with in view of the seasons they had had. There were some cases where the lessees had not stocked.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: Are those a large proportion of the cases?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I think not.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: How many?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I cannot say now.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: Surely the hon. member can give us some idea of the number of runs in abeyance, upon which he has not been able to decide?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said he would like to speak with some accuracy in the matter. He had no distinct recollection of the number, and it would be very unsatisfactory to make a guess at it. He would prepare the information and let the hon. member know exactly what the numbers were.

Mr. STEVENSON said that was exactly the reason why he called for the return; he wanted to get it before the vote came on. The Minister was as ignorant about it as he was about the previous vote.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Get the information out of the papers yourself, then.

Mr. STEVENSON said he would have the information from the Minister if he would not put the return on the table, as it was wanted. It should have been in the form in which he had called for it; and then the number of runs that had been reinstated would have been stated, and added up. To get any information at all he had had to wait while a boy was sent to the Printing Office for the papers, and after fussing through them for half-an-hour, he was told by the Minister in a most impertinent manner to look through the papers and find out the information for himself. That was a little too much. The Minister for Lands had received every consideration. The Premier had taken charge of everything he had to do in the House; and now, at that time of the night, when hon. members showed a willingness to discuss a vote fairly, he spoke to them in the most impertinent manner. The return had been called for months ago, and the Minister for Lands might have had it in such a shape that they could have got the information without hunting at all. He knew that a large proportion of the runs had been reinstated; and he knew that a great deal of hardship had taken place in regard to the matter. He had already mentioned a case where the father of a family had given several sons £20,000, or £30,000, to settle in Queensland with, and had come up from Melbourne to Brisbane for a week or ten days over the matter. He had had to employ agents the whole time, and was put to a great deal of trouble. He actually proved where he bought the cattle, and though some of them were lost on the way up, he was the sufferer by that. That gentleman, Mr. Watson, after showing every desire to stock his runs and settle his sons in Queensland, got a notice of forfeiture, and he was so disgusted that he said that if he had the leases there and then he would have sold them for half the money he had spent in the colony, and have taken his sons away. Was that any encouragement to people to settle in the colony? The Minister for Lands was very much to blame in the matter. The hon. member had been months in his office, but he did not know anything about it at all. He could not give them any information.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said he maintained that the return was in strict accordance with the hon. member's motion. The hon. member said the papers were not in the form he wanted them; but they were in the way he asked for them.

Mr. STEVENSON: They are not.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS asked in what particular they failed to be in accordance with the hon. member's motion?

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he did not think the hon. gentleman was behaving fairly. On the 18th of September the hon. member for Normanby asked for—

"A return showing the names of the licensees or lessees in the unsettled districts who have been asked to show cause why their runs should not be forfeited on account of non or insufficient stocking, or who have got notice of forfeiture on account of non or insufficient stocking; also the names of such licensees or lessees whose runs have been reinstated, or who have got promises that such runs will be reinstated; also all correspondence in connection with the foregoing."

The latter part of the information had not been given at all. There was simply a note at the 1884—5 K

end of the return that certain runs marked with a red cross had been reinstated, and that for others not so marked the rents had been received provisionally. What he had asked the Minister for Lands was, seeing he had dealt with all the papers, whether he could not from his own knowledge give the House some idea of the number that had been reinstated, and the number still awaiting adjustment. The hon. member should have had that information long ago; it was ten weeks since the return was asked for. He was bound to give the information if he wanted the business of the Government gone on with. He had no business to tell any hon. member to hunt through a lot of unprinted papers, and get information for himself. If the hon. member had told him that he would—

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said the hon. member had just admitted that every run reinstated was marked with a red cross. Did not that indicate what had been done with them? The rents of those runs not marked had only been received provisionally. All the correspondence in connection with both classes of cases was in the papers. He did not see what more the hon. gentleman wanted, unless he wanted them arranged in such a way that they might have been readily looked through or comprehended.

Mr. MACDONALD-PATERSON asked if it was meant that after the lessee of the run received the notice referred to by previous speakers, and after consideration of the whole circumstances of the case, that he had another notice informing him that he could go on as before. Was that his reinstatement?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said that reinstatement meant that the lessee was put back into the position he had held before, as if he had complied with all the conditions of the law.

Mr. MACDONALD-PATERSON said he did not like the word "reinstatement." If a man never broke faith with the Government in his contract, why should he be told that he was reinstated?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said the lessee might have failed in some respects inasmuch as he had not explained to the Government that he had not stock on his ground on account of drought or some other mishap. There had been great laxity in the administration of the law on that point for a long time, and men made no appeal to the Government to protect them against the effects of the law being carried out in a stringent manner. He thought those cases were deserving of consideration under the circumstances, because it had been taken for granted that as long as they paid their rents no questions would be asked as to their stocking.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that in asking the Minister for Lands the number of persons who had been reinstated, and the number of those whose cases were still under the consideration of the Government, he did not ask him to be so particular as to give them to a half per cent. But from having dealt with so many cases of that kind he was asked if he could give any notion of how the system had worked, and his answer was that he had given notice to the parties who had not fulfilled the conditions of their lease. Could the hon. gentleman not give any notion of the number of men who had really been reinstated; or in other words, had not the result been that, practically, the whole of them had been reinstated? Were there any cases of forfeiture? What proportion had been reinstated, and how many cases had been left for reinstatement—surely he must have that on his mind?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said he did not think he could say how many of those

gentlemen had been reinstated, and he could not say how many were left for consideration.

Mr. STEVENSON said the Minister for Lands had asked what he would have liked. He would have liked if he could have been able to take up the papers at once and have seen what runs had been reinstated and what had not. As the papers stood it would take some considerable time to get the information he wanted from them. That was the only time he could discuss the matter, which was very important and ought to be discussed. He believed a great injury had been done to a great many men; it had caused expense and had checked settlement. He also considered that some of the men who had received the notice had been actually accused of getting their runs by fraud.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No.

Mr. STEVENSON said the hon. gentleman knew that they were, and he (Mr. Stevenson) had got the papers to prove it. He knew it was said that many people had taken up watered runs without any stocking at a very low rate per square mile; that a great many blocks of frontage of the Thomson River had been taken up as unwatered country, and not stocked at all. The Minister for Lands had better take care of what he did, for many people had felt that bitterly. He (Mr. Stevenson) might mention one name. Mr. Watson had said that he felt that accusation even more keenly than the threat that his run would be taken away from him. Some people had consciences, and did not like to be accused of having acquired their runs by fraud. It was too late an hour to discuss this matter properly; and the Minister should postpone the vote and bring it up at another sitting of the Committee.

The PREMIER said that the hon. member would find the whole information in the papers before him. Why did he not get the papers a little sooner and study them, and not want the House to adjourn because he was too busy or idle to do his work?

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said it was ten weeks since the information was asked for, and they had not got it even now. He wanted to see the printed papers before him that night. He complained of the stubborn way in which the Minister for Lands had refused to give the Committee information—he having it all the time in his head—at any rate a man who was fit for the position he occupied ought to have it in his head.

Mr. STEVENSON said that before he left the House to attend to private business some time ago he had asked the Minister for Lands whether the papers were being prepared and would be ready to be laid on the table of the House. He must have known that he (Mr. Stevenson) wanted to get hold of them and to have the matter fully prepared for discussion. But it was only that afternoon that the papers had gone to the printers, and he did not know that they had been laid on the table until he made inquiry. He thought that at that late hour they had better postpone the matter.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: When will these documents be printed?

The PREMIER replied that they would be ready in a day or two. He had not seen the returns himself, but he ventured to say that in ten minutes he would be prepared to answer every question the hon. member had asked.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said the Premier had just passed the greatest condemnation possible upon his colleague, who had said that he could not give the information asked for.

The PREMIER said the questions put to his hon. colleague had reference to proportions and percentages; he had not been asked for any real information.

Mr. STEVENSON said the return was not properly prepared, as the Premier would see if he looked at it for a moment, and it would take a man an hour or two to get all the information he wanted out of it.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: When will the Supplementary Estimates for last year be laid on the table?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I hope to have them down on Friday or Tuesday next.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: Then we shall have another opportunity of returning to this question, and I hope the Minister for Lands will be able to give me more information on it than he appears to possess to-night.

Mr. JORDAN said the Minister for Lands had expressed his willingness to prepare a summary of the returns, and he hoped the hon. member for Normanby would be satisfied with that, so that they might get on with business.

Mr. STEVENSON said he was willing to allow business to go on, but it was in deference to what had been said by the leader of the Opposition, and not to the treatment he had received from the Minister for Lands. He had no wish to delay business, and would refer to the matter on a future occasion.

Question put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS moved that £1,550 be granted for Miscellaneous Services. There was an item of £50 for a German interpreter at the Beenleigh Land Office, making the total amount of the vote £1,600; but he did not propose to ask for that, as he was not satisfied that an officer of that kind would be wanted. The other new items were: £200 for the collection of indigenous timbers, and £500 for the destruction of Bathurst burr.

Mr. STEVENSON asked if the present German interpreter at Beenleigh was not to have his salary?

The PREMIER: It is on the Colonial Secretary's vote.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that was an extraordinary way of doing business. The Minister for Lands declined to ask for a man's salary because the man was not wanted, and then they found that he was already paid out of the Colonial Secretary's vote. He did not think they would throw Bismarck over. What about the collection of indigenous timbers—how was the money to be spent?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said the idea was to collect samples of the indigenous timbers of the colony for general information. Some years ago a collection of that nature was made, but it was not labelled, and no one knew in what condition it was now. The new collection would be stored in a shed to be built at the back of the Museum.

Mr. JESSOP said he saw £500 down for the destruction of Bathurst burr. Where was that going to be spent? If the Minister for Lands would come up on the Downs he would see that five times £500 would not be sufficient to eradicate the burr. A large quantity of Crown lands was overgrown with it, and he should like to hear the Minister for Lands say that he would put a larger sum on the Estimates next year. The destruction of burr had been a very sore point with the divisional boards, and he should like to see the matter taken in hand and dealt with. He would also like to know where the forest nursery was?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said the sum put down on the Estimates for the destruction of Bathurst burr was arrived at by the amount expended during the year 1883-4, and during the present year. £292 2s. 6d. had been expended in 1883-4, and £127 had been spent this year. With regard to the forest nursery: it was on Fraser's Island. The ranger who had charge of the timber reserve having little to do, employed his time in planting trees and looking after them. He had been surprised to hear from Mr. McDowall how many trees the ranger had planted.

Mr. NORTON said it was easy to plant trees; but looking after them was another thing. He had heard that out of 11,700 planted, 11,000 had been pulled up again. It was about time a report was obtained on the subject. He would like to ask the Minister for Lands if he knew anything of a large kind of burr which was growing about Ipswich and Brisbane. It was fast becoming as great a nuisance as the Bathurst burr, as it spread very rapidly. He had noticed some on an allotment near the Supreme Court, and had drawn the attention of Mr. Gordon, the Inspector of Sheep, to it. It was also to be found at Indooroopilly and Ipswich in large quantities; and Dr. Bancroft, who had examined it, pronounced the juice to be highly poisonous. It would be well to include that weed amongst the burrs to be destroyed.

Mr. BLACK said he would like some information in reference to the land at Geraldton, Mourilyan, which had lately been laid out as a township. The pioneer settlers at such places were as a rule allowed compensation for their improvements when the land was surveyed and cut up; but he had been given to understand that that had not been done at Geraldton, and he would like to know the reason?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said no distinction was made, and the usual rule was followed in the case mentioned by the hon. member. In one case, Mr. Swallow, a selector, had put up two iron skeleton sheds upon Government land, and he wanted the Government to buy them. They were of no possible use, and he was given the option of removing them from the land.

Mr. JESSOP said he wanted to know more about the Bathurst burr vote. The Minister for Lands had said £127 was expended last year. Where was it spent? He was sorry the members for Darling Downs were not present, for they could bear him out as to the extent to which the burr was spreading. He would suggest that power be given to Crown lands rangers to inspect those places where the burr was growing, and destroy it. That was really a matter which required consideration, as parts of the country were being completely ruined by the immense growth of burr. He did not know to what divisional boards the money had been given; but he knew that the board with which he was connected applied over and over again for assistance, and were unable to obtain it.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said there had been votes to the Jondaryan, Gowrie, and other boards. The Jondaryan Board had also put in a claim for £127 for the present year.

Mr. JESSOP said that he had no doubt, after that explanation, there would be a good many applications for a share in the vote.

Mr. NORTON said there was another matter he should like to ask the hon. gentleman about, and that was the case of Menzies v. Deshon. He spoke to the hon. gentleman about it some time ago, because he thought Mr. Menzies had rather a strong claim on the Government for delay caused before he was put in possession of his land.

The PREMIER: I think he got off very well.

Mr. NORTON said he did not know about that. At one time he thought Mr. Menzies was in the wrong, but after the decision was given he thought he was in the right. He had to go to law, and he was interfered with, and suffered considerable loss.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said he knew nothing at all about the matter. It was dealt with by the late Government, and if there was any blame they were responsible for it.

Mr. NORTON said he did not like that answer, because it was not in accordance with what the hon. gentleman said to him when he saw him in his office. He (Mr. Norton) quite admitted that it was the fault of the last Government, if there was any fault; but when he put the matter before the hon. gentleman some months ago the answer he gave was that he was not prepared to enter into the subject then—not because it had been dealt with by the last Government, but because he thought, the case having been taken into court, and Mr. Menzies having accepted the verdict, he forfeited what claim he might otherwise have had.

The PREMIER said that Mr. Menzies applied for a selection, and the late Government refused to give it to him. He had recourse to law, and he got the selection. He did not claim any damages. The delay in getting the selection was the fault of the then Minister for Lands, and it struck him (the Premier) that Mr. Menzies was in the same position as a man who had been delayed in getting a selection through the fault of the Survey Department in not surveying it. If they allowed claims for those delays, they would have plenty of them. He had heard of a case in which a delay of ten years took place in the survey of a selection.

Mr. JORDAN said he would like to know the system on which that £500 for the destruction of Bathurst burr was spent?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said that divisional boards had to send in applications and a copy of the contract for cutting burr. They also had to get the ranger or the land commissioner to see the way the work was done.

Mr. MELLOR said he would like to say a word about forest nurseries. While the Government were going to expend money in planting trees on Fraser's Island, which he thought was a capital thing for the future of the colony, there were innumerable places on the Mary River and other parts of the colony where there were thousands of young cedar-trees growing in large scrubs. The first crop of timber had been taken off; and if the Government were to proclaim reserves in those places, and get the Crown lands rangers to look after them, in a very short time the State would be possessed of very valuable cedar reserves.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said there was a good deal now spent in preserving timber and protecting timber reserves; and they would have to get a larger revenue from the timber before they could do what the hon. member wanted.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed, and the CHAIRMAN reported progress. The report was adopted, and the CHAIRMAN obtained leave to sit again to-morrow.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER moved that the House do now adjourn. They proposed to go on with the Estimates to-morrow.

Mr. JESSOP asked the Premier if the House would sit on Separation Day?

The PREMIER replied that it was not proposed, at present, to sit on Separation Day, and he did not think it would be convenient for hon. members to do so. If it were, the Government would be prepared to accede to their desire ; but they did not care to do so, unless it was the special wish of hon. members.

The House adjourned at two minutes past 12 o'clock.